



INTERNATIONAL DEPLOYMENT GROUP

GPO Box 401 Canberra City ACT 2601
Telephone 0261333676 Facsimile 0261333700
Email frank.prendergast@afp.gov.au
www.afp.gov.au
ABN 17 864 931 143

October 2009

Dr Timothy Kendall
Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs & Trade
Australian Senate
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Dr Kendall

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence & Trade Committee's Pacific Inquiry –
Additional Questions on Notice**

In your email of 8 September 2009, you sought answers to questions relating to the Pacific Regional Policing Initiative (PRPI) / Policing Partnerships (PPP) and more generally to Pacific policing capacity. The answers to your questions are attached.

Yours sincerely

Frank Prendergast
National Manager
International Deployment Group

Senate – Pacific Inquiry – Pacific Regional Policing Initiative (PRPI) / Pacific Partnerships (PPP) – Answers to Questions

What is the current status of the PRPI; has the PRPI been funded beyond the 2004–2008 period? In evidence provided to the committee, the AFP explained that the PRPI would be replaced by the Pacific Policing Partnerships (PPP) from January 2009 (*Submission 62*, p. 10). Has this occurred?

- PRPI ceased with effect 31 December 2008. From 1 January 2009, the Australian Federal Police assumed responsibility for ongoing police capacity building activities in the Pacific under a program known as the Pacific Police Development Program (PPDP).

Does the PPP have anything to do with the Pacific Partnerships for Development?

- The Pacific Police Development Program (PPDP) is implemented consistent with the principles underlying the Pacific Partnerships for Development. In Samoa, for example, where the law and justice sector was an initial priority area for Partnership for Development, the AFP program is involved in determining agreed targets and will then be actively supporting their achievement. The PPDP is being progressively incorporated into the agenda for bilateral meetings on the Partnership for Development process.

What is the relationship between the PPPD and the Bilateral Security Partnerships that were announced at the Fortieth Pacific Islands Forum meeting in Cairns (5–6 August 2009)?

- Effective domestic civilian policing and justice systems underlay internal stability and helps to protect against criminal threats. In this way, strengthening the effectiveness of Pacific police services is related to the new Security Partnerships. Priorities covered under the individual Security Partnerships will be determined through mutual agreement. As with the Partnership for Development process, the PPDP is being incorporated into the bilateral meeting process.

Where will the administrative and training support for the PPDP be located; how will it be resourced; how will it be staffed?

- Administrative and training support for the PPDP will be coordinated by a Canberra based team drawn from personnel within the International Deployment Group. Delivery of programs throughout the Pacific will be conducted by AFP personnel and, where necessary, specialist advisors from other government agencies or the private sector.

Will its focus on general policing duties, community policing training or investigations; will it focus on regional security issues such as terrorism and organised crime?

- PPDP is a bottom-up approach to policing with a focus on the community level through Regional and individual projects. The AFP Transnational Crime Network has a top-down focus on sophisticated and organised crime. It must be noted that the PPDP is a ‘policing development’ program and so covers the multiplicity of functions under police portfolios in the Pacific. AFP programs in the Pacific will collectively cover all of these issues with the PPDP strengthening bottom-up capacity development of policing agencies and reinforcing the International Network’s focus on organised crime.

How will the PPP operate in accordance with local sovereignty and jurisdictional considerations? For example, how would the problems that the AFP encountered in PNG, following the Wenge decision in 2005, be avoided to give legitimacy to the PPDP?

- The program does not involve officers taking on police executive powers in the Pacific, rather the AFP will provide police advisors and mentors. The program has been developed in close consultation with Pacific nations through an extensive conversation process which reflects the Talanoa concept used by Pacific Island peoples. The issues faced in PNG following the Wenge decision are not relevant to this program.

How will it interact with the Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police?

- The Program will liaise closely with the Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (PICP) through the PICP Secretariat. The PICP was briefed on the PPDP at the PICP meeting held in Port Moresby in August this year and has been briefed on two previous occasions.

Can the AFP please provide the Committee with indigenous police force numbers in Pacific Island Forum states?

The figures shown in the following table have been provided by Pacific Police Chiefs but should be regarded as estimates only.

Country	Population	Police
Cook Islands	15,600	150
Federated States of Micronesia (FSM)	111,000	300
Niue	1,200	15
Kiribati	98,900	300
Tonga	103,000	450
Republic of Marshall Islands (RMI)	54,000	165
Samoa	182,500	560
Palau	20.4	170
Tuvalu	10,000	80
Nauru	11,100	100
Solomon Islands	535,000	1024
Vanuatu	239,000	530
Papua New Guinea (PNG)	6,610,000	4,700
Totals	7,971,320	8,544

Can you also offer comment on the adequacy of these indigenous forces? For example:

- **Are these numbers adequate to perform essential policing duties?**
- **Are they concentrated in the urban areas or do they have a presence in regional areas?**
- **Could you elaborate on their role and their capacity to investigate crimes, provide a patrol presence, train new recruits etc?**

The answer to this question varies across the Pacific with all forces having both strengths and weaknesses. The sovereignty of these nations ranges through republics and federations to traditional custom regimes and as such, the character of policing varies extraordinarily across the region. Common to most is that at the community policing level, the police forces have the capacity to deal with general crime but are often limited in their ability to respond and investigate due to resourcing and development issues. As crimes become more complex, the level of capacity to deal with them diminishes and a greater level of support is needed in this regard.