

UDC 341.16:[351.74+355.3]



**T. Kovalova**



**O. Tkachenko**

## **ORGANIZATIONAL AND LEGAL BASES OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GENDARMERIES AND POLICE FORCES WITH MILITARY STATUS (FIEP)**

*The article, based on the current regulatory framework and up-to-date information from official sources, examines the organizational and legal foundations of the activities of the International Association of Gendarmeries and Police Forces with Military Status (FIEP) and its members. It defines the legal nature of FIEP as an international association of a coordinating type, operating on the basis of statutory regulation, rotating presidency, a commission-based organizational structure, and consensus-based strategic decision-making.*

*The study proposes a definition of the concept of the "organizational and legal foundations of the activities of FIEP and its members", clarifies its mission, membership criteria, ethical and human-rights requirements, as well as the legal force of the Association's principal acts and the mechanism for their implementation.*

*The article broadens the coverage of FIEP's subject composition by systematizing all its current members and grouping them according to institutional type. Based on a comparative legal analysis of the legislation of France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Romania, and the Netherlands, it identifies the common institutional core of gendarmerie-type forces: military status or military nature, a combination of law-enforcement and security functions, as well as mixed or functionally distributed subordination to the authorities responsible for defense, internal affairs, and justice. It is further substantiated that the legal nature of the National Guard of Ukraine corresponds to the material characteristics of a force with military status within the meaning of FIEP, and that the participation of the NGU in the Association has not only representative but also practical significance for improving personnel policy, service organization, international cooperation, the protection of strategic facilities, and the implementation of modern security standards. Specific proposals are formulated for the National Guard of Ukraine regarding the institutionalization of FIEP coordination, the doctrinal and educational implementation of the Association's developments, as well as the development of partnerships with the most relevant FIEP members.*

**Keywords:** *FIEP, gendarmerie, police forces with military status, National Guard of Ukraine, organizational and legal foundations, international cooperation, public security, military formation with law enforcement functions.*

**Statement of the problem.** In the current conditions of the transformation of the security environment, the spread of hybrid threats, armed conflicts of varying intensity, and increasing demands for ensuring public security, institutions that combine a military organization of service with law enforcement functions are becoming increasingly important. Gendarmeries and police forces with military status belong precisely to such institutions. In many states, they perform tasks related to maintaining public order, judicial or criminal police functions, protection of important facilities, response to crisis situations, and participation in international operations [1].

For Ukraine, the study of this issue is of particular practical importance given the legal nature of the National Guard of Ukraine (NGU) as

a military formation with law enforcement functions that is part of the system of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine, and its membership in FIEP [2, 22]. The National Guard of Ukraine is institutionally close to a number of European and transatlantic models of gendarmerie-type forces. Therefore, it can use the international association not only as a platform for external representation, but also as a mechanism for professional, organizational, and legal adaptation.

At the same time, in Ukrainian scientific literature, the issue of FIEP is often considered fragmentarily – either through the prism of individual foreign models of military police and gendarmerie, or in connection with discussions about the creation of a military police in Ukraine. In contrast, there is a lack of a comprehensive

up-to-date study that would combine the current FIEP Statute of 2023, official information on its current composition and structure, an analysis of the legal force of the association's acts, and an assessment of the significance of Ukraine's membership for the development of the NGU.

The relevance of the study is determined both by the needs of modern legal science in systematizing the organizational and legal model of FIEP and by the practical demand of Ukraine's security and defense sector for verified conclusions regarding the possibilities of using this international format for the development of the NGU. For science, the study of this problem is relevant because it allows for the clarification of the conceptual and categorical apparatus, the identification of common patterns in the functioning of forces with military status, and the determination of directions for further implementation of international experience into Ukrainian legal and managerial practice.

#### **Analysis of recent research and publications.**

Among the publications directly related to the issue under consideration, the work of D. Korniienko, A. Byzova, and R. Skrinkovskiy should be noted first. In their study, the authors analyzed the experience of FIEP members in performing military police functions [3]. This research provided an important comparative basis for understanding gendarmerie-type institutions and their significance for the reform of military justice in Ukraine. However, it was prepared before the adoption of the updated FIEP Statute of 2023 and does not cover the current statutory membership mechanisms, the commission-based organization, or the association's present membership composition.

Contemporary Ukrainian legal science also focuses on the creation of military police and the determination of the National Guard of Ukraine's place within the relevant institutional configuration. Thus, D. Morkvin, V. Batsamut, and I. Hokh substantiate the prospects of forming a military police in Ukraine, taking into account international experience and NATO standards. They highlight the potential of a military formation with law enforcement functions as the institutional basis for such a model [4]. Researcher V. Danko examines the National Guard of Ukraine through the prism of cooperation with other actors in the security sector, emphasizing its dual nature as a military formation with law enforcement functions [5]. In the work by M. Vozniuk, Ya. Holoborodko, V. Vlad, and Yu. Sevruk, foreign models of military police and the possibilities of their

application for reforming Ukrainian military legislation and service are studied [6].

In foreign periodicals, the emphasis is placed mainly on certain aspects of multilateral police and gendarmerie cooperation. Scholars F. Neubauer, K. Friesendorf, and U. Schroeder analyze the everyday activities of police experts in multilateral missions and demonstrate how international practices are shaped through experience, institutional continuity, and transnational exchange [7]. Researchers L. Malheiro, F. Bessa, J. Reis, and other authors study the implementation of the "Women, Peace and Security" agenda in European gendarmerie structures and point out normative and organizational gaps in this area [8]. Scholar M. Mazziotti di Celso examines the influence of the military police component on the Italian Armed Forces, demonstrating the importance of institutions of the Carabinieri type not only for public security but also for the internal military organization of the state [9].

The analysis of recent studies and publications indicates that scientific material has already been accumulated regarding individual models of gendarmeries and military police, as well as the place of the National Guard of Ukraine in the security and defense sector. At the same time, the research gap that has not been filled by other authors lies in the comprehensive determination of the organizational and legal foundations of FIEP as an international association, in the expanded coverage of all its current members, in clarifying the legal force of FIEP acts and the mechanism of their implementation, as well as in formulating applied recommendations for the National Guard of Ukraine.

**The purpose of the article** is to comprehensively define the organizational and legal foundations of the activities of the International Association of Gendarmeries and Police Forces with Military Status (FIEP) and its members, based on the current regulatory framework and up-to-date information from official sources, as well as to clarify the significance of this model of international cooperation for the National Guard of Ukraine.

To achieve this purpose, the following tasks must be solved:

1) to clarify the legal nature, mission, membership criteria, organizational structure, and legal force of the main FIEP acts;

2) to identify the common institutional features of gendarmeries and police forces with military status through a comparative legal analysis of the legislation of the member states and

the systematization of all current members of the association;

3) to determine the practical significance of the National Guard of Ukraine's participation in FIEP and to formulate proposals for the implementation of the association's developments into the activities of the NGU.

The object of the study is international cooperation of gendarmerie-type forces. The subject of the study is the organizational and legal foundations of FIEP's activities and the mechanisms of their manifestation in the legal status of its members and in the practice of the National Guard of Ukraine. The working hypothesis is that FIEP functions as an institutionally organized mechanism for developing and disseminating common standards for forces with military status, and that the NGU's participation in this association can be transformed into a tool for the targeted development of its normative, organizational, and educational capabilities.

The methodological basis of the study consists of formal-legal, comparative-legal, system-structural, and documentary methods, as well as elements of the functional method. The formal-legal method was used to interpret the FIEP Statute and national legislative acts; the comparative-legal method – for comparing the legal models of France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Romania, and the Netherlands; the system-structural method – to reveal the institutional structure of FIEP; and the documentary method – to verify the current composition of the association, its decisions, and official materials of the NGU. The author's contribution lies in the systematization of the current statutory and national regulatory framework of FIEP, in the expanded coverage of all its active members, and in correlating this model with the legal nature of the National Guard of Ukraine.

**Summary of the main material.** The organizational and legal foundations of FIEP's activities and those of its members should be understood as a system of normative, institutional, procedural, functional, and axiological elements that determine the legal nature of the association, its membership composition, the competence of its bodies, the procedure for decision-making, membership criteria, forms of international coordination, and ways of transforming jointly developed approaches into national acts, doctrines, training programs, and the practical activities of forces with military status. The normative

component of these foundations consists of the FIEP Statute, the Common Declaration, commission documents, and other derivative guiding materials; the institutional component includes the Senior Council, Presidency, Secretariat, commissions, and national contact points; the procedural component covers accession, observer status, acquisition of membership, revision of the statutory act, and internal implementation of decisions; the functional component refers to the areas of activity of the four commissions; and the axiological component includes requirements regarding human rights, legality, accountability, proportionality, and professional ethics.

In this sense, the organizational and legal foundations of FIEP have a two-level structure: at the level of the association itself, they formalize an international coordination mechanism for the interaction of gendarmerie-type forces, while at the level of member states they are specified in constitutions, codes, special laws, service statutes, disciplinary regulations, and departmental acts. It is precisely this construction that makes it possible to analyze FIEP not only as a forum for experience exchange, but as an institutionally organized model for the development and dissemination of common standards for forces with military status [2, 10, 11].

The current FIEP Statute defines the association as the International Association of Gendarmeries and Police Forces with Military Status and links its establishment to the Common Declaration signed in Madrid on 12 May 1994 [2]. The mission of the association is to strengthen relations between participants, develop police cooperation, and exchange experience in the areas of personnel management, service organization, new technologies and logistics, as well as international affairs [10]. The Statute explicitly states that only those formations that operate under a military code and have primary competence or co-responsibility for the prevention or investigation of criminal offences under judicial authority and the maintenance of public order under civil authority may join FIEP; they may additionally be assigned administrative tasks [2].

In terms of its legal nature, FIEP is best regarded as an international coordination-type association rather than a supranational body with its own authoritative competence. This conclusion follows from the statutory model, according to which strategic decisions are taken unanimously at the Senior Council level, formalized by a common declaration, and their further implementation depends on the national legal order of each member [2]. At the

same time, the Statute and its annexes combine the institutional and value-based components of membership: a candidate must confirm compatibility with basic international acts in the field of human rights and anti-corruption, as well as compliance with military status criteria, which include a hierarchical structure, military ranks, wearing of uniforms, military discipline, special military justice, and basic military training [2].

Organizationally, FIEP is built around the Senior Council of Directors/Commanding Generals, the Presidency, the Secretariat of the Presidency, national contact points, and four permanent commissions: Human Resources, Service Organization, New Technologies and Logistics, and International Affairs. The Senior Council determines the general policy and program of the association's activities, while rotational presidency ensures annual strategic and organizational renewal. The commissions cover personnel policy and professional training, service organization and operational activities, technological and logistical development, as well as international relations and expansion of the association [11].

The procedure for acquiring membership in FIEP is multi-stage and legally formalized. It includes a letter of intent, consideration of the candidacy by the International Affairs Commission, a fact-finding mission, granting observer status for at least one year, and subsequent unanimous approval of full membership at the association's summit. Loss of membership is possible in the case of voluntary withdrawal or non-compliance with the statutory agreement by decision of the Senior Council [2].

As of the official update of the Member Forces page on 18 November 2025, FIEP united 21 full members: France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Turkey, the Netherlands, Morocco, Romania, Argentina, Chile, Jordan, Qatar, Tunisia, Palestine, Ukraine, Brazil, Djibouti, Kuwait, Senegal, San Marino, and Moldova [12]. Additionally, the FIEP 2024 summit officially recorded the unanimous granting of membership to the Carabineros of the Republic of Moldova [13], while the FIEP 2025 summit confirmed the transfer of the presidency for the 2025–2026 cycle to the Argentine National Gendarmerie and the granting of observer status to the National Gendarmerie of the Republic of Congo and the National Guard of the United Arab Emirates [14]. This indicates the transformation of FIEP from a European-Mediterranean format into an interregional network of gendarmerie-type forces.

The expanded coverage of all FIEP members provides grounds for systematizing them by institutional type. Firstly, these are classical gendarmeries and related corps: France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Turkey, Morocco, Romania, Argentina, Djibouti, Senegal, San Marino, and Moldova. Secondly, these are police corps with military status, primarily the Royal Netherlands Marechaussee and the Carabineros de Chile. Thirdly, these are national guards – Tunisia, Ukraine, and Kuwait. Fourthly, these are hybrid-type internal or public security forces – the Jordanian Public Security Directorate, Lekhwiya Qatar, and the Palestinian National Security Forces. Fifthly, Brazil represents a separate federal model, where the FIEP member is not a single centralized gendarmerie, but the National Council of Commanding Generals of Military Police and Military Fire Corps, which unites the system of state military-police institutions [12].

Such a membership composition gives grounds to assert that FIEP unites not a single unified gendarmerie model, but a family of institutionally compatible forces for which the common features are military status or military nature, the performance of public security and public order tasks, and the existence of legal mechanisms for interaction with internal affairs, defense, and justice bodies. It is this broad typology that makes FIEP relevant for the National Guard of Ukraine, which similarly combines a military organization of service with law enforcement functions.

A comparative analysis of the current legislation of individual member states makes it possible to identify the common institutional core of the legal status of FIEP members. Firstly, they are characterized by military status or a military nature of the respective formation. Secondly, these forces combine tasks in the field of public order and public security protection with functions of judicial, criminal, or military police. Thirdly, they typically feature mixed or functionally distributed subordination, whereby issues of defense, military service, and discipline fall within the sphere of defense management, issues of public security fall within internal affairs, and procedural activities fall within the judicial authorities or the prosecutor's office.

In France, the Gendarmerie nationale, in accordance with the Code de la sécurité intérieure, is a force armée, and judicial police functions constitute one of its essential missions. It is tasked with ensuring public security and public order, particularly in rural and suburban areas [16]. At the same time, the Code de la défense classifies the gendarmerie as part of the armed forces [17], which

retains military status while performing general-profile police functions and participating in military missions. This model demonstrates the classic FIEP combination of military status with general-purpose police functions.

In Italy, after the reforms of 2000, the Arma dei Carabinieri was elevated to the rank of a separate armed force with an autonomous position in the Ministry of Defense system. Official Carabinieri materials define them as a *forza di polizia a competenza generale e in servizio permanente di pubblica sicurezza*, which simultaneously performs military tasks, public security functions, and judicial and military police duties [18]. The Italian model is characterized by functional multi-channel subordination: military tasks fall under the Minister of Defense, public order under the Minister of Internal Affairs, and judicial police activities under the judicial authorities.

The Spanish Guardia Civil, according to Ley Orgánica 2/1986, is an *instituto armado de naturaleza militar* that depends on the Ministry of Internal Affairs in performing statutory police functions and on the Ministry of Defense in matters of military missions [19]. The Guardia Civil is a state security body of a military nature at the national level, whose main mission is to protect persons and property and guarantee the free exercise of rights and freedoms. The Spanish model combines a rigid hierarchy stemming from the military nature of the institution with broad law enforcement competence.

In Portugal, the Guarda Nacional Republicana, in accordance with Lei n. 63/2007, is a *força de segurança de natureza militar* formed by military personnel of a special corps. It performs the mission of ensuring democratic legality, internal security, and the protection of citizens' rights, and also cooperates in the field of national defense [20].

The Romanian Jandarmeria Română, according to Legea nr. 550/2004, is a specialized state institution with military status that belongs to the system of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. It is tasked with maintaining public order, protecting the rights and freedoms of citizens, safeguarding public and private property, preventing and detecting offences, protecting important facilities, and combating terrorism [21]. The normative structure of the Romanian gendarmerie clearly demonstrates the combination of military service organization with police and security functions.

In the Netherlands, the Royal Netherlands Marechaussee is officially defined as a gendarmerie corps that is part of the armed forces and performs security functions. It combines

military and police identity ("military and police in one"). Its key tasks include border control, security and surveillance, military police functions within the defense system, and specialized international tasks [22].

Despite national differences, the models studied confirm the existence of a common legal core for the forces that are part of FIEP: the military nature of the institution, broad law enforcement competence, the ability to maintain public order under civil authority, and at the same time to operate within the defense management system. It is this core that ensures the institutional compatibility of the association's members and makes possible the development of common standards at the FIEP level.

The legal force of FIEP acts is multilevel in nature. Firstly, the Statutes of FIEP serve as the founding internal association act: they define the purpose of the association, the range of subjects, membership criteria, the status of members and observers, the system of bodies, the procedure for revising the agreement, and the basic rules of operation. Secondly, the Common Declaration is the annual summary act of the Senior Council: the Statute expressly provides that members' strategic decisions are taken unanimously and formalized by signing the Common Declaration, while proposals to amend the agreement become official only after their publication in such a declaration. Thirdly, commission materials, presidency work programs, summary reports, seminar documents, and thematic guiding materials of FIEP should be classified as "soft law" acts, as they do not replace national legislation but develop common standards, guidelines, and models of good practice for the association's members [15].

An example of such soft law is the AI Guideline Principles published in 2025. They propose a unified ethical framework for the use of artificial intelligence by gendarmeries and police forces with military status, based on the principles of non-maleficence, justice, beneficence, and autonomy, and link these principles to human control, fundamental rights impact assessment, traceability, auditing, and personnel training [15]. Notably, the FIEP 2025 summit separately recorded the accession of all association members to this guiding document.

The mechanism for implementing FIEP acts into the practice of member states is consistent and multi-stage. First, common approaches are developed within the commissions with the participation of POC representatives, who have a mandate from their directors or commanders to

express positions and make decisions on current issues; decisions at the commission level are taken by a two-thirds majority. Next, the results are brought to the Senior Council level, where strategic decisions are approved by consensus and receive political formalization in the Common Declaration [1]. After that, each member carries out internal implementation within its own legal order – through laws, regulations, doctrines, training programs, standard operating procedures, technical requirements, or international cooperation projects. The FIEP international association functions as a mechanism for coordinating and transmitting standards, not as a source of norms with direct supranational effect.

For Ukraine, the basic normative act is the Law of Ukraine "On the National Guard of Ukraine", which defines the NGU as a military formation with law enforcement functions that is part of the system of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine [2]. The official FIEP webpage dedicated to the National Guard of Ukraine confirms that the NGU is a military formation with law enforcement functions within the MIA system of Ukraine and emphasizes the combination of military and law enforcement training of its personnel [23].

Particular importance attaches to the 2025 NGU Activity Doctrine, which states that in peacetime the National Guard of Ukraine is part of the security forces, performs law enforcement functions, and develops capabilities for operations as part of the defense forces. Upon the introduction of martial law, it is brought to readiness to perform defense tasks and is subordinated to the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of Ukraine, except for directly specified exceptions [24]. This normative approach confirms the dual yet systematically organized nature of the NGU and brings it closer to the models of gendarmerie-type forces that form the core of FIEP.

Comparing the FIEP statutory criteria with the current Ukrainian regulatory framework provides grounds to assert that the NGU meets the material features of a force with military status within the meaning of the association. It functions as a military formation, performs law enforcement and security tasks, ensures public security and order, protects critically important facilities, participates in countering terrorist activities, and operates in interaction with other components of the security and defense sector [24]. In view of this, the NGU's participation in FIEP should be regarded as a tool for accessing proven models of personnel policy, service organization, technological development,

ethical standards, and international cooperation, rather than merely a symbolic international status.

The practical significance of the obtained results for the National Guard of Ukraine lies in the fact that participation in FIEP can be used as a mechanism for targeted institutional development. Given the structure of FIEP, the current priorities of its commissions, the AI Guideline Principles, and the theme of the Argentine presidency for 2025–2026 – "The Protection of Strategic Objectives: A Shared Challenge for Gendarmerie-Type Forces" – the NGU has the opportunity to reorient its international cooperation toward specific applied outcomes in the areas of protection of strategic facilities, public security, stabilization actions, technological development, and professional training [14, 15].

Firstly, in the normative and doctrinal sphere, it is advisable to develop an internal matrix for the implementation of FIEP standards, correlating the provisions of the FIEP Statute, the developments of the four commissions, and the AI Guideline Principles with the NGU Activity Doctrine, departmental guidelines on maintaining public order, protection of critical infrastructure, official ethics, and the use of modern technologies [1, 24].

Secondly, at the organizational level, permanent inter-functional coordination on FIEP issues should be institutionalized within the NGU Main Directorate at the level of the POC mechanism provided for by the Statute, with an annual plan for implementing summit and commission decisions [1]. Such a mechanism will make it possible to transform the NGU's participation in FIEP from an episodic format into a mode of systematic support, monitoring, and reporting on the implementation of agreed areas of cooperation.

Thirdly, in the field of personnel training, FIEP modules should be integrated into the programs of educational institutions and training centers of the NGU. For this purpose, the potential of the National Academy of the National Guard of Ukraine, the Kyiv Institute of the NGU, NGU training centers, and the International Interagency Multidisciplinary Training Center for Units (Stare village) can be used to develop courses on public order management, protection of strategic facilities, stabilization operations, ethics and human rights in law enforcement, as well as governance of AI and digital tools [24].

Fourthly, in the field of international cooperation, the NGU should focus its efforts on bilateral and multilateral projects with those FIEP members whose experience is most relevant to Ukrainian needs: France, Romania, Italy, Portugal,

the Netherlands, and Argentina. Current official NGU materials already demonstrate the practical value of such contacts: from discussions with the National Gendarmerie of France and the European Union Advisory Mission on cooperation in the field of modern technologies and public security to Ukrainian-Romanian initiatives under the Synergy Secure project aimed at strengthening the capabilities of mobile units [25–28].

Fifthly, in the field of performance evaluation, it is worth introducing indicators for the NGU of the actual implementation of FIEP developments: the number of updated training programs, internal departmental documents, joint exercises, bilateral projects, technological solutions, and training modules developed or updated under the influence of participation in the association. It is precisely this approach that transforms international membership into a measurable tool for developing capabilities, which corresponds to the modern role of the NGU as a military formation with law enforcement functions within the MIA system and the security and defense sector of Ukraine [25–28].

### **Conclusions**

The conducted study establishes that FIEP is an international coordination-type association whose organizational and legal model is based on current statutory regulation, rotational presidency, a commission-based work organization, a multi-stage accession procedure, and the combination of institutional and human rights membership criteria.

The following definition of the concept of "organizational and legal foundations of FIEP's activities and those of its members" is proposed: a system of normative, institutional, procedural, functional, and axiological elements that determine the legal nature of the association, its membership composition, the procedure for decision-making, and the ways of transforming jointly developed approaches into national legal orders and the practical activities of forces with military status.

The expanded coverage of all current FIEP members has made it possible to demonstrate that the association unites not a single unified gendarmerie model, but a family of institutionally compatible forces – ranging from classical gendarmeries and police corps with military status to national guards and hybrid-type internal security forces.

A common institutional core of the legal status of gendarmeries and police forces with military

status has been identified: military nature or military status, the combination of public security functions, judicial or criminal police functions, and mixed or functionally distributed subordination. It is this set of features that ensures the institutional compatibility of FIEP members and explains the specifics of their legal position within national legal orders.

It is substantiated that FIEP acts are predominantly of a coordinating and soft law nature: the Statute serves as the founding internal association act, the Common Declaration constitutes the form of political formalization of strategic decisions, and the commissions' guiding materials serve as benchmarks for subsequent national implementation through laws, regulations, doctrines, training programs, and internal standards.

It is proven that the legal nature of the National Guard of Ukraine corresponds to the material features of a force with military status within the meaning of FIEP. Consequently, the NGU's participation in the association holds significant practical importance for improving personnel policy, service organization, professional training, international cooperation, and the adoption of proven approaches to responding to contemporary threats.

The scientific novelty of the obtained results lies in the systematization of the current statutory and national regulatory framework of FIEP as of 2026, in its comprehensive correlation with modern models of the member states, in the expanded coverage of all current members of the association, and in the substantiation of the mechanism for implementing FIEP acts into the practice of the NGU. The theoretical significance of the article consists in clarifying the conceptual content of the category "police forces with military status", while its practical significance lies in the possibility of using the formulated recommendations in law-making, organizational, and educational activities related to the development of the National Guard of Ukraine.

Prospects for further research are seen in the study of the mechanisms for implementing FIEP standards and practices into the internal acts of the National Guard of Ukraine, in the development of a methodology for assessing the effectiveness of the NGU's participation in the association, as well as in a more in-depth analysis of the activities of individual FIEP commissions and bilateral formats of cooperation between Ukraine and FIEP members.

## References

1. FIEP (2023). FIEP Statutes 2023 Madrid. Retrieved from: <https://www.fiep.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/FIEP-STATUTES-2023-Madrid.pdf> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in English].
2. *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro Natsionalnu hvardii Ukrainy" № 876-VII* [Law of Ukraine about the National Guard of Ukraine activity no. 876-VII]. (2014, March 13). *Vidomosti Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy*. Retrieved from: <http://surl.li/qqeja> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in Ukrainian].
3. Korniienko D., Byzova A., Skrynkovskiy R. (2021). *Dosvid chleniv Mizhnarodnoi asotsiatsii zhandarmerii ta politseyskykh syl u viiskovomu statusi (FIEP) u vykonanni funktsii viiskovoi politsii* [Experience of members of the International Association of Gendarmeries and Police Forces with Military Status (FIEP) in performing military police functions]. *Path of Science*, vol. 7, no. 1. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22178/pos.66-6> [in Ukrainian].
4. Morkvin D., Batsamut V., Hoh I. (2024). *Perspektyvy stvorennia viiskovoi politsii v Ukraini dlia zabezpechennia dystsyplyny ta zakonnosti sered viiskovosluzhbovtiv: henezys, suchasnyi stan ta mistse v strukturi sektoru bezpeky i oborony* [Prospects for the creation of a military police in Ukraine to ensure discipline and legality among servicemen: genesis, current state and place in the structure of the security and defense sector]. *Chest i zakon*, no. 2 (89), pp. 106–113. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33405/2078-7480/2024/2/89/309268> [in Ukrainian].
5. Danko V. (2025). *Teoretychni zasady orhanizatsii vzaiemodii Natsionalnoi hvardii Ukrainy z instytuttsiiamy sektoru bezpeky u zabezpechenni hromadskoi bezpeky* [Theoretical foundations of organizing interaction between the National Guard of Ukraine and security sector institutions in ensuring public safety]. *Chest i zakon*, no. 3 (94), pp. 25–32. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33405/2078-7480/2025/3/94/349219> [in Ukrainian].
6. Voznyk M., Goloborodko Ya., Vlad V., Sevru Yu. (2025). *Reforming Military Law and Service in Ukraine: Lessons from the Military. Croatian and comparative public administration*, no. 25 (3), pp. 529–554. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31297/hkju.25.3.2> [in English].
7. Neubauer P., Friesendorf C., Schroeder U. (2022). Everyday police work abroad: A story of experience, continuity and change in multilateral missions. *International Peacekeeping*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 308–332. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13533312.2022.2047026> [in English].
8. Malheiro L., Bessa F., Silva D. et al. (2024). The implementation of the Women, Peace and Security (WPS) agenda in the European Gendarmerie Forces. *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 78–93. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/14613557231199329> [in English].
9. Mazziotti di Celso M. (2025). The impact of military policing on armed forces: The case of Italy. *Armed Forces & Society*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 690–711. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095327X231225771> [in English].
10. FIEP (2026). International Association of Gendarmeries and Police Forces with Military Status Search for: FIEP. Retrieved from: <https://www.fiep.org/about-fiep/the-association/> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in English].
11. FIEP (2018). International Association of Gendarmeries and Police Forces with Military Status. Retrieved from: <https://www.fiep.org/about-fiep/organisation/> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in English].
12. Member Forces – FIEP (2025). International Association of Gendarmeries and Police Forces with Military Status. Retrieved from: <https://www.fiep.org/member-forces/> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in English].
13. Summit FIEP (2024). Summit of the FIEP: the Carabinieri Corps relinquishes its presidency to the French National Gendarmerie. Retrieved from: <https://surl.li/pdfitk> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in English].
14. Summit FIEP (2025). The Impact and Challenges of Artificial Intelligence for Gendarmerie Forces. Retrieved from: <https://www.fiep.org/uncategorized/fiep-2025-summit/> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in English].
15. FIEP (2025). AI Guideline Principles. Retrieved from: <https://www.fiep.org/uncategorized/ai-guideline-principles/> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in English].
16. Légifrance (2018). Code de la sécurité intérieure. Article L421-1. Retrieved from: <https://surl.li/logpje> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in French].
17. Légifrance (2018). Code de la défense. Article L3211-3. Retrieved from: <https://surl.li/qyoqkv> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in French].
18. Arma dei Carabinieri (2025). Articolazione degli uffici. Retrieved from: <https://surl.li/ubwjpg> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in Italian].
19. Boletín Oficial del Estado (1986). Ley Orgánica 2/1986, de 13 de marzo, de Fuerzas y Cuerpos de Seguridad. Retrieved from:

<https://www.boe.es/buscar/doc.php?id=BOE-A-1986-6859> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in Spanish].

20. Diário da República (2007). Lei n. 63/2007, de 6 de novembro. Retrieved from: <https://dre.pt/dre/detalhe/lei/63-2007-629449> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in Portuguese].

21. Portal Legislativ (2004). Lege nr. 550 din 29 noiembrie 2004 privind organizarea și funcționarea Jandarmeriei Române. Retrieved from: <https://legislatie.just.ro/Public/DetaliiDocument/303041> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in Romanian].

22. Defensie.nl (2026). Royal Netherlands Marechaussee. Retrieved from: <https://english.defensie.nl/organisation/marechaussee> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in English].

23. FIEP (2022). The National Guard of Ukraine. Retrieved from: <https://www.fiep.org/member-forces/national-guard-of-ukraine/> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in English].

24. Ngu.gov.ua (2025). *Doktryna diialnosti Natsionalnoi hvardii Ukrainy* [Doctrine of the National Guard of Ukraine]. VKP NGU 1-00. Retrieved from: <https://surl.li/mhvnyt> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in Ukrainian].

25. Ngu.gov.ua (2026). *Natsionalna hvardiia Ukrainy ta Natsionalna zhandarmeriia Frantsii*

*obhovoryly spivpratsiu u sferi suchasnykh tekhnolohii* [The National Guard of Ukraine and the National Gendarmerie of France discussed cooperation in the field of modern technologies]. Retrieved from: <https://surl.li/dqfzsj> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in Ukrainian].

26. Ngu.gov.ua (2026). *KMIES v Ukraini pohlybliuie spivpratsiu z Natsionalnoiu hvardiieiu Ukrainy ta Natsionalnoiu zhandarmeriieiu Frantsii* [EUAM in Ukraine deepens cooperation with the National Guard of Ukraine and the National Gendarmerie of France]. Retrieved from: <https://surl.li/duhwti> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in Ukrainian].

27. Ngu.gov.ua (2025). *Natsghvardiitsi nalahodzhuiut spivpratsiu z kolehamy z Rumunii* [National Guard servicemen establish cooperation with colleagues from Romania]. Retrieved from: <https://surl.li/trrnk> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in Ukrainian].

28. Ngu.gov.ua (2026). *Ukraina ta Rumuniia pidsumuvaly rik spivpratsi v mezhhakh proiektu "Synergy Secure"* [Ukraine and Romania summarized a year of cooperation within the "Synergy Secure" project]. Retrieved from: <https://surl.li/npjsao> (accessed 10 April 2026) [in Ukrainian].

*The article was submitted to the editorial office 16.04.2025*

*Accepted for publication after peer review 11.05.2025*

*Publication date 29.05.2026*

УДК 341.16:[351.74+355.3]

Т. І. Ковальова, О. В. Ткаченко

### ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙНО-ПРАВОВІ ЗАСАДИ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ МІЖНАРОДНОЇ АСОЦІАЦІЇ ЖАНДАРМЕРІЙ ТА ПОЛІЦЕЙСЬКИХ СИЛ З ВІЙСЬКОВИМ СТАТУСОМ (FIEP)

На основі чинної нормативної бази й актуальної інформації офіційних джерел розкрито організаційно-правові засади діяльності Міжнародної асоціації жандармерій і поліцейських сил з військовим статусом (FIEP) та її членів. Визначено правову природу FIEP як міжнародної асоціації координаційного типу, що функціонує на засадах статутного регулювання, ротаційного головування, комісійної організації роботи та консенсусного ухвалення стратегічних рішень. Запропоновано визначення поняття «організаційно-правові засади діяльності FIEP та її членів», з'ясовано місію, критерії членства, етичні та правозахисні вимоги, а також юридичну силу основних актів асоціації та механізм їхньої імплементації.

Розширено охоплення суб'єктного складу FIEP шляхом систематизації всіх її чинних членів і їхнього групування за інституційним типом. На основі порівняльно-правового аналізу законодавства Франції, Італії, Іспанії, Португалії, Румунії та Нідерландів виокремлено спільне інституційне ядро сил жандармерійного типу: військовий статус або військову природу, поєднання правоохоронних і безпекових функцій, а також змішану чи функціонально розподілену підпорядкованість органам оборони, внутрішніх справ і правосуддя. Okремо обґрунтовано думку, що правова природа Національної гвардії України відповідає матеріальним ознакам *force with military status* у розумінні

*FIEP, а участь НГУ в асоціації має не лише представницьке, а й прикладне значення для вдосконалення кадрової політики, організації служби, міжнародної взаємодії, охорони стратегічних об'єктів і впровадження сучасних стандартів безпеки. Сформульовано конкретні пропозиції для Національної гвардії України щодо інституціоналізації FIEP-координації, доктринальної та освітньої імплементації напрацювань асоціації, а також розвитку партнерств із найрелевантнішими членами FIEP.*

**Ключові слова:** *FIEP, жандармерія, поліцейські сили з військовим статусом, Національна гвардія України, організаційно-правові засади, міжнародне співробітництво, публічна безпека, військове формування з правоохоронними функціями.*

**Kovalova Tetiana** – Candidate of Law, Associate Professor, Scientific Secretary of the Secretariat of the Academic Council, Kyiv Institute of the National Guard of Ukraine  
<http://orcid.org/0009-0001-0668-3047>

**Tkachenko Oleksandr** – Candidate of Legal Sciences, Senior Researcher, Head of the Department of State Security, Kyiv Institute of the National Guard of Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3485-6603>