



**Programme Name:** Leonardo Da Vinci

**Project Number:** 518620-LLP-1-2011-1-IT-LEONARDO-LMP

**Grant Agreement Number:** 2011-3905/001-001

**Project Title:** URBIS - Urban Manager for Security, Safety and Crisis Management

**WP N°3  
Deliverable N°3.1  
Title: FRAMEWORK ON EU AND NATIONAL  
LEGISLATION**

**Delivery date:** 30<sup>th</sup> April 2013  
**Deliverable level:** PU

**Document Name:** URBIS\_D3.1\_V1.0\_30042013\_P2\_GH/AE

**Version.Revision:** 1.0

**WP Leader:** Cardiff University



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme





## REVISION AND APPROVAL

Date	Author	Reviewer	Revision	Version Status	Approved by	Description of Change
30th April 2013	Gordon Hughes Adam Edwards	/	/	1.0	Amanda Zuffi	/



## Table of Contents

<b>A. THE EU LEVEL .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1. Urban security and crime prevention discourse and strategy .....	4
2. European-wide policy forums .....	9
2.2 <i>European Crime Prevention Network (EUCPN)</i> .....	9
2.3 <i>Observatory for the Prevention of Crime (OPC)</i> .....	11
2.4 <i>European Forum for Urban Security (EFUS)</i> .....	12
<b>B. THE NATIONAL LEVEL .....</b>	<b>14</b>
1. Urban security and crime prevention discourse and strategy .....	14



## A. The EU level

### 1. Urban security and crime prevention discourse and strategy

1.1 Discourse on the concept of 'urban security' does not explicitly exist at the EU-level where the concept of 'crime prevention' is the preferred terminology. Crime prevention discourse has been formally evident at the supranational, EU-level since 1993 when the European Parliament adopted a Resolution on small-scale crime in urban areas and its links with organised crime<sup>1</sup>. Here it was recognised that 'particular attention should be devoted to prevention projects' that would involve the active cooperation of parties through exchanges of experience at the European Community level, amongst other things. Even at this embryonic stage, the prerequisite of multi-agency approaches was acknowledged.

1.2 Since 1996, the EU has been *actively working on* crime prevention: the Stockholm conference in 1996 examined crime prevention connected with European economic integration and with social exclusion while subsequent seminars (such as Brussels, 1996; Nordwijk, 1997; London, 1998; Algarve, 2000) continued to shape and develop an EU approach to crime prevention<sup>2</sup>.

1.3 This recognition of the need for crime prevention was again reasserted in 1998 when the European Parliament adopted a Resolution on guidelines and measures specifically for the prevention of organised crime with reference to the establishment of a comprehensive strategy for combating it<sup>3</sup>. Again, the European Parliament stressed the particular importance of civil society in preventing crime and went on to call for support to civil society through:

- (i) targeted measures in the fields of labour, health, social, educational, training, cultural, youth and family policy to positively influence the circumstances and causes of crime,
- (ii) the development of innovative and people-friendly town planning to hinder crime and take account of preventive action,
- (iii) making use of opportunities to prevent the EU's big cities from becoming the favoured domain of organised criminals,
- (iv) the elimination of social disorganisation and the strengthening of the immediate social environment which can also increase informal social controls,
- (v) the strengthening of a sense of community and individual self-esteem and attachment to social values and objectives along with a readiness to have the courage of one's convictions,
- (vi) the integration of marginalised groups,

<sup>1</sup> Full text of the Resolution in the Official Journal of the European Communities (OJ C) 20, 24.1.1994, p. 189: D. available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:1994:020:SOM:EN:HTML> <Accessed 02/03/12>

<sup>2</sup> As remarked in a Communication on crime prevention in 2000: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2000:0786:FIN:EN:PDF> <Accessed 15/03/12>

<sup>3</sup> Full text of the Resolution in the OJ C 379, 7.12.1998, p. 44. Available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:1998:379:SOM:EN:HTML> <Accessed 02/03/12>



- (vii) measures to promote the establishment of bodies at the local and regional levels aimed at preventing crime,
  - (vii) comprehensive information on the real nature of criminal organisations to reduce individuals' tolerance and support of them,
  - (viii) promoting and supporting measures and projects to educate citizens to be law abiding,
  - (ix) community policing,
  - (x) measures to make citizens more willing to cooperate with the police and judicial authorities,
  - (xi) care for those in need,
  - (xii) measures to reduce recidivism,
  - (xiii) the establishment of victim support mechanisms,
  - (xiv) measures to prevent the trafficking of women and children,
  - (xv) effective measures to combat factors that lead to begging (especially by children),
- and;
- (xvi) stamping out the networks trafficking in women by also developing cooperation with their countries of origin.

1.4 The above measures reflect both sociological but also 'forensic' concerns and approaches to crime prevention. For example, there is recognition of crime prevention interventions in the areas of law enforcement and criminal justice, situational prevention, developmental prevention, and community prevention (see Tonry and Farrington, 1995; Hughes 1998) along with the three intellectual distinctions of primary, secondary and tertiary crime prevention (see Brantingham and Faust, 1976; Hughes 1998). Thus, EU discourse covers a range of strategies and interventions and incorporates a variety of actors and agencies targeted towards preventing criminality.

1.5 The Vienna Action Plan 1998<sup>4</sup> restated the need to 'develop cooperation and concerted measures on matters relating to crime prevention' in the five years following the entry into force in 1999 of the Treaty of Amsterdam<sup>5</sup> (signed in 1997). It was in the Amsterdam Treaty that the legal framework for EU-level crime prevention was created.

1.6 The amendments made by the Treaty of Amsterdam to the Treaty on European Union 1992 (otherwise known as the Maastricht Treaty) set out provisions for crime prevention across Member States. More specifically, Title VI, Article 29 of the Treaty stipulates as a key objective the requirement of a high level of safety within an 'area of freedom, security and justice' (AFSJ) for its

---

<sup>4</sup> Full text of the Vienna Action Plan available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31999Y0123%2801%29:EN:NOT> <Accessed 02/03/12>

<sup>5</sup> Full test of the Amsterdam Treaty available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/treaties/dat/11997D/htm/11997D.html#0001010001> >Accessed 09/03/2012>



citizens. This was to be achieved through common action of the Member States in the fields of police and judicial cooperation as well as by *preventing* and combating crime, organised or otherwise, in particular terrorism, human trafficking and offences against children, illicit drugs and arms trafficking, and corruption and fraud. Subsequently, several multi-annual programmes were established to facilitate this 'preventive' turn most notable of which were the three AFSJ programmes of Tampere, 1999-2004, The Hague, 2005-2009, and Stockholm, 2010-2014.

1.7 The Tampere European Council 1999<sup>6</sup> promoted the integration of crime prevention measures, exchanges of best practices and the strengthening of the network of competent national authorities for crime prevention and the cooperation of national crime prevention organisations. Juvenile, urban and drug-related crimes were proposed as priorities of these mechanisms. The possibility of a Community funded programme to facilitate these purposes was also set out (see European Crime Prevention Network (EUCPN) below).

1.8 Of analytical significance, the Tampere meeting also promoted the need for 'stronger external action', e.g. towards other regional (non-EU) and bordering states, and therefore emphasised policy responses aimed at reducing the 'supply' side of human and drugs trafficking, and terrorism, amongst others. This emphasis on 'upstream' policy responses also reflected the Hague Programme<sup>7</sup> that was to build on the 'achievements' of Tampere in relation to the AFSJ.

1.9 The Hague Programme 2005-2009 outlined that crime prevention is an 'indispensable part' of creating an AFSJ and again, as with the Tampere Programme, the focus on 'upstream' policy responses such as the interdiction of drug trafficking operations in an attempt to reduce the supply of narcotics into European localities was tied in with inter-national policing and judicial cooperation.

1.10 The Stockholm Programme 2010-2014<sup>8</sup> reaffirms the priority of developing an AFSJ but moves beyond the Tampere and The Hague Programmes by also emphasising the need for an 'internal security strategy' to be defined. Here, the importance of 'downstream' policy responses such as those reducing opportunities for the commission of criminal offences in particular situations as in the case of the trade in narcotics in particular neighbourhood settings like street corners, parks and transport termini and also the specific social, political and economic contexts of public safety in European localities.

1.11 In light of this, the '[t]he European Council is convinced that the enhancement of actions at European level, combined with better coordination with actions at regional and national level, are essential to protection from trans-national threats' (Stockholm Programme, 2010: 17). More specifically, the Programme reinforces the importance of more effective crime prevention measures such as promoting social inclusion and using a multidisciplinary approach which includes taking administrative measures and promoting cooperation between administrative authorities.

1.12 The Stockholm Programme refers to the increasing links between local crime and organised crime and its complex cross-border dimensions and encourages Member States to share mechanisms of best practice and country-specific experiences to cumulate knowledge on the

---

<sup>6</sup> Details of the Tampere Programme available at: <http://www.eurunion.org/partner/summit/summit9912/jha.html>  
<Accessed 02/03/12>

<sup>7</sup> Full text of the Hague Programme available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2005:053:0001:0014:EN:PDF> <Accessed 02/03/12>

<sup>8</sup> Full text of the Stockholm Programme available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2010:115:0001:0038:en:PDF> <Accessed 08/03/12>



effectiveness and efficiency of crime prevention strategies. The prevention of both mass criminality (i.e. volume crime) and cross-border crime impacting on the daily lives of EU citizens should be actively promoted and supported by Member States.

1.13 Various other Acts and Communications beyond the above discussed Programmes have also addressed the issue of crime prevention but all have consistently promoted similar themes to those of the three AFSJ Programmes. However, the Communication from the Commission to the Council and European Parliament on 'The prevention of crime in the European Union – Reflection on common guidelines and proposal for Community financial support 2000'<sup>9</sup> is particularly useful as it outlines the EU's strategy towards crime prevention. It states the strategy should operate on two levels:

- (i) national prevention policies that are
- (ii) supplemented by action of the EU and which without replacing national, regional or local action, will supplement the pyramid of responsibilities and facilitate national action while highlighting topics of common interest.

1.14 The Commission goes on to suggest that the strategy must be based on 'complementarity between enforcement and preventive instruments' as the effective use of penalties are in themselves dissuasive and thus preventive but that prevention should respect the fundamental principles of law and public freedoms.

1.15 The Commission states the EU should set the following targets to protect both citizen and society:

- To reduce opportunities for crime, so as to increase the risks that the criminal will be detected and punished and to reduce the possibilities of profiting from his crime.
- To reduce the factors which facilitate entry into the world of crime and repetition.
- To avoid victimisation, i.e. all those factors which, by placing a person in a situation of vulnerability, predispose him to being a victim of crime.
- To reduce the sense of insecurity.
- To promote and disseminate a law-abiding culture and a management culture designed to avert conflicts.
- To promote good governance and, in particular, to prevent corruption.
- To prevent criminal infiltration of the structures of the economy and society.

1.16 The Commission goes on to outline specific crime areas where preventive action should be targeted in relation to both general and organised crime:

'As regards general crime, attention must be devoted initially to urban, juvenile and drug-related crime. As regards organised crime, priority actions must aim at high-tech crime, drug trafficking, trafficking in human beings, and in particular the exploitation of women, the sexual exploitation of children, financial crime and euro counterfeiting' (2000: 9)

1.17 These objectives should be achieved through

- (i) knowledge (to improve understanding of crime),

---

<sup>9</sup> Full text of the Communication available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2000:0786:FIN:EN:PDF> <Accessed 15/03/12>



(ii) partnership (to develop cooperation and the networking of those involved in prevention at all levels) and;

(iii) a multi-disciplinary approach (to promote the complementarity of instruments with a view to developing prevention techniques and methods).

1.18 This EU strategy was to be supported by a) developing crime prevention in the *policies* of the EU (e.g. regulation of economic/financial activity, social policy, etc), b) testing legislative proposals: crime proofing (e.g. evaluation of instruments), c) improving knowledge of the phenomena of crime (e.g. increasing comparability of data), d) networking those involved in prevention (e.g. forums on crime prevention), and e) establishing a financial instrument (e.g. to fund research and projects).

1.19 It is within this crime prevention framework that several European-wide policy forums and organisations have been established to facilitate the cumulation of knowledge and best practice across Member States and beyond.



## 2. European-wide policy forums

2.1 At the operational level several supranational, European-wide policy forums have emerged. Some of these organisations were created following interventions at the EU-level while others have emerged more organically and independently. Most notable are the European Crime Prevention Network (EUCPN), as initiated in the Tampere Programme, the prospective Observatory for the Prevention of Crime (OPC) that was proposed in the Stockholm Programme, and the European Forum for Urban Security (EFUS) that emerged independent of the EU albeit part-funded through EU funded projects, while other EU funded research programmes such as CRIMPREV, which was completed in 2009, are also indicative of the 'preventive turn' within the EU.

### 2.2 European Crime Prevention Network (EUCPN)

2.2.1 The European Crime Prevention Network (EUCPN) was established with a Council Decision<sup>10</sup> in May 2001 but the EUCPN's foundations originated during the Tampere meeting, as above.

2.2.2 The EUCPN was also recognised by the Hague Programme where it stated that the EUCPN 'should provide expertise and knowledge to the Council and the Commission in developing effective crime prevention' and that it 'should be professionalized and strengthened'.

2.2.3 The operational framework of the EUCPN was set out in the 2001 Council Decision where the parameters of crime prevention were outlined. These were later amended by a Council Decision in 2009 following an evaluation into the EUCPN (see below) and the more recent Council Decision defined the parameters as follows:

'Crime prevention shall cover all measures that are intended to reduce or otherwise contribute to reducing crime and citizens' feeling of insecurity, both quantitatively and qualitatively, either through directly deterring criminal activities or through policies and actions designed to reduce the potential for crime and the causes of crime. It includes work of government, competent authorities, criminal justice agencies, local authorities and the specialist associations they have set up in Europe, the private and voluntary sectors, researchers and the public, supported by the media.'

(Council Decision, 2009: Article 1, paragraph 3<sup>11</sup>)

2.2.4 As clarified on the EUCPN's website, the main aims are:

- (i) to identify good practices in crime prevention and to share knowledge and experience gained between member countries,
- (ii) to accumulate and evaluate information on crime prevention activities,
- (iii) to improve the exchange of ideas and information within the Network,
- (iv) to develop contracts and facilitate cooperation between Member States,
- (v) to contribute to developing local and national strategies on crime prevention, and;
- (vi) to promote crime prevention activities by organising meetings, seminars and conferences.

<sup>10</sup> Full text of the Council Decision available at: <http://www.eucpn.org/key-papers/index.asp> <Accessed 02/03/12>

<sup>11</sup> Council Decision 2009 available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:321:0044:0046:en:PDF> <16/03/12>



2.2.5 These aims are achieved through the implementation of an agreed Work Programme that places emphasis on the production of several small projects within a defined timescale. The Work Programme itself does not have a specific timescale with new projects added as the need arises. Projects in the Work Programme fall within one or more of seven 'headline' themes: crime proofing of legislation; making goods less vulnerable to crime; common methodology to evaluate best practices; inventory of good practices; monitoring Member State crime prevention policies; focus on specific and well-defined types of crime (juvenile, urban, drugs); and, professionalising and strengthening the EUCPN.

2.2.6 The Work Programme:

- should be involved only with the identification (and ultimate dissemination) of good practice derived from literature and other research activity. It does not involve the development of crime prevention initiatives or the evaluation of such initiatives on the ground;
- should comprise projects that are of interest to the majority of Member States, in terms of the subject matter and the proposed outcomes; and
- should only contain projects or activities which have clearly defined outcomes based around a conventional project managed approach to ensure that the outputs will be delivered on target and to agreed quality standards.

2.2.7 However, the EUCPN was developed at a time when a strong EU legislative framework was (and still is) absent and when the EU has very limited competence in crime prevention – the strengths of the EU are largely found in the area of organised crime while the issue of 'volume' crime remains the responsibility of national authorities (Centre for Strategy and Evaluation Services, CSES, 2009: 5).

2.2.8 Several evaluations of the EUCPN have taken place (in 2004 and 2007) with various recommendations made. Most recently, in March 2009, the Centre for Strategy and Evaluation Services (CSES) published an evaluation report<sup>12</sup> for the European Commission's Directorate-General for Justice, Freedom and Security (DG JLS) that assessed the extent to which the aims of the EUCPN have been met.

2.2.9 The report concluded that since its creation in 2001, the EUCPN has played a positive role in raising the profile of crime prevention at a European level and facilitating networking between Member States over a short period of time despite challenges in terms of organisational issues and of the operational environment. The bringing together of policymakers and practitioners would 'almost certainly not have occurred' had the EUCPN not been established.

2.2.10 Key stakeholders that were consulted in the research strongly endorsed the rationale for cooperation at a European level and therefore the EUCPN's role in this process but critiqued the EUCPN for not being active enough in tackling these and other aspects of its remit. Furthermore, the report suggests the EUCPN's impacts have been 'very limited' with 'little awareness' of its activities resulting in the EUCPN's potential not being realised.

---

<sup>12</sup> Full report available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/doc\\_centre/crime/docs/evaluation\\_eucpn\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/doc_centre/crime/docs/evaluation_eucpn_en.pdf)  
<Accessed 16/03/12>

2.2.11 This has been for several reasons:

- (1) its development has been hindered by a lack of political will and the absence of a strong EU legal basis – i.e. the non-ratification of the Lisbon Treaty has left the EU with limited competence in crime prevention,
- (2) the diversity of national level approaches along with EU enlargement has complicated EUCPN's development – i.e. developing a cohesive European network with shared purpose is problematic.

2.2.12 Despite these above complications, the report is critical in its evaluation, suggesting the 'main explanation for under-performance lies with the EUCPN itself and in what can be described as an organisation failure'. The report goes on to state that the goals of the EUCPN's remit are appropriate, meaning there have been shortcomings in the organisation required to pursue them.

2.2.13 Subsequently, the report provides three courses of action:

- (A) maintain the status quo;
- (B) further development of the EUCPN as an EU Network; or,
- (C) the winding down of the EUCPN.

2.2.14 The report argues for option B, suggesting that in the short-term development be based of the current legal/financial status but that in the medium-term the EUCPN be given a legal personality and its own budget. If this is not feasible, the possibility of combining the EUCPN with a European agency/network should be considered. For development to take place, organisational shortcomings must be rectified and political will obtained.

2.2.15 The report goes in to make 35 recommendations for the EUCPN's development. Thus, the EUCPN was re-established in November 2009 when the Network was strengthened, particularly through enhanced participation of national representatives as reinforced with Council Decision 2009/902/JHA that replaced the earlier Council Decision 2001/427/JHA. This more recent Decision also proposed a further evaluation of the EUCPN in 2012.

### **2.3 Observatory for the Prevention of Crime (OPC)**

2.3.1 The recent Stockholm Programme aimed to build on developments in crime prevention at the EU-level through the creation of an Observatory for the Prevention of Crime (OPC)<sup>13</sup>. As the text of the Programme states:

'The European Council invites the Commission to submit a proposal building on the evaluation of the work carried out within the European Crime Prevention Network (EUCPN) with a view to setting up an Observatory for the Prevention of Crime (OPC), the tasks of which will be to collect, analyse and disseminate knowledge on crime, including organised crime (including statistics) and crime prevention, to support and promote Member States and Union institutions when they take preventive measures and to exchange best practice. The OPC should build on the work carried out within the framework of the EUCPN and the evaluation of it. It should include or replace the EUCPN, with a secretariat located within an existing Union agency and functioning as a separate unit.' (Stockholm Programme, 2010: s. 4.3.2, p. 21)

<sup>13</sup> Details on the proposed OPC available at: <http://efus.eu/wp-content/uploads/fileadmin/efus/pdf/OBS%20Doc%20de%20travail%20MM%20VA.pdf?9d7bd4> <Accessed 08/03/12>



2.3.2 Thus, in light of the above evaluation of the EUCPN in 2009 that proposed the furtherance of the Network, it appears that the European Council has taken the decision to explore the merging of the EUCPN.

2.3.3 The Stockholm Programme further invites the Commission to submit a proposal on setting up the OPC due by 2013 at the latest. No EU literature is available that discusses the OPC in any detail.

## **2.4 European Forum for Urban Security (EFUS)**

2.4.1 The European Forum for Urban Security (EFUS) is a non-governmental organisation (NGO) and European network of 300 local authorities that was established in 1987 and is located in Paris. EFUS's creation was supported by the Council of Europe (CoE) but was created on the initiative of Gilbert Bonnemaïson, former Mayor of Epinay-sur-Seine.

2.4.2 As argued in its two manifestos, the Naples 'Cities' Manifesto', agreed in 2000, and the more recent Aubervilliers and Saint Denis Manifesto on 'Security, Democracy and Cities', agreed in December 2012, the Forum exists to promote a particular understanding of crime and its prevention, one associated with principles of social justice, interventions driven by social and economic policy as much as by criminal justice and risk management, and foregrounding the role of municipal authorities as much as police and criminal justice agencies.

2.4.3 It aims to strengthen crime reduction policies and promote the role of local authorities in national and European policies, and it is within this context that the concept of 'urban security' amongst practitioners is most prevalent. In summary, EFUS has used the concept of urban security to reframe problems of crime and violence as problems of social justice, not just criminal justice, which are concentrated in cities but often have their origins elsewhere, for example in forms of financial and organized crime, but which can and ought to be prevented through social and economic policy interventions by partnerships of municipal authorities that are driven both by scientific insight and by popular democratic will.

2.4.4 As such, the concept of urban security has come to express a number of key tensions, if not contradictions, in European thinking about crime and violence – between the importance of prevention and sanctioning as policy priorities established by 'active citizens' as well as scientific and political elites. Consequently, and like many concepts coined in policy discourse, urban security acts as a 'floating signifier' where the concept may mean different things (e.g. different kinds of problems, different approaches) to different groups (e.g. policymakers, academics, practitioners), reflecting the ability of policy advocates to capture the concept for their particular interests.

2.4.5 EFUS works on all major issues in urban safety and security and builds links between European local authorities through practices, information exchanges, cooperation and training. EFUS also has as its objectives to generate links between local authorities on a national, European and international level and to promote the role of local authorities through the results of their programmes, projects and research.

2.4.6 Thus, EFUS members are made up of local, regional and national authorities, NGOs involved in crime prevention and universities, and come from 17 countries – all members pay a fee with only elected local and regional authorities having full membership.



2.4.7 For this fee, members gain

- (i) access to a 'vast network' of knowledge, experts, contacts and experiences
- (ii) links to more than 300 cities across Europe and help with contacting them
- (iii) the possibility of tailor-made training, consultation and technical assistance on security issues
- (iv) automatic receipt of all EFUS's publications and information newsletters
- (v) invitations to EFUS conferences, seminars and training programmes
- (vi) participation in inter-city cooperation and exchange programmes co-financed by the European Commission
- (vii) notification of important events in European Integration and European and international programmes
- (viii) access to a member-only section of the website which details urban security practices in Europe.

2.4.8 In its guidelines and principles, EFUS outlines that key in the implementation of safety policies is respect for human rights and that such policies must not involve the exclusion and repression of vulnerable groups.

## B. The National Level

### 1. Urban security and crime prevention discourse and strategy

1.1 The above-mentioned EUCPN requires member states to provide a document containing crime prevention strategies. These documents are hosted on the EUCPN's website (link: <http://www.eucpn.org/strategies/index.asp>). 17 members (out of 27) have provided such documents (one document, from Austria, is damaged and cannot be opened). Table X (see appendix) outlines the key aspects of these national crime prevention strategies in relation to legal/statutory frameworks, identified problems, identified approaches, responsible actors, expertise and training, and examples from policy/practice.

1.2 *Legal/statutory frameworks*: 10 of the 16 accessible documents provide specific details on the legal and statutory frameworks that empower authorities to engage in crime prevention and the management of urban security. However, given the membership of these nation-states with the EUCPN it can be inferred that provisions do exist in these jurisdictions for crime prevention and urban security management. Of those documents providing details, provisions for urban security management emanate from national constitutions, parliamentary decisions, criminal and civil law, and various other resolutions and regulations. These provisions are often related to specific internal concerns (e.g. national/internal security) and/or specific problems (e.g. juvenile delinquency, organised crime, etc.).

1.3 *Identified problems*: 15 of the 16 documents provide a diverse range of problems associated with crime prevention strategies but clear commonalities between jurisdictions also exist. For example, identified problems include more symptomatic concerns such as property crimes, interpersonal violence (including domestic violence), incivilities and substance misuse to economic crime, corruption, organised crime and cybercrime but also more generative concerns such as social segregation discrimination, illegal immigration, education and housing, racism, and gender equality. In addition, other problems such as natural disasters, corporate safety and state violence are also identified. However, identified problems in each jurisdiction frequently focus on volume crimes such as incivilities, interpersonal violence and property crimes.

1.4 *Identified approaches*: The 16 documents provide various approaches and strategy responses to the above identified problems. These approaches can be grouped into five general crime prevention strategies: (1) criminal justice responses such as the criminalisation of problematic activities, the use of sanctioning and strategies of repression and deterrence; (2) risk management responses such as various situational crime prevention approaches that aim to reduce the opportunities for crime and which implement technological mechanisms (e.g. lighting, CCTV, home/car security) to deter offending and early intervention with at-risk groups such as young people; (3) social prevention such as dealing social segregation and exclusion and the underlying causes of problematic behaviour as well as the rehabilitation of offenders; (4) educational and awareness raising programmes for potential and actual offenders as well as the wider citizenry; (5) intelligence-led strategies that involve information gathering about problematic behaviours, individuals and groups that can subsequently inform prevention strategies.

1.5 *Responsible actors*: The 16 documents highlight a preference for multi-agency partnership working and cooperation across the national, regional and local levels although variations of these prevention structures are evident across the jurisdictions. The state retains a primary role in all jurisdictions and across all levels where a variety of state agencies are involved. For example, while the police and central ministries often have primary strategic and operational responsibility,



there are also roles for other authorities such as fire and rescue, social workers and social services, housing authorities and schools. These state authorities often work in cooperation with non-state organisations such as voluntary and third-sector organisations (e.g. churches, community groups) and commercial enterprises as well as individual citizens all of which are increasingly responsible for crime prevention and the management of urban security.

1.6 *Expertise and training:* 11 of the 16 documents provided details on current expertise and training for those responsible for crime prevention. Issues of expertise appear underdeveloped across the jurisdictions although some strategies indicated the use of scientific expertise from disciplines such as criminology and sociology. There was, however, some reference to the professionalization of crime prevention as well as specialist training in relation to specific problems e.g. child sexual exploitation. In general, knowledge and training provisions take the following forms: (1) Expert networks/forums to enable cross-regional dialogue; (2) Exchange of information and best practice between practitioners and responsible actors; (3) State training into specific problems or aspects of crime prevention strategies; (4) Use of scientific expertise such as criminologists and sociologists; (5) Project evaluation and monitoring to understand the impacts of crime prevention approaches; and, (6) Evidence-based strategies utilising scientific research expertise.

1.7 *Examples from policy/practice:* The crime prevention strategies also provided a range of examples from policy and practice to substantiate their approaches to the identified problems. These related to various issues such as the structure of the multi-agency cooperation, the response to the specific problems (e.g. home burglary), specific programmes, and the use of awards for good practice.

1.8 *Available training qualifications:* Although not discussed in the prevention strategies, the available training qualifications in each jurisdiction were identified using the International Society of Criminology's Observatory on Academic Criminology Programs (<http://www.criminology-programs.org/>) and findings from Work Package 4 (Lead Partner: University of Maribor). Using the European Commission's European Qualifications Framework (EQF) (see [http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/eqf\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/eqf_en.htm)), the availability of level 6 (e.g. undergraduate qualifications or equivalents), level 7 (e.g. Masters and other postgraduate qualifications or equivalents) and level 8 (e.g. doctoral qualifications or equivalents) qualifications were identified. Given the identified problems are largely crime-related, the search was limited to crime-related qualifications. A mixture of these qualifications exists across the 17 jurisdictions.