IcARUS: Work Package 2
Review and Cross-Analysis of Urban Security

Professor Adam Crawford & Dr Christine A. Weirich (University of Leeds)

Introduction: progress update

We continue to make steady progress on the *Review*, having liaised with several partners, initiated the ethics progress, completed a comparison of partner cities, and presented working definitions of terms relevant to the project to our core partners. Our focus has largely been on consolidating the information from one-to-one meetings with partner cities, with a self-report survey which they also completed, allowing us to compile a preliminary comparison of broad characteristics and traits of our city partners. As we continue to prepare and develop the *Review*, we look forward to starting our data collection phase in the next coming months.

Partner Meetings & Discussions

We have been able to meet with several project partners, including Plus Ethics and Erasmus University to discuss our ethics procedures and the overlapping work between Work Package 1 and Work Package 2. In the last week of January, we also held our Core Partners Meeting, which proved to be extremely useful. In this meeting we presented additional terms to be added to our glossary of working definitions and received positive and constructive feedback from partners. We also were able to discuss our partner city comparisons document, which was an initial comparison of general traits of our partner cities.

Partner City Comparisons

The strategic plan of our task is to better understand the development trajectories, current challenges and needs, and future priorities of the research 'users', notably the six core partner cities - Lisbon, Nice, Riga, Rotterdam, Stuttgart and Turin – ahead of the State of the Art Review of research and innovation across the last 30 years in Europe. One important element of this contextual grounding to the *Review* - and the more general work of the IcARUS project - is to develop a clear understanding of the similarities and difference between the partner cities. In light of initial meetings and the review of documentation provided by city partners, we present the following summary which seeks to draw out comparative similarities and differences between the cities, for consideration in the *Review*.

Similarities

- All cities evidence a strong political commitment to multi-stakeholder partnerships in advancing innovations in urban security.

- All cities are keen to learn and share good practice from research and innovation with regard to urban security developments, crime prevention and multi-stakeholder partnerships at the city level.

- All cities are highly engaged in the IcARUS project and keen to benefit from better understanding and using the research evidence base and understanding what innovations and technologies have been most effective in other European cities.

- Many of the cities have experience working with Efus on previous or current projects and have established city-to-city relations with European partners.

- All cities have been on a 'journey of development' with regard to urban security policies and practices. For some this has a history that stretches back 30 years, for others its origins are more recent.

- All cities demonstrate a willingness to assimilate, utilise and implement learning from the IcARUS project and exhibit some considerable organisational receptiveness and absorptive capacity– understood as 'a set of organisational routines and processes by which [organisations] acquire, assimilate, transform, and exploit knowledge to create a dynamic organisational capability' (Zahar and George 2002: 186).

- This also highlights a desire on the part of partner cities for greater city-level communication within the IcARUS project, and more generally opportunities for sharing on a city-to-city basis.

- All cities demonstrate a desire to focus on pursing and using active research to inform new programmes or initiatives.

- All cities have specific needs that include and engage with IcARUS's four priority areas and each city is interested in developing new strategies and practices in at least one of these (and in some cases across the board).

Differences

- The cities are at different stages in their developmental trajectories with regard to the evolution of city-level urban security policies and practices.

- Two of the cities are national capitals - Riga in Latvia and Lisbon in Portugal – which present specific and unique challenges.

- For all the cities their specific geography or border location and for some their status as a port or international transport hub present distinctive security-related challenges.

- The infrastructure and resources available to coordinate and deliver multi-stakeholder partnerships vary significantly across the six cities.

- The legal competencies and relations with national/regional government vary across the six cities. This impacts in different ways with regard to the four priority areas. For example, for some cities organised crime is not a city-level competency but reserved for national institutions.

- The organisational structure for how crime prevention measures are considered and implemented between the six countries varies greatly. Some are strictly within a policing framework, others are based in social and community issues, and still others have specifically dedicated crime prevention units that operate independently.

- The organisation, provision and authorisation of law enforcement agencies - police forces – between the national and city-level authorities differ considerably between the cities/countries. In some cities, municipal policing is more developed and well-resourced than in others where there is greater reliance on national/state police.

- The nature and extent of partnership relations with civil society organisations and other public authorities involved in prevention (i.e. social care, education, housing, etc.) at the city-level vary across the cities.

- Some cities have more robust and developed crime and security data available at the city level. Some cities conduct yearly or bi-yearly security audits to determine areas which need improvement and/or effectiveness of prevention measures, and community perception of safety.

- As we are working across multiple countries within the EU, each country is regulated by its own national laws and policies, which differ in particular regard to crime and security. As such a number of regulations which may be legal in one country or city are deemed illegal in another. This has implications for crime prevention measures – for example prostitution in some countries is openly regulated which can have negative and positive effects on human trafficking.

Glossary Definitions

On behalf of the IcARUS project as a whole and to inform the preparation of the *Review*, we have begun to develop a glossary of terms as a means to create a central document of shared terminology for all partners within the project. The purpose of the glossary is to help clarify the conceptual parameters of the Review and to ensure an agreed understanding of key concepts among all consortium partners. Up to this point the glossary has terms relevant to the *Review* (including the four priority areas) but provides an opportunity to be developed across the project as a consortium resource. This document will be available to partners as a working document, which will likely have additions throughout the progress of the *Review*.

At the moment the following terms are defined within the glossary:

- **Preventing Juvenile Delinquency**
- **Preventing Radicalisation**
- **Preventing and reducing Organised Crime and Trafficking**
- **Managing Public Spaces**
- Urban security
- Crime prevention strategies
- Multi-stakeholder partnerships
- Governance and diversification of actors
- Cyberspace/technology
- Gender Issues
- Transnational and cross-border issues

Next Steps

We will continue to proceed on our ethics, prepare and consider aspect of the review, with the hope of beginning data collection in the next coming months. As are currently on schedule according to the timeline we presented in the previous newsletter.

We have also had some changes to our University of Leeds team, as Dr Elena Sciandra has moved onto a new position at INTERPOL where we wish her well. We are happy to introduce and welcome Dr Susan Donkin to the project as a Research Fellow in European Security who will join the project at the end of February.

References:

Zahra, S.A. and George, G. (2002) 'Absorptive Capacity: A review, reconceptualization and extension', *Academy of Management Review*, 27(2): 185-203