



www.icarus-innovation.eu
info@icarus-innovation.eu

2.4

Roadmap for the Improvement and Definition of Tools



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 882749

2.4

Roadmap for the Improvement and Definition of Tools

DELIVERABLE TYPE

Report

MONTH AND DATE OF DELIVERY

Month 21, 31st May 2022

WORK PACKAGE

WP 2

LEADER

University of Leeds

DISSEMINATION LEVEL

Public

AUTHORS

Adam Crawford, Susan Donkin &
Christine A. Weirich

Programme

H2020

Contract Number

882749

Duration

48 Months

Start

September,
2020

Contributors

NAME	ORGANISATION
Adam Crawford	University of Leeds
Susan Donkin	University of Leeds
Christine A. Weirich	University of Leeds

Peer Reviews

NAME	ORGANISATION
Barbara Holtmann	Fixed Africa
Patrick Charlier	UNIA
Tim Chapman	University of Strathclyde
Carla Napolano and Julia Rettig	Efus
Britta Hecking, Moritz Konradi and Sarah Vollmer	Camino
Caroline Davey and Andrew Wootton	University of Salford
Genny Dimitrakopoulou, Emmanouil Kermitsis and Katerina Georgakopoulou	KEMEA
Markus Pausch, Heiko Berner and Nedzad Mocevic	Salzburg University of Applied Sciences
Christina Zarafonitou, Christina Tatsi and Eleni Kontopoulou	Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences

Revision History

VERSION	DATE	REVIEWER	MODIFICATIONS
1. First Draft of Roadmap	06/05/2022	Julia Rettig and Carla Napolano – Efus; Britta Hecking, Moritz Konradi and Sarah Vollmer – Camino; Caroline Davey and Andrew Wooton – University of Salford	Review and Modifications
2. Second Draft of Roadmap	20/05/2022	Genny Dimitrakopoulou, Emmanouil Kerimitsis and Katerina Georgakopoulou – KEMEA; Caroline Davey and Andrew Wootton – University of Salford; Christina Zarafonitou, Christina Tatsi and Eleni Kontopoulou - Pantheion University; Markus Pausch, Heiko Berner and Nedzad Mocevic - Salzburg University of Applied Sciences; Britta Hecking, Moritz Konradi and Sarah Vollmer – Camino; Julia Rettig and Carla Napolano – Efus	Review and Modifications
2. Second Draft of Roadmap	20/05/2022	Barbara Holtmann (Fixed Africa) Tim Chapman (University of Strathclyde) and Patrick Charlier (UNIA) - Expert Advisory Board Members	Review
3. Final Version of Full Report	30/05/2022	Carla Napolano and Julia Rettig - Efus	Validation

The information and views set out in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf.

Table of Contents

Introduction and Aims	6
Problem Identification	8
Partnerships	10
Design and Innovation	12
Implementation	14
Outcomes	16
Evaluation	17
Communication	18
Focus Areas: Specific Guidance	19
Preventing Juvenile Delinquency	19
Preventing Radicalisation leading to Violent Extremism	19
Preventing and Reducing Trafficking and Organised Crime	20
Designing and Managing Safe Public Spaces	20
Implications for the IcARUS Project	21
References	22

Introduction and Aims

The primary aim of this *Roadmap* is to provide a guiding analytic framework to inform the IcARUS project; one that highlights strategic principles, design constraints, programme requirements and the parameters to be taken into account in defining, as well as in designing and implementing, the urban security tools and strategies in the six partner cities.¹ The *Roadmap* draws directly on the key lessons and insights from the *State-of-the-Art Review* of the accumulated research knowledge base (Task 2.1)² and the *Inventory of Tools and Practices* (Task 2.2),³ as well as the *Critical Review of 'What Works'* arising from the IcARUS Consortium workshop held in Berlin on 12-13th April 2022 (Task 2.3). It is intended to provide an analytical framework that underpins and informs the subsequent IcARUS project activities, notably the design, development and implementation of the tools and practices that are the focus of Work Packages 3 ('design') and 4 ('implementation').

The *Roadmap* seeks to draw out from the descriptive findings of the two *Reviews* the key prescriptive principles, constraints and guidance that focus on the practical question of: *what should be done?* It is not intended to serve as a catalogue of 'pick-and-mix' practices or tools that might be appropriated, adopted or transferred to new contexts. Moreover, it is not aimed at providing a high degree of granular detail that will furnish the content or mechanisms of resultant tools and practices. These are to be fashioned and co-designed with relevant stakeholders and representatives of end-users in the targeted city locations where the tools and practices will be implemented. In addition to the IcARUS *Reviews*, the *Roadmap* draws upon established guidance produced by the European Forum for Urban Security and its 2017 Manifesto *Security, Democracy and Cities: Co-producing Urban Security Policies* (Efus 2018).

Beyond informing the IcARUS project, this *Roadmap* should provide an accessible resource to guide and assist urban security practitioners and policy-makers across Europe in fashioning research-informed, innovative strategies. Hence, where possible, this *Roadmap* is written to guide practitioners keen to learn from the research knowledge and accumulated best practice experiences. It seeks to provide actionable knowledge with generalisable application. However, it comes with the important caveat, which echoes throughout the *State-of-the-Art Review*, that ***all urban security interventions are shaped and their effectiveness influenced by the contexts that sustain them and the implementation processes through which they are enacted and delivered.***

¹ The six IcARUS partner cities are Lisbon, Nice, Riga, Rotterdam, Stuttgart and Turin.

² See <https://www.icarus-innovation.eu/tools-insights/public-reports/>

³ See <https://www.icarus-innovation.eu/tools-insights/public-reports/>

*A central finding from the State-of-the-Art Review is that the **processes** of problem identification, design, context, implementation and evaluation **matter** greatly. Much of the research evidence base has focused on the questions of ‘what works’ and the effects on outcome patterns detached from the contexts that shape them and the processes through which they are given life and expression.*

In what follows, the guiding principles, constraints and learning opportunities are clustered around a number of broad thematic pillars that constitute the analytic framework:

- Problem identification;
- Partnerships;
- Design and innovation;
- Implementation;
- Outcomes;
- Evaluation;
- Communication.

It then provides some parameters for designing tools and practices in relation to the four IcARUS focus areas and concludes with some recommendations for the IcARUS project specifically.

Problem Identification

Context matters — nothing works everywhere, a lot of things work somewhere. Problems and their solutions are place and time dependent. Urban security problems might appear to be the same, but their underlying nature and causes may be very different, necessitating a distinct approach. Contexts can be understood as the composite of the relational and dynamic features or forces and interactions within which new security interventions are set. As such, contexts shape resultant outcomes, determining success or otherwise.

The following guiding principles, constraints and learning opportunities have been identified for this thematic area:

- Due regard should be given to the particular contexts in which tools and practices will be developed and applied; including the institutional settings, administrative infrastructures, individuals and interpersonal relationships.
- There is a need to understand the dynamic and changing nature of crime problems and the ways in which people adapt to new interventions, technologies and change. As a consequence, scanning and analysis processes need to be iterative and reflective.
- Define key terms, concepts and goals, and agree a shared understanding of their meaning and use across project partners, stakeholders and end-users.
- Define and understand the local problem — identifying the capacity of local actors and community members to provide knowledge and insight into the local problem. Avoid arriving at solutions too hastily.
- Have due regard to the gender implications for how problems are identified, defined and operationalised.
- Be aware of the capacity of certain interests and groups to represent their views more loudly than others. Seek out 'hard to hear' voices to ensure diversity, including characteristics of race, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation, social class, religion and belief.
- The scanning, investigation and delineation of the problem to be addressed should be informed by a rigorous analysis of data relating to the problem held by diverse stakeholders, as well as the insights and lived experiences of those users and beneficiaries on which the intervention seeks to impact.
- Good quality, shared data are vital in clarifying and defining the nature and extent of the problem(s) being tackled through focused analysis to ensure a genuine problem-based intervention. Seek to review data from a variety of sources (i.e. not only police statistics) in order to come to a comprehensive understanding of the issue.

- Make use of existing ‘problem-solving’ frameworks to help structure rigorous enquiries into the nature and extent of the problem - i.e. the SARA model,⁴ the 5Is⁵ and human-centred design thinking methodologies.⁶
- Specify and agree the shared aims, the mechanisms to achieve these and the desired outcomes that will result, as well as the theories of change that inform how it is intended that the outcomes are realised.

⁴ The SARA model highlights the four stages of: **Scanning** - identifying the problem; **Analysis** – understanding the underlying reasons; **Response** – developing methods to resolve the problem; and **Assessment** – check whether the method worked (see Clarke and Eck 2005).

⁵ The 5Is framework identifies: **Intelligence** – gathering and analysing information; **Intervention** – the mechanism to block, disrupt or weaken the causes; **Implementation** - converting the intervention principles into practical application; **Involvement** – mobilising relevant agencies and actors; and **Impact** – evaluation of the outcomes and results (see Ekblom 2004).

⁶ See Cooper, Davey and Wootton (2017).

Partnerships

The overwhelming lesson from the last 30 years is that the institutional context and resistant organisational cultures have often undermined the implementation of research-informed urban security and crime prevention. Urban security demands the engagement of multiple stakeholders. Advantages of multi-stakeholder partnerships derive not simply in the combination of perspectives, resources and skills, but also in framing and shaping problems and methods differently. However, differing cultures, values, interests and working practices can foster conflicts.

The following guiding principles, constraints and learning opportunities have been identified for this thematic area:

- Effective urban security strategies and practices rely on sustainable multi-stakeholder relations. Time and resources need to be allocated to forging trustworthy and committed partnerships.
 - Identify a broad spectrum of partners tailored to the particular issue;
 - Involve local communities in partnerships — as end-users and integral components to the provision of protective factors;
 - Once established, continue fostering these relationships and do not get complacent.
- Ensure that due attention is given to building inter-organisational and inter-personal trust relations, as well as public trust in authorities alongside and through urban security interventions.
 - Create a sense of shared ownership and develop shared values;
 - Clearly define responsibilities, tasks, expectations for each partner from the outset;
 - Acknowledge asymmetries of power differentials, seek to mitigate these and manage any conflicts in open and constructive ways;
 - Put in place accountability mechanisms;
 - Create meaningful engagement with end-users and beneficiaries.
- Aim to foster a culture of collaboration and a shared language, e.g. through joint training, common reflection on key concepts, collective problem-solving and building consensus despite differences.
- Create opportunities to monitor performance and render services accountable and reviewable. Encourage feedback throughout the process, adjusting and modifying practices where necessary.

Partnerships are often stymied by mistrust and a lack of mutual understanding between partners. These are exacerbated by problems of data sharing. Such inter-organisational barriers need to be overcome from the outset through shared agreements and understanding of both the diverse contributions that partners can make and the limitations on what can be expected of them.

- From the outset, due consideration needs to be given to overcoming the technological, legal, organisational and cultural barriers to data exchange and sharing relevant information between partner agencies:
 - Set up data sharing agreements and protocols. Joined up provision of different data sets allows for better coordination between agencies and provides new insights, identifying new opportunities for intervention and prevention;
 - Create opportunities for joint analysis and coordinated working between relevant agencies;
 - Joined-up provision provides an evidence-base from which to assess effectiveness.

Design and Innovation

The Reviews highlight both the dynamic nature of crime and security problems that are continually evolving in response to social and technological change and the tendency to retrofit solutions after innovations have occurred rather than to embed up-stream interventions at the design stage to effect security and harm reduction outcomes.

The following guiding principles, constraints and learning opportunities have been identified for this thematic area:

- Secure commitments to collaborations between designers, manufacturers, architects, planners, service providers and end-users from the outset.
- In designing holistic new interventions or tools, consideration should be given to the implications for aesthetics, accessibility, sustainability and social inclusion.
- In developing design-solutions:
 - Incorporating preventive elements into the initial design of new products and services is more effective than retrofitting solutions after the event;
 - Anticipate technological changes in products and services at the design stage;
 - Continuously monitor and adapt efficiency of policies, interventions, products and services in light of technological changes. Allow opportunities for formative evaluation that feeds into ongoing development.

Urban security is about more than crime reduction, incorporating public perceptions of insecurities, well-being, social cohesion and trust in authorities. Aesthetics and public sensibilities matter, given that security interventions can foster insecurity rather than public reassurance.

- Consider the desirability of complementary mixes of multiple interventions over single tools, while avoiding the dangers of 'overload' and assuming that all complementary measures should be used rather than the minimum number necessary to achieve the desired result.
- Design should focus on and incorporate the human elements within any eco-system or environment and the manner in which humans interact with technologies and machines. Ultimately, people are responsible for the outcomes of urban security interventions and are likely to enable or undermine their success.
- The use of digital technology and online spaces provide abundant opportunities as platforms for positive interactions and interventions. Explore and exploit these opportunities where relevant.

- Where possible, interventions should seek to build and sustain local knowledge and capacity in ways that enhance resilience, foster social cohesion and community engagement.
- In designing new urban security tools and practices it is important to combine different types of knowledge — both ‘knowing-that’ with ‘knowing-how’.
- Those designing new interventions should avoid simply ‘reinventing the wheel’ and learn from the research evidence base and good practice that can and needs to be appropriately transferred and adapted to particular contexts.
- Attention should be given to how the organisational learning and public understanding that derive from innovative practices can be sustained over time and brought into the mainstream of routine practices and service delivery.

Implementation

It is not that the science is poor with regard to crime prevention and urban security — although it is inevitably incomplete, in some places inadequate and shifting in the light of technological and social change. Rather it is not being implemented or being implemented in inappropriate ways, circumstances and situations that constitute the most basic contemporary challenge.

The following guiding principles, constraints and learning opportunities have been identified for this thematic area:

- An integrated approach to urban security requires alignment between national and municipal authorities and a clear understanding of the relative jurisdiction, competencies and responsibilities, between central government departments in order to avoid conflicts and ‘turf wars’.
- Ensure appropriate political commitment and leadership to long-term, comprehensive strategies, paying due regard to narrow political horizons and short timelines by highlighting intermediate outcomes or ‘quick wins’ throughout the intervention cycle.
- Avoid knee-jerk reactions to high profile crime incidents. Where possible, seek to structure opportunities for dialogue and exchange in which politicians engage with researchers and practitioners to foster long-term and comprehensive strategies.
- Ensure that interventions are embedded within infrastructures that align with local cultural values, underpinned by sustainable funding and supported by long-term organisational commitments and political support.

Implementation failure is the most frequent cause of ineffective interventions. Too often implementation tends to be seen as linear, rationalistic and technocratic. Yet, the intentions and expectations of designers are not always realised in their application. People actively shape the implementation process through their use, translation and adaptation of tools and policies into lived practices and experiences. Administrative structures, political leadership, institutional commitment and buy in from stakeholders are all pivotal to successful implementation.

- Given the breadth of their competencies and their role as local anchor institutions, city and municipal authorities should play a vital role in harnessing coalitions of partners for change in ways that break free from siloed approaches and inter-professional rivalries.
- Citizens and local populations affected by new interventions need to be seen and treated as active co-producers of security and agents of change rather than as passive recipients of services.
- Explore and make use of opportunities to activate community engagement and foster citizen participation across the implementation process.

- Understanding the culture, values and motivations of those actors and end-users responsible for implementing and delivering new strategies and working with new tools will help align design proposals with intended outcomes.
- There needs to be due recognition of capacity and capability of communities and citizens for self-regulation through persuasion and voluntary compliance rather than threats of administrative sanctions or penal measures.

Outcomes

Security is a common good and a fundamental component of democracy. However, security is but one imperative that sometimes collides with other public goods or private pursuits. One person's security may adversely impact on or come at the cost of other people's freedoms or liberties. Respect for human rights needs to be embedded as an overarching objective. Caution must be given not to over prioritise security against other public benefits and values – be they social, cultural, environmental, educational or health-related.

The following guiding principles, constraints and learning opportunities have been identified for this thematic area:

- The safety and security benefits of particular interventions need to be balanced carefully against other public goals, social values and human rights.
- In recognition that unintended consequences can arise from well-intentioned interventions, there is a need to ensure that new strategies, practices and tools accord with a principle of parsimony – whereby less interventionist measures are preferred in the first instance - and the guiding principle of 'do no harm'.
- In framing appropriate outcomes, due consideration should be given to the principles of proportionality, necessity and legality.
- Fundamental public issues should not be marginalised by a focus on security nor valued (and funded) solely in terms of the role they might play in crime prevention or enhancing security.
- Attention should be given to the unequal distribution of crime harm as it compounds social and economic inequalities. Interventions should not add to the concentration of harm and vulnerability, nor increase existing inequalities of service provision or social outcomes, avoiding the stigmatisation of groups or neighbourhoods.
- Due regard should be accorded to the differential gender implications and impacts of given urban security strategies and tools.
- Consideration should be given to the social and economic costs of interventions, as well as impacts on people's freedoms, privacy or liberties that accompany new security measures.
- Actions or interventions that infringe liberties are more evidently justifiable if: (a) those who support the actions are also impacted by them; and (b) the impacts of such actions are not restricted to or unevenly distributed among members of identifiable minority groups — whether implicitly or through anticipated differential implementation.

Evaluation

Reviews of the research evidence across the last 30 years and current tools and practices clearly demonstrate the paucity of attention given to evaluation of interventions in terms of both outcomes and the process of implementation. There is a general lack of evaluation-based tools. Evaluation of the effects and impacts of preventive interventions remain patchy, limited in rigour and frequently under-resourced. Evaluation of interventions is vital as a mechanism of accountability, to help strengthen institutional development and to inform accumulated knowledge and evidence.

The following guiding principles, constraints and learning opportunities have been identified for this thematic area:

- There is a need for more robust evaluation to be built into the design and delivery of new interventions from the outset.
- To assess what is working and what needs improving, engage researchers and those with knowledge and experience of the research evidence base in the planning, design, delivery and evaluation of new tools.
- To enable evaluation, clearly define the aims of any programme or intervention, as well as the outcome measures.
 - Assess the availability of necessary data to inform the evaluation.
- From the outset, specify the theories of change that inform how specific mechanisms trigger the anticipated outcomes, so that they can be tested to provide a better understanding of how an intervention works or is intended to work.
- Continuously monitor any changes or influences affecting interventions or the identified problem.
- Urban security outcomes should not only be conceived in terms of crime reduction, but can include diverse forms of harm minimisation, public perceptions of insecurities, societal security, well-being and lived experiences, as well as enhancing public trust in authorities.
 - Ask different questions and make use of or create alternative data.
- To enhance adaptive learning, ensure that all failures and unintended consequences are acknowledged, recorded and appropriate lessons realised. Understanding why an intervention did not work will help learning and foster future improvement.
- The process of implementation itself should be assessed and evaluated, as well as the outcomes derived from particular tools and practices.
- Evaluation should be built in from the outset, participative and engaged with the processes of design and delivery, fostering formative insights as well as summative feedback. Any findings and recommendations should communicate helpful and meaningful implications for future practices.

Communication

One of the ironies of urban security interventions is that in their implementation they may foster perceptions of insecurities by alerting citizens to risks, heightening sensibilities and scattering the built environment with visible reminders of threats. Alternatively, by excluding, prohibiting or displacing certain activities, behaviours or people, they may communicate powerful messages (inadvertently or otherwise) about identity and belonging in public spaces.

The following guiding principles, constraints and learning opportunities have been identified for this thematic area:

- Create and foster regular communication between partners, ensuring any barriers are identified and tackled in a timely manner so as not to jeopardise the intervention.
- Consider how best to communicate the innovative features of a given intervention in publicly accessible ways that highlight their positive attributes.
- Assess and consider the communicative properties of interventions, tools and practices.
 - What messages about safety, identity and belonging do new interventions convey to users, stakeholders or the general public? And, how are these interpreted (possibly differently) by diverse user groups?
- Avoid overly simplistic communication of ‘success’ and rather shift communications to focus on organisational learning as an important and ongoing aspect of a culture of openness and experimentation.
- There is much that can be learnt from unsuccessful interventions in terms of the theories that underpin them, the processes of implementation and the methods used to evaluate success.
- Seek to foster systems of accountability, transparency and shared responsibility, rather than a culture of blame, so as to ensure more efficient implementation, support multi-agency partnerships, and ultimately facilitate the evaluation process.

Focus Areas: Specific Guidance

The guidance outlined above applies to both general urban security practices and problem-specific domains of new tools and approaches. The IcARUS project is focused on four focus areas: preventing juvenile delinquency; preventing radicalisation leading to violent extremism; preventing and reducing trafficking and organised crime; and designing and managing safe public spaces. Domain-specific guidance from the *Reviews* is outlined below.

Preventing Juvenile Delinquency

- Focus on building resilience from an early age. Combine resilience building at the individual, familial and community levels.
- Design broad interventions aimed at strengthening social cohesion and integration to large cohorts.
- Building relationships and networks of support are of central importance, as constructive and resilient relationships with young people and their families are an important condition for success.
- Consider tailoring gender-specific interventions rather than expecting interventions to work in similar ways with all mixed-gender groups of a similar age.
- Create standardised forms of measurement to serve as the foundation of meaningful, quality evaluation research.
- With regard to early intervention and developmental programmes, consider the role of and collecting supplemental data on social, educational (including learning disabilities), and skills-based learning.

Preventing Radicalisation leading to Violent Extremism

- Identify if there is a particularly problematic form of radicalisation in the intervention area.
- Identifying and following the platform(s) used to communicate by groups seeking to polarise or radicalise will help to:
 - Gain useful insights to inform prevention programmes and counter-narratives;
 - Identify potential points of intervention.
- Consider providing broad and universal interventions protecting individuals from *any* form of radicalisation by developing critical thinking skills
- Develop inclusive and community-focused programmes, mindful of and suited to the local context.
- Consider whether gender-specific interventions may be beneficial, appropriate or necessary.
- Foster empowerment via participation:
 - Provide experiences of participation in everyday democratic processes of dialogue and decision-making to counter perceptions and experiences of marginalisation;
 - Share examples of non-violent resistance.

- Strengthen and promote civic education as political education even without preventive justification.
- Clearly define and foster core values, such as human rights and democracy.
- Provide safe spaces to discuss controversial topics, democratic deficits, and ideologies, allowing for heightened emotions without the fear of referral to the authorities.

Preventing and Reducing Trafficking and Organised Crime

- Identify the business models underlying the local organised crime problem and identify opportunities for intervention and future prevention.
- Understand the drivers facilitating trafficking; which industries fuel the demand and provide the relevant services and goods?
- Identify victims and the drivers pushing them to rely on or to be drawn into organised crime;
 - Consider providing (structural) alternatives, such as legitimate employment or educational training;
 - Consider gender-specific interventions aimed at protecting victims of human trafficking.
- Identify protective factors and resilience skills of individuals and communities.
- Involve civil society and local communities in the fight against organised crime and trafficking.
- Keep abreast of technological developments likely exploited by organised crime groups.
- Create cross-jurisdictional collaborations to better understand the problem and find effective and tailored solutions.

Designing and Managing Safe Public Spaces

- Encourage legitimate use of public spaces by enabling diverse groups of users to reclaim and use public spaces.
- Ensure well-maintained, adequately lit and welcoming spaces to foster perception of safety.
- Given the significant gender differences with regard to experiences and perceptions of safety in public spaces, consider the specific implications of design and management interventions for women, girls, trans and non-binary users.
- Involve the community and seek feedback to improve design and management of safe public spaces.
- Commit to strategies favouring informal actors and self-regulation over law enforcement interventions.
- Where used in public spaces, ensure CCTV is integrated into a comprehensive prevention strategy to render it effective.

Implications for the IcARUS Project

Realising the blend of past learning with future provision, the combination of social and technological innovation and the means through which these can support societal values of tolerance, trust, social inclusion and harm minimisation in ways that address the safety needs of diverse communities in our European cities is the challenge that the IcARUS project is seeking to address.

- The IcARUS project should consider how it ensures the learning from the accumulated knowledge base — as set out in the Reviews — and the principles elaborated in this *Roadmap* are applied and implemented across the duration of the project, in ways that inform the design of new tools and their implementation.
- In the design and implementation phases, due regard should be given to the principles and learning elaborated throughout this *Roadmap*.
- Processes of self-evaluation and critical reflection should be built into the design and implementation of the tools in the six cities, as well as evaluation of the impacts of the tools.
 - One way in which critical reflection and ‘learning through doing’ might be ensured is for each city to have its own group of external ‘critical friends’ drawn from the academic community and civil society organisations represented within the IcARUS consortium and outside of the city themselves. These small groups could oversee, record and assess the development of the tools and practices over time and contribute to the evaluation of outcomes.
- Careful consideration should be given to how the IcARUS project will ensure the rigorous evaluation of the processes of design, implementation and the outcomes that derive from the tools and practices in the six cities to enable wider learning across and beyond IcARUS.

References

- Clarke, R.V. and Eck, J.E. (2005) *Crime analysis for problem solvers in 60 small steps*, Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
- Cooper, R., Davey, C.L. and Wootton, A.B. (2017) *Design Against Crime: A Human-Centred Approach to Designing for Safety and Security*, London: Routledge.
- Eklom, P. (2004) 'Shared Responsibilities, Pooled Resources: A Partnership Approach to Crime Prevention', in P. Eklom and A. Wyvekens (eds) *A Partnership Approach to Crime Prevention*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- European Forum for Urban Security (2018) *Security, Democracy and Cities: Co-producing Urban Security Policies Manifesto*, Paris: Efus.



CONSORTIUM



European Forum for Urban Security (Efus)



FH Salzburg

Fachhochschule Salzburg (FHs) Salzburg University of Applied Sciences



Plus Ethics



Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR)



Laboratory of Urban Criminology / Pantheon University of Social and Political Sciences (Pantheon)



University of Salford



University of Leeds



Landeshauptstadt Stuttgart Municipality of Stuttgart



Riga Municipal Police (RMP)



City of Rotterdam



City of Nice



Lisbon Municipal Police / Lisbon Municipality (LMP/CML)



Local Police of Turin (PLTO)



make sense



CAMINO



Idiap Research Institute



KEMEA



LOBA

