

A Cursory Review of Selected Crime Prevention Coordination Mechanisms

Prepared by Sarah Ferencz and Jessica Jahn

Submitted on November 22, 2016

University of the Fraser Valley

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. France	2
2.1. Additional Resources	4
3. Sweden	4
3.1. Additional Resources	6
4. Singapore	6
4.1. Additional Resources	7
5. Australia	7
5.1. Additional Resources	10
6. Conclusion	10

1. Introduction

- Crime prevention coordination mechanisms are internationally recognized as a key feature of any successful national crime prevention strategy. Such mechanisms have been historically developed to effectively and efficiently facilitate priority areas, mobilize communities and stakeholders, and increase regional capacity to ultimately reduce crime and improve the quality of life for all.
- According to the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime (2010),¹ 21 countries have established national coordinating or developmental entities responsible for instituting crime prevention strategies and related policies, including South Africa, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Hungary, Morocco, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Netherlands, Poland, Dominican Republic, Czech Republic, El Salvador, Sweden, and Slovenia. Since 2010, other countries have convened such coordination mechanisms, including but not limited to Singapore and Japan. In addition, Indonesia and Malaysia have established crime prevention foundations, which are officially affiliated with the Asian Crime Prevention Foundation.
- This briefing note presents a cursory review of the typical structures and mandates of selected national crime prevention coordination mechanisms, concentrating on those in France, Sweden, Singapore, and Australia, and concludes with a short synthesis of identified themes. While the following briefing note does not purport to be an exhaustive analysis of such coordination mechanisms, it is hoped that key comparative insights will inform and assist in the development of similar coordination mechanisms in the Republic of the Union of Myanmar.

2. France

- In France, the establishment of crime prevention coordination mechanisms can be traced back to the early 1980's, when Prime Minister Pierre Mauroy convened the **National Crime Prevention Council** to strengthen the collaboration between the State and local leadership for the purposes of preventing crime. More recently, the so-called Act of March 5, 2007 requires mayors to develop and facilitate local crime prevention policies for their respective municipality—in accordance with the priorities of the national crime prevention strategy—thereby officially devolving the responsibility of crime prevention (and security) to local governments.
- There exist several entities, both local and national, that contribute to the prevention of crime in France, including:

¹ See http://www.crime-prevention-intl.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/Crime_Prevention_and_Community_Safety_ANG.pdf

- (1) **Local councils for security and prevention**, which are directly involved with the implementation of the respective local crime prevention policy. A local council must be created in every community with over 10,000 residents.
 - (2) **The Regional Council for Crime Prevention** that studies and advises local councils on the key priorities for each local crime prevention policy.
 - (3) *The Comité interministériel de prévention de la délinquance* (the Interdepartmental Committee on Crime Prevention; CIPD), which was established in 2006 to “fix the large government funding allocations for crime prevention while coordinating the action of the different ministries concerned” (European Forum for Urban Safety, 2016, p.1).² Furthermore, the CIPD is responsible for the development and implementation of the national crime prevention strategy, as well as the distribution of State-funded resources and technical assistance, which supports local governments in effectively realizing the priorities of both the respective local policy and national strategy for the prevention of crime.
- In May of 2013, the CIPD adopted the National Crime Prevention Strategy (2013-2017),³ which includes three priority areas/action programs:
 - “Priority 1: action program for youth exposed to crime.
 - Priority 2: action program to improve the prevention of violence against women, domestic violence and victims’ assistance.
 - Priority 3: action program to improve public peace of mind.”⁴
 - According to the European Forum for Urban Safety (2016), the priorities for the national crime prevention strategy, including the main priorities for each local policy, were/are informed by data gathered by the **National Observatory on Crime and Penal Responses** (ONDRP). In addition, the ONDRP undertakes national victimization surveys, while the Centre for Research on Law and Penal Institutions and the Institute for Urban Planning and Urbanism in Ile-de-France lead local victimization surveys.
 - In addition, the European Forum for Urban Safety (2016) suggests that there are currently three main changes/debates occurring in France that will or have already affected the structure and organization of the existing crime prevention coordination mechanisms, including:

² See p.1 https://efus.eu/files/2016/04/AUDITS_fichespays_FR_ENG.pdf

³ See http://www.crime-prevention-intl.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/2015/srategieversionRIM_ENGLISH.pdf

⁴ See p. 3 http://www.crime-prevention-intl.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/2015/srategieversionRIM_ENGLISH.pdf

- (1) The currently ongoing territorial reforms are modifying the governance of public policy and notably security policy, which is leading to discussions around the role of inter-municipalities in preventing crime;
- (2) The integration of prevention and violence radicalization into crime prevention policies and the increase in the financial resources allocated to this problem; and
- (3) The national strategy and budget have been refocused around secondary and tertiary prevention. However, the majority of local authorities continue to include primary prevention in their local crime prevention policies.

2.1. Additional Resources

- For further information on the use of territorial approaches in the implementation of crime prevention strategies, please [click here](#) (only available in French).

3. Sweden

- In Sweden, crime prevention has long been acknowledged as a cornerstone of safe, prosperous, and vibrant communities. In fact, the **Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention** (commonly referred to as ‘Brå’) was established in 1974 with the aim of producing Sweden’s official crime statistics, assisting in the development of Sweden’s national crime prevention strategy, forming strategic alliances with other agencies to strengthen techniques for the prevention of crime, and funding and supporting **local crime prevention councils**.⁵
- According to Svanberg (2014),⁶ Swedish **local crime prevention councils** serve as platforms for cooperation between local stakeholders on a grassroots level. Such councils typically centre around (1) alcohol and drug prevention; (2) at-risk youth; (3) crime prevention in schools; and (4) more broadly on safety and security, including video camera surveillance, outdoor lighting, and neighbourhood watch programs. However, Andersson (2005)⁷ suggests that there exists great variance with respect to the mandates and priority areas of such councils, which may be reasonably explained by the varying needs and problems experienced by each community. Representatives of these councils typically include a local coordinator, police personnel, social workers, and teachers/administrators.
- In 1996, the Government of Sweden adopted its comprehensive national crime prevention strategy entitled *Our Collective Responsibility*,⁸ which is predicated on two main principles:

⁵ See <https://www.bra.se/bra/bra-in-english/home/about-bra.html>

⁶ See p. 40 http://www.crime-prevention-intl.org/uploads/media/ICPC_report_4.pdf

⁷ See p. 82 [http://polis-](http://polis-beta.osce.org/countries/f/71/156/The%20Swedish%20National%20Council%20for%20Crime%20Prevention.pdf)

[beta.osce.org/countries/f/71/156/The%20Swedish%20National%20Council%20for%20Crime%20Prevention.pdf](http://polis-beta.osce.org/countries/f/71/156/The%20Swedish%20National%20Council%20for%20Crime%20Prevention.pdf)

⁸ See <http://www.gov.se/contentassets/ed27de7824124efca35d6f2eb7f14806/our-collective-respsibility>

- (1) In order to effectively prevent and combat crime, broader social approaches—beyond those of the criminal justice system—must be taken seriously; and
 - (2) The causes of crime must be dealt with locally, particularly where the problem or transgression originated from. *This point is similar to the model used in France, wherein the onus is on the local governments to implement measures to proactively address crimes that are potentially unique or more pronounced in each respective community.*
- The strategy also mandates the establishment of a **Crime Prevention Implementation Committee**, which was broadly tasked with ensuring that the intentions and elements of the strategy are translated into practice, as well as apportioning the funds for the respective crime prevention work; although it is not entirely clear if this committee was actually convened or what role it played in facilitating the crime prevention strategy.
 - While the *Our Collective Responsibility* strategy has not been updated or amended since its adoption, additional plans have been developed to address more specific and evolving areas, such as organized crime and violence against women.
 - Svanberg (2014)⁹ offers a case study of a community called Rinkeby—a district in the City of Stockholm—that represents a model for other communities with respect to crime prevention initiatives. In particular, Rinkeby’s local crime prevention council has undertaken initiatives relating to situational and social crime prevention, as well as advancing collaboration with social services and other stakeholders, which has largely focused on (1) drug and abuse prevention; (2) social inclusion; (3) prevention of at-risk youth from being recruited into criminal groups, and; (4) prevention of intimate partner and family violence, including honour-related violence. According to Svanberg (2014), this multifaceted and cross-sectoral approach of addressing the underlying causes of crime has reduced the crime rates in Rinkeby, although no official statistics to substantiate this claim are provided.
 - Of note, two main challenges emerged in the available literature outlining the coordination mechanisms executed in Sweden (of which should come as no surprise), including:
 - (1) Information sharing across sectors, including opportunities (i.e., inter-governmental meetings and meetings with religious leaders) for open and confidential sharing of relevant information; and
 - (2) Insufficient resources. In particular, front-line staff reported that senior managers do not perceive crime prevention as an important cause that is worthy of resources.

⁹ See p. 41 http://www.crime-prevention-intl.org/uploads/media/ICPC_report_4.pdf

3.1. Additional Resources

- For a list of guidance documents published by the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention, please [click here](#).
- The following is a document developed by the Polisen and the European Union entitled the [Methodological Manual for Cooperation to Counteract Social Unrest](#), which shares the experiences of many districts in Sweden relating to the strengthening of cross-sectoral cooperation, particularly among police services with schools, social services, and recreation amenities.
- In addition, the report entitled [Evaluation of the Cooperation to Prevent Social Unrest in the Jarva Area](#) describes police-social services cooperation and identifies the varying factors that have led to a better cooperation process between police services and other sectors involved in crime prevention in Jarva, Sweden.

4. Singapore

- For nearly five decades, crime prevention has occupied a prominent position in the Singaporean policy and planning discourse. In particular, the Singapore Police Force relies heavily on community policing strategies, with the expectation that all persons in Singapore have a social responsibility to be well educated in crime prevention measures and adopt safety precautions for both their individual persons and property.¹⁰
- In 1977, the **Crime Prevention Branch of the Singapore Police Force** was formed, which was later integrated into the **Crime Prevention Division**. Currently, the Division is responsible a range of crime prevention initiatives, including the National Police Cadets Corps, the Crime Risk Surveys, Crime Prevention for Senior Citizens, Crime Prevention Committees, Crime Watch TV Programmes, and Neighbourhood Watch Schemes.
- Furthermore, the Division works closely with the **National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC)**, a non-profit organization that is devoted to advancing public awareness of crime; developing crime prevention measures suitable for public review; coordinating efforts of organizations interested in such activities; and collaborating with local police to determine priority hot spots, new and emerging forms of crime, and community needs. The NCPC is comprised of representatives from commercial and industrial sectors, as well as the public sector and the Singapore Police Force. Under the NCPC, there exist several, more focused subcommittees, including:
 - (1) The Hotel Security Committee
 - (2) Security at Construction Worksites Committee
 - (3) Children and Youth Committee

¹⁰ See p. 140 http://www.unafei.or.jp/english/pdf/PDF_rms/no56/56-12.pdf

(4) Security at Commercial Premises Committee

(5) Security in Housing Committee

(6) Focus Group Committee

- According to a news article that was published on November 20, 2016,¹¹ the NCPC and the Singapore Police Force recently launched a new anti-scam helpline to give advice to the public on ploys if they suspect that they have fallen for one.
- Additionally, the **Central Narcotics Bureau (CNB)** administers drug prevention and education programming.
- However, our cursory review **did not reveal any explicit mention or online documentation of a national crime prevention strategy in Singapore, although the author wishes to make clear that she does not doubt that there exists such a comprehensive strategy in Singapore—she was just simply unable to locate it.** In addition, it seems as though—in contrast to the approaches adopted by France and Sweden—that **Singapore has not established local coordinating crime prevention entities.** Put differently, rather than devolving the responsibility of crime prevention to local governments, it appears as though the responsibility of such public education, coordination, and research is assumed by the Singapore Police Force and the NCPC.

4.1. Additional Resources

- For a review of Singapore’s crime prevention systems, please refer to UNODC’s questionnaire by [clicking here](#).
- To view Singapore’s National Cybercrime Action Plan, please [click here](#).

5. Australia

- In 2012, the **Australian and New Zealand Crime Prevention Senior Officers’ Group (ANZCP SOG)** produced the National Crime Prevention Framework. ANZCP SOG provides a national forum for sharing crime prevention information between senior crime prevention personnel of the States, Territories, and Commonwealth of New Zealand and Australia governments. The aims of this group include:
 - Support strategic thinking and policy development on crime prevention;
 - Promote inter-jurisdictional collaboration;
 - Promote and encourage strategic research in crime prevention; and

¹¹ See <http://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/singapore/new-hotline-launched-in-the-fight-against-scammers/3304164.html>

- Share information regarding matters discussed at Ministerial and Senior Officer Forums.
- The Australian National Crime Prevention Framework was developed by the **Australian Institute of Criminology** (AIC), outlining the most effective approaches to crime prevention in addition to outlining potential roles and functions for various jurisdictions in delivering crime prevention services. The purposes of the framework produced by AIC include:
 - Support a coordinated approach in addressing crime and safety issues of national importance, including emerging crime problems;
 - Promote improved collaboration between crime prevention agencies between jurisdictions;
 - Improve crime prevention effectiveness across Australia by promoting principles of good practice and successful strategies;
 - Encourage commitment to crime prevention across all levels of government and sectors; and
 - Assist with guiding the allocation of crime prevention resources.
- In adopting the National Crime Prevention Framework, states, territories, and commonwealth governments must adhere to the following principles:
 - Strong and committed leadership;
 - Collaboration between stakeholders in addressing the causes of crime, while drawing upon the necessary skills, expertise, resources, and responsibilities;
 - Applying research and evaluation findings to the development and implementation of crime prevention efforts, specific to the local setting, and with special attention to high need areas;
 - A focus on outcomes and commitment to measurable results through evaluation and performance measures, and clear accountability;
 - Building and maintaining the capacity to implement effective crime prevention policies and practices;
 - Promoting an active and engaged community, while being responsive to the diversity and evolution of such communities;

- Adopting a long term commitment to sustainable crime reductions and criminal justice savings; and
 - Coordinating among sectors to imbed crime prevention into relevant social and economic policies, such as education, employment, health, and housing, with special focus on high risk demographics.
- One should note that the National Crime Prevention framework is not intended to outline specific actions for stakeholders. Instead, the framework provides guidance through a discussion of best practices for policies, strategies, and programs related to crime. These best practices include:
 - Addressing environmental conditions that contribute to and sustain crime;
 - Eliminating risk factors and enhancing protective factors to reduce the likelihood an individual will engage in criminal activity;
 - Addressing social exclusion and promoting community cohesiveness; and
 - Enhancing the capacity of criminal justice agencies to address and prevent crime.
- To ensure compliance of the National Crime Prevention Framework, ANZCP SOG and its member agencies are responsible for overseeing the implementation of the framework. High importance issues are also communicated to the **Standing Council on Police and Emergency Management** (SCPEM). Priority areas, as discussed in section seven of the framework, are annually reviewed. Moreover, individual jurisdictions are responsible for reviewing crime prevention strategies within their jurisdiction.
- In response to this framework, Australia also launched a crime prevention technical assistance service in 2012 known as **Crime Prevention ASSIST**. The service is intended to inform crime prevention policy makers and practitioners across all sectors and jurisdictions across three areas of service delivery:
 1. Production of applied crime prevention resources;
 2. Training and professional development in crime prevention evaluation; and
 3. Funded research and evaluation.

5.1. Additional Resources

Ford, S. (2014). *Some Crime Prevention Programs in Australia: A Snapshot*. Australian Crime Prevention Council. Retrieved from: www.acpc.org.au/images/documents/Some-crime-prevention-programs-in-Australia.pdf

This working paper submitted to the Australian Crime Prevention Council outlines a variety of crime prevention programs utilized within Australia, many of which involve inter-jurisdictional communication. Links to such programs are provided within the document.

Community Crime Prevention. (2014). *The Community Crime Prevention Framework*.

Department of Justice. Retrieved from:

<http://www.crimeprevention.vic.gov.au/home/resources/the+community+crime+prevention+framework>

This framework outlines the specific initiatives, objectives, principles, and priorities within Victoria. Specifically, the framework outlines the ways in which the state will collaborate with councils and community-based organizations in crime prevention initiatives.

NSW Police Force Crime Prevention Strategy 2015 – 2017. (2015). New South Wales Police Force. Retrieved from NSW Police Force website:

http://www.police.nsw.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0019/392131/Crime_Prevention_Strategy_2015-2017_Online.pdf

This strategy outlines the focus areas and initiatives the New South Wales Police Force is employing, including mechanisms of collaboration between stakeholders.

Australian Institute of Criminology on behalf of the Australian and New Zealand Crime Prevention Senior Officers' Group. (2012). *National Crime Prevention Framework*.

Australian Government. Retrieved from Australian Government Website:

http://www.aic.gov.au/crime_community/crimeprevention/ncpf.html

Crime Prevention: Current Projects. (2015). Australian Government. Retrieved from Australian Government website: http://www.aic.gov.au/crime_types/in_focus/crimeprevention.html

6. Conclusion

- This briefing note has outlined comparative insights relating to the typical structures and mandates of crime prevention coordination mechanisms, namely those in France, Sweden, Singapore, and Australia. Accordingly, this cursory review reveals the following key points:

- (1) **France, Sweden, and Australia have established both national and local coordinating entities** that assume the responsibility of translating the priorities of the respective crime prevention strategy into reality. In particular, local coordinating entities have flexibility with respect to the priority areas, allowing policy makers and stakeholders to tailor initiatives to best suit their local context.
- (2) Of note, Singapore appears to enjoy a slightly different structure than the aforementioned countries, wherein **the national coordinating body (the National Crime Prevention Council) is the main oversight body relating to crime prevention programs, initiatives, and funding. It appears as though local coordinating entities, such as local crime prevention councils, have not been established in Singapore.**
- (3) A consistent theme that emerged in the available information is that **all coordinating mechanisms, irrespective of the country or region, are increasingly expected to not only prevent crime in the long term, but also improve the health, wellbeing, and quality of life for all.** This increased public expectation has posed significant challenges to some of the most developed and prosperous countries.
- (4) Unsurprisingly, **cross-sectoral cooperation with various organizations—of which may be directly or indirectly involved in work relating to crime prevention—was underscored in all of the selected countries as a key priority of their coordination mechanisms.**
- (5) **All of the surveyed countries are committed to undertaking research, particularly annual victimization surveys and evaluation research, to inform and direct their crime prevention policies and initiatives.** In particular, such research is particularly emphasized in Australia.
- (6) While this likely goes without saying, it was observed that **all of the coordination mechanisms had close working partnerships with police personnel.**
- (7) Lastly, similarities with respect to the **mandates of the coordination mechanisms emerged, which include but are not limited to (1) delivering crime prevention services; (2) apportioning public funds; (3) forming partnerships with other related organizations; (4) disseminating public education and information materials; and (5) developing new techniques for crime prevention.**