

European Crime Prevention Award (ECPA)

Annex I

Approved by the EUCPN Management Board in 2018

Please complete the template in English in compliance with the ECPA criteria contained in the Rules and procedures for awarding and presenting the European Crime Prevention Award (Par.2 §3).

General information

1. Please specify your country.

Sweden

2. Is this your country's ECPA entry or an additional project?

Yes, this is Sweden's ECPA entry

3. What is the title of the project?

Risk Reduction Intervention, RRI

4. Who is responsible for the project? Contact details.

Contact:

Susanna Bellander, susanna.bellander@polisen.se, +46737357774, Swedish Police Authority

Developer:

Susanne Gosenius, susanne.gosenius@polisen.se, +46105614384, Swedish Police Authority

Christer Tessmann, christer.tessmann@polisen.se, +46702838591, Swedish Police Authority

Manager:

Hanna-Sofia Åkerman, hanna-sofia.akerman@polisen.se, Swedish Police Authority

5. Start date of the project (dd/mm/yyyy)? Is the project still running (Yes/No)? If not, please provide the end date of the project.

01/04/2018

Still ongoing and implemented at a national level.

6. Where can we find more information about the project? Please provide links to the project's website or online reports or publications (preferably in English).

Very limited materials in English. It doesn't illustrate the whole work of the Risk Reduction Intervention.

Enclosed materials could be sent if asked for (as well as links and reports in Swedish):

1. National handbook
2. Evaluation from Malmö University
3. Internal evaluation

7. Please give a **one page** description of the project (**Max. 600 words**)

Within the Police Authority, there was already a crime prevention measure focusing on reducing threat from perpetrators, called proactive measures. The method is used extremely rarely in very specific cases and involves actors within the authority of which there are only a few. The idea of simplifying and developing the method with the aim of expanding the use both in terms of the number of cases and the type of crime (such as repeated crime against particularly vulnerable crime victims) led the police in the South region to start a pilot project in April 2018, which today has resulted in Risk Reduction Intervention, RRI.

There are other methods aiming of reducing the threat from perpetrators such as prosecution, restraining orders, and electronic monitoring. However, a motivated perpetrator is not prevented by these measures, rather it is the motivation itself that must be reduced in order for the threat to be effectively reduced. Reducing the threat is exactly what RRI aims for and what prompted the method to be developed. The goal of the method is to enable victims to live safety and with as much freedom as possible. By reducing the threat, the need for protection is reduced and the victim can live with fewer or no restrictions which normal witness protection entails.

The method consists of a combination of risk assessments, conversations with the perpetrators, and protection and support for the victims. The conversation methodology is based on influencing perpetrators to change their criminal behaviour by helping them to find new strategies to deal with their problems. The problems are often about emotional problems such as feeling offended or by the loss of a life partner. It can also be caused by mental health problems or due to having a harmful view of relationships. Thus, there is often a need to help the perpetrators to get in touch with psychiatry or with various forms of support centres. In some cases, there is also a need for motivational conversations to motivate the victim to leave a destructive and dangerous relationship and/or to participate in a legal process.

RRI is a collaboration between the units for witness protection and negotiating within the police. Witness protection is specialized in performing risk assessments and provide relevant support and protection measures. The negotiators are specialized in talking to people in crisis and helping individuals change their thinking patterns. Both components are necessary. Through cooperation between these two, crime prevention effects are achieved.

The process starts with the initiation of an RRI case, usually by the police, but there may also be requests from external actors such as social services.

Witness protection makes a structured risk assessment to assess whether it is appropriate to carry out the intervention and to be able to choose relevant support and protection measures. RRI is advantageously used when it comes to repeated crime against vulnerable victims or in cases where the perpetrator has difficulty letting go of the victim.

The negotiating unit design an individual strategy containing a plan for the conversation and also for how the perpetrator is to be handled in the future. At the same time, Witness protection provide the victim with relevant support and protection measures.

After the conversation, the interviewer gives feedback to those handling the case to create an updated overall picture of the threat. The case is then continuously followed up and evaluated.

The evaluations show that criminality ceased in 72% of the cases and decreased in further 7%. The police authority decided in 2021 that RRI should be a national method and a national governing handbook was produced.

I. The project shall focus on prevention and/or reduction of everyday crime and fear of crime within the theme.

8. Which **crime prevention/ reduction mechanisms** were used in this project to contribute to crime prevention and/or the reduction of crime or the fear of crime? Multiple answers are possible.

Establishing and maintaining normative barriers to committing criminal acts

e.g. 'Offenders, we are watching you' campaigns

Reducing recruitment to criminal social environments and activities by eliminating or reducing the social and individual causes and processes that lead to criminality

e.g. social and financial support for disadvantaged families

Deterring potential perpetrators from committing crimes through the threat of punishment

e.g. decreasing the time between arrest and punishment

Disrupting criminal acts by stopping them before they are carried out

e.g. increasing police patrols in vulnerable areas

Protecting vulnerable targets by reducing opportunities and make it more demanding to carry out criminal acts

e.g. placing locks and cameras

Reducing the harmful consequences of criminal acts

e.g. initiatives to recover stolen goods

Reducing the rewards from criminal acts

e.g. restorative justice programmes

Incapacitating (or neutralising) perpetrators by denying them the ability (capacity) to carry out new criminal acts

e.g. imprisonment of key gang members

Encouraging desistance from crime and rehabilitating former offenders so they are able to settle back into a normal life

e.g. prison rehabilitation programs

Explain how this/these crime prevention mechanisms were used (**Max. 300 words**)

The method establishes and maintains normative barriers to committing criminal acts through the meetings and follow ups that the negotiators have with the perpetrator. The negotiators create an agreement with the perpetrator that consists over time and carry out a number of follow-ups. Most focus lays on the perpetrator's needs. The negotiator also contributes by being a guide in non-criminal behaviour.

The method has a deterring effect due to the contact between negotiators and perpetrator. The perpetrators are less likely to commit crimes when they know that the Police have an eye on them and are in personal contact with them. The perpetrators are also helped to see profits by ceasing their criminal behaviour.

By reducing motivation, repeated crime is reduced, which in turn means reduced repeated exposure.

The intervention is aimed at protecting vulnerable victims by confronting the perpetrator instead of the vulnerable victim. Through this the vulnerable victim is spared from further, often profound, interventions (e.g. relocation, protected residence, etc.)

The negotiators are trained in a special conversation technique that aims at encouraging desistance from crime so that they are able to settle back into a normal life. By reducing the threat to those who are repeatedly exposed, conditions are created to live in as much security and freedom as possible, which means living with fewer restrictions linked to the vulnerability to crime. Thus, the method generates increased security for the victims and an improved quality of life for the perpetrators.

RRI does not consist solely of an effort on a single occasion, but rather it consists of several interactions with the perpetrator where follow-up takes place. Follow-up takes place partly to ensure the crime prevention effect, partly to evaluate the method itself and carry out development where necessary.

II. The project shall have been evaluated and have achieved most or all of its objectives. For more information on evaluation, click [here](#)

9. What were the reasons for setting up the project? Was this context analysed before the project was initiated and in what way (How, and by whom? Which data were used?)? In what way did this analysis inform the set-up of the project? (**Max. 150 words**)

Vulnerable crime victims are particularly often exposed to repeated crimes by the same perpetrator. In order to protect the victims, support and protection measures can be put in place. However, protection most often entails restrictions on the protected person's freedom.

Instead of using security measures that impose restrictions in victims' lives, we need to put more focus on methods reducing the threat. Some already existing measures of that kind are primarily prosecution, contact bans and contact bans with electronic monitoring. However, a motivated perpetrator is not prevented by these measures, rather it is the motivation itself that must be reduced in order for the threat to be effectively reduced. Reducing the threat is exactly what RRI aims for and what prompted the method to be developed.

Within the Police Authority, there is already a crime prevention measure aiming at perpetrators called proactive measures. The method is used extremely rarely and in very specific cases. Proactive efforts consist of competences within the Swedish Police, of which there are only a few. The idea of simplifying and developing the method with the aim of expanding its use both in terms of the number of cases and the type of crime (such as repeated crime against particularly vulnerable crime victims) led the police in the South region to start a pilot project in April 2018, which today has resulted in RRI.

Susanne Gosenius och Christer Tessmann identified the need in their daily work and therefore began to develop RRI based on their respective experiences and knowledge.

10. What were the objective(s) of the project? Please, if applicable, distinguish between main and secondary objectives. (**Max. 150 words**)

Main objectives:

Preventing repeated crime aimed primarily at particularly vulnerable crime victims and through that improve victims' quality of life.

Secondary objectives:

Get more perpetrators to refrain from further crime.

Increase victims' safety and increase their sense of security.

Increase perceived security and improved of quality of life for victims.

Improved quality of life also for the perpetrator.

Introduce RRI as a national crime prevention measure within the Police Authority.

Produce control documents to enable and quality-assure the method.

11. Has there been a process evaluation?¹ Who conducted the evaluation (internally or externally?) and what were the main results? Which indicators were used to measure the process? Did you make changes accordingly? (**max. 300 words**)

Initially, a pilot project was carried out in Police Region South. After the method was developed, tested and used within the pilot project the method was evaluated which showed very good results (crime ceased in 72% of all cases).

A decision was made to make RRI a national method and a national governing handbook was produced.

The national implementation has consisted of training the various regions' negotiators and officers from witness protection. Today, 6 out of 7 regions have implemented RRI and in the last region implementation is underway.

External evaluation Malmö University

Malmö University carried out a larger evaluation of the pilot project in Police Region South. Otherwise, the work is continuously followed up internally at the Police Authority.

Main result: The evaluation states that risk-reducing measures can be implemented in a promising way.

Questions:

¹ **Process evaluation:** Also called *implementation evaluation*, or *monitoring*, this process documents **how the activities were implemented** in order to determine any deviations from the original planning. It facilitates finding explanations for when the results of the intervention are not as expected.

- How are cases selected for RRI?
- What do the efforts that are carried out within the framework of RRI consist of?
- How do the practitioners feel that the behaviour of the perpetrators can be changed and thus prevent recidivism?

Method: Semi-structured interviews with police officers and civilian employees.

12. Has there been an outcome² or impact³ evaluation? Who conducted the evaluation (internally or externally?), which data and evaluation method were used and what were the main results? Which indicators were used to measure the impact? (**Max. 300 words**)

Internal outcome evaluation Police, South region

Main result: During the period 2019–2021, RRI has been used in 118 cases. In these cases, crime ceased in 85 cases (72%) and decreased in a further 8 cases (7%). RRI has had the greatest effect in cases concerning particularly vulnerable crime victims, domestic violence, stalking, repeated violations of restraining orders, and crimes against personnel exposed because of their profession.

Reached goals:

- The main goals have been achieved by preventing repeated crime directed primarily at particularly vulnerable crime victims.
- Several perpetrators have refrained from further crime.
- In cases where crime has stopped or decreased, perceived security and improved quality of life for victims of crime has increased.
- Multiple perpetrators who stopped their criminal behaviour have reported an improved quality of life.

Method: All cases within a selected time period were followed up and various indicators were measured. The evaluation was focused on the effects of the intervention.

Following indicators have been followed up:

- Number of initiated cases
- Number of decided RRI cases

² **Outcome evaluation:** Measures the **direct effect** (i.e., extent of the changes) **of the intervention on the target group, population, or geographic area**. The information produced by the outcome evaluation determines at what level the **objectives were achieved**.

³ **Impact evaluation:** Measures **long-term effects** of the intervention on the target group, as well as **indirect effects** on the broader community. The information produced by the impact evaluation determines at what level the **ultimate goals** of the intervention were achieved.

- Number of interventions carried out and type of intervention (risk-reducing conversation, motivational conversation, cooperation with investigators, other measures)
- Perpetrator (gender and age)
- Victim (gender and age)
- Relationship between perpetrator and victim (partner/expartner/relative/family/friend/acquaintance/known/unknown/other/unspecified)
- Effect of intervention (criminality has ceased/criminality has decreased/situation is unchanged/continued interest/ceased initially but then continued/deprived of liberty due to current case/other effect)
- Number of crimes committed by the perpetrators against the victim
- Type of crime
- Reason for decision to cancel interventions (mental illness/the threat is assessed to be higher/the threat has ceased/the perpetrator does not want to participate/insufficient information about the perpetrator/perpetrator arrested/other reason)

Internal impact evaluation, National Police

Main result: Ongoing; Aiming to measure results in the longer perspective.

Method: A combination of questionnaires for impact measurement in each case, qualitative follow-up and searches in different police systems. The questionnaires consist of the above-mentioned indicators.

III. The project shall, as far as possible, be innovative, involving new methods or new approaches.

13. How is the project innovative in its methods and/or approaches? (**Max. 150 words**)

Society at large has few methods directed at the perpetrator in order to reduce threats and to prevent crime, in particular when it comes to domestic violence, stalking, repeated violations of restraining orders, and crimes against vulnerable victims.

There has often been a fear that actions directed at the perpetrator will instead trigger worse behaviour and even create a greater threat to the victim. That fear is justified and it is therefore of the utmost importance that measures against the perpetrator are carried out correctly.

With RRI, these aspects have been taken care of and the risk of counterproductive effects has been reduced.

By using negotiators in the interviews, analysts for the risk assessments and witness protection officer for supplementary protection and support measures, the best possible conditions for success are provided. By bringing together these various unique resources and deploying them together with the aim of reducing threat is all together an innovative method with a new approach.

The perpetrators are made visible and the knowledge that the police see them can have a deterrent effect.

IV. The project shall be based on cooperation between partners, where possible.

14. Which partners or stakeholders were involved in the project and what was their involvement? (**Max. 200 words**)

The method:

The negotiation units and witness protection units contribute with their unique skills and together develop the method continuously. It is these two competences that mainly constitute the method. The negotiators are trained in a communicative approach and conversation methodology, the witness protection is trained in providing relevant protection. The police are also generally educated and trained to provide for their own protection and to have a security mindset connected to their own behaviour.

In cases where the perpetrator is assessed to need more support, the police help to put the perpetrators in contact with psychiatry or various support centres which are often reached through the municipality.

The project:

The pilot project was initially run in Police Region South. A steering group was added to the pilot project consisting of representatives from the national operational department, witness protections in the South region, and from the unit of negotiation.

A reference group was appointed as well tasked to review and advise. This consisted of representatives from the national operational department and from regional unit of witness protection. Following units have been involved in the work with of developing a national governing handbook, getting the method decided as a national method and implementing the method nationally:

Both regional and national witness protection, unit for negotiating, legal department, and process manager for crime victims and witness protection.

V. The project shall be capable of replication in other Member States.

15. How and by whom is the project funded? (**Max. 150 words**)

Swedish police have financed the project.

In Sweden today, for the RRI method, each region (7) has a coordinator for witness protection and a coordinator for negotiation activities. At a national level, there are individuals who are responsible for the development of the method. In addition to these, the number of individuals who work with the method varies based on the regional need. A total of approximately 25 individuals work with the method, deployed in all regions. However, there are more trained officers who can be activated if necessary.

The witness protection coordinator is responsible for producing a document consisting of a risk assessment and a memorandum containing an assessment of the case, the perpetrator and the protected person. The coordinator must then hand over the documentation to the coordinator of the negotiation activities

The coordinator from the negotiation activities must, based on the documentation submitted by witness protection, make his own assessment as to whether RRI is suitable to implement. The coordinator must also be responsible for selecting the interviewers who are to be trained in the method and ensuring that interviewers have the right skills.

The coordinators carry out all work within the framework of their everyday assignment, and the focus has all been on the method to be a tool in everyday work.

16. What were the costs of the project in terms of finances, material and human resources? (**Max. 150 words**)

The method is financed internally within the existing budget.

All expenses were taken care of within the framework of the existing budget. The expenses that cost the most are salaries, followed by training of coordinators and travel to coach each region during the implementation work. Malmö University received 100,000 SEK (9,171 Euros) in compensation for the evaluation.

17. Has a cost-benefit analysis⁴ been carried out? If so, describe the analysis, including how and by whom it was carried out and list the main findings of the analysis. (**Max. 150 words**)

No cost-benefit analysis has been done. However, we can state from the results (that shows that 72% of 118 individuals completely stop committing crimes after the intervention) that it saves vast sums of money that the legal process and protective measures would otherwise have cost.

18. Are there adjustments to be made to the project to ensure a successful replication in another Member State?

Each country needs to ensure that the method is compatible with national legislation.

However, the method is a strong contribution to police methods and police exist in all countries. It is thus possible to implement the method in any country.

19. How is the project relevant for other Member States? Please explain the European dimension of your project.

In the same way as in Sweden. In 72% of the 118 cases the perpetrators stopped committing crime after the intervention. That is a fantastic result and

⁴ **Cost-benefit analysis:** A type of economic evaluation that compares the direct and indirect cost of the resources employed in the intervention, with the equivalent economic value of the benefits.

implies that the victims, in these 72%, will be able to gradually regain their lives.

The method is universal in its kind because it largely deals with human behaviours and needs and therefore can be used throughout Europe. All countries in Europe have problems with repeated crime against particularly vulnerable crime victims. By using this method, victims can to a much greater extent live their life safe and without limitations.

Please provide a short general description of the project (abstract for inclusion in the conference booklet – **max. 150 words**).

Risk Reduction Intervention, RRI, is a method that aims to reduce the perpetrator's motivation to continue to subject the victim to crime which enables the victim to live safely and with as much freedom as possible.

The method consists of a combination of risk assessments, abusive conversations with the perpetrators and protection and support for the victims. It is primarily carried out by the witness protection unit and the negotiation units within the police. Witness Protection specializes in carrying out risk assessments and providing relevant support and protection measures. The negotiators specialize in talking to people in crisis and helping individuals change their thought patterns.

The evaluations show that crime stopped in 72% of cases and decreased in another 7%. RRI has had the greatest impact in cases involving particularly vulnerable crime victims, domestic violence, stalking, repeated violations of restraining orders and crimes against personnel exposed because of their profession.