

## SUMMARY

### Examination of the conditions required for an effective KVVU

Commissioned by the Research and Documentation Centre (*Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek- en Documentatiecentrum*, WODC) of the Ministry of Security and Justice, Regioplan Policy Research has conducted a study of the possible effectiveness of the Quality Meter for Nightlife Safety (*Kwaliteitsmeter Veilig Uitgaan*, KVVU).

The KVVU is a tool for local initiatives that promote nightlife safety. The aim of the KVVU is to improve safety in entertainment districts by stimulating cooperation between the parties involved (the municipal administration, the Public Prosecution Service, police and catering establishments) by identifying the problems affecting safety and by acting jointly to tackle these problems. The KVVU is an initiative of the Ministry of Security and Justice (S and J, formerly the Ministry of Justice). In 2005, responsibility for the KVVU was transferred to the Dutch Centre for Crime Prevention and Safety (*Centrum voor Criminaliteitspreventie en Veiligheid*, CCV) which collaborates with the Royal Netherlands Hotel and Catering Association (*Koninklijke Nederland Horeca*, KHN) in implementing the quality meter. KHN provides support in applying the KVVU and has been responsible for its implementation in municipalities since 2006. The CCV keeps up with developments and manages the KVVU. Consequently, the KVVU is a tool used at the local level but stimulated, financially supported and monitored at the national level by the ministries most involved (S and J and the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations), which are interested in its significance for national security policy.

We examined the KVVU with the aim of identifying the conditions required for an effective nightlife security policy and ascertaining the degree to which the current KVVU meets these conditions. This examination should make it clearer whether the KVVU in its current form – a national policy programme with nationally organised support and implementation by local partners – can be effective and where it can be improved.

The study can be divided into four components:

- a literature study to identify possible measures for promoting nightlife safety and determine their effectiveness;
- a literature study to determine the conditions for enabling effective cooperation between the parties involved;
- a literature study to determine the conditions for enabling effective national coordination;
- a document study and interviews conducted with 22 randomly selected municipalities with KVVU experience to determine the relationship between the results of the literature study and the KVVU in practice.

The interviews were held with representatives of municipalities that started (preparations for) a KVV in 2008 or earlier.

## **Measures and effectiveness**

The literature study identified 48 measures that could form part of a nightlife safety policy. These measures have been subdivided into four categories defined in situational-prevention theory. Each of the four categories is focused on a key principle that can help prevent unsafe situations: increasing the risk of apprehension (increasing the risks), increasing the effort required to commit offences or cause a nuisance (increasing the effort), preventing situations that invite criminal activity (reducing provocations) and removing possibilities for making excuses (removing excuses).

On the basis of the literature, we conclude that seven measures are effective in improving objective and subjective safety. However, this does not always apply in the context of nightlife safety, where five of these seven measures were effective. Seven measures are promising, meaning that there are indications that they are effective but the evidence is not strong enough. The effectiveness of 35 measures is unknown. This is not to say that they are ineffective but rather that insufficient research has been carried out in order to determine the effect these measures might have. One measure is not effective and one measure is counterproductive.

**Table S.1 Nightlife Safety Measures, ordered by effectiveness**

<b>Increasing the risks of apprehension</b>	<b>Increasing the effort</b>	<b>Reducing provocations</b>	<b>Removing excuses</b>
<b>Effective</b>		<b>Effective</b>	
Increasing police capacity		Cordoning off streets	
Problem-oriented policing			
Street lighting			
Neighbourhood prevention/citizen patrol			
<b>Effective, but not for nightlife safety</b>			
CCTV monitoring			
Functional supervision			
<b>Promising</b>		<b>Promising</b>	
Catering sector prevention team		Preventive frisking	
		Secured parking facilities	
		Door policy/admission policy	
<b>Promising</b>			
Codes of conduct			
		Safer bars/Bar code	
		Community policing	
<b>Effectiveness unknown, possibly indirectly effective</b>			
Promote reporting to police			
Catering sector complaints desk			
Catering sector helpline			
<b>Unknown</b>		<b>Unknown</b>	
Expanding surveillance (untargeted)		Weapons safes	
Establishing police post		Plastic drinking cups	
		<b>Unknown</b>	
		Closing hour regimes/cooling-off period	
		Removal routes/traffic regulation/traffic circulation	
Supervision by private security companies		Taxi policy/available transport options	
Architectural changes		Passing out chocolate	
Extending policy surveillance		Sensory manipulation	
		Cleaning	
		Paving	
		<b>Unknown</b>	
		Codes of conduct/house rules	
		Parking rules	
		Café outdoor area policy	
		Events policy	
		Setting up traffic signs	
		Departure points	
		SUS ('keep it calm') teams	
		Bans	
		Placement of urinals	
		Weekend arrangement	
		Time restrictions on the sale of alcohol	
		Passing out food	
		Alcohol policy	
		Alcohol and drug checks	
		Control of violence for angry impulsive drinkers (COVAID)	
		Festival beer	
		<b>Not effective</b>	
		Information on behaviour	
<b>Counterproductive</b>			
Bike surveillance			

Effective measures are mainly those measures not specifically developed to promote nightlife safety and that are certainly not used exclusively in the context of nightlife safety. The broader application of these measures will have led to greater familiarity with them among researchers and policymakers, which itself means there are sufficient numbers of good quality studies into their effectiveness. It is important to point out that the effectiveness of a number of 'effective measures' does not apply in a nightlife context. These are namely measures that elicit risk-avoiding behaviour by potential offenders. Nightlife violence is characterised by much impulsive behaviour, behaviour which can less effectively be influenced by risk-heightening measures than is the case with calculated behaviour. This is also explicitly acknowledged in evaluations of the effectiveness of CCTV monitoring, for example. CCTV monitoring is consequently considered a measure that is not effective in promoting safety in entertainment districts. With regard to other effective measures that are risk-heightening, their effectiveness or ineffectiveness has not been exactly determined in the specific nightlife context.

The effective measures entail (with one exception) a boosting of supervision and enforcement in entertainment districts, with the police, perhaps working together with citizens, assuming the role of most important actor ('increasing the risk of apprehension'). An important element is that the deployment of the police specifically targets the major risks (locations, offences, and times). Measures geared towards improving police intelligence which are not effective in themselves (such as opening a catering sector complaints desk or promoting the reporting of incidents to police) may possibly boost the effectiveness of (targeted) police deployment.

There is little research available into the effectiveness of measures more specific to the catering sector and to nightlife safety and, consequently, few conclusions can be made in this regard.

## **Situational prevention**

If applying the principles of situational prevention, the greatest certainty exists with respect to the effectiveness of measures geared toward increasing the risks attendant on criminal or nuisance-causing behaviour ('the risk of apprehension'). This is the more repressive side of crime prevention. The least certainty regarding effectiveness exists with respect to measures geared towards removing excuses and reducing provocations. This is the far less repressive side, characterised by much attention for activities such as providing information, persuading and preventing situations that could result in a conflict. A far greater contribution could potentially be made to this less repressive side by the social partners, i.e. the police and municipal administration, and the catering industry than is the case with repressive measures.

It is also important that the measures in the category 'increased risk of apprehension' all appeal to the (more or less rational) cost-benefit assessment made by potential offenders. In a nightlife context with potential offenders that are relatively often under the influence of alcohol and drugs, this cost-benefit assessment may be possibly less relevant than in other contexts. In a nightlife context influenced by the use of substances, behaviour will more often be impulsive. This calls for a greater emphasis on measures according to the other principles of situational prevention. However, few effective measures according to the other principles have been identified.

## **Cooperation and national support**

The literature study revealed principles of (or conditions for) effective cooperation relating to the environment (context), the structure and the management of cooperation as detailed below:

- context: sufficient means, unambiguous clear aim and interest, continuation of earlier cooperation, few changes of staff, frequent and face-to-face meetings;
- structure: powerful core organisation, compact network, alliance partners with the power to overrule, flexibility with respect to internal rules, hierarchical relations and result obligations;
- management: project leader responsible for safeguarding the mission, vision and goals, learns from similar and successful collaborative partnerships.

The literature did not contain any standards for these factors, e.g. the size of the network (what is the ideal size?) or the availability of resources (how many resources?).

National support can increase the effectiveness of local cooperation by:

- stimulating participation in the cooperative efforts, removing obstacles to participation and encouraging communication on the cooperative efforts, the policy goals and their achievement;
- making resources available that address local demand, in terms of money, knowledge and expertise (methods, instruments);
- a support structure that takes into account local relationships and local interests.

## **The structure of the KVV in municipalities**

The final step in the study is an examination of the results of the literature study with KVV's in 22 randomly selected municipalities. These municipalities offered a variety of measures comparable with that found in the literature, i.e. spread across the principles of increasing the risk of apprehension, increasing the effort required to commit offences or cause a nuisance, preventing

situations that invite criminal activity and removing possibilities for making excuses.

Of the 48 measures contained in the literature, 14 are not part of the KVVU approach applied by the municipalities surveyed; the other 34 measures are part of one or more KVVUs. A total of 20 per cent of the measures in the KVVU's examined was qualified as effective or promising. The effectiveness of the remaining 80 per cent is unknown (nine KVVUs involved ineffective measures).

At effective measure that is part of many KVVUs is the improvement of street lighting (mentioned 11 times). A second effective measure is extra police supervision/additional police capacity (mentioned seven times). Other measures referred to in the literature as effective were not mentioned in the KVVUs. The measures qualified as promising that were applied most were admission policy/door policy (mentioned eight times) and bar code/conflict training (mentioned six times). Secured parking was mentioned twice. Preventive frisking and the deployment of a catering sector prevention team were both mentioned once.

Measures of which the effectiveness is unknown but which are mentioned often in the KVVUs are collective bans (14), opening/closing hours policy (11), removal orders/exclusion orders (11), catering sector helpline (8), CCTV monitoring (8), taxi policy (7), maintenance of the environment/paving/amenities (6), codes of conduct (5), alcohol and drug checks (5) and the placement of public toilets and urinals (5).

The overall picture of the measures in the surveyed municipalities, classified in accordance with the principles of situational prevention, overlaps markedly with the measures as provided in the literature: relatively many measures focus on the areas of increasing risk (supervision and enforcement) and eliminating excuses (providing information and persuading) and somewhat fewer measures are geared towards increasing the required effort and reducing provocations.

According to the representatives of the randomly selected KVVU municipalities, the choice of measure is not based on knowledge or effectiveness as this knowledge is often unavailable at the local level or there is no knowledge whatsoever on the effectiveness. Measures are selected after the municipality carries out its own analysis on the basis of a measure matrix provided by the national support structure. They are a continuation of policy implemented earlier in the municipalities, they are based on policy in one or more other municipalities or on ideas provided by the national support structure during the start-up phase.

Cooperation in the KVVUs is qualified as good by the municipal officials when asked. Further analysis reveals that the KVVUs of the various municipalities exhibit a number of strengths and weaknesses, which impact the effectiveness

of the cooperation. Strengths are building on previous cooperation (15 municipalities), the continuity of participation (18 municipalities), the intensity of the cooperation and the high frequency of consultations (13 municipalities) and adequate funding available in the majority of the surveyed KVUs (20 municipalities). Weaknesses are the lack of knowledge on the effectiveness of measures and on the results of policy (7 municipalities), divergent interests resulting in goals that are not shared by all involved (11 municipalities) and changes in coordination and a low frequency of consultations (9 municipalities). Further weaknesses are the lack of hierarchy, decision-making authorities, strict result agreements and result obligations: these aspects could negatively influence the effectiveness of cooperation.

The national support structure played a role exclusively in the initial phase of KVV (launch, provision of information, transfer of tools). Its role was also motivational. Following the initial phase, however, it is up to the local parties to set up the cooperative structures and implement the measures.

### **Conclusion: KVV and conditions for a safe nightlife policy**

Looking at the three perspectives of effective safe nightlife policy (effective national support, effective cooperation, effective measures), we have to conclude that the KVUs examined satisfy the conditions for a safe nightlife policy to a limited extent only. The effectiveness of the measures deployed is not understood well enough, poor coordination between the parties in certain areas hampers effectiveness (different aims and interests, limited intensity of effort/frequency of meetings, limited hierarchy, lack of knowledge of effectiveness) and the national support structure is not set up in a way that promotes the effectiveness of implementation at the local level (other than the cooperation in itself). In drawing this conclusion, we should note that the KVUs examined were all established in 2008 or earlier.

The aim of the study was to determine whether the KVV can be effective. The study revealed several obvious limitations. Currently, too little is understood about the effectiveness of measures. Obtaining greater certainty regarding an effective KVV depends on having more knowledge on the effectiveness of measures, particularly with respect to measures outside the direct context of supervision and repression. The cooperation and coordination between the various parties involved suffers for a lack of shared interests and goals. An effective national support structure must primarily be able to provide solid support backed up by knowledge. In order to avoid a situation where the requisite knowledge is imposed on the cooperating parties from above, it is important that the knowledge provided keys in with the requirements of the local cooperating parties in terms of effectiveness. Since these requirements are not currently communicated, a national support organisation will need to stimulate the cooperating parties to draw up inventories of their requirements. This means an approach is needed that is more pro-active than is currently the

case at the KVUs examined in this study. Consequently, the KVUs are unable to fully satisfy the conditions for an effective safe nightlife policy. The conditions will only be met more fully when more knowledge is made available to the KVVU parties cooperating at the local level and when there is more long-term interactive national support.