



DELIVERABLE 3.4

Unity – Gathering of user requirements for CP tools

Executive summary

Due date: 31st August 2016

Date of submission: 31st August 2016

Lead beneficiary: Centre of Excellence in Public Safety Management/Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam

Project Title: Unity

Grant Agreement: 653729

Funding Scheme: Research and Innovation action – Safeguarding Secure Society

Duration Time: 36 months

Start date: 01/05/2015



Project funded by the European Commission within the H2020 Framework Programme

Introduction

WP3 (Policing and Community Requirements and Best/Effective practices) enables the identification of overarching themes and concepts to describe the commonalities and differences of community policing (CP) concepts and practices. The focus in this work-package lies on the interaction of diverse groups and organizations. It thus supports the development of the Unity CP platform as well as the content and methodologies for the test beds and pilot evaluations.

The objective of this fourth and final WP3 deliverable D3.4 is to provide an overview of expectations with respect to the potential purpose, usage and features a platform or tool should (and should not) possess to support community policing in the eight Unity countries. This report presents similarities as well as differences across three usage groups, within and between participating countries. From this, user requirements can be formulated to guide the development of the Unity platform. This deliverable builds upon the previous deliverables, which mapped out the best/effective practices on community policing (WP 3.1), shared CP themes and concepts (WP 3.2), and provided a comparative view on stakeholder needs and perspectives (WP 3.3). As such, even though the current study is explorative in nature, the previous studies do provide some focus. More specifically, WP 3.4 will focus on features and functions that support accountability of the police, information sharing between the relevant parties, trust and relationships between the relevant parties and visibility of police forces, as these functional areas emerged as highly relevant for CP in both the studies and pilot exercises.

It should be noted that though this deliverable focuses on IT tools to support community policing, community policing is much more than just IT tools. Please find the previous deliverables for results pertaining to the wider conceptualization of CP beyond IT tool development.

Methods

The selection of groups and participants for D3.4 was based on three considerations:

1. **Collection of information from multiple stakeholders** which include the police, citizens and organizations collaborating with the police and citizens in community policing efforts;
2. **Comparability of participants across countries:** The main characteristics of the groups should be the same across all partner countries to allow for a comparison between the countries;
3. **Manageable effort:** To keep efforts manageable for partners, the identification of user requirements for community policing tools needed to be based on a small number of groups.

The three groups selected for the subsequent data collection and pilot testing are:

- Young members of a minority group (between 18-25 years)
- Members of an intermediary, i.e., an organization or group that supports community policing efforts for and with young member of the minority group
- Members of the police force that are involved in community policing efforts for - and with the main community group

Each country could choose one or two additional communities of special interest to their country. The number of interviews was set to 10 per group, providing a total of (at least) 30 interviews per country. Table 1 provides an overview of the number of interviews ultimately collected and analyzed per country for WP3.4.

Table 1. Number of interviews analyzed for D3.4 per country and group

Country	Police	Community	Intermediaries	Total per country
Belgium	10	10	10	30
Bulgaria	10	10	10	30
Croatia	10	10	10	30
Estonia	10	10	10	30
Finland	10	11	10	31
Germany	10	10	7	27
Macedonia	10	10	10	30
UK	12	10	9	31
Total	82	81	76	239

Though the sample includes a wide variety of respondents, we want to caution against an over-interpretation and over-reliance on the specifics of the findings. Given the small number of individuals per group, our results should not be considered as representative for any stakeholder group or even country.

Our approach to capture current and desired states of ICT use for community policing was exploratory and involved using open-ended interview questions. The interviews captured the following information from all three groups:

1. Current channels and tools for communication between police, intermediaries and community partners including
 - a. Reasons for contacts between police, intermediaries and community members
 - b. Methods used for the contact between groups
2. Needed and desired information, channels and ICT functionalities to support community policing on the four main function areas accountability, information sharing, trust and visibility.
3. Conditions for acceptance, rejection and use of ICT tools for community policing

As with previous cycles of data analysis, our analytic approach followed thematic and content analytic principles to identify the main topics and themes in the data. For this, interview answers were coded in several cycles, starting with open or initial coding. The resulting codes were then clustered into high-order categories per main topic. The coding was conducted in the qualitative software package Atlas.ti.

Results and conclusion

Though there are nuances in the reasons groups have to contact others and be contacted through, the themes are generally consistent and revolve around **crime fighting, information management, cooperation and collaboration, providing- or requesting assistance** and **communication** (establishing and maintaining lines of communication). For crime fighting, different reasons show a fairly even distribution, with the only peak for **reporting crimes and incidents**. When it comes to requesting or offering assistance, **Assistance and service (general)** received the greatest number of mentions. This reflects the general nature of a lot of the interview answers given by the participants, where a lot of received requests pertained to general assistance and service. For the third category, information exchange, both **collecting** and **providing information** received a great number of mentions, showing a fairly even distribution between requests and offers for information.

The same applies to current methods for community policing; the methods used to contact others are largely the same as the methods contacted through, across groups and countries. Our participants use the **telephone** (and to a lesser extent fax), followed by **web/internet based** methods and **face-to-face** communication. The most important thing to take away from this is the prevalent importance of face-

to-face contact and communication for community policing, illustrating that though ICT tools can play a powerful supporting role, it cannot replace face-to-face communication. Furthermore, at the micro-level there are differences in methods between countries and groups, where for example communities prefer to contact others by phone, but are contacted themselves more often face-to-face, and Estonian participants note the use of print media to be contacted through. This illustrates the importance of a modular approach to ICT tool development, where different partners and countries can choose various methods to contact and communicate with others, and vice-versa. The tables and graphs in this section provide a comprehensive list of current methods, which could potentially be further strengthened.

The second section, on desired features and functions desired to support community policing in the functional areas of information sharing, building relationships and trust, accountability and visibility, showed considerable overlap between functional areas. Most of these mentions relate to **communication and use**, which is a general category which describes general characteristics of communication through the tool, such as the direction of communication and ease of use of the tool. Another category to receive a lot of the mentions is **ethical considerations**, which highlights the importance of features related to data protection and anonymity. Three other categories to receive a great number of mentions relate specifically to the desired tool and its content to support information sharing, namely the **technical features**, **specific functionalities**, and **ICT information content**. These relate to the general and specific things the ICT tool is desired to do as well as the specific information that should be stored, sent, received, analyzed, etc. through the tool.

Generally speaking, communication and use centered around the importance of **ease of use** and **allowing for fast responses**. Simply speaking, any ICT tool to be developed for Unity is required to be easy to use and communication should be quick. Furthermore, due to the multicultural nature of community policing, **multiple language options** were identified to be important. Furthermore, as many of the partners, particularly the young minority community, already use various apps and social media, **app integration** as well as **social networks** were mentioned frequently as desired functions and features, to be compatible with **smartphones**, **tablets** and accessible through **websites**. Participants also expressed a desire for an integrated **chat and message service** to communicate with each other, without having to use current commercial apps and services. Furthermore, many participants voiced that the tool should be of high **quality** and **effective**, as well as **reliable** in order to be adopted for use, regardless of functional area. Participants also desired **login and access limitations**, as well as **data protection** safeguards and the possibility of **anonymity of users**, in order to counter abuse of the tool and protect its actual users from malpractice. When it comes to sharing information specifically, many participants expressed a desire for a **shared database** with **up-to-date** and **detailed** information. Common information to be desired included **list or links for services and contacts**, **local information**, and an overview of **policing activities** and **results**, in part to facilitate community policing directly, but also to improve the accountability and visibility of relevant partners.

The third section focused on specific conditions for adoption and rejection of an ICT tool to support community policing; the make it or break it factors for ICT tool use. Most of the conditions for rejection were negative versions (or absences of) conditions for adoption. Furthermore, though some conditions received more mentions than others, caution must be taken against underestimating the impact not meeting even a single condition for adoption could have. For example, **ethical considerations** did not garner as many mentions as **system** and **organization conditions**, but not meeting conditions for **anonymity** and **data protection** would surely prevent use of a system for CP. Similarly, meeting a condition for rejection could mean the ICT tool will not be adopted by certain groups in certain countries. As such, rather than summarizing and generalizing the conditions for

adoption and rejection here, we refer to sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 for an in-depth discussion of the individual conditions, per group and country

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, many participants emphasized throughout this report the importance of face-to-face communication for community policing, regardless of the functional area. Though this report focused on user requirements for ICT tool development, this tool cannot replace face-to-face communication. Instead, it should aim to connect relevant community policing partners, facilitate information sharing between them, and promote their respective visibility and accountability, alongside and supporting face-to-face contact.