

**Economic and Social Council**Distr.: General
9 February 2007

Original: English

**Commission on Crime Prevention
and Criminal Justice****Sixteenth session**

Vienna, 23-27 April 2007

Item 5 of the provisional agenda*

**Use and application of United Nations standards and
norms in crime prevention and criminal justice****United Nations standards and norms in crime prevention
and criminal justice****Report of the Secretary-General***Summary*

The purpose of the present report is to provide information on the implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 2002/13 of 24 July 2002, in which the Council accepted the Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime. The report is based on replies received from Governments to a questionnaire designed in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolutions 2004/28 of 21 July 2004 and 2006/20 of 27 July 2006 on the use and application of United Nations standards and norms related primarily to the prevention of crime.

The report addresses four main issues: (a) structuring crime prevention at the government level; (b) crime prevention approaches; (c) implementation issues; and (d) international cooperation, networking and technical assistance. At the time of drafting of the report, 42 Member States had responded to the questionnaire. Many of the respondents reported that they had specific crime prevention plans through which they implemented in whole or in part the Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime. The main elements of a successful crime prevention plan identified by Governments included establishing a central body, department or unit that is charged with the implementation of national programmes and coordination of national efforts; reviewing strategies on a regular basis and adapting national and local plans in accordance with needs; institutionalizing programmes focused on children and youth;

* E/CN.15/2007.1.



producing guides, toolkits and manuals; creating a genuine commitment on the part of central and local government; and creating partnerships and cooperation with elements of civil society. Challenges included implementing social crime prevention; addressing organized crime and terrorism; improving coordination among different government bodies; dissemination of knowledge and creating expertise; making use of advanced technologies; and devising evaluation mechanisms, in particular those connected with cost-benefit assessments.

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	1-3	4
II. Structuring crime prevention at the government level	4-18	4
III. Crime prevention approaches	19-34	9
IV. Implementation issues	35-52	13
V. International cooperation, networking and technical assistance	53-57	18
VI. Conclusions and recommendations	58-62	20

I. Introduction

1. By its resolution 2002/13 of 24 July 2002, the Economic and Social Council accepted the Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime. In its resolutions 2004/28 of 21 July 2004 and 2006/20 of 27 July 2006, the Council requested the Secretary-General to convene a meeting of intergovernmental experts to design an information-gathering instrument on standards and norms related primarily to crime prevention. In its resolution 2006/20, the Council also requested the Secretary-General to report to the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice at its sixteenth session on the use and application of United Nations standards and norms related primarily to crime prevention.

2. Pursuant to Council resolutions 2004/28 and 2006/20 and thanks to the financial contribution of the Government of Canada, the Intergovernmental Expert Group Meeting on Crime Prevention was held in Vienna from 20 to 22 March 2006 to develop a questionnaire on standards and norms primarily related to crime prevention. In August 2006, the questionnaire was submitted to all Member States for their reply. At the time of drafting of the present report, the following 42 Member States had responded to the questionnaire: Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Colombia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States of America. A response was also received from the International Police Association.¹

3. The present report analyses the replies received from Governments on the use and application of standards and norms related primarily to the prevention of crime, and is structured according to the main themes of the questionnaire, namely (a) structuring crime prevention at the government level; (b) crime prevention approaches; (c) implementation issues; and (d) international cooperation, networking and technical assistance.

II. Structuring crime prevention at the government level

4. The Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime state that it is the responsibility of all levels of government to create, maintain and promote a context within which relevant governmental institutions and all segments of civil society, including the corporate sector, can better play their part in preventing crime (Economic and Social Council resolution 2002/13, annex, para. 2). To that end, it was recommended that Governments create partnerships with all relevant sectors and include prevention as a permanent part of their structures and programmes for controlling crime.

5. Thirty-seven Member States² reported that they had taken steps to implement the approach to crime prevention defined in the Guidelines. The steps included

¹ It should be noted that replies received after 1 January 2007 were not considered for the purposes of the preparation of the report.

² Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican

developing national action plans, establishing specific bodies charged with implementing crime prevention strategies, devising particular programmes (for example, neighbourhood watches) and appointing inter-ministerial commissions to oversee the implementation of crime prevention programmes and to advise on further measures to be taken. One Government (Portugal) reported that it had implemented a wider definition of crime prevention that included law enforcement and other criminal justice interventions, without specifying what the wider definition entailed. Another Government (Iceland) reported that it considered it beneficial to approach crime prevention through lifestyle and health perspectives rather than focusing solely on crime. For example, it had launched a campaign against illegal drug use, “Drug-free Iceland”, through the Public Health Institute.

6. Most Member States indicated that they had either incorporated elements of crime prevention into national four- or five-year programmes or established an action plan. Several Governments noted that they did not have a plan to implement the Guidelines, however one of them was in the process of developing one (Algeria) and another reported that technical assistance was required for that purpose (Moldova).

A. Crime prevention policies, strategies and action plans

7. Thirty-seven Member States³ reported that they had adopted specific crime prevention policies or strategies at the national level. Twenty-four⁴ and 26⁵ States had also adopted specific crime prevention policies at the regional and local levels, respectively. Most Governments adopted national plans of up to five years and included review mechanisms, such as annual reports. Some of the national action plans focused exclusively on crime prevention, while others were part of more general plans for fighting crime or protecting national security. In some cases, the implementation of the action plan was facilitated by the issuance of specific guidelines by responsible government organs such as the attorney-general, an inter-ministerial commission or the police.

Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States of America.

³ Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

⁴ Belarus, Bolivia, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Greece, Lithuania, Mexico, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, United Arab Emirates, and United States.

⁵ Belarus, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Japan, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, United Arab Emirates and United States.

8. Some Member States reported that they had adopted action plans to target specific criminal behaviours such as illegal carrying of weapons, the use of stolen mobile phones to commit crimes and drug-related crimes. Others focused on preventive measures for specific locations such as public transportation, schools and jewellery shops or specific groups such as taxi drivers, youth or immigrants. Some Member States had also adopted action plans at the regional level, adapted to the specific needs of each region or federal entity. Most Governments also had plans at the local level, for example involving teams to follow up on implementation, the assigning of tasks to local police, local prevention or neighbourhood watch committees and meetings with community leaders.

9. Twenty-five Member States⁶ reported that their national policy or strategy had been enshrined in legislation, in a format adapted to their national legal systems. Some States had adopted specific legislation, while others had amended existing legislation relevant to crime prevention or adopted plans through governmental decisions or decrees.

B. Responsibility for leadership in crime prevention

10. Most of the Member States replying to the questionnaire indicated that in their countries, crime prevention was the responsibility of the ministry of the interior, the police or the ministry of justice. In 12 reporting States⁷ the responsible office was the ministry of the interior, in two⁸ it was the ministry of the interior in collaboration with other ministries, in six⁹ it was the police, in four¹⁰ the ministry of justice, in four¹¹ several ministries operating jointly and in three¹² an independent agency. One country (Iceland) reported that the national public health institute had been charged with the task. Some States reported establishing new government departments tasked with crime prevention, such as national crime prevention councils. In those countries where several bodies were responsible for crime prevention, usually the police, the attorney-general or the ministry of the interior were involved.

C. Governmental structures

11. In paragraph 17 of the Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime, Governments were encouraged to make prevention a permanent part of their structures and programmes for controlling crime by (a) establishing centres or focal points with expertise and resources; (b) establishing a crime prevention plan with clear

⁶ Belarus, Bolivia, Canada, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Greece, Hungary, Lithuania, Mexico, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

⁷ Algeria, Bolivia, Czech Republic, Moldova, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Spain and Syrian Arab Republic.

⁸ Lithuania and Portugal.

⁹ Brunei Darussalam, Cyprus, Japan, Mauritius, Singapore and Swaziland.

¹⁰ Estonia, Netherlands, Republic of Korea and United States.

¹¹ Germany, Haiti, Serbia and South Africa.

¹² Canada, Hungary and Latvia.

priorities and targets; (c) establishing linkages and coordination between relevant government agencies or departments; (d) fostering partnerships with non-governmental organizations, the business, private and professional sectors and the community; and (e) seeking the active participation of the public in crime prevention by informing it of the need for and means of action and its role.

1. Centres or focal points

12. In connection with the recommendation to Governments to establish centres or focal points, 30 Member States¹³ reported that they had focal points at the national level. Two States¹⁴ replied that such focal points existed only in part. Twenty-three States¹⁵ reported that they also had focal points at the regional level. These were usually specific units within the departments responsible for crime prevention, such as national crime prevention councils or inter-ministerial commissions tasked with overseeing the implementation of national action plans. One Government (Canada) reported that the prevention of certain types of crime was addressed by bodies other than the focal point (for example, the Family Violence Initiative led by the Public Health Agency of Canada).

2. Setting clear priorities

13. Twenty-six Member States¹⁶ replied that they had crime prevention plans with clear priorities at the national level, while eight¹⁷ replied that they had them in part. Sixteen countries¹⁸ indicated that they had such plans at the regional level, 17¹⁹ reported that they had them at the local level and 11²⁰ reported that they had regional or local plans only partially.

3. Establishing linkages and coordination

14. Thirty-one Member States²¹ indicated that they had established linkages and coordination between relevant government agencies and organizations at the

¹³ Belarus, Bolivia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

¹⁴ Canada and Romania.

¹⁵ Belarus, Bolivia, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Germany, Greece, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Pakistan, Poland, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

¹⁶ Belarus, Bolivia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovenia, South Africa, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

¹⁷ Canada, Estonia, Haiti, Latvia, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Spain and Sweden.

¹⁸ Belarus, Bolivia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Greece, Iceland, Mauritius, Moldova, Poland, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

¹⁹ Belarus, Bolivia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Greece, Germany, Iceland, Mauritius, Moldova, Poland, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

²⁰ Canada, Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Pakistan, Portugal, Republic of Korea and Sweden.

²¹ Belarus, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic,

national level, while 20 countries²² replied that they had established such mechanisms at the regional level. Four²³ and seven²⁴ Member States indicated that they had established such linkages only in part at the national and regional levels, respectively.

4. Fostering partnerships

15. Twenty-four Member States²⁵ reported that they were fostering partnerships with non-governmental organizations, the business, private and professional sectors and the community at the national level, 16²⁶ at the regional level and 18²⁷ at the local level. Some States reported that partnerships with the business sector were relatively limited compared to those in other sectors (such as government, non-governmental organizations, law enforcement/police services).

5. Public participation

16. Twenty-three Member States²⁸ reported that they were seeking active participation of the general public at the national level (and 10 in part), 14²⁹ States reported that they were doing so at the regional level and 17 States³⁰ at the local level. Many of the Member States replying to the questionnaire reported that one of the challenges to effective implementation of crime prevention strategies was raising awareness and mobilizing public involvement in plans.

Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Moldova, Pakistan, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

²² Belarus, Bolivia, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Germany, Greece, Japan, Moldova, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

²³ Haiti, Mauritius, Netherlands and Senegal.

²⁴ Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Pakistan and Senegal.

²⁵ Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

²⁶ Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Germany, Greece, Japan, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

²⁷ Brunei Darussalam, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

²⁸ Brunei Darussalam, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Pakistan, Poland, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

²⁹ Cyprus, Czech Republic, Germany, Greece, Japan, Poland, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, South Africa, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

³⁰ Brunei Darussalam, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Lithuania, Poland, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, South Africa, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

D. Specific role for the police

17. Most Member States reported that they had a specific role for the police in crime prevention efforts. The role of the police included situational prevention, such as patrols, supervising and monitoring in areas where national action plans were applied, as well as involvement in social prevention. Some noted that the police also participated in the training of young leaders, in awareness-raising campaigns and in forming coalitions with national and local stakeholders.

E. Development of skills

18. Most Members States replying to the questionnaire had plans for the development of skills in crime prevention. Thirty-three³¹ reported that they provided professional development, while 32³² reported that they had encouraged educational institutions to offer basic and advanced courses. Twenty-six³³ indicated that they had developed certification and professional qualifications, and 34³⁴ were promoting the capacity of communities to develop and respond to their own needs. Many Governments reported that one of the main challenges to effective crime prevention was the lack of expertise in the field and the need for specific training programmes.

III. Crime prevention approaches

19. The Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime refer to various approaches generally called social, community-based and situational crime prevention, as well as preventing recidivism. In paragraph 6 (a) these approaches are described as promoting the well-being of people and encouraging pro-social behaviour through social, economic, health and educational measures, with a particular emphasis on children and youth, and focusing on the risk and protective factors associated with crime and victimization. In paragraph 25 the Guidelines encourage Governments to address the risk factors of crime and victimization by: (a) promoting protective

³¹ Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States. Canada reported that it did so in part.

³² Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

³³ Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Moldova, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

³⁴ Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

factors through comprehensive and non-stigmatizing social and economic development programmes, including health, education, housing and employment; (b) promoting activities that redress marginalization and exclusion; (c) promoting positive conflict resolution; and (d) using education and public awareness strategies to foster a culture of lawfulness and tolerance while respecting cultural identities. Most of the Member States replying to the questionnaire indicated that they had incorporated these approaches in whole or in part in their crime prevention policies, strategies or programmes.

A. Social crime prevention

20. In reply to the specific questions on social crime prevention, 34 Member States³⁵ reported that the concept was part of their crime prevention policies, strategies or programmes. In particular, 36 Member States³⁶ reported that their crime prevention policies, strategies or programmes included a specific focus on children and youth at risk of victimization or offending; 34 countries³⁷ had a focus on vulnerable groups; and 28³⁸ had a focus on the different needs of men and women.

21. Examples of programmes targeting youth included the establishment of social networks to address comprehensively the needs of children at risk; programmes targeting drug abuse; special programmes for street children; and measures to control the sale of alcohol, gambling and violence in schools. One country (Senegal) reported that it had issued a manual on prevention including a series of educational programmes.

22. One country (Canada) reported that its policies had shifted from social prevention to focus more on children and youth at risk of victimization and/or offending. The targeted populations included very young children who demonstrated aggressive behaviour; children who were victims of abuse or neglect or had witnessed violence in the home; children under the age of criminal responsibility who came into conflict with the law for behaviour that could bring them into the

³⁵ Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic and United States.

³⁶ Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

³⁷ Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

³⁸ Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Japan, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, United Arab Emirates and United States. Canada reported that it did so in part.

youth justice system if they were of age; children exiting the child protection system or the youth justice system; street youth; and youth at risk of involvement or involved with guns, gangs and drugs.

23. Member States also reported on prevention programmes focusing on other vulnerable groups such as persons with disabilities, the elderly, single parents, socially or economically disadvantaged groups, indigenous groups, new immigrants, rural residents, the homeless, drug addicts and those living alone.

24. Many of the Member States replying to the questionnaire had incorporated gender issues in their crime prevention plans and addressed phenomena such as domestic violence. Some measures were taken at the policy level such as guidelines for differential treatment during investigation of young boys and girls, while others were more concrete, such as establishing separate shelters for men and women victims of domestic violence, and crisis centres for women.

25. Thirty Member States³⁹ indicated that they had integrated crime prevention considerations into social and economic policies and programmes. Two⁴⁰ replied that they had partially integrated such considerations. In some States, crime prevention measures were part of national plans for development, eradication of poverty or social integration.

26. Most Member States replying to the questionnaire reported that their crime prevention policies, strategies or programmes promoted protective factors (35 countries); promoted activities to redress marginalization or exclusion (34 countries); promoted positive conflict resolution (33 countries); used education and public awareness (37 countries); or involved the media (37 countries). Several countries noted that this was an area where technical assistance was needed.

27. The measures reported on ranged from using sports events to promote a drug-free approach, to providing information to immigrants on the legal situation in their new country. Many States had incorporated conflict resolution in their legal system and provided education on such measures. One country (Senegal) reported that it had initiated penal mediation for certain criminal offences and another (the Netherlands) reported that it had established neighbourhood mediation facilities.

28. Education and public awareness programmes had been established in many countries, involving meetings with the public, campaigns for non-violence, education programmes for young people and programmes for the prevention of drug addiction. The media were also used as a tool in crime prevention through promotional spots, interviews and participation in radio and television programmes, newspapers and magazines. One Government (Senegal) reported having utilized networks of journalists specializing in prevention.

³⁹ Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

⁴⁰ Moldova and Canada.

B. Locally based crime prevention

29. In paragraph 6 (b) of the Guidelines, crime prevention is described as encompassing approaches which change the conditions in neighbourhoods that influence offending, victimization and the insecurity that results from crime by building on the initiatives, expertise and commitment of community members.

30. Thirty-one Member States⁴¹ reported that they had specific crime prevention policies, strategies or programmes designed to change the conditions that influence offending, victimization and insecurity in neighbourhoods. Such programmes included providing access to basic social needs, improving infrastructure in vulnerable areas, cooperation with local non-governmental organizations and increased police presence in certain neighbourhoods. Twenty-seven Member States⁴² reported that their prevention policies or strategies included an integrated approach to address the multiple risk and protective factors in highly vulnerable neighbourhoods or communities. Such programmes included neighbourhood watches, improvement of health services and programmes to detect risk factors in families and schools.

C. Situational crime prevention

31. Situational crime prevention is defined in paragraph 6 (c) of the Guidelines as including approaches which prevent the occurrence of crimes by reducing opportunities, increasing risks of being apprehended and minimizing benefits, and by providing assistance and information to potential and actual victims. Specific measures include: (a) improved environmental design; (b) appropriate methods of surveillance that are sensitive to the right to privacy; (c) encouraging the design of consumer goods to make them more resistant to crime; (d) “hardening” targets without impinging upon the quality of the built environment or limiting free access to public space; and (e) implementing strategies to prevent repeat victimization (see para. 26 of the Guidelines).

32. Twenty-one Member States,⁴³ or half of the countries replying to the questionnaire, reported that they had such programmes, strategies or policies designed to improve environmental design and management. Twenty-two countries⁴⁴ implemented appropriate methods of surveillance that were sensitive to

⁴¹ Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Japan, Lithuania, Mexico, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

⁴² Belarus, Bolivia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States. Canada replied that this was partially implemented.

⁴³ Belarus, Bolivia, Cyprus, Estonia, Germany, Japan, Lithuania, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States. Canada reported that this was partially implemented.

⁴⁴ Belarus, Canada, Czech Republic, Germany, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain,

privacy; 20⁴⁵ promoted target hardening without impinging on the quality of the built environment; 17⁴⁶ encouraged the design of crime-resistant consumer goods; and 31⁴⁷ implemented strategies to prevent repeat victimization.

33. Member States reported on policy measures such as creating specific ministries for the environment or quality of life, and specific measures such as urban planning and safe housing. Several of the replies mentioned the use of closed-circuit television and surveillance cameras in public spaces, roads and sporting events. Specific measures to harden targets included car protection measures and increased security measures in specific establishments (credit entities, jewellery shops, firearms stores, pharmacies, lottery stands, gambling institutions, deposits of valuables or dangerous objects). Strategies to prevent repeat victimization included providing support to victims (in some cases through specialized units), imposing aggravated penalties when offences were repeated and establishing anonymous hotlines for drug-related matters.

D. Reintegration and preventing recidivism

34. The Guidelines (para. 6 (d)) recommend that States take measures to prevent recidivism. Thirty-one Member States⁴⁸ reported that they had specific policies, strategies or programmes to prevent recidivism by assisting in the social reintegration of offenders and other preventive mechanisms. Most programmes were implemented within detention facilities such as prisons and jails, and were applied while offenders were still incarcerated. Others applied post-imprisonment assistance and social reinsertion programmes and projects. Some programmes targeted specific groups such as juveniles in conflict with the law or drug addicts.

IV. Implementation issues

A. Sustainability and accountability

35. The Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime (paras. 1, 10 and 20) emphasize the importance of the principles of sustainability and accountability to ensure the implementation of effective crime prevention programmes and initiatives.

Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

⁴⁵ Belarus, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Germany, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

⁴⁶ Belarus, Cyprus, Germany, Japan, Lithuania, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, United Arab Emirates and United States.

⁴⁷ Belarus, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

⁴⁸ Belarus, Bolivia, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

Sustainability and accountability are promoted through well-planned crime prevention strategies, allocated with adequate resources, complemented by periodic reviews and involvement of the community.

36. Most Member States replying to the questionnaire reported that they achieved sustainability by devising action plans, backed up by sufficient budgets and subject to annual review. Many highlighted the involvement of elements of civil society, allowing for transparency and constant review, as an important factor in sustainability. One country (Swaziland) reported that maintaining connections with traditional leaders supported the sustainability of programmes. Some countries reported on the establishment of regional councils, commissions or task forces. Action plans were strengthened by appropriate legislation, budget provisions and specific manuals and guidelines. One Member State (Poland) reported that it held competitions among units to identify and promote best practices. Another (the Netherlands) reported that it had developed an evaluation manual which helped to identify best practices and allocate resources to the most effective practices. One country (South Africa) promoted accountability by creating clusters of ministries with shared responsibilities.

B. Cost assessment

37. Seventeen Member States,⁴⁹ or less than half of those replying to the questionnaire, reported that they had been making systematic attempts to assess the costs of crime and crime control measures, including crime prevention measures. In some cases, the attempts were initiated and financed by international organizations.

C. Knowledge-based crime prevention strategies

38. The Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime (paras. 11 and 21-23) identify the essential elements of knowledge-based crime prevention strategies, including intervention planning and systematic evaluation of best practices, costs, outcomes and results.

39. Most Member States reported that the use of knowledge-based crime prevention strategies, policies or programmes was facilitated by (a) supporting the generation and utilization of useful information and data (35 Member States); (b) supporting the sharing of useful information and data (32 Member States); and (c) promoting the application of useful information and data to reduce repeat victimization, persistent offending and crime in high-crime areas (30 Member States).

40. States described the knowledge-based process as generally including initial information-gathering by different units, sharing of information with other units and evaluation of the information by a central unit. The final stage would usually involve analysis of the information by a specialized unit in order to identify trends and recommend efficient crime prevention strategies. Some States reported that they

⁴⁹ Belarus, Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Lithuania, Netherlands, Pakistan, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

had conducted specific surveys, for example, on the prevalence of drug abuse among young persons and on public attitudes towards corruption. In some States, reports and other results of this process were also disseminated to the public.

41. Member States reported that they supported the sharing of useful information and data by organizing seminars and national congresses on crime prevention, participating in international forums and sharing information among all governmental bodies concerned.

D. Intervention planning

42. Most Member States reported that the planning of crime prevention policies, strategies or programmes in their countries included (a) a systematic analysis of crime problems, their causes, risk factors and consequences, in particular at the local level (31 States); (b) a plan that drew on the most appropriate approaches and adapted interventions to the specific local problems and local context (29 States); (c) an implementation plan to deliver efficient, effective and sustainable interventions (30 States); (d) mobilizing entities that were able to tackle causes of crime (32 States); and (e) monitoring and evaluation of strategies, policies and programmes (32 States).

43. According to the replies received, systematic analysis of crime problems was usually the responsibility of the attorney-general's office or the police and served as a basis for taking appropriate measures. Adapting measures to specific local problems was done by local or regional crime prevention units, sometimes in the framework of a flexible national model. Some Governments reported that crime prevention plans were initially devised at the local (rather than national) level, and were designed for local needs. Institutionalizing that evaluation process guaranteed the delivery of efficient, effective and sustainable interventions. Countries reported that monitoring and evaluation were done at all levels by the bodies charged with crime prevention, including by local participants.

44. With regard to mobilizing entities that are able to tackle causes of crime, Governments reported on initiatives to generate synergy among the efforts of different government departments, civil society organizations, community representatives and international organizations. Some countries also established working groups or local task forces.

45. The majority of the respondents reported that their crime prevention policies, strategies or programmes included rigorous evaluation to determine what worked, whereas fewer than half of the respondents⁵⁰ undertook cost-benefit analyses. Twenty-six Member States⁵¹ assessed reduction in crime, victimization and fear of crime, and 20⁵² assessed outcomes and 28⁵³ assessed unintended consequences.

⁵⁰ Bolivia, Canada, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, United Arab Emirates and United States.

⁵¹ Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

⁵² Belarus, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania,

Twenty-eight⁵⁴ reported that evaluation of components or specific activities of their national crime prevention policy or strategy was undertaken.

46. Member States reported that the evaluation of best practices as well as of outcomes and consequences was regularly undertaken both qualitatively (by discussing issues with the stakeholders) and quantitatively (by the gathering of statistics). Cost-benefit analysis was still being developed by some Governments, in some cases with the assistance of international organizations.

E. Links between local crime and transnational organized crime

47. In paragraph 13, the Guidelines recommend that national crime prevention diagnoses and strategies should, where appropriate, take account of links between local criminal problems and transnational organized crime. Paragraph 27 of the Guidelines presents a series of measures that could be taken, including (a) reducing existing and future opportunities for organized criminal groups to participate in lawful markets with the proceeds of crime, through appropriate legislative, administrative or other measures; (b) developing measures to prevent the misuse by organized criminal groups of tender procedures conducted by public authorities and of subsidies and licences granted by public authorities for commercial activity; and (c) designing crime prevention strategies to protect socially marginalized groups, especially women and children, who are vulnerable to the action of organized criminal groups, including trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants. Paragraph 31 of the Guidelines requires Member States to collaborate to analyse and address the links between transnational organized crime and national and local crime problems.

48. Eight countries⁵⁵ replied that they did not analyse the links between local crime and transnational organized crime, while 29⁵⁶ reported that they did. One country indicated that such an assessment was conducted in part. Most of the countries that answered positively referred either to the programmes and agencies that conduct such an assessment (usually the police) or to the areas of assessment. Areas of attention included juvenile delinquency, trafficking in persons, drug trafficking and abuse, terrorism and organized crime. Some countries focused on

Mauritius, Moldova, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, United Arab Emirates and United States. Canada reported that it did so in part.

⁵³ Belarus, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States. Canada reported that it did so in part.

⁵⁴ Belarus, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Moldova, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

⁵⁵ Brunei Darussalam, Czech Republic, Egypt, Iceland, Mauritius, Netherlands, Serbia and Slovenia.

⁵⁶ Belarus, Bolivia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Moldova, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and United States.

illegal migration and links to local crime. Most Member States referred to the importance of responding to transnational organized crime.

49. One Member State (Canada) reported that through the National Coordinating Committee on Organized Crime, supported by a federal government secretariat, key federal, provincial and territorial government officials, prosecutors and representatives from the law enforcement community came together to identify national policy priorities to be addressed. These included illicit drugs, outlaw motorcycle gangs, economic crime, money-laundering, illegal immigration and trafficking in persons. Another Government (Germany) reported that its law enforcement authorities had a large number of crime-fighting concepts, strategies and preventive programmes designed to deal with specific offences. As a general rule, those programmes addressed the links between crime on the domestic level and transnational organized crime. Nationwide coordination of the required action was ensured by corresponding bodies. Germany further reported that the Federal Criminal Police Office had created an important and successful instrument by developing the source country strategy, which included dispatching liaison officials for combating international organized crime. Other forms of Governments' response to the threat of global organized crime included signing bilateral agreements, sharing information, participating in international and regional networks and amending their laws to allow for extradition and mutual legal assistance.

50. Most Member States replying to the questionnaire reported that crime prevention policies, strategies or programmes in their countries included measures to prevent the misuse of public tender procedures, subsidies and licences (27 States); or measures to protect socially marginalized groups, especially women and children, who are vulnerable to exploitation by organized criminal groups, including the prevention of trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants (32 Member States).

51. Specific measures included legislation against money-laundering and corruption, screening of participants in public tenders and review of government contracts. One Government (the Netherlands) reported on legislation that provided public administration bodies with additional grounds to refuse or reject licenses or subsidies.

52. With regard to measures to protect socially marginalized groups, especially women and children, who are vulnerable to exploitation by organized criminal groups, Member States that are parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (General Assembly resolution 55/25, annex I) and the Protocols thereto (Assembly resolutions 55/25, annexes II and III, and 55/255, annex) reported that they adapted their legislation to allow for the protection of victims of human trafficking, child prostitution and smuggling, sometimes through establishing victims' protection units. Other States had developed manuals and guidelines on the investigation and prosecution of these specific crimes.

V. International cooperation, networking and technical assistance

A. Participation in international networks

53. The Guidelines (paras. 29, 30, 32 and 33) encourage Member States to facilitate international cooperation and develop networks for the exchange of practices and knowledge.

54. Most Member States replying to the questionnaire indicated that they participated in international networks for the exchange of information and knowledge on crime prevention policies, strategies or programmes. The following networks and organizations were mentioned: Interpol, the European Crime Prevention Network, the European Forum for Urban Safety, the European Police Office, the International Organization for Migration, the European Union Phare Project against money-laundering, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime, the Prevention Council of the Nordic States, the Scandinavian Research Council for Criminology, the Southern African Development Community and the ASEAN Chiefs of Police Conference. Lack of funding was cited by most countries as the main obstacle to Governments' participation in international networking.

B. Guides, toolkits, compendiums or manuals of crime prevention practices

55. Several Member States mentioned that they could share guides, toolkits and manuals of crime prevention practices. The following countries have provided a reference or the addresses of websites where such information can be found: Canada, (www.psepc.gc.ca/prg/cp/guidance_applicants-index-en.asp),⁵⁷ Cyprus (www.police.gov.cy), Estonia (www.kuriteoennetus.ee, www.pol.ee/?id=103426 and www.naabrivalve.ee), Hungary (www.bunmegelozes.hu), the Netherlands (www.hetccv.nl), Romania (www.mai.gov.ro/index15.htm), Singapore (www.ncpc.gov.sg), Slovakia (www.minv.sk/prevencia/pages/prevencia/publikacie/publikacie/strategia_anj.doc) and the United States (www.ncjrs.gov).

C. Technical assistance

56. Twenty-four Member States reported that they needed technical assistance in crime prevention,⁵⁸ while 19 reported that they were able to provide technical

⁵⁷ A more comprehensive list of resources provided by Canada will be made available on the UNODC website (www.unodc.org).

⁵⁸ Canada commented in its reply that it "has benefited enormously since the inception of its National Crime Prevention Centre from the expertise of specialists outside of Canada, and has several key areas where this expertise would be invaluable to advancing a solid crime prevention agenda. This being said, the affirmative reply is not intended to suggest that Canada requires funded technical assistance". Greece noted that its positive reply reflected the fact that the Hellenic Police Force monitored the ever evolving trends in crime and new practices for handling crime and was receptive to adopting practices that it considered optimal for handling

assistance.⁵⁹ The table below provides an overview of the areas where assistance is needed, the countries in need of assistance and the countries in a position to provide assistance.

57. In addition to the areas identified in the table below, Member States identified developing skills and encouraging public participation as areas in which assistance was needed. Within the area of sustainability and accountability, making cost-benefit assessments was one specific activity for which States needed assistance.

Technical assistance in crime prevention

<i>Area of crime prevention^a</i>	<i>Need technical assistance</i>	<i>Can provide technical assistance</i>
Including prevention as a permanent part of government structures (para. 17)	Mauritius, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Syrian Arab Republic	Canada, Hungary, Slovakia (partly)
Government support for the development of crime prevention skills (para. 18)	Hungary, Mauritius, Pakistan, Slovakia (partly), Syrian Arab Republic	Romania
Government and civil society support of partnerships (para. 19)	Mauritius, Slovakia, Syrian Arab Republic	Canada, Japan, Pakistan, Romania
Social crime prevention (paras. 6 (a), 8 and 25)	Mauritius, Pakistan, Romania, Slovakia	Canada, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Portugal, Syrian Arab Republic
Locally based or neighbourhood crime prevention (para. 6 (b))	Canada, Mauritius, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Slovakia	Japan, Portugal, Syrian Arab Republic
Situational crime prevention (paras. 6 (c) and 26)	Lithuania, Pakistan, Romania, Slovakia, Syrian Arab Republic	Japan, Poland, Portugal
Prevention of recidivism (para. 6 (d))	Pakistan, Romania, Slovakia	Japan
Sustainability and accountability of crime prevention (paras. 1, 10 and 20)	Canada, Mauritius, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Syrian Arab Republic	Japan, Romania
Knowledge-based crime prevention (paras. 11 and 21)	Canada, Hungary, Mauritius, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Syrian Arab Republic	Portugal, Slovakia
Planning interventions (para. 22)	Canada, Mauritius, Pakistan, Slovakia, Syrian Arab Republic	Japan, Mauritius, Romania
Monitoring and evaluation (para. 23)	Canada, Hungary, Lithuania, Mauritius, Pakistan, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic	Japan, Romania

crime in general and its various forms in particular.

⁵⁹ Germany noted in its reply that “the possibility of technical assistance exists in many areas of crime prevention; however, this is substantially dependent upon the concrete financial and personnel resources which are available or can be made available by other offices in the specific area”.

<i>Area of crime prevention^a</i>	<i>Need technical assistance</i>	<i>Can provide technical assistance</i>
Assessing the links between local crime problems and transnational organized crime (paras. 13, 27 and 31)	Canada, Iceland, Pakistan, Slovakia, Syrian Arab Republic	Japan, Romania
All areas	Belarus, Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Moldova, Senegal, Serbia, South Africa	Bolivia, Singapore

^a The relevant paragraphs of the Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime are shown in parentheses.

VI. Conclusions and recommendations

58. The analysis of the replies to the questionnaire indicates that many countries have specific crime prevention plans, implementing in whole or in part the Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime. However, considering that fewer than one quarter of States Members of the United Nations have replied to the questionnaire, it is difficult to ascertain what the global situation is in terms of implementation of the Guidelines.

59. The replies to the questionnaire provide important insights into the experiences of countries which have adopted crime prevention policies, strategies and programmes. The main elements of a successful crime prevention policy that can be drawn from the replies are the following: establishing a central body, department or unit that is charged with the implementation of national programmes and coordinates the efforts of central and local government, as well as other organizations; reviewing strategies on a regular basis in order to better identify real needs as well as best practices, and adapting national and local plans accordingly; institutionalizing programmes focused on children and youth; producing guides, toolkits and manuals to assist in the dissemination of knowledge on crime prevention and coherent implementation of plans; creating a real commitment of central and local government to the success of crime prevention programmes, backed up by sufficient funding and resources; and creating partnerships and cooperation with non-governmental organizations and encouraging active participation of the public in the crime prevention effort.

60. As some Member States commented on the high costs of crime prevention measures, it is worth repeating the observation made by one respondent Government (the United States): "Crime prevention may appear very costly in the beginning, but over the long term, it is less expensive than the alternative in terms of quality of life and direct expenses of crime."

61. The main challenges encountered by the respondents in delivering effective crime prevention can be summarized as follows: strengthening social prevention as public policy and creating organs responsible for its implementation; addressing specific areas of organized crime such as drug trafficking, trafficking in human beings and illegal immigration; improving coordination among different government bodies involved in crime prevention; disseminating knowledge to local governments and stimulating their active

participation in crime prevention; creating training programmes to address lack of expertise in crime prevention and creating databases on best practices; making use of advanced technologies to improve crime prevention strategies; and devising evaluation mechanisms, in particular those connected with cost-benefit assessment.

62. It is recommended that States cooperate in the implementation of the Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime by sharing expertise and best practices and by providing technical assistance in areas where they have successfully implemented crime prevention strategies. Such cooperation may be bilateral or in the framework of international organizations, in particular UNODC. It is further recommended that the challenges of effective crime prevention identified by States be addressed in a comprehensive manner by the international organizations active in this area.
