



Exploring social acceptability in urban crime prevention: perspectives from six EU cities

Alejandro Nicolás-Sánchez

<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-8314-2157>

Plus Ethics; PARADIGMA Innovation

Francisco Javier Castro-Toledo

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0743-4605>

Plus Ethics; PARADIGMA Innovation

<https://doi.org/10.1387/inecs.28555>

Abstract

This study assesses the social acceptability of innovative urban security strategies implemented in six European cities (Riga, Stuttgart, Lisbon, Nice, Turin, and Rotterdam) within the EU-funded IcARUS project during 2024. Using the Nominal Group Technique (NGT), two sessions per city engaged local stakeholders (n = 27), blending technical expertise with the lived experiences of local citizens. This participatory approach fostered in-depth discussions, prioritisation of ideas, and a deeper understanding of the social benefits and challenges shaping the acceptability of each tool. Key benefits included strengthened trust between communities and public institutions, enhanced safety perceptions, and greater civic engagement. However, challenges such as resource constraints, political instability, and communication gaps threatened long-term sustainability. By integrating insights from diverse contexts, this research highlights the importance of co-designed crime prevention solutions. This research offers a clear roadmap for fostering trust, inclusion, and resilience in urban security, guiding future initiatives toward sustainable and socially accepted outcomes.

Keywords: *impact, public participation, social acceptability, urban security*

Correspondence: anicolas@plusethics.com

© This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction, provided the original author and source are credited.

1. Introduction

Effective crime prevention requires more than addressing immediate outcomes; it must align with societal values and support sustainable, long-term impacts. Social Impact Assessment (SIA) offers a comprehensive framework to evaluate the broader implications of interventions, including their effects on social structures, community cohesion, and individual behaviours (Burgess, 2012; Bottero et al., 2020; Cohen et al., 2022). This approach enables policymakers to optimise benefits, mitigate unintended consequences, and strengthen trust and social cohesion within communities (Arce-Gomez et al., 2015; Prenzler, 2021). Central to the success of crime prevention strategies is their social acceptability. Factors such as fairness, transparency, and inclusivity shape public perceptions of legitimacy and effectiveness (Burgess, 2012; Laufs, 2022; Taebi, 2017). Without community support, even technically sound interventions may fail to achieve their intended impact. Participatory tools, such as the Nominal Group Technique (NGT), provide systematic methods for integrating diverse perspectives, ensuring strategies address societal concerns while meeting practical objectives (Vander Laenen, 2015; Shimizu et al., 2021; Wright & Raab, 2012).

This work examines the role of social acceptability within SIA frameworks to enhance urban security strategies, with a focus on resilience in European local communities. Adopting an interdisciplinary approach, it combines theoretical insights, participatory methods, and rigorous evaluations to guide the development of interventions that reduce crime while promoting sustainable and equitable urban development. This study is structured in such a manner as to provide a detailed evaluation of the social benefits and challenges of specific urban security tools implemented during 2024 in six European cities through the EU-funded IcARUS project—Riga, Stuttgart, Lisbon, Nice, Turin, and Rotterdam—, incorporating insights from key stakeholders from the municipalities through a collaborative and interactive process.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1. SIA: Introducing principles

Social Impact Assessment (SIA) is defined as a systematic process for evaluating the social consequences of projects, policies, or programmes throughout their lifecycle (Vanclay, 2020). Initially a regulatory tool, SIA has expanded to involve diverse stakeholders—such as project developers, financiers, and affected communities—ensuring that social dimensions are integrated into project management to foster positive outcomes and mitigate adverse effects.

A foundational aspect of SIA is stakeholder engagement, enhancing both the legitimacy and acceptance of assessment outcomes. Participatory approaches, which prioritise representativeness and deliberation, are particularly effective in addressing social development and the needs of vulnerable populations (Gulakov & Vanclay, 2019; Curtis et al., 2020). Furthermore, active participation contributes to

addressing concerns related to social development, resilience, and the specific needs of vulnerable populations, reinforcing the overall impact of SIA (Vanclay, 2020). Methodologically, SIA combines quantitative and qualitative techniques to capture complex social dynamics, while impact pathways—causal links between project activities and social outcomes—guide the evaluation (Sureau et al., 2019), supported by other social indicators in sectors like the sharing economy (Curtis et al., 2020).

Beyond methodological considerations, SIA addresses a broad spectrum of social dimensions, including community development, cultural heritage, human rights, and social inclusion, and its adaptability is evident across sectors (Vanclay, 2020). By addressing these dimensions, SIA not only minimises adverse effects but also enhances the potential for projects to contribute positively to societal well-being. However, opportunities remain to further develop SIA by integrating interdisciplinary perspectives, particularly those drawn from the social sciences, to refine existing frameworks and methodologies (Sureau et al., 2019).

2.2. The role of SIA and social acceptability in crime prevention

SIA has emerged as a vital tool for understanding how crime prevention strategies affect communities, social structures, and individual behaviours. Beyond measuring crime reductions, SIA incorporates the unique characteristics, expectations, and perspectives of communities (Arce-Gomez et al., 2015; Weisburd et al., 2017), identifying both potential benefits and unintended harms, aligning interventions with societal values and long-term sustainability (Burgess, 2012; Bonilla-Alicea & Fu, 2019; Taebi, 2017). This approach highlights the interplay between interventions and social constructs like trust, cohesion, and safety perceptions (Prenzler, 2021).

Procedural justice theory underpins SIA by demonstrating that public perceptions of police legitimacy depend more on fairness and respectful treatment than on crime reduction alone (Tyler & Jackson, 2014; Peyton et al., 2019; Bolger & Walters, 2019; Aston et al., 2021). Trust-building measures, such as body-worn cameras and smart city data collection, can foster cooperation but require context-sensitive implementation (Hedberg et al., 2017; Shimizu et al., 2021). Environmental interventions—such as CCTV systems, improved lighting, and inclusive public spaces—can reduce crime while enhancing wellbeing, though their effectiveness depends on local dynamics, community involvement, and other mediating factors (Salazar-Tobar, 2024; Gurinskaya, 2020; Ceccato, 2020; Castro-Toledo et al., 2017). As a fundamental part of SIA, robust frameworks for evaluating social acceptability are crucial for assessing the multifaceted impacts of crime prevention strategies. Interventions that reduce crime but heighten perceptions of surveillance highlight the need to balance technical effectiveness with societal acceptance (Galdon Clavell & Frowd, 2015; Gurinskaya, 2020). Institutional efficacy plays a pivotal role, as resource-limited communities may struggle to maintain social control mechanisms, undermining resilience, legitimacy, and their capacity to implement effective interventions (Wright et al., 2013; Cohen,

2020). Additionally, fear of crime—often independent of actual crime rates—can fragment communities, necessitating careful consideration of both safety and surveillance anxieties (Castro-Toledo, 2019; Ceccato & Nalla, 2020), with measures potentially reinforcing such anxieties (Wright & Raab, 2012; Burgess, 2012; European Commission, 2023: p. 8). Evaluations must thus be informed by diverse perspectives to balance these concerns, fostering accountability and public confidence (Wright & Raab, 2012).

As shown in the following section, participatory methods, such as the Nominal Group Technique (NGT), enable the inclusion of diverse stakeholder perspectives, fostering knowledge co-production and aligning evaluations with responsible research and innovation principles (Vander Laenen, 2015; Hugé & Mukherjee, 2018; Buhner et al., 2022; European Commission, 2018). By integrating participatory approaches with robust evaluation frameworks, policymakers can design interventions that build trust, strengthen communities, and enhance societal acceptance, promoting both immediate and long-term sustainability.

3. Methodology

3.1. Methods

The study employs the Nominal Group Technique (NGT)¹ (Delbecq & Van de Ven, 1971), a structured method for fostering quantifiable consensus in small groups. Participants first respond individually to moderated questions before collectively prioritising ideas, ensuring equal participation and reducing dominance. NGT is effective for structured consultations, promoting actionable outcomes and considering minority perspectives (De Ruyter, 1996; Vander Laenen, 2015; Hugé & Mukherjee, 2018; Wadhwa et al., 2014). Its mixed-methods approach addresses the lack of standardised methodologies in SIAs (Bonilla-Alicea & Fu, 2019), combining qualitative and quantitative insights for a comprehensive understanding of social phenomena (Delbecq & Van de Ven, 1971; Vander Laenen, 2015).

3.2. Sample

For each city, two nominal group technique sessions were conducted to assess socio-economic, moral, and legal factors underpinning the design and social acceptability of innovative urban security strategies. One devoted to identifying the main social benefits of the urban security tool, and one to identifying the main social challenges, corresponding directly to the two guiding questions presented in the Variables and Procedure section. Both sessions involved the same group of stakeholders and were held on the same day for logistical reasons, though independent and separated by a coffee break. The decision to conduct two sessions per city rather than a greater number reflects the project's multi-city comparative design, which prioritised analytical breadth across six national contexts over intensive depth at any single site. This trade-off is consistent with multi-site participatory research in applied settings.

Following data collection, qualitative and quantitative analyses were carried out to refine tool designs, enhancing their alignment with social needs. Sessions involved multistakeholder representatives from the six cities, conducted online in May and June 2024. Each group included four to five participants—within the recommended range for equitable discussions (Delbecq et al., 1975; McMillan et al., 2014)—and lasted approximately two hours. Participants were professionals actively involved in the IcARUS project from each of the six partner municipalities—Riga, Stuttgart, Lisbon, Nice, Turin, and Rotterdam—. Over the course of the project's four-year collaborative process, these individuals had contributed directly to the co-design and iterative development of the urban security tools, working alongside academic researchers, police services, and local communities. Their institutional knowledge of both the tools and the local security contexts in which they operate positioned them as an appropriate sample for this exploratory study, which seeks initial, informed insights on a topic with limited prior academic treatment rather than statistical representativeness of broader populations. In line with principles of responsible research and in view of the sensitivity of some discussion content, neither name nor specific departmental roles and positions have not been reported, as the small and identifiable nature of each city's project team means that such detail could indirectly compromise participant anonymity. Participants provided informed consent after receiving detailed briefings. While smaller than typical engagement groups, this size accommodated project objectives, practical constraints, and the virtual format, aligning with flexible participant ranges reported in previous studies (Barkhuizen, 2014; Harb et al., 2021).

1. The Description of Action (DoA) in the IcARUS Grant Agreement initially proposed surveys, but this was replaced with group dialogues involving stakeholders who were both technically informed and impacted as citizens of IcARUS municipalities. This shift addressed survey limitations, such as difficulties in obtaining representative samples, low response rates, rigid closed-ended questions, and risks of citizen disengagement if feedback produced no visible changes (Wadhwa et al., 2014). Nominal groups provided a more flexible method for exploring opinions, refining ideas, and gaining insights into social acceptability within specific contexts, while actively involving stakeholders. This methodological change was approved through an amendment.

Table 1.*Summary of details from the Nominal Groups with each IcARUS municipality*

City	Urban security tool	Link to further information	Date	N ²	Language	Session duration
RIGA	PAR DROŠU RĪGU	https://www.icarus-innovation.eu/tools-insights/icarus-tools/riga-toolkit/	27/05/2024	4	English	112 min
STUTTGART	TRICK17	https://www.icarus-innovation.eu/tools-insights/icarus-tools/stuttgart-toolkit/	04/06/2024	4	German	107 min
LISBON	JOVEM DESIGN LISBOA	https://www.icarus-innovation.eu/tools-insights/icarus-tools/lisbon-toolkit/	05/06/2024	5	Portuguese	203 min
TURIN	SBOCCIAMO TORINO	https://www.icarus-innovation.eu/tools-insights/icarus-tools/turin-toolkit/	06/06/2024	4	Italian/ Spanish	142 min
NICE	DEMANDEZ ANGELA	https://www.icarus-innovation.eu/tools-insights/icarus-tools/nice-toolkit/	06/06/2024	5	French	140 min
ROTTERDAM	SPAANSE POLDER CAFÉ	https://www.icarus-innovation.eu/tools-insights/icarus-tools/rotterdam-toolkit/	12/06/2024	5	English	145 min

3.3. Variables and Procedure

This research explores the social acceptability of urban security initiatives by examining social benefits and challenges as perceived by local stakeholders. Social benefits refer to the positive impacts that an intervention can have on society, while social challenges highlight obstacles or potentially adverse effects that the intervention could create or exacerbate within a community³. Their interplay influences social acceptability, with greater benefits enhancing acceptance and rising challenges hindering it. Two guiding questions framed the sessions, prompting participants to identify the main social benefits and challenges of each IcARUS tool based on their dual roles as experts and as citizens who may be positively or negatively impacted by the solutions. The questions were adapted to each city's context and tool.

Taking into account both your professional experience in the field of urban security and your condition as a [INSERT CITY] citizen, what do you identify as the main social benefits of [INSERT IcARUS' tool] that could contribute positively to its social acceptance?

Taking into account both your professional experience in the field of urban security and your condition as a [INSERT CITY] citizen, what do you identify as the

main social challenges of [INSERT IcARUS' tool] that could contribute negatively to its social acceptance?

Sessions followed a structured format:

- Idea generation: each participant was asked to submit three brief responses in the chat within five minutes, recorded in real-time and later translated for analysis.
- Clarification and discussion: over 20 minutes, and with real-time sharing of the ideas with the group, the facilitator guided participants through a process of thematic consolidation, proceeding idea by idea and inviting clarifying questions to ensure that each item was clearly understood and substantively distinct from the others. Where participants identified overlapping, near-identical, or complementary items, the group collectively decided — through open discussion facilitated by the moderator — whether to merge, split, rephrase, or retain them as separate entries. The aim was to produce a final list of items that were mutually non-overlapping, independently comprehensible, and each votable in their own right. This collective refinement step is intrinsic to the NGT method (Delbecq & Van de Ven, 1971; Vander Laenen, 2015) and does not constitute a separate analytical coding procedure; final grouping decisions were made by participants themselves, with the facilitator acting as a process support rather than an analytical arbiter.
- Prioritisation and quantification: participants ranked their top five benefits and challenges, assigning scores (5 points for the highest priority, 1 point for the fifth). Unranked items received no votes. The quantitative results were tallied and explained in real time.

4. Results

4.1. Riga

Social Benefits

In Riga, trust between police and citizens emerged as the most valued social benefit (32% of votes), fostered by interactive communication channels that encouraged active citizen involvement in neighbourhood security. The project also highlighted the potential for more efficient policing through better understanding of community needs. Additional benefits, including improved perceptions of safety and a positive shift in the police's image, reinforced the project's ability to enhance collaboration and cooperation.

2. In Lisbon and Nice, one participant from the first session was unable to attend the second session due to other professional and urgent commitments. The N for the challenges session in these two cities was therefore 4.

Table 2.*Summary of Nominal Group results on social benefits of PAR DROŠU RĪGU*

	Votes		M	Participants	
	Points	%		N	%
Idea 1. Police tactics could be more efficient and closer to citizens needs because of better understanding	12	20%	3,0	4	100%
Idea 2. Citizens feel involved to the security process in the neighbourhood and volunteer inform police about different violations	14	23%	3,5	4	100%
Idea 3. Destigmatises police officers as persons who only want to punish	9	15%	2,3	4	100%
Idea 4. Closer connection and regular communication establishes trust between police officers and the citizens	19	32%	4,8	4	100%
Idea 5. Feeling of safety in the city increases	6	10%	1,5	4	100%
Total	60	100%	-	4	100%

Note. The final voted ideas resulted from clarification and discussion, where similar ideas were grouped, rephrased, merged, or split for added detail. Only the tables with the final list of ideas are presented. Social Challenges Challenges in Riga centred on the risk of eroding trust if police failed to act on survey feedback or adapt strategies (27% of votes). Miscommunication, stemming from poorly selected officers, and a lack of understanding at higher management levels amplified these concerns. Additional hurdles included citizen disengagement and mismatched expectations, emphasising the complexities of maintaining constructive and sustainable relationships between law enforcement and the community.

Social Challenges

Challenges in Riga centred on the risk of eroding trust if police failed to act on survey feedback or adapt strategies (27% of votes). Miscommunication, stemming from poorly selected officers, and a lack of understanding at higher management levels amplified these concerns. Additional hurdles included citizen disengagement and mismatched expectations, emphasising the complexities of maintaining constructive and sustainable relationships between law enforcement and the community.

3. It is crucial to note that not all identified aspects were strictly social—some reflected logistical issues, while others are dynamic or potential risks, such as "lack of interest from the city." Framing these challenges as dynamic informs strategies to optimise benefits and mitigate risks, offering a more nuanced understanding of the tools' social impact.

Table 3.

Summary of Nominal Group results on social challenges of PAR DROŠU RĪGU

	Votes		M	Participants	
	Points	%		N	%
Idea 1. Incorrect communication from police side because of inappropriate officers involved	15	25%	3,8	4	100%
Idea 2. Due to citizens not willing to take a part in the project, their involvement is decreased and responses are indifferent and useless	8	13%	2,0	4	100%
Idea 3. Citizens begin to think that their opinions are always useful and correct	5	8%	1,3	4	100%
Idea 4. In case the police don't react or change tactics according to results of the surveys, the mistrust increases	16	27%	4,0	4	100%
Idea 5. The lack of understanding on HQ level leads to lack of will to use the tool/approach in the future	16	27%	4,0	4	100%
Total	60	100%	-	4	100%

4.2. Stuttgart

Social Benefits

In Stuttgart, inclusivity took centre stage as the project's defining benefit, earning 22% of the votes. Its accessible, low-threshold design encouraged participation from a diverse audience, making it both practical and impactful. The project's cost-effective implementation (17% of votes) further enhanced its appeal, alongside its success in engaging marginalised groups and younger participants. Through innovative approaches like gamification, the project demonstrated the power of creativity in promoting social cohesion and addressing urban challenges.

Table 4.

Summary of Nominal Group results on social benefits of TRICK17

	Votes		M	Participants	
	Points	%		N	%
Idea 1. Access to vulnerable groups	6	10%	1,5	3	75%
Idea 2. Low-threshold inclusive event	13	22%	3,25	3	75%
Idea 3. improvement of perceived security	5	8%	1,25	1	25%
Idea 4. Gamification of complex issue	5	8%	1,25	2	50%
Idea 5. Boosts intrinsic motivation in participants	4	7%	1	1	25%
Idea 6. Everyone can participate giving ideas or become a part of the show.	0	0%	0	0	0%
Idea 7. Caters to hotspots of adolescents in the urban space.	2	3%	0,5	1	25%
Idea 8. Resource efficient ready-to-go tool	10	17%	2,5	3	75%
Idea 9. Improve trust in the city and public institutions	4	7%	1	2	50%
Idea 10. Great entertainment factor and transparency	5	8%	1,25	1	25%
Idea 11. Volunteer-based	0	0%	0	0	0%
Idea 12. Provokes a reaction in adolescents	4	7%	1	2	50%
Idea 13. Impact through passive reception	0	0%	0	0	0%
Idea 14. Sparks curiosity in spectators	2	3%	0,5	1	25%
Total	60	100%	-	4	100%

Social Challenges

However, resource constraints emerged as the biggest challenge for Stuttgart’s initiative, with 28% of votes highlighting funding and manpower shortages as threats to its scalability and sustainability. Systemic issues, such as bureaucratic inefficiencies and miscommunication across organisations, compounded these difficulties. Additionally, risks of misinterpreting the project’s intentions, particularly its impact on vulnerable groups, underscored the importance of clear messaging and careful planning to avoid unintended consequences.

Table 5.*Summary of Nominal Group results on social challenges of TRICK17*

	Votes		M	Participants	
	Points	%		N	%
Idea 1. Bureaucratic and communication challenges across organisations	8	13%	2	3	75%
Idea 2. Intervention may be misunderstood in a way that is threatening to vulnerable groups	3	5%	0,75	2	50%
Idea 3. Lack of interest on the part of the city	7	12%	1,75	2	50%
Idea 4. Lack of interest of the part of the stakeholders	3	5%	0,75	1	25%
Idea 5. Unsuccessful realisation of the workshop's objective	7	12%	1,75	2	50%
Idea 6. Bad weather	1	2%	0,25	1	25%
Idea 7. Inadequate timing and location	4	7%	1	1	25%
Idea 8. Saturation of spectators	0	0%	0	0	0%
Idea 9. Responsibilities and further development of the project	0	0%	0	0	0%
Idea 10. Resources (money, people, materials)	17	28%	4,25	4	100%
Idea 11. Violent passersby	3	5%	0,75	1	25%
Idea 12. Insufficient transparency and communication of the project	4	7%	1	1	25%
Idea 13. Permit from the city council	0	0%	0	0	0%
Idea 14. Other events taking place at the same time	3	5%	0,75	2	50%
Total	60	100%	-	4	100%

4.3. Lisbon

Social Benefits

Lisbon's initiative excelled in fostering knowledge relationships among community members, a benefit recognised by 25% of votes. This effort significantly enhanced social cohesion and active citizenship. Complementing this was increased citizen participation in local safety initiatives (24%), reflecting robust communal engagement aimed at the collective good. Other benefits included strengthening trust between police and youth, as well as equipping young participants with valuable life skills, which bolstered informal social controls and enhanced community resilience.

Table 6.

Summary of Nominal Group results on social benefits of JOVEM DESIGN LISBOA

	Votes		M	Participants	
	Points	%		N	%
Idea 1. Promotes the approximation (informal ties) between police and citizens (communication, interaction, exchange of information)	3	4%	0,6	1	20%
Idea 2. Increase (improve better) the trust relationship between the police and youth from local community	11	15%	2,2	4	80%
Idea 3. Develops youth life skills (personal and social ones)	9	12%	1,8	3	60%
Idea 4. Promote the participation (involvement) of citizens for practical citizenship for safety at the local level and (achieve) the common good through democratic procedures	18	24%	3,6	5	100%
Idea 5. Promotion (rise) and deepening of knowledge relationships among individuals in the community (youth, neighbours, families, sellers(dealers), workers, police, partner entities) strengthening bonds among themselves and increasing inclusion and social cohesion	19	25%	3,8	5	100%
Idea 6. Recognition of preventive practices of risky behaviours with the direct experience of the youth, and the acknowledgement of the community	4	5%	0,8	2	40%
Idea 7. Positive impact on the public security and the perception of safety in the neighbourhood's public spaces	6	8%	1,2	4	80%
Idea 8. Strengthening and deepening of local partnerships for the continuity and reinforcement of the project's impact on the community	5	7%	1	1	20%
Total	75	100%	-	5	100%

Social Challenges

The most pressing challenge in Lisbon was the risk of losing political support (27%), threatening the programme's long-term sustainability. Weak partner networks (18%) further limited the project's reach, while disbelief in community projects due to prior negative experiences hindered public trust. Additional obstacles, such as insufficient programme publicity and inappropriate selection of police mentors, undermined community engagement and the initiative's broader impact.

Table 7.

Summary of Nominal Group results on social challenges of JOVEM DESIGN LISBOA

	Votes		M	Participants	
	Points	%		N	%
Idea 1. Groups (or members groups) that engage in illegal activities established in the community that may see the JDL as an obstacle.	0	0%	0	0	0%
Idea 2. Disbelief in this type of community projects due to previous experiences with similar one but with negative or irrelevant results	8	13%	2	2	50%
Idea 3. Weak culture established in community participation in this type of projects	1	2%	0,25	1	25%
Idea 4. Difficulty in participating in the JDL due to organisational reasons (scheduling conflicts)	3	5%	0,75	1	25%
Idea 5. The weak existence of partner networks makes it almost impossible to promote the social acceptance of this type of project	11	18%	2,75	3	75%
Idea 6. Absence of support or resources for the implementation of the solutions presented by the youth at the final event	6	10%	1,5	2	50%
Idea 7. Difficulty in participating in the JDL challenge due to personal reasons (motivation/availability)	2	3%	0,5	1	25%
Idea 8. The program no longer receives political support (local political recognition).	16	27%	4	4	100%
Idea 9. Insufficient publicising of the program among the local community and the rest of the Lisbon community, affecting family participation in the JDL project	6	10%	1,5	3	75%
Idea 10. The inappropriate selection of the police mentors' profile	7	12%	1,75	3	75%
Total	60	100%	-	4	100%

4.4. Turin

Social Benefits

In Turin, the project's emphasis on data-driven approaches to juvenile delinquency prevention earned 25% of the votes, showcasing its reliance on accurate, evidence-based strategies. Equally important was the 360° stakeholder engagement (22%), which incorporated diverse perspectives in the co-design process. A bottom-up approach (17%) ensured that local input remained central, enhancing the relevance and effectiveness of interventions. Holistic and multidisciplinary methods further strengthened police tactics and community collaboration.

Table 8.*Summary of Nominal Group results on social benefits of SBOCCLIAMO TORINO*

	Votes		M	Participants	
	Points	%		N	%
Idea 1. Help the police not to be self-referential on urban security issues	5	8%	1,25	3	75%
Idea 2. Involves associations, citizens and municipal offices in a co-design on security that would otherwise not take place	1	2%	0,25	1	25%
Idea 3. Opens up to proposals from below (bottom-up approach)	10	17%	2,5	4	100%
Idea 4. Focus on data-driven juvenile delinquency prevention	15	25%	3,75	3	75%
Idea 5. Promotes a 360' vision through the diversity and transversality of stakeholders (organisations, associations, municipal offices).	13	22%	3,25	3	75%
Idea 6. Encourages a holistic and multidisciplinary approach	7	12%	1,75	2	50%
Idea 7. Even citizens feel more included because they can bring their ideas through the Committee	0	0%	0	0	0%
Idea 8. The ability to analyse data in a collaborative way, with experts from other organisations and other areas, is developed, improving the competences of the individuals who participate	3	5%	0,75	1	25%
Idea 9. Encourages mixed approaches in addressing complex issues: quantitative (given by the dashboard) and qualitative (with the experience of the participants)	6	10%	1,5	3	75%
Total	60	100%	-	4	100%

Social Challenges

The primary challenge was maintaining Committee members' motivation and commitment (27%), a critical factor for ensuring the initiative's success. Difficulties in establishing measurable outcomes for preventive strategies (17%) reduced clarity and long-term planning. Political constraints, such as shifting priorities and insufficient planning, jeopardised the programme's continuity, while limited data availability and integration of policies across departments underscored the need for coordinated efforts to sustain the project's impact.

Table 9.

Summary of Nominal Group results on social challenges of SBOCCIAMO TORINO

	Votes		M	Participants	
	Points	%		N	%
Idea 1. The motivation in the use of the tool could be politicised and associated with a political vision and discontinuous representatives	9	15%	2,25	3	75%
Idea 2. The Committee does not directly involve the young people concerned, but only the organisations working with them.	5	8%	1,25	1	25%
Idea 3. The scarcity of data makes it difficult to compile a dashboard that can inform the Committee in a comprehensive way	6	10%	1,5	2	50%
Idea 4. Lack of time by city politicians to adequately plan	7	12%	1,75	3	75%
Idea 5. Problems in generating commitment and incentivising participation of Committee members	16	27%	4	4	100%
Idea 6. Lack of short-term results	0	0%	0	0	0%
Idea 7. Difficulty in establishing metrics for assessing preventive effectiveness	10	17%	2,5	4	100%
Idea 8. The mistrust by citizens about data collection even if anonymised	0	0%	0	0	0%
Idea 9. The difficulty in having integrated social policies between different departments involved	3	5%	0,75	1	25%
Idea 10. Ensuring the balance between privacy and usefulness of data with respect to tracking individuals	4	7%	1	2	50%
Total	60	100%	-	4	100%

4.5. Nice

Social Benefits

Nice’s initiative stood out for its ability to provide direct support to victims of harassment and individuals in insecure situations, identified as the top social benefit (28% of votes). Raising awareness about street harassment (17%) further highlighted the programme’s preventative value, engaging broader groups beyond potential victims. Additional benefits included fostering solidarity, shared values, and reducing feelings of insecurity in public spaces. While less prioritised, the creation of solidarity networks and links between city services and citizens demonstrated the programme’s potential for enhancing civic engagement and cooperation.

Table 10.

Summary of Nominal Group results on social benefits of DEMANDEZ ANGELA

	Votes		M	Participants	
	Points	%		N	%
Idea 1. Assistance for victims of harassment or people in a situation of insecurity who use this system	21	28%	4,2	5	100%
Idea 2. Reducing the feeling of insecurity in the public space	10	13%	2	3	60%
Idea 3. Increase the feeling of solidarity to combat street harassment	11	15%	2,2	2	60%
Idea 4. Increase the feeling of sharing common values	11	15%	2,2	4	80%
Idea 5. Increased awareness of street harassment and its implications	13	17%	2,6	4	80%
Idea 6. Create a solidarity network for members	4	5%	0,8	2	40%
Idea 7. Improve the quality of life in public spaces	2	3%	0,4	1	20%
Idea 8. Create a link between city services and citizens	3	4%	0,6	3	60%
Total	75	100%	-	5	100%

Social Challenges

The main challenge was sustaining member involvement over time (33% of votes). Mobilising new participants (20%) and following up with existing members (8%) presented further difficulties, particularly given the programme’s reliance on businesses and venues. Resource constraints, such as budget cuts and staff fatigue, posed additional risks, while gaps in police awareness and societal recognition of harassment highlighted barriers to the initiative’s broader implementation.

Table 11.

Summary of Nominal Group results on social challenges of DEMANDEZ ANGELA

	Votes		M	Participants	
	Points	%		N	%
Idea 1. Mobilise new members	12	20%	3	3	75%
Idea 2. Fatigue among teams in partner establishments due to staff turnover	3	5%	0,75	1	25%
Idea 3. Reduction in dedicated budget (communication, partnership with associations for training, etc.)	5	8%	1,25	2	50%
Idea 4. Reduction in dedicated human resources	4	7%	1	3	75%
Idea 5. Sustained member involvement	20	33%	5	4	100%
Idea 6. Greater ownership and recognition of what sexist and sexual street harassment entails	3	5%	0,75	1	25%
Idea 7. Find support systems for these victims that have a real understanding of the phenomenon	4	7%	1	2	50%
Idea 8. Lack of awareness of the offence on the part of the police and/or the means available to detect the offence	4	7%	1	1	25%
Idea 9. Disinvolvement of members due to training issues	0	0%	0	0	0%
Idea 10. Medium- and long-term follow-up of members	5	8%	1,25	3	75%
Total	60	100%	-	4	100%

4.6. Rotterdam

Social Benefits

Rotterdam’s tool excelled in building trust in local authorities by valuing input from entrepreneurs and workers, a benefit receiving 24% of votes. Open and active dialogue among stakeholders (23%) fostered collaboration and knowledge exchange to address local security issues. Additional benefits included community building and enhanced commitment to the development of Spaanse Polder, which strengthened social bonds and increased participation.

Table 12.

Summary of Nominal Group results on social benefits of SPAANSE POLDER CAFÉ

	Votes		M	Participants	
	Points	%		N	%
Idea 1. Reaching an increasing part of the people in the area	8	11%	1,6	4	80%
Idea 2. Open & active discussion between entrepreneurs, civil servants & the police concerning the Spaanse Polder	17	23%	3,4	5	100%
Idea 3. Enhance commitment in the development of Spaanse Polder (bringing them together with the aim of making a good playground for new ideas in the future)	15	20%	3,0	4	80%
Idea 4. Building a community by getting to know each other and the companies (building lasting connections and motivation for next meetings)	15	20%	3,0	5	100%
Idea 5. Trust in local authorities because of taking entrepreneurs and workers seriously when they have suggestions on how to improve their working space (e.g. against criminal activities)	18	24%	3,6	5	100%
Idea 6. With this people together new ideas about development form and things we never thought of come up	2	3%	0,4	2	40%
Total	75	100%	-	5	100%

Social Challenges

The primary challenge was the risk of losing trust in authorities if feedback did not lead to tangible results (27%). Entrepreneurs' overly ambitious goals (19%) revealed tensions between immediate expectations and the time required for systemic change. Other issues included shifting political attention, low participation, weak diversity among stakeholders, and misaligned goals, all of which posed risks to inclusivity and the project's overall progress.

Table 13.

Summary of Nominal Group results on social challenges of SPAANSE POLDER CAFÉ

	Votes		M	Participants	
	Points	%		N	%
Idea 1. Not enough people show up	7	9%	1,4	4	80%
Idea 2. Change of attention of professionals (politicians, local and national governments...) in the area	12	16%	2,4	3	60%
Idea 3. Weak diversity of participants (mainly entrepreneurs, not employees)	7	9%	1,4	3	60%
Idea 4. Very ambitious visions and goals by the council of entrepreneur that need more time to be fulfilled in time	14	19%	2,8	4	80%
Idea 5. Possible dominance of a group of people (a select group of entrepreneurs)	8	11%	1,6	3	60%
Idea 6. Losing trust on government/public servants/police by not actually listening to entrepreneurs and showing results	20	27%	4,0	5	100%
Idea 7. Lack of common goals between government/entrepreneurs/property owners	7	9%	1,4	3	60%
Total	75	100%	-	5	100%

5. Discussion

The Icarus project highlights the critical role of local context and stakeholder engagement in leveraging the social benefits of urban security tools. A key outcome that can enhance social acceptance is the enhancement of trust and communication between public institutions, police, and communities. Initiatives like JOVEM DESIGN LISBOA and SPAANSE POLDER CAFÉ exemplify how empathetic, transparent communication builds trust and strengthens relationships, consistent with findings on procedural justice and fairness in public interactions (Peyton et al., 2019; Tyler & Jackson, 2014; Bolger & Walters, 2019; Aston et al., 2021). Beyond trust, community cohesion and inclusion are central benefits. DEMANDEZ ANGELA, for instance, fosters shared values to combat harassment, while SPAANSE POLDER CAFÉ creates a sense of belonging among workers and entrepreneurs, reflecting the importance of inclusive strategies in building resilient communities (Buhner et al., 2022; Galdon Clavell & Frowd, 2015; Ellis & Abdi, 2017). It is also worth noting that trust between communities and institutions does not develop in a vacuum: citizens' perceptions of security are shaped partly by how public safety is framed in broader public discourse, including by media coverage that can amplify fear of crime independently of actual crime trends (Ceccato & Nalla, 2020; Castro-Toledo, 2019). The participatory tools evaluated in Icarus offer a complementary logic — one grounded in direct, reciprocal dialogue rather

than unidirectional communication — which may contribute to more grounded and locally anchored perceptions of safety.

Empowerment and skill development are equally noteworthy benefits. Programs like PAR DROŠU RĪGU and SBOCCIAMO TORINO engage citizens in meaningful roles, fostering personal and civic growth, which aligns with research on the role of active participation in promoting sustainable social outcomes (Taebi, 2017; Sharma et al., 2022; Igalla et al., 2019). Similarly, innovative approaches like gamification in TRICK17 raise awareness and encourage behavioural change, demonstrating the effectiveness of creative methods for social engagement (Shimizu et al., 2021; Fernández-Galeote et al., 2021; Khatibi et al., 2021). Inclusivity and accessibility further bolster the success of these tools, as demonstrated by the low-threshold, participatory designs in TRICK17 and SBOCCIAMO TORINO. These efforts align with findings that inclusive urban design improves perceptions of safety and social cohesion (Ceccato, 2020; Cassarino et al., 2021). Relatedly, criminological research suggests that citizens' fear is often conditioned more by visible signs of disorder and environmental decay — incivilities — than by objective victimisation risk (Skogan, 1990; Hinkle & Weisburd, 2008). Several of the social challenges identified by stakeholders across IcARUS cities, including concerns about community disengagement and the erosion of shared public spaces, resonate with this dynamic, and suggest that the social acceptability of urban security tools is shaped by their effectiveness in reducing crime and also by their capacity to address the environmental and relational conditions that generate subjective insecurity.

Additionally, data-driven strategies enhance decision-making, as seen in SBOCCIAMO TORINO, where such approaches address juvenile delinquency, enabling continuous evaluation and adaptation (Hobson et al., 2021; Weisburd et al., 2017). Lastly, IcARUS tools contribute to public safety and well-being. Programs like PAR DROŠU RĪGU and DEMANDEZ ANGELA mitigate insecurity and foster communal safety, underscoring the value of thoughtful design and community involvement in addressing fear of crime (Castro-Toledo, 2019; Lee et al., 2016; Wright & Raab, 2012).

This paper has also identified significant social challenges threaten the sustainability and acceptability of these tools. Mistrust and miscommunication between citizens and authorities, as observed in PAR DROŠU RĪGU and SPAANSE POLDER CAFÉ, highlight the need for transparency and procedural justice to foster cooperation (Aston et al., 2021; Peyton et al., 2019; Tyler & Jackson, 2014). Poor communication strategies and insufficient training for officers exacerbate these issues, requiring comprehensive efforts to bridge these gaps (O'Brien et al., 2020; McLean et al., 2020). Political and institutional instability also poses a major obstacle. Programs like JOVEM DESIGN LISBOA and SPAANSE POLDER CAFÉ illustrate how shifting political priorities can jeopardise long-term progress. Securing sustained funding and stakeholder partnerships is essential to mitigate such risks (Davey & Wootton, 2016; Laufs & Borrion, 2022; Wright et al., 2013).

Inadequate community engagement, in relation to TRICK17 and PAR DROŠU RĪGU, could reduce participation and perceived relevance, emphasising the importance of co-production in fostering trust and commitment (Morrison-Saunders et al., 2022; Galdon Clavell & Frowd, 2015; Prenzler, 2021). Resource constraints further limit effectiveness. Funding and personnel shortages, as seen in TRICK17 and DEMANDEZ ANGELA, restrict the ability to address challenges comprehensively. Exploring alternative funding sources and prioritising impactful areas can alleviate these constraints (Cohen, 2020; Bayley, 2016; Laufs & Borrion, 2022). Ensuring project continuity through robust follow-up mechanisms is also vital (Oliver et al., 2020; Farrington & Hawkins, 2019; Morrison-Saunders et al., 2022), as demonstrated in SBOCCIAMO TORINO, where short-term setbacks could have reduced motivation and support.

Organisational and bureaucratic challenges complicate implementation, as evidenced by TRICK17 and SPAANSE POLDER CAFÉ, where delays could have stemmed from poor coordination and procedural hurdles. Streamlining inter-organisational processes and fostering communication are crucial to overcome such barriers (Salazar-Tobar, 2024; Crawford & Evans, 2017). Similarly, logistical factors like timing and external conditions like weather, as seen in TRICK17 and DEMANDEZ ANGELA, highlight the importance of adaptability and effective planning.

Lastly, social dynamics, including weak diversity, inadequate interactions and misunderstandings about program intentions, persist as challenges for programs such as TRICK17 and SPAANSE POLDER CAFÉ. Addressing these requires promoting cultural sensitivity, raising awareness, and ensuring equitable participation (Stougaard, 2020; Buhner et al., 2022). Thoroughly considering the integrative perspective that these findings display is critical for designing and implementing effective, ethical, and socially accepted urban security solutions.

6. Concluding remarks

This research evaluated urban security tools in six European cities within the EU-funded IcaRUS project, revealing the multifaceted nature of urban security, which requires balancing ethical considerations, social acceptability, and practical implementation. The findings underscore the importance of integrating crime science and empirical evidence to design interventions that strengthen community cohesion, public safety, and active citizenship. Key approaches—such as inclusivity, prevention, and data-driven strategies—empower communities to co-create solutions while addressing root causes. However, social challenges, including trust deficits, limited community engagement, and systemic vulnerabilities like political instability and resource constraints, can hinder social acceptance and intervention effectiveness. Despite its contributions, this study is not without limitations. First, its context-specific scope — six European cities, each with a distinct urban security tool — limits direct comparability across cases and constrains the generalisability of findings beyond the IcaRUS project context; future research should expand geographical coverage and incorporate longitudinal analyses. Second, the sample

consisted of municipal professionals who had been actively involved in the development of the IcARUS tools over several years, which, while appropriate for an exploratory study seeking initial, informed insights on an understudied topic, means that findings do not capture the perspectives of broader community members or less engaged citizens; future work should involve more diverse and representative stakeholder groups, including through larger participatory methods. Third, two NGT sessions per city — one on benefits, one on challenges — represent a limited window into each local context; replication with additional sessions or complementary methods would strengthen confidence in the consensus reached. Fourth, the virtual format of the sessions, while necessary for a multi-national project, reduces non-verbal interaction and may affect group dynamics relative to face-to-face NGT; future applications targeting more diverse populations will also need to address the digital divide to ensure equitable participation.

By linking theoretical insights with practical application, this research deepens the understanding of the interplay between social benefits and challenges in urban security initiatives. It highlights the importance of continuous evaluation, community participation, and evidence-based policymaking to promote secure, inclusive, and sustainable urban environments. These findings offer a blueprint for future interventions, urging academics and practitioners to refine tools and strategies that align with community needs and foster transformative progress in urban security.

7. References

- Arce-Gomez, A., Donovan, J. D., & Bedggood, R. E. (2015). Social impact assessments: Developing a consolidated conceptual framework. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 50, 85-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2014.08.006>
- Aston, E., O'Neill, M., Hail, Y., & Wooff, A. (2021). Information sharing in community policing in Europe: Building public confidence. *European Journal of Criminology*, 20, 1349 - 1368. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14773708211037902>.
- Barkhuizen, G. (2014). Number of participants. *Language Teaching Research*, 18, 5-7. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168813510447>
- Bayley, D. H. (2016). The complexities of 21st century policing. *Policing a Journal of Policy and Practice*, 10(3), 163–170. <https://doi.org/10.1093/policy/paw019>
- Bolger, P. C., & Walters, G. D. (2019). The relationship between police procedural justice, police legitimacy, and people's willingness to cooperate with law enforcement: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 60, 93–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2019.01.001>
- Bonilla-Alicea, R., & Fu, K. (2019). Systematic Map of the Social Impact Assessment Field. *Sustainability*, 11(15). <https://doi.org/10.3390/SU11154106>
- Bottero, M., Bragaglia, F., Caruso, N., Datola, G., & Dell'Anna, F. (2020). Experimenting community impact evaluation (CIE) for assessing urban regeneration programmes: The case study of the area 22@ Barcelona. *Cities*, 99, 102464. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2019.102464>

- Buhrer, S., Feidenheimer, A., Walz, R., Lindner, R., Beckert, B., & Wallwaey, E. (2022). Concepts and methods to measure societal impacts – an overview. *Discussion Papers Innovation Systems and Policy Analysis*, 74. <https://publica-rest.fraunhofer.de/server/api/core/bitstreams/06cee3b3-f386-4ef5-8026-26c9311e0923/content>
- Burgess, J. P. (2012). The Societal Impact of Security Research. *PRIO Policy Brief*, 9. <https://www.prio.org/publications/7377>
- Cassarino, M., Shahab, S., & Biscaya, S. (2021). Envisioning Happy Places for All: A Systematic Review of the Impact of Transformations in the Urban Environment on the Wellbeing of Vulnerable Groups. *Sustainability*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/SU13148086>.
- Castro-Toledo, F. J. (2019). *Sociedad tecnológica y miedo al crimen*. Edisofer, Madrid.
- Castro-Toledo, F. J., Perea-García, J. O., Bautista-Ortuño, R., & Mitkidis, P. (2017). Influence of environmental variables on fear of crime: Comparing self-report data with physiological measures in an experimental design. *Journal Of Experimental Criminology*, 13(4), 537-545. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-017-9295-1>
- Ceccato V., & Nalla, M. K. (Eds.) (2020). *Crime and Fear in Public Places Towards Safe, Inclusive and Sustainable Cities*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429352775>
- Ceccato, V. (2020). The architecture of crime and fear of crime: research evidence on lighting, CCTV and CPTED features. In V. Ceccato & M. K. Nalla (Ed.), *Crime and Fear in Public Places Towards Safe, Inclusive and Sustainable Cities* (pp. 38-71). Routledge. <https://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/39937>
- Cohen, A., Vakharia, S. P., Netherland, J., & Frederique, K. (2022). How the war on drugs impacts social determinants of health beyond the criminal legal system. *Annals of Medicine*, 54 (1), 2024–2038. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07853890.2022.2100926>
- Cohen, M. A. (2020). *The Costs of Crime and Justice*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429431562>
- Crawford, A., & Evans, K. (2017). Crime Prevention and Community Safety. In A. Liebling, S. Maruna, & L. McAra (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (pp. 797-824) Oxford University Press. <https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/110446/1/>
- Curtis, S., Singh, J., Mont, O., & Kessler, A. (2020). Systematic framework to assess social impacts of sharing platforms: Synthesising literature and stakeholder perspectives to arrive at a framework and practice-oriented tool. *PLoS ONE*, 15(10): e0240373. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0240373>
- Davey, C., & Wootton, A. (2016). Integrating crime prevention into urban design and planning. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 9, 153-165. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPMD-09-2015-0043>.
- De Ruyter, K. (1996). Focus versus nominal group interviews: a comparative analysis. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 14(6), 44–50. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02634509610131153>
- Delbecq, A. L., & Van de Ven, A. H. (1971). A Group Process Model for Problem Identification and Program Planning. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 7(4), 466–492. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002188637100700404>

- Delbecq, A. L., Van de Ven, A. H., & Gustafson, D.H. (1975). *Group techniques for program planning: a guide to nominal group technique and Delphi processes*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman.
- Ellis, B., & Abdi, S. (2017). Building Community Resilience to Violent Extremism Through Genuine Partnerships. *American Psychologist*, 72, 289–300. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000065>.
- European Commission (2023). Horizon Europe Work Programme 2023–2024: Civil Security for Society. https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/wp-call/2023-2024/wp-6-civil-security-for-society_horizon-2023-2024_en.pdf
- European Commission, Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, Flecha, R., Radauer, A., Besselaar, P. (2018). Monitoring the impact of EU Framework Programmes: Expert Report, Publications Office. <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2777/518781>
- Farrington, D., & Hawkins, J. (2019). The Need for Long-term Follow-ups of Delinquency Prevention Experiments. *JAMA network open*, 2 3, e190780. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.0780>.
- Fernández-Galeote, D., Rajanen, M., Rajanen, D., Legaki, N., Langley, D., & Hamari, J. (2021). Gamification for climate change engagement: review of corpus and future agenda. *Environmental Research Letters*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abec05>.
- Galdon Clavell, G., Frowd, P.M. (2015). Using Societal Impact Assessment (SIA) to Improve Technological Development in the Field of Crime Prevention. In Aiello, L., McFarland, D. (eds) *Social Informatics. SocInfo 2014. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 8852. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-15168-7_16
- Gulakov, I., & Vanclay, F. (2019). Social impact assessment and stakeholder engagement in the Russian Federation: Representativeness, deliberativeness and influence. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 75, 37-46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.EIAR.2018.11.004>
- Gurinskaya, A. (2020). Predicting citizens' support for surveillance cameras. Does police legitimacy matter? *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 44(1–2), 63–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01924036.2020.1744027>
- Harb, S. I., Tao, L., Peláez, S., Boruff, J., Rice, D. B., & Shrier, I. (2021). Methodological options of the nominal group technique for survey item elicitation in health research: A scoping review. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 139, 140–148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.08.008>
- Hedberg, E. C., Katz, C. M., & Choate, D. E. (2017). Body-Worn Cameras and Citizen Interactions with Police Officers: Estimating Plausible Effects Given Varying Compliance Levels. *Justice Quarterly*, 34(4), 627–651. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2016.1198825>
- Hinkle, J. C., & Weisburd, D. (2008). The irony of broken windows policing: A micro-place study of the relationship between disorder, focused police crackdowns and fear of crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36(6), 503–512. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2008.09.010>

- Hobson, J., Lynch, K., Payne, B., & Ellis, L. (2021). Are Police-Led Social Crime Prevention Initiatives Effective? A Process and Outcome Evaluation of a UK Youth Intervention. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 31(3), 325-346. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1057567718814891>
- Hugé, J., & Mukherjee, N. (2018). The nominal group technique in ecology & conservation: application and challenges. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 9(1), 33– 41. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12831>
- Igalla, M., Edelenbos, J., & Van Meerkerk, I. (2019). Citizens in Action, What Do They Accomplish? A Systematic Literature Review of Citizen Initiatives, Their Main Characteristics, Outcomes, and Factors. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-019-00129-0>.
- Khatibi, F. S., Dedekorkut-Howes, A., Howes, M., & Torabi, E. (2021). Can public awareness, knowledge and engagement improve climate change adaptation policies? *Discover Sustainability*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-021-00024-z>
- Laufs, J. (2022). *Crime Prevention and Detection Technologies in Smart Cities: Opportunities and Challenges* [Doctoral dissertation, University College London]. University College London Repository. https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10147500/1/PhD%20Thesis_compressed.pdf
- Laufs, J., & Borrión, H. (2022). Technological innovation in policing and crime prevention: Practitioner perspectives from London. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 24(2), 190-209. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14613557211064053>
- Lee, J., Park, S., & Jung, S. (2016). Effect of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) Measures on Active Living and Fear of Crime. *Sustainability*, 8, 872. <https://doi.org/10.3390/SU8090872>.
- Mclean, K., Wolfe, S., Rojek, J., Alpert, G., & Smith, M. (2020). Randomized controlled trial of social interaction police training. *Criminology and public policy*, 19, 805-832. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12506>.
- McMillan, S. S., Kelly, F., Sav, A., Kendall, E., King, M. A., Whitty, J. A., & Wheeler, A. J. (2014). Using the Nominal Group Technique: how to analyse across multiple groups. *Health Services and Outcomes Research Methodology*, 14(3), 92–108. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10742-014-0121-1>
- Morrison-Saunders, A., Arts, J., Pope, J., Bond, A., & Retief, F. (2022). Distilling best practice principles for public participation in impact assessment follow-up. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 41(1), 48–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14615517.2022.2119527>
- O'Brien, T., Meares, T., & Tyler, T. (2020). Reconciling Police and Communities with Apologies, Acknowledgements, or Both: A Controlled Experiment. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 687, 202 - 215. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716220904659>.
- Oliver, K., Lorenc, T., & Tinkler, J. (2020). Evaluating unintended consequences: New insights into solving practical, ethical and political challenges of evaluation. *Evaluation*, 26 (1), 61-75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389019850847>
- Peyton, K., SierraArévalo, M., & Rand, D. (2019). A field experiment on community policing and police legitimacy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*

- United States of America, 116, 19894 - 19898. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1910157116>
- Prenzler, T. (2021). *Ethics and Accountability in Criminal Justice: Towards a Universal Standard (3Ed.)*. Australian Academic Press. <https://research.usc.edu.au/esploro/outputs/99564006902621>
- Salazar-Tobar, F. (2024). *One-size-fits-all? The diffusion of policing models in Latin America* [Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers The State University of New Jersey]. ProQuest. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/fa813459090f00d2aade685613a6e9e2/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Sharma, S., Kar, A., Gupta, M., Dwivedi, Y., & Janssen, M. (2022). Digital citizen empowerment: A systematic literature review of theories and development models. *Information Technology for Development*, 28, 660 - 687. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02681102.2022.2046533>.
- Shimizu, Y., Osaki, S., Hashimoto, T., & Karasawa, K. (2021). The Social Acceptance of Collecting and Utilizing Personal Information in Smart Cities. *Sustainability* 2021, 13(16), 9146. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13169146>
- Skogan, W. G. (1990). *Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Cities*. The Free Press.
- Stougaard, M. S. (2020). Co-producing Public Welfare Services with Vulnerable Citizens: A Case Study of a Danish-Somali Women's Association Co-producing Crime Prevention with the Local Authorities. *VOLUNTAS International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 32(6), 1389–1407. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-020-00235-4>
- Sureau, S., Neugebauer, S., & Achten, W. (2019). Different paths in social life cycle impact assessment (S-LCIA)—a classification of type II impact pathway approaches. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 25, 382-393. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-019-01693-9>
- Taebi, B. (2017). Bridging the Gap between Social Acceptance and Ethical Acceptability. *Risk Analysis*, 37(10). <https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.12734>
- Tyler, T. R., & Jackson, J. (2014). Popular legitimacy and the exercise of legal authority: Motivating compliance, cooperation, and engagement. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 20(1), 78–95. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034514>
- Vanclay, F. (2020). Reflections on Social Impact Assessment in the 21st century. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 38, 126 - 131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14615517.2019.1685807>
- Vander Laenen, F. (2015). Not just another focus group: making the case for the nominal group technique in criminology. *Crime Science* 4(5). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40163-014-0016-z>
- Wadhwa, K., Barnard-Wills, D., & Wright, D. (2014). The state of the art in societal impact assessment for security research. *Science & Public Policy*, 42(3), 339–354. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scu046>
- Weisburd, D., Farrington, D. P., & Gill, C. (2017). What works in crime prevention and rehabilitation. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 16(2), 415–449. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12298>

- Wright, D., & Raab, C. D. (2012). Constructing a surveillance impact assessment. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 28(6), 613-626. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2012.09.003>
- Wright, K., Pratt, T., Lowenkamp, C., & Latessa, E. (2013). The Systemic Model of Crime and Institutional Efficacy: An Analysis of the Social Context of Offender Reintegration. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 57, 92-111. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X11425218>

Acknowledgements

We thank all participants from the IcARUS EU-funded project municipalities (Rotterdam, Nice, Lisbon, Stuttgart, Riga, and Turin) and the researchers who assisted with session translations, particularly Tobias Gretenkort, Bráulio Figueiredo, Anne Boisseau (EFUS), Marta Pellón (EFUS) and Inés Amzal (EFUS).

Funding

The author(s) declare that financial support was received for this research. This work is funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme under grant agreement No. 882749 (IcARUS).

Ethics statements

The activities conducted with municipalities were approved by evaluators of the European Commission's Horizon Europe programme. All participants provided informed consent, and researchers ensured compliance with national and European data protection laws.

Supplementary Material

ANNEX: Initial, original and non-translated results of the Nominal Group sessions

8. Initial, original and non-translated results

The following section show an essential part of the methodology of these sessions. In the following tables, two columns will show the evolution between the initial answers of the participants in relation to the question posed, and the final ideas after the group reorganised, merged or split the previously written ideas. In cities where the sessions were conducted in the mother tongue, other than English, additional tables will show the original answers as written by the participants in the chat, before being translated for analysis.

8.1. Riga

Table 14.

List of social benefits provided by the participants of Riga's session (initial/final ideas)

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Police tactics could be more efficient and closer to citizens' needs.	Idea 1. Police tactics could be more efficient and closer to citizens needs because of better understanding
Idea 2. Citizens feel involved to the security process in those neighbourhood	Idea 2. Citizens feel involved to the security process in the neighbourhood and volunteer inform police about different violations
Idea 3. Establishes trust between stakeholders and citizens	Idea 3. Destigmatizes police officers as persons who only want to punish
Idea 4. Destigmatizes police officers as persons who only want to punish	Idea 4. Closer connection and regular communication establishes trust between police officers and the citizens
Idea 5. Helps to understand better the needs of local society	Idea 5. Feeling of safety in the city increases
Idea 6. Involve local society in strengthening security and provides them the tool to operate	
Idea 7. Communication between police officers and citizens regularly	
Idea 8. Trust in police officers	
Idea 9. People will inform police about crimes more often	
Idea 10. Closer connection with police and more trust to police	
Idea 11. Bigger safety feeling in city	

Table 15.

List of social challenges provided by the participants of Riga's session (initial/final ideas)

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Citizens don't see positive results or changes	Idea 1. Incorrect communication from police side because of inappropriate officers involved
Idea 2. Communication is too aggressive from police side	Idea 2. Due to citizens not willing to take a part in the project, their involvement is decreased and responses are indifferent and useless
Idea 3. Citizens' activity is less and formal	Idea 3. Citizens begin to think that their opinions are always useful and correct
Idea 4. Citizens begin to think that their opinions are always useful and correct	Idea 4. In case the police don't react or change tactics according to results of the surveys, the mistrust increases
Idea 5. In case the police don't react, the mistrust increases	Idea 5. The lack of understanding on HQ level leads to lack of will to use the tool/approach in the future
Idea 6. Lack of headquarters (HQ) will to use tool/approach	
Idea 7. The lack of understanding on HQ level how to implement the results of the surveying to daily tactics	
Idea 8. Involvement of other police officers	
Idea 9. Citizens not willing to take part in project	
Idea 10. Not seeing any changes in situation of city safety	
Idea 11. Citizens don't see the results	
Idea 12. Lack of trust to officers	

8.2. Stuttgart

Table 16.

List of social benefits provided by the participants of Stuttgart's session (initial/final ideas) – Original (German)

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Zugang zu den schwierigsten Gruppen einwandfrei	Idea 1. Zugang zu den vulnerablen Gruppen
Idea 2. Niedrigschwelliges Angebot	Idea 2. Niedrigschwelliges und barrierefreies Angebot
Idea 3. barrierefreie Ansprache der Leute im Sozialraum der Stadt	Idea 3. gefühlte Sicherheit wird verbessert
Idea 4. gefühlte Sicherheit wird verbessert	Idea 4. Gamifikation der komplizierten Thematik
Idea 5. Gamifikation der komplizierten Thematik	Idea 5. Ziel der Intrinsischen Motivation
Idea 6. Intrinsische Motivation wird gefördert	Idea 6. Jeder kann sich als Ideengeber:in beteiligen und/oder Teil der Show werden.
Idea 7. Niederschwelliges Angebot	Idea 7. Angebot an den Hotspots der Jugendlichen im urbanen Raum
Idea 8. jeder kann sich beteiligen	Idea 8. Ressourceneffizientes Ready-to- Go Tool
Idea 9. Angebot an den Hotspots der jugendliche im urbanen raum	Idea 9. Vertrauen in die Stadt und öffentliche Institutionen erhöhen
Idea 10. es ist ein verständliches und somit niederschwelliges Angebot	Idea 10. Hoher Unterhaltungswert und Transparenz
Idea 11. Möglichkeit für die solziele Mitarbeiter weiter das Projekt weiter zu führen (ready to go Tool)	Idea 11. Freiwilliges Angebot
Idea 12. Vertrauen in die Stadtverwaltung wird erhöht	Idea 12. Reaktion der jugendlichen
Idea 13. Hohes Unterhaltungswert	Idea 13. Wirkung durch passive Rezeption
Idea 14. Die Durchführung ist einfach zu handhaben	Idea 14. Neugierde wird geweckt
Idea 15. ungewöhnliche Wendepunkt der Performance	
Idea 16. Macht Spaß und ist ein transparentes Angebot	
Idea 17. Jeder kann zuschauen oder auch mitmachen	
Idea 18. einfache Übertragbarkeit des Konzeptes	
Idea 19. Freiwilliges Angebot	
Idea 20. Reaktion der Jugendlichen - die wollen es besprechen	
Idea 21. replizierbarkeit	
Idea 22. Auch durch das Zuschauen wird Wirkungerzeit	
Idea 23. Neugierde wird geweckt	

Table 17.

List of social benefits provided by the participants of Stuttgart's session (initial/final ideas) - Translated

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Unhindered access to the most difficult groups	Idea 1. Access to vulnerable groups
Idea 2. Low-threshold offer	Idea 2. Low-threshold inclusive event
Idea 3. Barrier-free addressing of people in the social space of the city	Idea 3. Improvement of perceived security
Idea 4. Improved perceived safety	Idea 4. Gamification of complex issue
Idea 5. Gamification of the complex topic	Idea 5. Boosts intrinsic motivation in participants
Idea 6. Intrinsic motivation is promoted	Idea 6. Everyone can participate giving ideas or become a part of the show
Idea 7. Low-threshold offer	Idea 7. Caters to hotspots of adolescents in the urban space
Idea 8. Everyone can participate	Idea 8. Resource efficient ready-to-go tool
Idea 9. Offer at the hotspots of young people in urban areas	Idea 9. Improve trust in the city and public institutions
Idea 10. It is an understandable and therefore low-threshold offer	Idea 10. Great entertainment factor and transparency
Idea 11. Opportunity for social workers to continue the project (ready-to-go tool)	Idea 11. Volunteer-based
Idea 12. Increased trust in the city administration	Idea 12. Provokes a reaction in adolescents
Idea 13. High entertainment value	Idea 13. Impact through passive reception
Idea 14. Easy to manage implementation	Idea 14. Sparks curiosity in spectators
Idea 15. Unusual turning point of the performance	
Idea 16. Fun and a transparent offer	
Idea 17. Everyone can watch or participate	
Idea 18. Easy transferability of the concept	
Idea 19. Voluntary offer	
Idea 20. Reaction of the young people - they want to discuss it	
Idea 21. Replicability	
Idea 22. Effectiveness even through watching	
Idea 23. Curiosity is aroused	

Table 18.

List of social challenges provided by the participants of Stuttgart's session (initial/final ideas) – Original (German)

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Bürokratische Herausforderungen bei den Organisationen	Idea 1. Bürokratische und kommunikative Herausforderungen bei den Organisationen
Idea 2. Könnte missverstanden werden	Idea 2. Könnte zulasten vulnerabler Gruppen missverstanden werden
Idea 3. Desinteresse der Stadt (Verwaltung oder Bevölkerung)	Idea 3. Desinteresse der Stadt
Idea 4. desinteresse der Stakholder	Idea 4. Desinteresse der Stakholder
Idea 5. Mangelhafter Transfer zu Workshopziel	Idea 5. Mangelhafter Transfer zum Workshopziel
Idea 6. schlechtes Wetter	Idea 6. schlechtes Wetter
Idea 7. falsche Ort - fehlende Zielgruppe	Idea 7. unpassender Ort und Zeit
Idea 8. Schlechtes Wetter (Seasonal bedingt außer Schulen)	Idea 8. Übersättigung der Zuschauer
Idea 9. Es könnte langweilig werden bei mehrmaliger wiederholung (richtig verstanden?)?	Idea 9. Zuständigkeiten und mögliche Weiterentwicklung
Idea 10. unpassende tageszeit Sachressourcen	Idea 10. Geld-, Personal- und
Idea 11. Man kennt es schon wenn mehrmals wiederholt?	Idea 11. Gewalt seitens der Passanten
Idea 12. vielleicht Anknüpfung / Weiterführung notwendig	Idea 12. Eingeschränkte Transparenz und Kommunikation des Projektes
Idea 13. Schulferien	Idea 13. Genehmigung seitens der Stadt
Idea 14. Unpassende Ort-Zeit außer Schulen usw.	Idea 14. konkurrierende Veranstaltungen
Idea 15. Missinterpretation zulasten vulnerabler Gruppen	
Idea 16. Finanzierung	
Idea 17. Digitales Tool -> Touchscreen im öffentlichen Raum	
Idea 18. Vielleicht doch keine Ressourcen? Trotz wenig Ressourcen?	
Idea 19. Gewalt seitens der Passanten	
Idea 20. Vielleicht Kein Interesse von den Stakeholdern es weiterzuführen?	
Idea 21. Eingeschränkte Transparenz und Kommunikation des Projektes	
Idea 22. Genehmigung seitens der Stadt	
Idea 23. konkurrierende Veranstaltungen	
Idea 24. Eingeschränkte Nachhaltigkeit (Finanzierung, Netzwerk, ...)	

Table 19.

List of social challenges provided by the participants of Stuttgart's session (initial/final ideas) – Translated

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Bureaucratic challenges for the organisations	Idea 1. Bureaucratic and communication challenges across organisations
Idea 2. Could be misunderstood	Idea 2. Intervention may be misunderstood in a way that is threatening to vulnerable groups
Idea 3. Disinterest of the city (administration or population)	Idea 3. Lack of interest on the part of the city
Idea 4. Disinterest of the stakeholders	Idea 4. Lack of interest of the part of the stakeholders
Idea 5. Inadequate transfer to the workshop goal	Idea 5. Unsuccessful realisation of the workshop's objective
Idea 6. Bad weather	Idea 6. Bad weather
Idea 7. Wrong location - missing target group	Idea 7. Inadequate timing and location
Idea 8. Bad weather (seasonally affected except schools)	Idea 8. Saturation of spectators
Idea 9. It could become boring with repeated repetition (understood correctly?)	Idea 9. Responsibilities and further development of the project
Idea 10. Inappropriate time of day	Idea 10. Resources (money, people, materials)
Idea 11. It becomes familiar if repeated multiple times?	Idea 11. Violent passersby
Idea 12. Maybe continuation/follow-up necessary	Idea 12. Insufficient transparency and communication of the project
Idea 13. School holidays	Idea 13. Permit from the city council
Idea 14. Inappropriate location-time except schools, etc.	Idea 14. Other events taking place at the same time
Idea 15. Misinterpretation at the expense of vulnerable groups	
Idea 16. Funding	
Idea 17. Digital tool -> Touchscreen in public space	
Idea 18. Maybe no resources after all? Despite few resources?	
Idea 19. Violence from passersby	
Idea 20. Maybe no interest from the stakeholders to continue it?	
Idea 21. Limited transparency and communication of the project	
Idea 22. Authorisation from the city	
Idea 23. Competing events	
Idea 24. Limited sustainability (funding, network...)	

8.3. Lisbon

Table 20.

List of social benefits provided by the participants of Lisbon's session (initial/final ideas) – Original (Portuguese)

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Promove a aproximação polícia- cidadãos	Idea 1. Promove a aproximação polícia- cidadãos (comunicação, interação, troca de informação)
Idea 2. Aumenta a relação de confiança entre os polícias e os jovens	Idea 2. Aumenta a relação de confiança entre os polícias e os jovens e comunidade
Idea 3. Desenvolve competências de vida nos jovens (competências pessoais e sociais)	Idea 3. Desenvolve competências de vida nos jovens (competências pessoais e sociais)
Idea 4. Promove uma cidadania para a segurança a nível local	Idea 4. Promove a participação dos cidadãos para uma cidadania prática para a segurança a nível local e o bem comum através dos procedimentos democráticas
Idea 5. Participação de toda a comunidade do bairro para um bem comum	Idea 5. Promoção e aprofundamento das relações de conhecimento entre indivíduos na comunidade (jovens, vizinhos, famílias, comerciantes, trabalhadores, polícia, entidades parceiras) fortalecendo laços entre si e aumentando a inclusão e coesão social
Idea 6. Desenvolvimento de competências nos jovens	Idea 6. Reconhecimento de práticas preventivas de comportamentos de risco com a experiência direta dos jovens e a constatação da comunidade
Idea 7. Aumento da relação de confiança entre a polícia-jovens-comunidade públicos do bairro	Idea 7. Impacto positivo na segurança e sentimento de segurança nos espaços
Idea 8. Promoção e aprofundamento das relações de confiança entre jovens, familiares e outros estratos da população com os polícias	Idea 8. Fortalecimento e aprofundamento das parcerias locais para a continuidade e reforço do impacto do projeto na comunidade
Idea 9. Reconhecimento de práticas preventivas de comportamentos de risco com a experiência direta dos jovens e a constatação da comunidade	
Idea 10. Promoção do exercício de cidadania, retirando o conceito do plano abstrato e contribuindo tanto nos jovens, familiares e restante comunidade para o conhecimento experiencial de práticas de resolução dos problemas identificados em sociedades democráticas	
Idea 11. Envolvimento social da população do bairro	
Idea 12. Valorização dos jovens participantes pela sua participação ativa no projeto	
Idea 13. Criar laços sociais com um maior grupo de indivíduos do bairro	
Idea 14. Impacto positivo na segurança e sentimento de segurança nos espaços públicos do bairro	
Idea 15. No DLD os resultados foram positivos com função da diversidade de contributos para os resultados finais	
Idea 16. A ideia de aproveitar esses resultados, compilá-los num projeto mais abrangente que envolva a comunidade e alargar o projeto a outrastemáticas como formas de prevenção da criminalidade, incivildades e outras	
Idea 17. Criar um grupo de trabalho que envolva elementos da comunidade com contributos do conhecimento e partilha de situações de carências sociais de elementos da comunidade para encaminhamento e soluções	
Idea 18. Envolver a comunidade com culturas e grupos que possam estar mais "fechados" para uma melhor integração e descoberta de novas oportunidades	

Table 21.

List of social benefits provided by the participants of Lisbon's session (initial/final ideas) – Translated

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Promotes the approximation (informal ties) between police and citizens	Idea 1. Promotes the approximation (informal ties) between police and citizens (communication, interaction, exchange of information)
Idea 2. Increase (improve better) the trust relationship between the police and youth	Idea 2. Increase (improve better) the trust relationship between the police and youth from local community
Idea 3. Develops youth life skills (personal and social ones)	Idea 3. Develops youth life skills (personal and social ones)
Idea 4. Promotes citizenship for safety at the local level	Idea 4. Promote the participation (involvement) of citizens for practical citizenship for safety at the local level and (achieve) the common good through democratic procedures
Idea 5. Participation of the neighbourhood community for [achieving] common good	Idea 5. Promotion (rise) and deepening of knowledge relationships among individuals in the community (youth, neighbours, families, sellers(dealers), workers, police, partner entities) strengthening bonds among themselves and increasing inclusion and social cohesion
Idea 6. Develops the youth skills	Idea 6. Recognition of preventive practices of risky behaviours with the direct experience of the youth, and the acknowledgment of the community
Idea 7. Increase the trust relationship between the youth, the community and the police	Idea 7. Positive impact on the public security and the perception of safety in the neighbourhood's public spaces
Idea 8. Rise and deepening of trust relationship between youth, family members, and other strata of population with the police	Idea 8. Strengthening and deepening of local partnerships for the continuity and reinforcement of the project's impact on the community
Idea 9. Recognition of preventive practices of risky behaviours with the direct experience of the youth and acknowledgment of the community	
Idea 10. Rise of the exercise of citizenship, removing (overcoming) the concept from the abstract level and contributing both in the youth, families, and remaining community for the experiential knowledge of practices for solving problems identified in democratic societies	
Idea 11. Social involvement of the neighbourhood population	
Idea 12. Valuing the young participants for their active participation (involvement) in the project	
Idea 13. Generate (create, improve) the social bonds with a larger group of individuals in the neighbourhood	
Idea 14. Positive impact on the public security and the perception of safety in the neighbourhood's public spaces	
Idea 15. In the JDL, the results were positive due the diversity of contributions to the final outcomes.	
Idea 16. The idea of taking advantage of these results (outcomes), compiling them into a more comprehensive project that involves the community, and expanding the project to other themes as ways to prevent crime, incivilities, and other related issues. .	
Idea 17. Create a working group that involves community members in order to contribute with knowledge and share situational social needs for guidance and solutions.	
Idea 18. Involve (mobilise) the community with different cultures and groups that may be more "close off" for better integration and discovery of new opportunities.	

Table 22.

List of social challenges provided by the participants of Lisbon's session (initial/final ideas) – Original (Portuguese)

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Grupos que pratiquem ilegalidades instituídos na comunidade que poderão ver o JDL como sendo um obstáculo	Idea 1. Grupos que pratiquem ilegalidades instituídos na comunidade que poderão ver o JDL como sendo um obstáculo
Idea 2. Descrença neste tipo de projetos pela comunidade devido a experiências anteriores com semelhanças a este projeto mas com resultados negativos ou pouco relevantes	Idea 2. Descrença neste tipo de projetos pela comunidade devido a experiências anteriores com semelhanças a este projeto mas com resultados negativos ou pouco relevantes
Idea 3. Fraca cultura instituída na participação da comunidade neste tipo de projetos	Idea 3. Fraca cultura instituída na participação da comunidade neste tipo de projetos
Idea 4. Dificuldade em concertar horários e disponibilidade entre jovens, monitores e agentes mentores	Idea 4. Dificuldade de participação no Desafio JDL por motivos organizacionais (incompatibilidade de horários)
Idea 5. Desfasamento familiar do projeto JDL	Idea 5. Fraca existência de redes de parceiros torna-se quase impossível promover a aceitação social deste tipo de projeto
Idea 6. Dificuldade em garantir pontualidade e assiduidade dos jovens	Idea 6. Falta de apoios ou recursos para a implementação das soluções apresentadas pelos jovens no evento final
Idea 7. Sem existência de redes de parceiros torna-se quase impossível promover a aceitação social deste tipo de projeto	Idea 7. Dificuldade de participação no desafio JDL por motivos pessoais (motivação / disponibilidade)
Idea 8. Falta de apoios ou recursos para a implementação das soluções apresentadas pelos jovens no evento final	Idea 8. Programa deixar de receber apoio político (reconhecimento político local)
Idea 9. Falta de confiança na comunidade sobre o projeto JDL	Idea 9. Pouca divulgação do programa junto da comunidade local e da restante comunidade Lisboaeta, afetando a participação familiar ao projeto JDL
Idea 10. Dificuldade em incutir nos jovens com 15 ou mais anos, a assiduidade na participação do programa JDL	Idea 10. A seleção inadequada do perfil dos polícias mentores
Idea 11. Não serem implementados os contributos e as ideias identificadas pelo JDL	
Idea 12. Programa deixar de receber apoio político	
Idea 13. Pouca divulgação do programa junto da restante comunidade Lisboaeta	
Idea 14. A seleção inadequada do perfil dos polícias mentores	
Idea 15. A não concretização das soluções propostas pelos jovens	
Idea 16. A falta de motivação dos jovens em participarem no JDL	
Idea 17. O fraco envolvimento das entidades parceiras na implementação do projeto	

Table 23.

List of social challenges provided by the participants of Lisbon's session (initial/final ideas) – Translated

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Groups (or members groups) that engage in illegal activities established in the community that may see the JDL as an obstacle.	Idea 1. Groups (or members groups) that engage in illegal activities established in the community that may see the JDL as an obstacle.
Idea 2. Disbelief in this type of community projects due to previous experiences with similar one but with negative or irrelevant results	Idea 2. Disbelief in this type of community projects due to previous experiences with similar one but with negative or irrelevant results
Idea 3. Weak culture established in community participation in this type of projects	Idea 3. Weak culture established in community participation in this type of projects
Idea 4. Difficulty in reconciling schedules and availability among young people, monitors, and mentor agents	Idea 4. Difficulty in participating in the JDL due to organisational reasons (scheduling conflicts)
Idea 5. Family disengagement from the JDL project	Idea 5. The weak existence of partner networks makes it almost impossible to promote the social acceptance of this type of project
Idea 6. Difficulty in ensuring punctuality and attendance of the youth.	Idea 6. Absence of support or resources for the implementation of the solutions presented by the youth at the final event
Idea 7. Without the existence of partner networks, it becomes almost impossible to promote the social acceptance of this type of project	Idea 7. Difficulty in participating in the JDL challenge due to personal reasons (motivation/availability)
Idea 8. Absence of support or resources for the implementation of the solutions presented by the youth at the final event	Idea 8. The program no longer receives political support (local political recognition).
Idea 9. Lack of trust in the community about the JDL project	Idea 9. Insufficient publicising of the program among the local community and the rest of the Lisbon community, affecting family participation in the JDL project
Idea 10. Difficulty in instilling in young people aged 15 or older, the regular attendance in the JDL program	Idea 10. The inappropriate selection of the police mentors' profile
Idea 11. The contributions and ideas identified by the JDL not being implemented	
Idea 12. The program does not receive political support	
Idea 13. Little publicising of the program among the rest of the Lisbon community	
Idea 14. The inappropriate selection of the police mentors' profile	
Idea 15. The non-implementation of the solutions proposed by the youth	
Idea 16. The absence of motivation of the youth to participate in the JDL's program	
Idea 17. The weak involvement of partner entities in the implementation of the project	

8.4. Turin

Table 24.

List of social benefits provided by the participants of Turin's session (initial/final ideas) – Original (Italian)

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Sbocciamo Torino aiuta la polizia a non essere auto referenziale sui temi di sicurezza urbana	Idea 1. Aiuta la polizia a non essere auto referenziale sui temi di sicurezza urbana
Idea 2. Sbocciamo Torino apre a proposte dal basso e multidisciplinari	Idea 2. Coinvolge le associazioni, i cittadini e gli uffici comunali in un co- design sulla sicurezza che altrimenti non ci sarebbe
Idea 3. Sbocciamo Torino coinvolge le associazioni, i cittadini e gli uffici comunali in un co-design sulla sicurezza che altrimenti non ci sarebbe	Idea 3. Apre a proposte dal basso (bottom-up approach)
Idea 4. Bottom-up approach	Idea 4. Focus sulla prevenzione della delinquenza giovanile basata sui dati
Idea 5. Focus sulla prevenzione	Idea 5. Promuove una visione a 360 gradi attraverso la diversità e la trasversalità degli stakeholder (organizzazioni, associazioni, uffici comunali)
Idea 6. Organizzazioni trasversali	Idea 6. Incoraggia un approccio olistico e multidisciplinare
Idea 7. Visione a 360° per la diversità degli stakeholder	Idea 7. Anche i cittadini si sentono più coinvolti perché possono portare le loro idee attraverso il comitato
Idea 8. Sinergia tra organizzazioni, associazioni, uffici comunali	Idea 8. Sviluppa la capacità di analizzare i dati in modo collaborativo, con esperti di altre organizzazioni e di altri settori, migliorando le competenze delle persone coinvolte
Idea 9. Anche i cittadini si sentono più coinvolti perché possono portare le loro idee attraverso il comitato	Idea 9. Incoraggia approcci misti nell'affrontare questioni complesse: quantitativi (dati dal cruscotto) e qualitativi (con l'esperienza dei partecipanti)
Idea 10. Viene creato un canale di relazione diretta tra le organizzazioni dei cittadini e il Comune, facilitando la partecipazione dei cittadini al processo decisionale	
Idea 11. Sviluppa la capacità di analizzare i dati in modo collaborativo, con esperti di altre organizzazioni e di altri settori, migliorando le competenze delle persone coinvolte	
Idea 12. Permette un dialogo che prende in considerazione sia l'aspetto quantitativo (dato dal cruscotto) sia quello qualitativo (con l'esperienza dei partecipanti), sottolineando a tutti i partecipanti e al pubblico in generale l'importanza di un approccio misto nell'affrontare questioni complesse	

Table 25.

List of social benefits provided by the participants of Turin's session (initial/final ideas) – Translated

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Sbocciamo Torino helps the police not to be self-referential on urban security issues	Idea 1. Help the police not to be self-referential on urban security issues
Idea 2. Sbocciamo Torino opens up to bottom-up and multidisciplinary proposals	Idea 2. Involves associations, citizens and municipal offices in a co-design on security that would otherwise not take place
Idea 3. Sbocciamo Torino involves associations, citizens and municipal offices in a co-design on security that would not otherwise take place	Idea 3. Opens up to proposals from below (bottom-up approach)
Idea 4. Bottom-up approach	Idea 4. Focus on data-driven juvenile delinquency prevention
Idea 5. Focus on prevention	Idea 5. Promotes a 360° vision through the diversity and transversality of stakeholders (organisations, associations, municipal offices).
Idea 6. Cross-cutting organisations	Idea 6. Encourages a holistic and multidisciplinary approach
Idea 7. 360° vision for the diversity of stakeholders	Idea 7. Even citizens feel more included because they can bring their ideas through the Committee
Idea 8. Synergy between organisations, associations and municipal offices	Idea 8. The ability to analyse data in a collaborative way, with experts from other organisations and other areas, is developed, improving the competences of the individuals who participate
Idea 9. Even citizens feel more included because they can bring their ideas through the Committee	Idea 9. Encourages mixed approaches in addressing complex issues: quantitative (given by the dashboard) and qualitative (with the experience of the participants)
Idea 10. A direct relationship channel is created between citizens' organisations and the municipality, facilitating citizen participation in the decision-making process	
Idea 11. It develops the ability to analyse data collaboratively, with experts from other organisations and other areas, improving the competencies of the individuals involved	
Idea 12. It allows for a dialogue that takes into consideration both a quantitative aspect (given by the dashboard) and a qualitative one (with the experience of the participants), which underlines for all participants and citizens in general the importance of a mixed approach in dealing with complex issues	

Table 26.

List of social challenges provided by the participants of Turin's session (initial/final ideas) – Original (Italian)

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Potrebbe essere altamente politicizzato e associato a un assessore/sindaco specifico, e potrebbe essere interrotto dall'amministrazione comunale successiva (è necessario il sostegno politico)	Idea 1. La motivazione nell'uso dello strumento potrebbe essere politicizzata e associata a una visione politica e a rappresentanti discontinui
Idea 2. In generale, il comitato non coinvolge direttamente i giovani interessati, ma solo le organizzazioni che lavorano con loro	Idea 2. Il comitato non coinvolge direttamente i giovani interessati, ma solo le organizzazioni che lavorano con loro
Idea 3. La scarsità di dati rende difficile la compilazione di un cruscotto che possa informare in modo esaustivo il comitato	Idea 3. La scarsità di dati rende difficile la compilazione di un cruscotto che possa informare il comitato in modo completo
Idea 4. Mancanza di tempo per i politici della città da dedicare alla questione	Idea 4. Mancanza di tempo da parte dei politici della città per una pianificazione adeguata
Idea 5. Mancanza di motivazione del comitato	Idea 5. Sfide nel generare impegno e incoraggiare la partecipazione dei membri del comitato
Idea 6. Mancanza di risultati a breve termine, quindi minore motivazione	Idea 6. Mancanza di risultati a breve termine
Idea 7. Discontinuità dei politici e quindi dell'approccio politico	Idea 7. Difficoltà nello stabilire metriche per la valutazione dell'efficacia preventiva
Idea 8. Non è possibile misurare le azioni di prevenzione (ad esempio, perché utilizzando dati anonimizzati non si può "seguire" la stessa persona)	Idea 8. La diffidenza da parte dei cittadini sulla raccolta dei dati anche se anonimizzati
Idea 9. Non avere i protagonisti, ma solo gli interlocutori che parlano di loro.	Idea 9. La difficoltà ad avere politiche sociali integrate tra diversi assessorati coinvolti
Idea 10. La difficoltà ad ingaggiare le ONG senza premialità	Idea 10. Garantire l'equilibrio tra la privacy e l'utilità dei dati per quanto riguarda il tracciamento delle persone.
Idea 11. La diffidenza da parte dei cittadini sulla raccolta dei dati anche se anonimizzati	
Idea 12. La difficoltà ad avere politiche sociali integrate tra diversi assessorati coinvolti	

Table 27.

List of social challenges provided by the participants of Turin’s session (initial/final ideas) – Translated

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. It could be highly politicised and associated with a specific councillor/mayor, and could be terminated by the next municipal administration (political support is necessary)	Idea 1. The motivation in the use of the tool could be politicised and associated with a political vision and discontinuous representatives
Idea 2. In general the Committee does not directly involve the young people concerned, but only organisations working with them	Idea 2. The Committee does not directly involve the young people concerned, but only the organisations working with them.
Idea 3. The scarcity of data makes it difficult to compile a dashboard that can inform the Committee in a comprehensive way	Idea 3. The scarcity of data makes it difficult to compile a dashboard that can inform the Committee in a comprehensive way
Idea 4. Lack of time to dedicate by city politicians	Idea 4. Lack of time by city politicians to adequately plan
Idea 5. Lack of motivation of the Committee	Idea 5. Problems in generating commitment and incentivising participation of Committee members
Idea 6. Lack of results in the short term, and therefore less motivation	Idea 6. Lack of short-term results
Idea 7. Discontinuity of politicians, and therefore of the political approach	Idea 7. Difficulty in establishing metrics for assessing preventive effectiveness
Idea 8. Not being able to measure prevention actions (e.g. due to the fact that using anonymous data we cannot ‘follow’ the same individual)	Idea 8. The mistrust by citizens about data collection even if anonymised
Idea 9. Not having the protagonists, but only stakeholders talking about them	Idea 9. The difficulty in having integrated social policies between different departments involved
Idea 10. The difficulty in engaging NGOs without reward	Idea 10. Ensuring the balance between privacy and usefulness of data with respect to tracking individuals
Idea 11. The mistrust by citizens about data collection even if anonymised	
Idea 12. The difficulty in having integrated social policies between different departments involved	

8.5. Nice

Table 28.

List of social benefits provided by the participants of Nice's session (initial/final ideas) – Original (French)

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Prise en charge des victimes ou personne en situation d'insécurité	Idea 1. Prise en charge des victimes d'harcèlement ou personne en situation d'insécurité qui utilisent ce dispositif
Idea 2. Diminution du sentiment d'insécurité	Idea 2. Diminution du sentiment d'insécurité sur l'espace public
Idea 3. Augmentation du sentiment de solidarité	Idea 3. Augmentation du sentiment de solidarité pour lutter contre le harcèlement de rue
Idea 4. Augmentation du sentiment de partage de valeurs communes	Idea 4. Augmentation du sentiment de partage de valeurs communes
Idea 5. Prise de conscience collective du harcèlement et insécurité sur l'espace public	Idea 5. Facilite la prise de conscience du harcèlement de rue et de ses implications
Idea 6. Lutte contre le sentiment d'insécurité sur l'espace public	Idea 6. Création d'un réseau solidaire pour les adhérents
Idea 7. Pour les adhérents: création d'un réseau solidaire	Idea 7. Améliorer le cadre de vie dans l'espace public
Idea 8. Améliorer le cadre de vie dans l'espace public	Idea 8. Créer du lien entre les services de la ville et les citoyens
Idea 9. Diminuer le sentiment d'insécurité	
Idea 10. Une prise en charge directe et réelle des personnes qui utilisent ce dispositif	
Idea 11. Pour tout public confondu (dont adhérents) : connaissance et reconnaissance du phénomène grandissant du harcèlement de rue	
Idea 12. Créer un mouvement de solidarité pour lutter contre le harcèlement de rue	
Idea 13. Créer du lien entre les services de la ville et les citoyens	

Table 29.

*List of social benefits provided by the participants of Nice's session (initial/final ideas)
– Translated*

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Assistance for victims or people in situations of insecurity	Idea 1. Assistance for victims of harassment or people in a situation of insecurity who use this system
Idea 2. Reducing the feeling of insecurity	Idea 2. Reducing the feeling of insecurity in the public space
Idea 3. Increased sense of solidarity	Idea 3. Increase the feeling of solidarity to combat street harassment
Idea 4. Increased sense of shared values	Idea 4. Increase the feeling of sharing common values
Idea 5. Collective awareness of harassment and insecurity in the public space	Idea 5. Increased awareness of street harassment and its implications
Idea 6. Combating the feeling of insecurity in the public space	Idea 6. Create a solidarity network for members
Idea 7. For members: creating a network of solidarity	Idea 7. Improve the quality of life in public spaces
Idea 8. Improving the quality of life in public spaces	Idea 8. Create a link between city services and citizens
Idea 9. Reduce the feeling of insecurity	
Idea 10. Direct and real support for the people who use these tools	
Idea 11. For the general public (including members): awareness and recognition of the growing phenomenon of street harassment	
Idea 12. Create a solidarity movement to combat street harassment	
Idea 13. Create a link between city services and citizens	

Table 30.

List of social challenges provided by the participants of Nice's session (initial/final ideas) – Original (French)

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Mobiliser de nouveaux adhérents sur le long terme	Idea 1. Mobiliser de nouveaux adhérents
Idea 2. Fatigue des établissements partenaires pour former leurs équipes au regard du turn over	Idea 2. Fatigue des équipes des établissements partenaires au regard du turn over
Idea 3. Baisse du budget dédié	Idea 3. Baisse du budget dédié (communication, partenariat avec des associations pour la formation, etc)
Idea 4. Désinvestissement des commerçants dans le temps	Idea 4. Baisse des ressources humaines dédiés
Idea 5. Baisse des RH dédiés	Idea 5. L'implication pérenne des adhérents
Idea 6. L'implication pérenne des adhérents	Idea 6. L'appropriation plus massive et la reconnaissance de ce qu'implique un harcèlement de rue sexiste et sexuel
Idea 7. L'appropriation plus massive et la reconnaissance de ce qu'implique un harcèlement de rue sexiste et sexuel	Idea 7. Trouver des dispositifs d'aide pour ces victimes qui aient une vraie connaissance du phénomène
Idea 8. Trouver des dispositifs d'aide pour ces victimes qui aient une vraie connaissance du phénomène	Idea 8. Méconnaissance de l'infraction par les services de police et/ou les moyens disponibles pour relever l'infraction
Idea 9. Reconnaissance de l'infraction par les services de police	Idea 9. Désimplication des membres liée à des problématiques de formation
	Idea 10. Le suivi des adhérents au moyen et long terme

Table 31.

List of social challenges provided by the participants of Nice's session (initial/final ideas) – Translated

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Mobilise new members over the long term	Idea 1. Mobilise new members
Idea 2. Partner establishments are tired of training their teams because of staff turnover	Idea 2. Fatigue among teams in partner establishments due to staff turnover
Idea 3. Reduction in the dedicated budget	Idea 3. Reduction in dedicated budget (communication, partnership with associations for training, etc.)
Idea 4. Businesses' disinvestment over time	Idea 4. Reduction in dedicated human resources
Idea 5. Reduction in dedicated human resources	Idea 5. Sustained member involvement
Idea 6. Sustained member involvement	Idea 6. Greater ownership and recognition of what sexist and sexual street harassment entails
Idea 7. Greater ownership and recognition of what sexist and sexual street harassment entails	Idea 7. Find support systems for these victims that have a real understanding of the phenomenon
Idea 8. Find assistance mechanisms for these victims that have a real understanding of the phenomenon	Idea 8. Lack of awareness of the offence on the part of the police and/or the means available to detect the offence
Idea 9. Recognition of the offence by the police	Idea 9. Disinvolvement of members due to training issues
	Idea 10. Medium- and long-term follow- up of members

8.6. Rotterdam

Table 32.

List of social benefits provided by the participants of Rotterdam's session (initial/final ideas)

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Reaching a large part of the people in the area	Idea 1. Reaching an increasing part of the people in the area
Idea 2. Collaboration between the entrepreneurs, the employees, the police and the municipality	Idea 2. Open & active discussion between entrepreneurs, civil servants & the police concerning the Spaanse Polder
Idea 3. Ask for entrepreneurs and employees their point of view on different topics and take it into account	Idea 3. Enhance commitment in the development of Spaanse Polder (bringing them together with the aim of making a good playground for new ideas in the future)
Idea 4. Open & active discussion between entrepreneurs & civil servants concerning the Spaanse Polder	Idea 4. Building a community by getting to know each other and the companies (building lasting connections and motivation for next meetings)
Idea 5. Enhance commitment in development of Spaanse Polder	Idea 5. Trust in local authorities because of taking entrepreneurs and workers seriously when they have suggestions on how to improve their working space (e.g. against criminal activities)
Idea 6. Getting to know each other	Idea 6. With this people together new ideas about development form and things we never thought of come up
Idea 7. Trust in local authorities after a period of working in an area with a lot of criminal activities	
Idea 8. The Spaanse Polder cafe brings civil servants and entrepreneurs together who normally don't speak that much in such kind of setting	
Idea 9. With this people together new ideas form and things were we never thought of come up	
Idea 10. The cafe setting and the look- into-your-neighbours-kitchen make people enthusiastic for the next Spaanse Polder café	
Idea 11. Take entrepreneurs and workers seriously when they have suggestions how to improve their working space	
Idea 12. Creating new ideas	

Table 33.

List of social challenges provided by the participants of Rotterdam's session (initial/final ideas)

Initial ideas	Final ideas
Idea 1. Not enough people show up	Idea 1. Not enough people show up
Idea 2. The proof of the pudding is in the eating	Idea 2. Change of attention of professionals (politicians, local and national governments...) in the area
Idea 3. Not enough feedback from public servants on new ideas and signals from the entrepreneurs	Idea 3. Weak diversity of participants (mainly entrepreneurs, not employees)
Idea 4. Change of professionals in the area	Idea 4. Very ambitious visions and goals by the council of entrepreneur that need more time to be fulfilled in time
Idea 5. Weak diversity of participants (mainly entrepreneurs participated, not many employees)	Idea 5. Possible dominance of a group of people (a select group of entrepreneurs)
Idea 6. Lack of concrete feedback given by the police which can have a negative impact of the trust between the entrepreneurs and the police and the commitment of participants	Idea 6. Losing trust on government/public servants/police by not actually listening to entrepreneurs and showing results
Idea 7. The council of entrepreneur and the municipality take too much time with the suggested ideas, loss of commitment	Idea 7. Lack of common goals between government/entrepreneurs/property owners
Idea 8. Possible dominance of a group of people	
Idea 9. Losing trust by not actually listening to entrepreneurs	
Idea 10. Lack of political will to act	
Idea 11. Decreasing number of participants	
Idea 12. Government focuses on other targets than business districts	
Idea 13. Lack of common goals between government/entrepreneurs	