**European Crime Prevention Award (ECPA)**

**Annex I**

**Approved by the EUCPN Management Board in 2018**

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

**General information**

1. Please specify your country.

|  |
| --- |
| Denmark |

1. Is this your country’s ECPA entry or an additional project?

|  |
| --- |
| Udfyldes af DKR |

1. What is the title of the project?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **The project shall focus on prevention and/or reduction of everyday crime and fear of crime within the theme.**
2. Which **crime prevention/ reduction mechanisms** were used in this project to contribute to crime prevention and/or the reduction of crime or the fear of crime? Multiple answers are possible.

|  |
| --- |
| **Establishing and maintaining normative barriers to committing criminal acts**  e.g. ‘Offenders, we are watching you’ campaigns  **Reducing recruitment** to criminal social environments and activities by eliminating or reducing the social and individual causes and processes that lead to criminality  e.g. social and financial support for disadvantaged families  **Deterring** potential perpetrators from committing crimes through the threat of punishment  e.g. decreasing the time between arrest and punishment  **Disrupting** criminal acts by stopping them before they are carried out  e.g. increasing police patrols in vulnerable areas  **Protecting vulnerable targets** by reducing opportunities and make it more demanding to carry out criminal acts  e.g. placing locks and cameras  **Reducing the harmful consequences** of criminal acts  e.g. initiatives to recover stolen goods  **Reducing the rewards** from criminal acts  e.g. restorative justice programmes  **Incapacitating** (or neutralising) perpetrators by denying them the ability (capacity) to carry out new criminal acts  e.g. imprisonment of key gang members  **Encouraging** desistance from crime and rehabilitating former offenders so they are able to settle back into a normal life  e.g. prison rehabilitation programs  Explain how this/these crime prevention mechanisms were used ((**Max. 300 words**) |

1. **The project shall have been evaluated and have achieved most or all of its objectives.** For more information on evaluation, click [here](https://eucpn.org/document/research-report-evaluations)
2. What were the reasons for setting up the project? Was this context analysed before the project was initiated and in what way (How, and by whom? Which data were used?)? In what way did this analysis inform the set-up of the project? (**Max. 150 words**)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Has there been an outcome[[2]](#footnote-2) or impact[[3]](#footnote-3) evaluation? Who conducted the evaluation (internally or externally?), which data and evaluation method were used and what were the main results? Which indicators were used to measure the impact? (**Max. 300 words**)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **The project shall, as far as possible, be innovative, involving new methods or new approaches.**
2. How is the project innovative in its methods and/or approaches? (**Max. 150 words**)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **The project shall be based on cooperation between partners, where possible.**
2. Which partners or stakeholders were involved in the project and what was their involvement? (**Max. 200 words**)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **The project shall be capable of replication in other Member States.**
2. How and by whom is the project funded? (**Max. 150 words**)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Has a cost-benefit analysis[[4]](#footnote-4) been carried out? If so, describe the analysis, including how and by whom it was carried out and list the main findings of the analysis. (**Max. 150 words**)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Process evaluation:** Also called *implementation evaluation*, or *monitoring*, this process documents **how the activities were implemented** in order to determine any deviations from the original planning. It facilitates finding explanations for when the results of the intervention are not as expected. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. **Outcome evaluation:** Measures the **direct effect** (i.e., extent of the changes) **of the intervention on the target group, population, or geographic area**. The information produced by the outcome evaluation determines at what level the **objectives were achieved**. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. **Impact evaluation:** Measures **long-term effects** of the intervention on the target group, as well as **indirect effects** on the broader community. The information produced by the impact evaluation determines at what level the **ultimate goals** of the intervention were achieved. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. **Cost-benefit analysis**: A type of economic evaluation that compares the direct and indirect cost of the resources employed in the intervention, with the equivalent economic value of the benefits. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)