

**Best Practices to Combat
Organized Crime
Research Workshop**

Summary Report

**November 17 - 18, 2009
Ottawa, Ontario**

Prepared by

Groupe Intersol Group, Inc.

For

Research and National Coordination, Organized Crime Division
Law Enforcement and Policing Branch
Public Safety Canada

*The views expressed herein are solely those of the
authors, or of the individual workshop participants, and
do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of
Public Safety Canada.*

Report No. 012, 2010

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, 2010

Cat. No.: PS4-100/2010E-PDF

ISBN No.: 978-1-100-20035-4

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Overview of Panelist Presentations	3
Emerging Themes.....	3
Suggested Areas for Research	4
Workshop Proceedings	5
Opening Remarks	5
Expectations of Participants	5
Day One: First Panel and Roundtable Discussion	6
Dr. James Sheptycki	6
Presentation: “Paradigms of Organized Crime: Thinking About the Policing Challenges of the 21st Century”	6
Dr. Yvon Dandurand	7
Presentation: “Addressing Organized Crime in Canada”	7
Discussion Reports: “Paradigms of Organized Crime”	9
Research Priorities.....	10
Day One: Second Panel and Roundtable Discussion.....	10
Dr. Stephen Schneider	10
Presentation: “Crime Prevention Through Social Development”	10
Discussion Reports: “Crime Prevention Through Social Development”	12
Research Priorities.....	12
Dr. Martin Bouchard.....	13
Presentation: “The Importance of Organization in Understanding Street Gang Delinquency”	13
Discussion Reports: “The Importance of Organization in Street Gang Delinquency”	14
Research Priorities.....	14
Day Two: First Panel and Roundtable Discussion.....	14
Dr. Ernesto Savona	14
Presentation: “Combining Macro with Micro Approach to Organized Crime”	15
Dr. Michael Levi.....	15
Presentation: “The Prevention of Organized Crime Revisited”	16
Discussion Reports: “Non-Enforcement Based Methods for Organized Crime”	17
Research Priorities.....	18
Day Two: Second Panel and Roundtable Discussion	18
Professor David Kennedy	18
Presentation: “Best Practices to Combat Organized Crime”	19
Discussion Reports: “Second Panel on Day Two”	19
Research Priorities.....	20
Conclusion	20
Appendix A: Participants.....	22

Executive Summary

On November 17 and 18, 2009, a Research Workshop on Best Practices to Combat Organized Crime was held in Ottawa, Ontario. The workshop was an opportunity to share information, foster collaboration, and inform the Canadian research agenda on organized crime.

The workshop consisted of panelist presentations followed by roundtable discussions for all workshop participants. The presentations provided information and insights which informed the ensuing discussions. During the roundtable discussions, participants explored the applicability of the content of the presentations to their work, considered what more can be done to combat organized crime, and identified key research priorities.

This report contains a summary of the presentations and findings of the roundtable discussions.

Overview of Panelist Presentations

Dr. James Sheptycki spoke of the need for a paradigm shift in the way we view law enforcement and social harm.

Dr. Yvon Dandurand gave an overview of some of the issues facing organized crime research, control, and prevention in Canada today.

Dr. Stephen Schneider spoke of the benefits of crime prevention through social development.

Dr. Martin Bouchard presented his findings on the relationship between degree of group organization and juvenile criminal offending.

Dr. Ernesto Savona spoke about script analysis, a “micro” research methodology used to study organized crime in Italy.

Dr. Michael Levi spoke about regulatory measures used to prevent organized crime in the UK.

Professor David Kennedy spoke about effective measures used to reduce gang violence in the United States.

Emerging Themes

Some themes that emerged during the workshop were:

1. greater cooperation is required between agencies, sectors, and jurisdictions because organized crime crosses borders and sectors and therefore must be addressed in a comprehensive, collaborative way;
2. there is no single or shared understanding of the definition of organized crime, making it difficult to develop strategies and measure results;
3. several of the approaches suggested by panelists propose greater focus on preventative measures which will create a natural tension, and potentially competition for funding, between proponents of preventative alternative measures at one end of the law and order continuum and traditional law enforcement measures at the other end of the continuum;
4. issues associated with data sharing and exchange makes it difficult for researchers to obtain quality data to do their research; and,

5. in setting priorities for enforcement and research it is important to consider the social harm of the offence or criminal market being targeted.

Suggested Areas for Research

During the roundtable discussions and presentations in plenary, the following topics emerged as key areas for further research:

- **Social harm**
Questions: What kinds of social harm are caused by organized crime? How can we coordinate law enforcement and community resources to diminish harm? Are some law enforcement interventions creating harmful results?
- **Gang violence**
Questions: Where is gang violence taking place in Canada? What types of organizational structures are most highly predictive of violence? What factors put young people at risk for joining gangs? Which prevention programs would interest young people and be effective?
- **Displacement**
Questions: When does enforcement or policy result in organized crime being prevented or controlled, and when is it merely displaced? What are the best ways to address displacement? Is displacement good or bad?
- **Legislation**
Questions: Does current legislation create criminal opportunities? Do criminal justice practitioners think that the tools they have available are sufficient?
- **Criminal networks**
Questions: What are the structures of activity and association of criminal networks? To what extent has organized crime infiltrated legitimate businesses and public institutions and what are the vulnerable sectors? What are the long-term cycles of violence?
- **Information sharing**
Questions: How transparent is information sharing between law enforcement agencies and between law enforcement agencies and the public?
- **Corrections**
Questions: Which sentencing principles are most effective? What are the long-term patterns of re-offence?
- **Interventions**
Questions: How do offenders respond to interventions? Which types of interventions are most effective?
- As well as research in the areas of **human trafficking, money laundering, and white collar crime** (particularly financial crime and fraud).

Workshop Proceedings

Opening Remarks

Richard Wex

Assistant Deputy Minister, Law Enforcement and Policing Branch, Public Safety Canada

Mr. Wex welcomed participants to the research workshop on the sharing of best practices and research methodologies to combat organized crime. He also welcomed the panelists from Canada, Europe, and the United States and thanked all for attending.

A meeting was held in 2007 at which ministers responsible for justice and public safety discussed the best way forward to collectively fight organized crime. Mr. Wex indicated that the direction from that meeting guided efforts to strengthen the legislative framework to deal with a number of vulnerabilities related to organized crime.

Mr. Wex considers research to be an island of influence and he said that this type of workshop was exactly the type of initiative that he had hoped his group would carry out. He said that the purpose of the workshop was to foster new relationships and partnerships, as well as to generate discussion on promising approaches to fighting organized crime that would help inform the research agenda in Canada.

In conclusion, Mr. Wex introduced the speakers and wished all a productive workshop.

Expectations of Participants

Following the introduction of the speakers, participants were asked to share their expectations for the workshop. Participants were interested in sharing and expanding their knowledge of:

- research methodologies and trends;
- approaches to combating organized crime;
- how to measure organized crime; and,
- alternative practices and cooperation between organizations.

Participants also wanted to:

- inform the Canadian research agenda on organized crime;
- develop research ideas and inform their policy work;
- achieve increased collaboration and strengthen partnerships;
- address the difficulty of collecting data on organized crime;
- learn more about how to translate research into effective policy and operational action;
- apply the theories and approaches to the work in which they are currently engaged;
- explore better methods of disrupting organized crime;
- discuss new trends in research;
- contribute to evidence-based policy; and,
- compare what is happening in Canada with other parts of the world.

Day One: First Panel and Roundtable Discussion

Dr. James Sheptycki

Department of Criminology, York University

Dr. Sheptycki's research expertise revolves around issues of transnational crime and policing. He has written on a variety of substantive criminological topics including domestic violence, serial killers, money laundering, drugs, public order policing, organized crime, police accountability, intelligence-led policing, witness protection, risk and insecurity. He is currently engaged in research concerning "guns, crime and social order."

Dr. Sheptycki was the lead author on the *Annotated Organized Crime Bibliography Project*, completed by NetL3.com on behalf of Public Safety Canada. The purpose of the study was to get a clear picture of the current academic literature related to organized crime. The researchers developed an initial database of over 300 bibliographic entries covering 10 international geographic regions and 7 subject themes.

Presentation: "Paradigms of Organized Crime: Thinking About the Policing Challenges of the 21st Century"

Dr. Sheptycki discussed the main finding from the *Annotated Organized Crime Bibliography Project* and the impetus for this research workshop: a paradigm shift in research on methods for combating organized crime. This shift is from traditional law enforcement approaches (e.g., surveillance, arrests, seizures, and prosecutions) to be more inclusive of the full range of tools available, including innovative methods, such as prevention and administrative law.

Dr. Sheptycki argued that a paradigm shift is necessary in order to align with the ever-changing forms of organized crime and take into account the larger concept of social harm. A new paradigm would allow a more accurate definition of the policy problem and result in the development and application of more successful solutions to these problems.

The traditional model of law enforcement is hierarchical and jurisdictional. This is not sufficient because it does not allow an effective response to the highly complex, trans-national realities of criminal activity. This model also does not adequately address the damaging effects of various behaviors -- criminal and non-criminal -- on the environment, the economy, and society.

Alternative paradigms are emerging which consider realms of human security and reduction of social harm. Models are being developed which attempt to more accurately represent the risks to public safety and solutions are being proposed that include broader public engagement in activities like community mobilization and crime prevention. A new paradigm could lead to an infrastructure that supports good governance of society as a whole.

Dr. Sheptycki concluded his presentation by acknowledging that a paradigm shift does not happen easily and expressed his desire for academic institutions to contribute to the discussion.

Dr. Yvon Dandurand

Associate Vice-President of Research, Graduate Studies, University of the Fraser Valley

Dr. Dandurand is a well-known criminologist and legal researcher whose latest projects involve the study of organized crime, terrorism, the drug trade, and trafficking in persons. He has served on numerous United Nations experts committees, including committees on firearms regulation, victims of crime, violence against women, juvenile justice, prison reform, restorative justice, terrorism, and organized crime.

Dr. Dandurand has argued for improvements to traditional law enforcement methods, such as more intelligence-driven, strategic approaches, as well as more effective case management and coordination between police and prosecutors. Very recently, Dr. Dandurand attended a conference in Mexico on alternative approaches to combating organized crime.

Presentation: “Addressing Organized Crime in Canada”

The focus of Dr. Dandurand’s presentation was on the response to organized crime in Canada. He provided an overview of many issues that are currently being dealt with and detailed areas that need more attention. Dr. Dandurand pointed out that while there is more to do, Canada should acknowledge the things that are done well compared to other countries, and the problems that have been avoided, most notably:

- a lack of corruption and complicity between politicians and organized criminals; and,
- less escalation of violence and fewer incidents involving firearms than in other countries.

Dr. Dandurand detailed a list of considerations to keep in mind when developing research on organized crime:

1. **Difficulty of accessing research data.** Researchers have to get together and build networks in order to facilitate the collection of quality data for research. One area of difficulty is the confusion between intelligence data that must be kept secret for operational and security reasons and evidence data that can be used by researchers. The difference between these two types of information must be clarified in order to facilitate data collection.
2. **Measuring results.** People who fight organized crime are often unwilling to have their performance accurately measured, but this is necessary in order to understand what is happening and what is working. We have to be able to critically assess information and not arrive at incorrect conclusions due to political influence.
3. **Crime prevention and community involvement.** There are a lot of promising initiatives in this area that should be sustained; however, police will sometimes need to engage in ways that they have not always been willing to engage.
4. **Political climate and panic.** When there is an outbreak of violence or criminal activity, a panicked public’s response can make it difficult to make progress. When making decisions about how to deal with criminal activity, it is important to consider the best long-term outcome and not respond inappropriately or in a purely reactive manner to a specific, localized event.

5. **Linkages.** Researchers should look at the links not only between minor and major crimes, but all aspects of the fight against organized crime to better understand and successfully integrate all players and strategies that affect crime prevention and control.
6. **Ethno-cultural community relations with police.** The marginalization of some cultural groups makes them particularly vulnerable to being exploited by organized crime. A lack of communication between law enforcement and these communities can make it difficult for these groups to cooperate with the justice system.

Dr. Dandurand listed twelve specific areas that are not working very well and need to be looked at:

1. the legal definitions of organized crime are complicated and make prosecution and conviction difficult and should be clarified;
2. “disrupting” organized crime is not an adequate solution because it can lead to displacement and escalate violence;
3. there is a lack of longitudinal research on cycles of violence, leading to a narrow view of the situation and responses based on out-of-date information;
4. there is a lack of information about displacement of crime (Efforts need to be cross-jurisdictional in order to understand the full scope of the problem.);
5. response to organized crime is not sustained (There is an observable cycle of crime, public outcry, then a response in the form of a task force or similar initiative. After a time, there is reduction in funding and task forces required for successful control and prevention are dismantled.);
6. organized crime does not operate in hierarchical networks (Strategies have to reflect the fluid and changing ways in which organized criminal networks operate.);
7. the strategy of attempting to remove the profits through “follow the money” approaches to tackling organized crime has not been effective in halting organized crime;
8. old policies have led to violence and social harm that can be observed today in the drug and sex trades (Governments should be careful not to fuel organized crime by writing policies that create opportunities for illicit profit for organized groups.);
9. as the opportunities for illicit profits increase, new strategies must be developed to continuously guard against corruption;
10. resources for early intervention in juvenile crime are not sufficient;
11. the use of informants and the witness protection program should be improved because these players are essential to efforts to combat organized crime; and,
12. international cooperation must be improved (Organized crime is international and moves across borders. Efforts to deal with major organized crime will fail unless countries cooperate. In order for international cooperation efforts to succeed, we must consider the asymmetry in priorities between different countries.).

Discussion Reports: “Paradigms of Organized Crime”

The following is a summary of the main points presented in plenary after the roundtable discussions.

How and why is this new paradigm relevant to our current objectives of reducing organized crime?

Participants agreed that it would be good to develop policing and community approaches that were designed to reduce or mitigate the harm caused by organized criminal activities. They also noted that some concepts in the “new” paradigm, including early intervention and prevention, have been around for some time but are only now gaining momentum. Both prevention and enforcement are necessary when we’re trying to put the new paradigm into practice; it’s finding the appropriate mix that can be difficult.

Are there examples from your own experience that confirm or refute what the panelist is proposing?

Participants agreed that priorities in addressing organized crime enforcement have not always been effectively identified. For example, more emphasis is placed on marijuana grow operations despite the fact that fraud or human trafficking likely causes more harm.

Participants brought up an example of a new model of policing in Surrey, British Columbia called “wraparound policing”. This model identifies youth who are likely to become involved in gangs, amongst other activities. Other initiatives are being implemented on a small scale, but the enforcement approach is still dominant.

If we are to accept what the panelist is proposing, how can we incorporate this new paradigm into current practice models e.g. legislative, policing, community programs, etc.?

In answer to the above question, participants suggested that the paradigm makes sense but that it is hard to put into practice with the resources available. There are numerous organizations and agencies responsible for organized crime, therefore coordination and information sharing is difficult.

Participants also noted that individual ideologies could impact the successful adoption of a new paradigm and it will be a gradual process to get people to buy in. In order to facilitate the adoption of this paradigm, sustained academic involvement and public access to court and intelligence data could contribute in a meaningful way.

To enable the adoption of a new paradigm, cooperation between all levels of government and multiple sectors is required. Changes to legislation could also enable this shift. Participants pointed out that care must be taken to evaluate each set of circumstances as national strategies do not always apply to unique situations and it is important not to alienate communities.

What do we still need to know – what are the gaps in our knowledge? In light of those gaps, what research questions should be the focus of our priorities?

Participants said that a tool or mechanism is required to facilitate information sharing between the justice system and the academic community. Information that is technically in the public domain is difficult to obtain. Researchers and academics assert that they need access to the data so that they can analyze the data and interpret it for the public.

Participants also noted the following knowledge gaps:

- a view of the impact of organized crime through the lens of social harm;
- information on criminal opportunity structures; and,
- quantitative and qualitative information about the various proposed strategies under the paradigm shift.

Research Priorities

Participants suggested the following research priorities:

- longitudinal research on patterns of re-offence;
- studies on the effectiveness of the witness protection program;
- study and evaluate core policies and initiatives, not just marginal and new programs;
- research on the effectiveness of interventions and whether they in themselves actually cause harm;
- research on social harm, its impact and causes;
- determining which data can be cleaned, anonymized, and shared publicly to increase public understanding;
- research on the transparency of information sharing between law enforcement agencies and between law enforcement and the public;
- developing models to determine if a paradigm shift would be effective;
- research on the effectiveness of current law enforcement strategies;
- research on how to move approaches and behaviour to a new paradigm; and,
- research on the effectiveness of the prison system on rehabilitation.
-

Day One: Second Panel and Roundtable Discussion

Dr. Stephen Schneider

Department of Sociology and Criminology, St. Mary's University

Dr. Schneider is recognized both nationally and internationally as a leading scholar and researcher in the field of organized crime. He has recently released a book: *Iced: The Story of Organized Crime in Canada*. He has written several books and journal articles on a variety of topics, including description and analysis of money laundering methods, critical analyses of law enforcement efforts to combat organized crime, and the development of crime prevention methods.

Presentation: “Crime Prevention Through Social Development”

Dr. Schneider’s presentation focused on how organized crime prevention can be achieved through social development. His conceptual framework maintains that there are many early predisposing factors for a criminal career, including negative family, neighborhood, school, and peer influences. He discussed the potential for organized crime prevention through programs aimed at core areas for the positive development of children and youth:

- education (academic development);
- life and social skills (behavioral development);
- physical activity (health development);
- mentors (positive role models); and,
- effective parenting (a nurturing social environment).

Dr. Schneider pointed out the tension that currently exists between law enforcement and prevention. He emphasized the need for a national comprehensive strategy that uses an integrative approach to both enforcement and prevention. This approach should involve not only community, government, and law enforcement, but should also include people in the private sector who have a lot of expertise to contribute and could make a big difference in terms of effectiveness and expediency. Because the cross-border operations of organized crime need to be addressed, barriers that obstruct cooperation between agencies need to be removed.

Dr. Schneider also pointed out the need for placing a greater emphasis on realistic prioritization based on social harm. Crime is not a criminal justice problem, it's a social problem and it needs to be addressed through social policy. The way we currently deal with crime is inherently flawed because it is reactive and does not address the root causes. We have to shift emphasis to institutions that can truly address crime as a social problem and a social ill. The institutions that have been proven to work include families, communities, the mental health care system, and recreational and cultural institutions. Despite evidence that these approaches work, they are not given sufficient resources.

Provinces are responsible for education, health care, and other social institutions, but the federal government can also play a significant role. Two programs suggested by Dr. Schneider were universal daycare and a nationwide after school program. These types of initiatives can have an impact on crime, particularly if they are targeted to higher risk communities. Research has shown that money spent on programs like this could be more effective than spending money on prisons which can turn offenders into habitual offenders.

Social developmental approaches have been shown to work. Dr. Schneider argued that these approaches could be used to combat organized crime because organized criminals tend to share the same psychological traits and risk factors as other chronic offenders. These risk factors and ways to mitigate them have been studied using theories such as Differential Association, Social Learning, and Social Disorganization.

Neighborhood poverty contributes to juvenile delinquency. The federal government could play a role in improving conditions in poor neighborhoods in order to ensure that young people are not being raised in conditions that contribute to criminal activity. In some cases, more resources are not required; it is a matter of enabling cooperation and partnership between agencies that can make a difference.

Dr. Schneider summarized the work he did with the PALS Program (**P**ositive Role Models and **M**entors, **A**cademic Tutoring, **L**eisure and Physical Activity, **S**ocial and Life Skills Development). The PALS Program is an integrated crime prevention program that has resulted in a measurable impact on participants. The program addresses the specific factors that put disadvantaged youth at risk of future criminal behavior. It addresses five key areas, which include education, life and social skills, physical activity, mentors, and effective parenting.

Dr. Schneider closed his presentation by suggesting that we shift resources away from the criminal justice system into social development solutions that might impact on the problem.

Discussion Reports: “Crime Prevention Through Social Development”

The following is a summary of the main points presented in plenary after the roundtable discussions.

How or why is this information relevant to our current objectives?

Participants described an effort to build capacity in the community that was undertaken in Ottawa called “No communities left behind.” This was a multi-agency effort where the police were not the lead agency, but were key players. The initiative was not resource intensive for police organizations but had a positive impact in developing communities. This suggests that we should encourage partnership to integrate and pool resources in order to achieve desired outcomes.

Participants also noted the difficulty of building trust between police and the community at large when police are engaged in intelligence-led policing that can be perceived as “spying.”

What are the strengths of the proposed approach?

Participants said that one of the strengths of the proposed approach is that social development strategies are evidence-based and strike at the root causes of crime. They also pointed out that building communities is a good in and of itself, even if crime prevention results are not always measurable.

What are the weaknesses of the proposed approach?

Participants thought that the proposed approach faced at least three immediately identifiable difficulties.

1. Community capacity building is proactive and requires long-term commitment that can compete with resources required for reactive policing. Sometimes institutional memory suffers when people change posts and a sustained effort can be difficult to maintain.
2. Collaboration across all levels of government and many different disciplines can be difficult to achieve.
3. Political horizons might not be conducive to social development initiatives.

What do we still need to know? What more needs to be done from a research perspective in order to maximize the effectiveness of the proposed approaches?

In response, participants indicated that the following questions should be answered:

- How many programs are needed to address the issues?
- Which programs work best?
- What factors put kids at risk of joining gangs?

Research Priorities

Participants suggested that research should be undertaken to identify:

- the programs which will interest young people;

- the factors that put young people at risk for joining gangs; and,
- the effectiveness of current programs.

Participants also suggested that more information is needed about the best mechanisms to coordinate resources and integrate them to maximize effectiveness.

Dr. Martin Bouchard

School of Criminology, Simon Fraser University

Dr. Martin Bouchard's work focuses primarily on illicit drug markets, especially marijuana cultivation. His other areas of interest include examining the role of social and criminal capital in criminal careers, the spread of criminal innovations, methods for estimating the size of criminal populations, and police effectiveness.

Presentation: "The Importance of Organization in Understanding Street Gang Delinquency"

Presented by Dr. Martin Bouchard, School of Criminology, Simon Fraser University

Dr. Bouchard's presentation focused on gaining a better understanding of the nature of organized crime and its influence. He presented results from a recent study of Quebec teenagers, showing how "delinquent groups" can be distinguished from "street gangs" by differences in their level of organization, and how this level of organization determines their involvement in particular delinquent activities. Second, he discussed his recent work on the economic influence of the Hells Angels on illicit drug markets in Quebec, showing how criminal organizations can be small in size, yet high in actual influence.

Dr. Bouchard discovered a strong correlation between the level of organization of a group and delinquent activities. The conclusion was that delinquency could be better predicted based on the level of organization of the group rather than whether or not the group identified as a gang. The level of organization of the gang is also a predictor of involvement in violence.

Key findings, include:

- gang membership matters;
- group membership matters;
- organization matters more than gang membership for delinquency, particularly for drug supply offenses;
- both membership and organization is important for violence; and,
- neither membership, nor organization matters for property crimes.

Dr. Bouchard also spoke about a capture-recapture research method originally developed in biology. This method can be used to provide estimates of the size of "hidden populations" and was used by Dr. Bouchard to estimate the size of the marijuana cultivation industry in Quebec, Canada. The capture-recapture analysis draws on arrest data to estimate the number of marijuana growers.

Dr. Bouchard's recommendation for future research was to include the notion of organization as a key factor for research and policy purposes, and to study the economics of illegal markets in more detail.

Discussion Reports: “The Importance of Organization in Street Gang Delinquency”

Following is a summary of the main points presented in plenary after the roundtable discussions.

How can this research be applied to our efforts to reduce organized crime?

Participants suggested that the instrument developed in Dr. Bouchard’s study for determining the level or degree of organization could be used to empirically identify groups and communities who are at risk and would benefit from programs like PALS. They also suggested that the instrument be used in the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth (NLSCY) to identify youth that belong to groups with a high level of organization.

In light of your response to the previous question, how would this knowledge change your approach to your work – what does this mean in terms of concrete changes to your work?

Participants said that research should continue to take a “ground-up” approach, rather than to assume that the structure of gangs is hierarchical. Because of the fact that criminal networks are always changing and adapting, it would be useful to study these structures empirically. One way to do this would be to apply social network analysis. This type of analysis could also provide information on whether disruption of organized crime is a viable strategy, or one that causes more problems.

What do we still need to know? What more needs to be done from a research perspective to confirm the applicability of the proposed conceptual framework?

Participants noted that the results of Dr. Bouchard’s study might be specific to a particular age group. More study would be required to determine if the same conclusions could be made about other forms of organized crime. It was noted that youth are not organizing to commit profit-driven crime to the same degree as adults, so the reasons for organizing should also be considered.

Research Priorities

Participants suggested that research should be undertaken to identify:

- which organizational structures are most highly predictive of violence; and,
- how gangs and other criminal networks respond to law enforcement interventions.

Participants also suggested that researchers could learn more about how criminal networks operate by using social network analysis.

Day Two: First Panel and Roundtable Discussion

Dr. Ernesto Savona

Director, Transcrime Joint Research Centre on Transnational Crime, Catholic University of Milan

Dr. Savona is one of Europe’s leading experts on the measurement of organized criminality and its impacts, as well as legislative measures against organized crime. He currently holds the position of Editor-in-Chief of the *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, and is the

Director of the Transcrime Institute, a joint centre operated by the Catholic University of Milan and the University of Trento.

Dr. Savona has recently coordinated and participated in numerous research projects for both the Republic of Italy and the European Union, including those dealing with topics such as the estimation of the costs of crime, cost-benefit analysis of corporate transparency requirements for the private sector relevant to the fight against organized crime, assessing the vulnerabilities of legal sectors to organized crime, non-criminal policies to combat organized crime, witness protection, and the crime-proofing of products, legislation, and regulations.

Presentation: “Combining Macro with Micro Approach to Organized Crime”

Dr. Savona’s presentation described the methodologies used to study three organized crime groups in Sicily, Calabria, and Campania. All three groups were involved in the construction industry and used corruption to infiltrate and operate within the legitimate economy.

Dr. Savona argued for using both a macro and a micro approach to studying organized crime that could lead to better understanding and implementation of appropriate preventative measures. By integrating both types of methodologies, a clearer picture emerges and this is necessary in order to measure what is actually going on in these complex networks of criminal activity. Often, countries are measuring organized crime from a macro perspective. The micro methodology proposed and tested by Dr. Savona is called script analysis.

In a script analysis, the researcher looks at the individual steps of a specific crime. By studying the steps taken, we can understand the criminal process. This understanding informs reliable and effective measures to prevent crime by reducing the opportunities to commit crime.

Based on the script analysis of the three crime groups, some situational measures were proposed that would reduce the opportunities for organized crime to infiltrate the public construction industry in Italy. These measures are:

- increasing the effort to force enterprises to disclose the identity of subcontractors;
- increasing the risk of detection of criminal activities;
- reducing the benefits to criminals by encouraging competition among enterprises participating in bids and eliminating the opportunity to gain monopolies over raw materials;
- changing opportunities through “crime proofing” legislation by ensuring that legislation always consider the criminal opportunities that it may inadvertently create; and,
- reducing the excuses used by politicians to justify criminal activity for economic or political reasons.

Dr. Savona closed his presentation by suggesting that researchers should augment macro research with micro qualitative analysis in order to effectively implement preventative measures to reduce organized crime.

Dr. Michael Levi

Professor of Criminology, Cardiff University, Wales, United Kingdom

Dr. Levi is one of Europe’s leading scholars on white-collar, economic, and financial crime. He has published extensively on these topics in leading academic journals. He has also held the

position of Editor-in-Chief of *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, the official journal of the British Society of Criminology, as well as positions on the editorial boards of the *British Journal of Criminology*, the *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, and *Global Crime*. Dr. Levi is currently working on “The Patterns, Organisation and Governance of Economic Crimes” through a Professorial Fellowship for the British Economic and Social Research Council.

Presentation: “The Prevention of Organized Crime Revisited”

Dr. Levi’s presentation focused on some of the regulatory and non-justice system approaches to crime prevention that have been undertaken in the UK. He suggested that public and private institutions must cooperate in these initiatives.

Dr. Levi started his presentation by identifying some of the current knowledge gaps and difficulties related to organized crime, including information on the structures of association and structures of activity for crimes. There is also a lack of information on prevention methods due to a “cultural resistance and fear of exposure of both successful prevention activity and (unsuccessful?) non-activity.” Lack of reviews of cases and a shortage of quality historical data makes it difficult to identify performance indicators and develop ways to measure the effectiveness of prevention efforts.

One example of regulatory prevention methods is the Serious Crime Prevention Order (SCPO) in the UK. The SCPO imposes restrictions on an organized crime gang member so that he cannot possess a list of chemicals that could be used for producing drugs, or more than one mobile phone, or a certain amount of cash. These restrictions are intended to make crime more difficult to carry out and can expedite prosecution when they are contravened. These restrictions can also be viewed as a partial invasion of civil liberties and rights.

Crime prevention requires partnership between multiple public institutions as well as partnerships between private and public institutions. Some public-public tactics include environmental health inspections of premises owned by organized criminals, refusing applications for permits and licenses required to run businesses, and targeting criminal loan sharks using Office of Fair Trading powers to withdraw consumer credit licenses. These tactics carry a higher risk of corruption because of the potential for profit and abuse. Private-public tactics involve legislating the private sector to take responsibility for inhibiting opportunities to commit financial crime and obtain the prerequisites of crime. Some of these prevention tactics include: consolidation of databases (financial, payroll, claims, education, and other databases), voice recognition software in welfare applications, and chip and PIN cards.

Organized crime does not operate solely in the underworld but interacts with and takes place within legitimate businesses. Because of this, public-private partnerships are necessary for crime prevention.

Dr. Levi made three major recommendations.

1. We need a strategy for collecting information on criminals’ actual responses to interventions. This information can be obtained from wire taps and other bugging devices as well as debriefings.
2. Policing authorities need to think about what is happening to displaced offender, and this effort must cross borders.
3. Industry needs information about which businesses are vulnerable to organized crime.

Dr. Levi concluded his presentation by noting that what is being done in the UK is part of a fairly advanced agenda, but that certain measures interfere in ways that some people feel invade their privacy.

Discussion Reports: “Non-Enforcement Based Methods for Organized Crime”

The following is a summary of the main points presented in plenary after the roundtable discussions.

How and where are these strategies feasible and relevant in the Canadian context?

Participants said that Canada, like the UK, could place restrictions on convicted criminals in order to help prevent further crimes from taking place. They also suggested that immigration regulations could be leveraged to report persons who are members of organized crime groups.

Regulatory requirements were also discussed. Better regulation of financial transactions could aid in the prevention of crime.

Participants discussed the vulnerability of certain businesses to organized crime and suggested that the construction industry, particularly in Montreal, should be looked at for evidence of criminal activity. Regulatory agencies should take on a larger role in the private sector to prevent crime.

What are some of the unique barriers in the Canadian context to implementation of these strategies?

Participants noted that a barrier to these strategies in the Canadian context is the limited ability to analyze and detect financial crime. We need to establish priorities for financial crime that reflect the harm caused by it. However, because Canada is very liberal and individualistic, financial surveillance techniques might not be easy to implement given the privacy culture that exists. The general ideological resistance to legislating business activities also makes it difficult to implement these strategies. Industry is more interested in profit than the public good.

Another suggested barrier to these approaches are the jurisdictional responsibilities, relationships, and structures of federal, provincial, and municipal governments. These structures make multi-level governance difficult to orchestrate.

Regulatory measures can be difficult to implement because they could negatively impact vulnerable communities and because they can sometimes inadvertently create opportunities for crime. It was also noted that new regulations must not create an environment that would foster the corruption of public officials.

Participants indicated that more specific research projects and further evidence is required in order to take effective, concrete action, instead of discussing the issues in the abstract. More data needs to be publicly available and academic researchers need access to discussions among both private and public expert groups.

What do we still need to know from a research perspective?

Participants said that more information is required on:

- the impact of regulation on preventing opportunities for crime;

- the extent to which organized crime has infiltrated legitimate businesses and public institutions;
- vulnerable sectors like the construction industry and the security industry;
- money laundering; and,
- financial crime.

Participants felt that more information is required on the long-term cycles of violence in organized crime. Anecdotal evidence suggests that as criminal organizations evolve, violence becomes more implied than real, but that concrete evidence is not currently available.

Participants also noted that an increased emphasis needs to be placed on measuring crime prevention efforts and better strategies to deal with the displacement of criminal activity.

Research Priorities

Participants identified the following research priorities:

- perform a study of federal legislation to identify opportunities for crime;
- identify vulnerable sectors in the Canadian economy through robust threat assessment;
- perform victimization surveys at the local level, particularly regarding extortion, but this could be applied to other kinds of criminal activity as well;
- determine what criminal justice practitioners think about the application of tools that are currently in place and examine to what extent legislation is a help or a hindrance;
- study areas where there are no instances of organized crime and determine why this is the case; and,
- use the script analysis method for studying human trafficking, insider trading, and other white collar crime.
-

Day Two: Second Panel and Roundtable Discussion

Professor David Kennedy

Director, Centre for Crime Prevention and Control, John Jay College, University of New York

Professor Kennedy is a frequently quoted expert on applied crime control, and has been highly successful at implementing innovative crime reduction strategies through hands-on fieldwork, action research, and operational partnerships with law enforcement, communities, social service providers, and other practitioners. His specialties are gang and gun violence, overt drug markets, and domestic violence. Deterrence is the central feature of his approach, in which law enforcement, communities, and social service providers directly engage with offenders to set standards, offer help, and establish clear consequences for continued offending. Applications of this framework include the Boston Gun Project, which dramatically reduced street gang-related gun violence and homicides in Boston in the mid- to late-1990s, and the High Point Intervention, which eliminated overt drug markets and resulted in improved neighborhood conditions in High Point, North Carolina in the mid-2000s. His recent book, *Deterrence and Crime Prevention*, is a major theoretical and practical advance in the deterrence field.

Presentation: “Best Practices to Combat Organized Crime”

Mr. Kennedy’s presentation focused on his views on effective deterrence strategies, which involve convincing known offenders, through the presentation of evidence and the promise of immediate enforcement action, that they face maximum risk of sanctions for continued offending. He showed the effectiveness of this strategy with the Boston Gun Project and the High Point Intervention.

Mr. Kennedy’s presentation described how research on situational crime prevention was applied to particular situations in order to solve specific problems. He pointed out that situational crime prevention should be used as a heuristic to provide guidance in solving problems. He expressed his interest in community-oriented policing and looking at a problem in terms of community conditions instead of in terms of crime.

In his work on the Boston Gun Project, Mr. Kennedy described that the approach was to go “to the ground” and ask front-line practitioners what was actually happening on the streets. By analyzing the particular details of the situation, they were able to develop and implement a successful solution to the problem that responded to the realities of those unique circumstances.

Mr. Kennedy emphasized the need for the practice of criminology to focus on detailed attention to specific problems. The information gleaned from this type of study can inform higher level abstractions, but useful evidence is obtained and concrete progress made through detailed, empirical study of particular situations.

Acknowledging the fact that each solution must be tailored to a specific situation, Mr. Kennedy also identified a few key characteristics of an effective and flexible operational framework for the successful deterrence of gang violence:

- core partnership and engagement of the moral agents of the community (family, social services, law enforcement);
- direct engagement with offenders through forums, meetings, home visits, or call-ins;
- moral engagement with offenders;
- an offer of help to offenders who want to stop offending;
- clear communication of consequences; and,
- efficient and selective application of sanctions and enforcement to targeted groups.

The message to offenders has to include the fact that the violence has to stop, that they are important and valuable, the values and ethics of the street code are wrong, the authorities will help them, the authorities will stop them if necessary, and that everyone wants things to change.

Discussion Reports: “Second Panel on Day Two”

The following is a summary of the main points presented in plenary after the roundtable discussions.

How is this approach applicable to other types of organized crime?

Participants agreed that this model could be applied in parts of Canada, but it should be looked at on a case-by-case basis to see where it could actually be successful. They suggested that the

approach might be effective if applied to prison gangs or to particular communities plagued by street gang violence and drug markets, such as Hobbema.

How is this approach applicable to addressing gang violence at the local level in Canada?

Participants indicated that if the model was tailored appropriately to specific circumstances, it could be applicable at the local level in Canada. They also suggested that the model could be advanced using parole officers.

What else do we need to know? What research do we need to do to test the applicability for other types of non-street gang organizations?

Participants felt that the model might be transferrable to other types of criminal activity, like financial crime, but that the levers would likely have to be changed. In general, it was noted, the levers for each group would have to be correctly identified in order for the approach to be successful.

Participants wondered if the approach could be applied to multi-jurisdictional organized crime groups, and also were unsure whether the approach decreased overall activity of the gang in the drug trade or managed only to decrease violence while other criminal activities continued.

Research Priorities

Participants identified the following research priorities:

- as the Canadian justice system is different from the American justice system, determine whether the Canadian enforcement measures would be strong enough to deter offenders;
- study the factors for reoffending;
- determine which regions in Canada are affected by violence, and identify the key actors and ringleaders of the offenders;
- train researchers and social workers on how to conduct the meetings and do follow-up research to ensure that it is working;
- identify the areas in Canada where there is gang violence and tie police performance measures to decreases in violence;
- determine whether or not this model simply displaces the offenders; and
- obtain more information about different types of criminal populations, for example those who commit fraud.

Conclusion

The Research Workshop was a place where policy makers, government researchers, and practitioners met with academic experts on organized crime to explore innovative and interesting perspectives in the area of organized crime research. As this summary indicates, the group was largely supportive of the paradigm shift identified amongst scholars who study this subject. The group was largely intrigued by the possibilities inherent in a paradigm shift from traditional suppressive responses to organized crime groups towards preventative measures and behaviour-oriented approaches.

During the workshop discussions, it became apparent that even amongst experts and practitioners there is still no consensus on the definition of organized crime, which inhibits strategy development and the measurement of results. Many agreed that priorities for enforcement and research should consider the social harm of the practice being targeted. Another pressing observation was the need for greater inter-jurisdictional and inter-sectoral cooperation, which attendees noted this kind of workshop was one way of fostering. It was also observed that funding pressures generally leaned towards short-term and reactive enforcement responses, rather than the preventative and innovative longer-term methods proposed in some of the approaches being discussed at the workshop. Finally, it was noted a number of times that two solitudes often exist, between governments and law enforcement on one side and the public and scholars interested in interpreting the data they hold on the other.

There were many suggestions for areas that governments, law enforcement, and academics might best prioritize as important next areas to research on the subject of organized crime. Many agreed that researching the social harm caused by organized crime was important. Research that focuses on promising methods of researching and suppressing the violence that is associated with organized crime was suggested as important. So too was the issue of displacement, where participants were interested in understanding the impacts of enforcement measures, amongst other issues. This concern is related to the group's desire to know more about how offenders respond to interventions meant to suppress organized crime, to understand how effective interventions ultimately are on criminal behaviour. Research looking at criminal opportunities in legislation and regulation was of interest to many, as were detailed, specific studies of organized criminality associated human trafficking, money laundering, and white collar crime. More research was also suggested on the structures of criminal networks, the extent organized crime infiltrates the legitimate private and public economies, and the economic sectors vulnerable to organized crime.

Appendix A: Participants

The Research Workshop was held under the Chatham House Rule, so only organizational affiliations are provided here, unless they were an official speaker. A number of organizations provided multiple participants from different policy or program areas.

British Columbia, Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General

Canadian Border Services Agency

Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada

Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse

Correctional Service of Canada

Criminal Intelligence Service Canada

Criminal Intelligence Service Ontario

David Kennedy, City University of New York

Department of Justice Canada

Dr. Ernesto Savona, Catholic University Milan

Dr. James Sheptycki, York University

Dr. Martin Bouchard, Simon Fraser University

Dr. Michael Levi, Cardiff University

Dr. Stephen Schneider, St. Mary's University

Health Canada

Law Enforcement and Policing Branch, Public Safety Canada

Metropolis Project, Citizenship and Immigration Canada

National Crime Prevention Centre, Public Safety Canada

Nova Scotia, Department of Justice

Ottawa Police Services

Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Strategic Policy Branch, Public Safety Canada