



**‘New Developments; media, myths  
and managing expectations’**

**Report of the 6<sup>th</sup> Electronic  
Monitoring Conference 2009**

**Egmond aan Zee**

**Report prepared by**

**Dr Anthea Hucklesby**

**Centre for Criminal Justice Studies**

**University of Leeds, UK**

## Contents

Introduction	3
EM in Europe	4
Reducing prison populations	4
Technological issues	5
Probation and EM	7
Private sector involvement in EM	7
Victim protection	8
Managing expectations	10
Ethical issues	12
Compliance with EM	13
Theorising EM	14
The evidence base for EM	14
Conclusions	16
References	17
Appendix	18
Programme	
Workshops	

## Introduction

This is the report of the 6<sup>th</sup> European Electronic Monitoring conference run by CEP in Egmond aan Zee, the Netherlands between 7-9 May 2009. Over 200 delegates from a wide range of countries attended the conference. The theme of the conference was 'New Developments; media, myths and managing expectations'. The event was opened by Leo Tigges (Secretary General of CEP), Sjef van Gennip (Director, Probation Service, The Netherlands) and Dineke Ten Hoorn Boer (Director-General Prevention, Juvenile Justice and Sanctions, Ministry of Justice, The Netherlands).

Leo Tigges provided some insights into how probation might develop in Europe in the short to medium term which provided a context to the conference. These included:

- i) an increase in the number of members of the CEP reflecting the expansion of probation because of its advantages over the use of imprisonment;
- ii) an increasing recognition of the importance of probation by the institutions of the EU. New probation rules were currently being prepared which will harmonise the probation rules across the EU. They will include EM;
- iii) making probation, including EM, transferable between EU states so that offenders can be punished in a different state to where they were sentenced. An EU framework agreement on alternative sanctions will come into force in 2011;
- iv) the increasing involvement of the EU institutions in EM. Following a review of current practice, regulations on finance and professional standards are going to be introduced for EM contractors. It is envisaged that this will produce a single market so that contracts can operate transnationally.

He also explored the contribution that EM can make to offenders' desistance.

Dineke Ten Hoorn Boer took up this theme suggesting that attention should focus on the contribution that EM can make to reducing recidivism. She suggested EM has a contribution to make but that this must occur in the context of probation. She went on to say that EM is only one of a number of elements required to tackle recidivism and the challenge facing EM is to balance its use within supervisory processes.

Sjef van Gennip provided an overview of the use of EM in Netherlands suggesting that radio frequency (RF) EM had become 'normalised' for offenders being released from prison. Its use as a community sentence was less widespread. Take up during pilots of this application had been low because probation staff did not recommend the EM and sentencers were not sure what value was added by the use of EM. He went on to report that pilots using GPS technology to monitor exclusion zones for sex offenders commenced in the Netherlands in 2005. It had been used in 45 cases so far and its use was expected to increase over time. The appeal of GPS was that it provided additional controls on offenders which increased sentencers and public confidence in the measure.

The remainder of the report will deal with issues raised during the three days of the conference thematically. It will highlight salient issues rather than providing descriptions of each of the contributions at the conference (presentations are available on the CEP website at: [http://www.cep-probation.org/default.asp?page\\_id=116&news\\_item=191](http://www.cep-probation.org/default.asp?page_id=116&news_item=191)). The objective of the report is to provide readers with a flavour of the debates and discussions which took place during the conference.

## **EM in Europe**

The number of countries operating EM in Europe continues to grow. Information about two new schemes in Norway and Estonia were presented during the conference. These added to the wide diversity of models in use across the EU. It is important that any lessons learnt from schemes can be used and built upon in other EU countries. This bi-annual conference provides one forum for discussion but the CEP has the potential to take on a greater role in pooling of knowledge and experience about EM. There are several ways in which CEP's role might develop including: undertaking a mapping exercise of the use of EM in EU countries; building up a research and data bank; and facilitating collaborative research bids for EU and other funding.

A substantial amount of experience has built up around the implementation and operation of EM schemes. Consequently some participants felt that it was time to move on from discussing the implementation of new schemes at the conferences. Instead, they suggested that the focus of discussions should turn to questions relating to what works, how EM works and for whom it works. This will build up an evidence base for the use of EM drawing out good practice.

## **Reducing prison populations**

It was universally acknowledged that EM had been introduced in all countries as a way of managing prison populations. Several speakers suggested that EM had contributed to reducing prison populations in their countries. Despite a general consensus, very limited evidence is available about the extent to which the introduction of EM has reduced prison populations. It was acknowledged that it was easier to evidence the impact of early release of prisoners on EM on prison populations than the use of EM at the pre-trial or sentencing stage where net-widening is likely to occur. Indeed, Marc Renzema (Professor, Kutztown University, US) suggested that around half of offenders subject to EM were unlikely to have received a prison sentence if EM was not imposed. He also highlighted the need to take account of offenders who are resentenced or recalled to prison as a result of breaches when considering the impact of EM on prison populations. He concluded that the impact of EM on prison populations is likely to be over-estimated as are the cost savings. This is especially pertinent when any cost savings are likely to be marginal because the fixed costs of imprisonment are so high.

Mike Nellis (Professor, University of Strathclyde, UK) suggested that EM appeared to be an ideal way to reduce the prison population for a number of reasons:

- It enabled day life to continue;
- It provided an element of control;
- It is more controlling than probation; and
- It prohibits offenders but does not inhibit.

However, further research is needed to quantify the impact of EM on prison populations.

### **Technological issues**

The term EM encompasses a range of technologies including:

- Radio frequency technology
- GPS tracking
- Voice Verification
- Remote alcohol monitoring
- Inmate tracking system
- Victim protection

Radio frequency technology is the most widely used. Technological innovations resulted in EM companies (Elmo Tech, G4S, Guidance monitoring systems, Serco) displaying smaller, less obtrusive RF tagging devices during the conference and at their presentations and also new and improved GPS systems.

One challenge for contractors is the provision of EM in countries without the necessary infrastructure to use current technologies. An example is South Africa where a number of barriers to the use of EM exist. These were outlined by Judge Bertelsmann (Judge, South African Supreme Court) and Derek House (Chief Operating Officer, Shadow Tagging Systems) and include: the huge geographical distances in South Africa; informal settlements which have no address; the lack of electricity and telephones; and language issues because of the 11 official languages in South Africa. Derek House presented a new technology. He claimed that no external power was required for the tagging scheme and the unit would operate for up to a year without the need to recharge the battery. However, the technology had not yet to be tested in the field or demonstrated to independent observers. The challenges presented by large geographic distances were also raised in the workshop on Norway.

Mike Nellis, in his presentation, suggested that tracking movement rather than house arrest or restricting movements was the objective which was sought from EM. Many participants were interested in this technology and its application in their countries. The use of GPS tracking raises a number of issues which were discussed during the conference. These included:

- how to manage the large quantity of data produced by GPS tracking;
- the cost of GPS systems;
- privacy issues;
- how to deal with offending in the home;
- exit strategies; and
- drift whereby equipment fails to locate offenders exact whereabouts but places them in a nearby location.

The workshop on GPS tracking led by Brian Barton (Elmo Tech) and Jan Verhoeff (De Maat Advies BV, The Netherlands) suggested that compliance is quite good with little evidence that it worsens over time. It also suggested that tracking has the ability to contribute to the prevention of recidivism, enables offenders to resume 'normal life' and assists with reintegration. It highlighted the importance of understanding what the technology is capable of and what GPS tracking can provide. It was acknowledged that a key element in the use of GPS tracking was the correct targeting of its use on high-risk offenders, particularly sex offenders and domestic violence offenders. Thorough training of staff and clear policies and procedures were also highlighted as key elements in the effective operation of GPS tracking. It was also suggested that an effective monitoring centre was vital to managing data flow.

In the workshop on Remote Alcohol Monitoring (RAM) it was suggested that RAM addressed issues raised by the link between alcohol and crime particularly in relation to driving and violent offences. Contributors (Ruud Boelens (Consultant, The Netherlands) and Tami Mazel (Elmo Tech)) suggested that the use of RAM may prevent offending and also change offenders' behaviour. Ruud Boelens posed the question of why the technology is used extensively in the US but not in Europe. Currently RAM is in use only in the Netherlands and Sweden within the EU. It was suggested that this was because of human rights concerns and questions about the added value provided by RAM.

### **Probation and EM**

There is a much stronger tradition in continental Europe than in the UK of operating EM alongside probation supervision. Michiel van der Veen (Programme Manager, Reclassering Netherlands) suggested that EM makes probation a 'more solid product' enhancing confidence in community supervision. There was a general consensus that operating EM alongside probation supervision was the most appropriate model to bring about desistance. However, several speakers mentioned their concerns about the increasing use of EM technologies having the effect of making probation look dated and old fashioned. Mike Nellis raised the prospect of technologies replacing social work/probation. He went on to say that technologies already exist to do this and people have a choice about whether this will happen. Technological solutions are also likely to divert resources from more traditional rehabilitation and social work functions. Mike summed up choice facing probation: adapting to work with technological solutions or facing the prospect of losing control of supervising offenders. Mike warned that EM fits squarely in the modernisation agency and if probation does not work

alongside it then it may well lose its position as the primary organisation involved in the supervision of offenders in the community.

The workshop on Norway (Marianne Oster (Ministry of Justice, Norway), Tony Roerbu (Senior Advisor/Project Manager, Correctional Services IT Centre, Norway) and Keith Phillips (Director, Guidance Monitoring, UK)) provided a case study of how EM can be integrated with offender management. Offenders are required to work whilst subject to EM but the economic recession presented challenges in this regard. Furthermore, mandatory employment conditions raise concerns about the potential for offenders to be stigmatized at work and privacy and questions about what constitutes suitable employment.

### **Private sector involvement in EM**

The extent of the involvement of the private sector in EM varies between countries. In the UK, private contractors run all aspects of EM. In other countries, statutory organisations manage EM simply buying equipment from private contractors. The issues raised by public and private sector involvement in EM were discussed in a workshop facilitated by Andy Homer (Serco) and Benoit Grandel (Chef du Department Insertion et Probation). Delegates' views on the involvement of the private sector in the operation of EM were mixed. Issues related to whether offenders' privacy was undermined by private sector involvement. Several delegates were also concerned about whether breaches might be dealt with mechanistically by the private sector so that they adhere strictly to their contracts but potentially increasing breach rates. Anthea Hucklesby (Senior Lecturer, University of Leeds, UK) explored the relationship between the public and private sectors and the extent to which they were integrated and worked together. Several presentations discussed what information about offenders should be provided to the private sector. Such considerations were viewed as particularly pertinent for young people. Underlying these discussions were concerns about whether information provided to the private sector would be secure, kept confidential and only used for the purposes for which it was supplied.

Discussions about private sector involvement in EM resulted in one delegate suggesting that the conference programme was anglo-centric and failed to capture the diversity of issues about EM in Europe.

### **Victim protection**

Two presentations related to the use of EM in victims' protection. Both presentations concentrated on domestic violence cases where the aim is to keep the two parties apart and prevent offenders contacting their victims. Inka Wennerberg (Senior Administrative Officer, National Police Board, Sweden) discussed a Swedish pilot programme using EM to protect domestic violence victims by monitoring compliance with Restraining Orders. The pilots were set up to test the technology. Three methods of victim protection were tested (reverse tracking using radio frequency technology (the monitoring unit is sited in the victim's home whilst the tag is on the offender); tracking of offenders; and tracking of victims) and three levels of exclusion zones

(personal, local, regional). Each variant has advantages and disadvantages related to cost, the level of protection afforded to victims, the amount of time available for victims and authorities to react when exclusion zones are breached and the impact upon offenders' rights to free movement. However, the technology and the size of the exclusion zone are irrelevant if mechanisms are not in place to respond. At various times during the conference, it was pointed out that all forms of EM rely upon humans to police them and react to problems when the technology indicates that offenders have entered exclusion zones or done something else which is prohibited. We know very little about the personnel who operate EM or the views of the authorities who are expected to respond to alerts.

Edna Erez (Professor, University of Illinois, Chicago, US) spoke about the use of EM in domestic violence cases in the US. Bilateral arrangements are also in place in the US so that EM technology is deployed on offenders and with victims. Both RF and tracking technology is used mostly at the pre-trial stage instead of a bail bond.

The findings of the evaluations were as follows:

- The equipment worked. The technology does not provide one hundred per cent protection. The equipment remained relatively untested in Sweden because it was not used to any great extent.
- The findings of the Swedish evaluation suggested that it works as a deterrent because offenders are aware that they will be discovered, that evidence of breach is provided and victims are warned that offenders are nearby.
- Clear detailed information about what was expected of offenders whilst on the scheme needed to be available. It was vital that they were able to understand and act upon instructions. Language was a problem for some offenders.
- The findings of the Swedish evaluation suggested that offenders had to be motivated to comply for the scheme to work. It also suggested that the scheme could result in lifestyle changes if a support programme was also in place.
- In terms of victims, the evaluations in both Sweden and the US suggested that EM gave them a sense of control. Victims were given a tangible sense of safety by having the equipment in their homes. Mobile units were also provided when victims were away from their homes.
- Victims in the US RF scheme were very positive about it. They valued it because: it gave them time without contact with their partners so they could rethink their relationships; it provided them with a sense of safety; and, it gave them the opportunity to interact with their abusers on their own terms. Victims also felt that the scheme resulted in the police taking them seriously for the first time because they received an immediate response from police if an event occurred. Victims also perceived that the equipment was very sensitive and this gave them confidence in the scheme.

The findings of the study of GPS tracking in the US were less positive. Edna Erez outlined the problems that were encountered which included:

- A lack of understanding of the technology, how it works and so on resulting in victims being confused;
- Confusion also existed about how victims would be notified when offenders breached their exclusion zone; and
- Victims felt unprotected because they had no tangible evidence, i.e. visible equipment, that offenders were being tracked.

A number of common issues arose from the pilots which included:

- False alarms were a problem in both schemes;
- The equipment was not tamperproof which caused particular problems with children; and
- No exit strategy existed so that equipment was removed abruptly when victims were not prepared for it.

A number of concerns arise from the schemes which were discussed during the session. These included:

- Do such systems provide a false sense of safety and control for victims causing victims to be off guard and vulnerable to attack?
- How wide should exclusion zones be? What is acceptable in terms of the rights of defendants/offenders?
- How to balance protection of victims and the rights of offenders.

### **Managing expectations**

Coinciding with one of the themes of the conference, many speakers mentioned issues related to managing expectations and the disjuncture between what EM technologies can do in reality and what people think they can do. The importance of not overselling the technology was raised in a number of sessions. Managing expectations was viewed as an important challenge for all EM schemes. The session devoted to managing expectations and the media provided two case studies from the Netherlands and England and Wales which provided important information about how to manage media expectations.

Michiel van der Veen discussed the experience of the Netherlands when they set up a satellite tracking pilot. Their aim was to avoid unrealistic expectations of its capabilities as well as negative media reporting. They drew upon the model used by the private sector to manage the introduction of a new product hiring a management consultant to advise them. A number of phases were gone through before full implementation. Criminal justice professionals and the University were involved during all of the phases. The first phase was to create an implementation strategy. The second phase involved small-scale use of satellite tracking to test out the technology. Phase three involved simplifying and standardising the information which was to be made available. Only when all the phases were completed did they present satellite tracking to the media. Michiel explained that the press were invited to a day long meeting at which they were presented with the details of what satellite tracking was able to do and were given the opportunity to ask questions so that they became fully informed about EM. After which the media were asked to keep the pilot low profile and so far they were reported to have done this.

The situation in England and Wales is in sharp contrast to the Netherlands. As George Barrow (Ministry of Justice, UK) explained tagging is an easy target for the media. The UK media loves crime stories and tagging ticks many of the boxes for a good news story: it has a visual identity and it is linked to science fiction and crime. As a result, tagging has had a substantial amount of media attention in the UK. This has resulted in a universal recognition of EM but knowledge about its use is superficial. George suggested that the public and the media are misinformed about all aspects of EM. Such problems were heightened by politicians who were unrealistic about the capabilities of EM when presenting EM to the public and the media therefore raising expectations of what it is able to do.

George went on to outline a number of events which had coalesced in England and Wales to produce the negative media coverage of EM. One was an organised revolt by the probation union which resulted in misinformation and myths being published by the media. Two, television companies placed undercover reporters in tagging companies and provided offenders with cameras. In both instances bad practices were uncovered. Three, a number of incidents occurred when serious offences were committed by offenders whilst tagged.

George suggested that the influence that the traditional media have on the reputation of EM can be overestimated particularly as a result of the rise in the use of the internet. However, he drew on his experiences to draw out some lessons which had been learnt in England and Wales about how to deal with the media. These included:

- the need to plan for a crisis because it will occur at some point;
- the importance of controlling who speaks to the media and what they say; and
- getting endorsements from sources trusted by the public such as a victims group.

George closed his presentation by suggesting that a communication strategy involving sentencers and the judiciary was as important to the continued success of EM than a media strategy.

Richard Morris (G4S) discussed the media from the perspective of an EM contactor. He began by saying that EM is a big programme in the UK so problems would inevitably occur. He reported that G4S have a full-time communications team who work nationally and locally. He went on to present the lessons learnt after a documentary was screened showing footage from an undercover reporter which exposed poor practice in his organisation. These were to:

- have a tight communication plan which focussed on what, how and when information is to be communicated.
- take professional advice.
- work in partnership with the Ministry of Justice to ensure that consistent messages are sent.
- ensure that any response to a crisis is quick.
- provide an alternative perspective by offering good news stories and positive information. Since the documentary was screened, G4S have been proactive in working with local criminal justice agencies and the media which has paid dividends in relation to media reports.

The main thrust of the session was that communications strategies should be agreed jointly between government departments and EM contractors especially when incidents happen. Strategies should be proactive and not reactive. An effective strategy needed to communicate evidence on the effectiveness of EM, cost and so on. Strategies also needed to engage with both the courts and the media and include involvement in the training of court personnel, the distribution of literature to sentencers, regular contact with the media and the publication of regular articles on EM to inform the public and sentencers.

## **Ethical issues**

Since the inception of EM ethical issues have been raised about its use. As EM technologies continue to develop new ethical issues surface. Most of the sessions during the conference discussed ethical issues and these are explored in this section. It was clear from the discussions that different countries as well as individuals had varied approaches to the ethical dilemmas raised by EM.

The concept of surveillance itself raises many ethical issues. Mike Nellis noted that surveillance generally creates anxieties. The widespread introduction of tracking has raised additional issues relating to privacy.

The issue of transparency was discussed in several sessions and relates to what information is passed onto offenders and victims. Questions were asked about whether offenders and victims have a right to know that they are subject

to EM. In the US for example, Edna Erez explained that neither offenders nor victims were informed that they were being monitored. In the UK, a recent report from the Chief Inspector of Probation (HMIP, HMICA, HMIC, 2008) had highlighted the fact that offenders are given no information about breach policies so they are unaware of the thresholds, which operate in relation to when formal breach action would be taken. This raised questions about whether offenders should be made fully aware of all aspects of EM and its operation and whether keeping the operation of EM (or parts of it) secret enhances its effectiveness. Clearly research is needed to elucidate these issues. At the time of the conference, the Ministry of Justice in England and Wales were beginning pilots to make the breach criteria more transparent to offenders.

A case in the Netherlands raised issues about the length of time that offenders should be subject to RF tagging or tracking. Is lifetime or long-term GPS tracking feasible or desirable, for example? If EM is used long-term, what exit strategies are in place to ease offenders' transition and to prevent bingeing or relapses happening?

Several presentations raised the prospect of pain inflicting tags being made available. These would be activated when offenders go into exclusion zones and, in their current form, will incapacitate them by producing an electric shock. Mike Nellis also discussed the use of implant technology to avoid problems with offenders removing tags. He warned that significant ethical concerns will be raised by future advances in technology and the challenge is to decide whether to employ them and, if so, how. He raised the issue of whether EM is simply the thin end of the wedge and a means by which levels of surveillance can be increased more generally.

Several presentations discussed the prospect of EM being used for unconvicted defendants (US) and low risk offenders (South Africa) including offenders who were unable to pay relatively small fines. Such moves raise issues of proportionality. Questions including whether EM should be used as an alternative to a fine or whether it is acceptable to use tracking for low risk offenders were debated.

The workshops on Remote Alcohol Monitoring debated questions about whether it is ethical to prohibit offenders from using alcohol and what such practices had to do with the objectives of programmes. Some participants, particularly from France, were concerned that RAM abused offenders' rights.

Additional ethical issues were examined in relation to young people. Attendees of the workshops on young people and EM (facilitated by Mary Wyman (Youth Justice Board, UK), Susan Walker (Youth Justice Board, UK) and Jos ter Voert (Reclassering Nederland)) were generally opposed to EM being used for offenders under the age of 14 because it was felt that young people were unable to understand the choices they make when they opt for EM. It was viewed as more acceptable to use EM for offenders aged between 14 and 18. Discussions also centred around whether young people's rights were violated by EM and whether it was appropriate to confine them to 'family life' when this may not be a positive experience.

Conference delegates were asked to reflect on the involvement of the private sector in sponsoring the conference. Delegates views were invited on the extent to which private contractors should contribute financially to the running of the conference.

### **Compliance with EM**

Compliance issues were discussed in a number of contexts during the conference. Anthea Hucklesby drew on her research undertaken in England and Wales to identify good practice. She highlighted the important role played by the personnel who operate EM (monitoring officers in England and Wales) in offenders' compliance and how their working conditions impact upon how they undertake their role. She also discussed the crucial role that families and significant others play in offenders' compliance by providing both emotional and practical support to offenders as well as being a source of tension and strain. Consequently, she suggested that more attention should be given to their role. A third finding from her research was the importance of tangible evidence that offenders were being monitored in the form of visits and telephone calls from the monitoring company.

Mike Nellis drew upon his work in relation to compliance with EM outlining his theoretical model. His model includes five types of compliance: incentive-based, trust-based, threat-based, surveillance-based and incapacitative-based compliance.

### **Theorising EM**

Theorising EM is in its infancy and lags behind the development and use of EM. Mike Nellis' presentation started to address these issues. He suggested that EM is a type of surveillance. He acknowledged that the surveillance, which arises from EM is only partial and not as intrusive as prison. Nevertheless, EM is a surveillance-based sentence based upon remote location monitoring rather than visual surveillance. The focus of EM is on the body rather than the mind. Compliance with EM involves the body being present or absent at a particular time and place. EM is not itself rehabilitative but it may assist in the rehabilitation process. EM is also not incapacitative. It prohibits rather than inhibits offenders. It provides them with a set of rules, which they have a choice about whether to abide in full awareness of the consequences of their actions.

### **The evidence base for EM**

Marc Renzema is currently responsible for the Campbell review of EM. He stated that he was planning to resign from this post because the Campbell rules about what constitutes good research are too rigid. According to Campbell rules, randomised controlled trials are the gold standard but they raise considerable ethical issues and are rarely practical. Marc suggested that other forms of research are valid provided that the problems and limitations of the methodology are discussed. The usual methodology adopted in studies of

EM (as elsewhere) was quasi-experimental studies, which used matching techniques. Such studies attempt to match individuals on EM with similar individuals who receive other sanctions to measure effect sizes between experimental and control/comparison groups. Marc suggested that there were a number of traps associated with matching studies which impact upon research outcomes and the validity of the research. These included that the groups of individuals or timescales differed for the experimental and comparison groups.

Marc suggested that whilst research in recidivism was important, research on other issues should also be undertaken. He raised several research questions, which in his view should form the EM research agenda:

1. Does EM perform better than alternative sanctions whilst offenders are subject to it?
2. Does EM have a long-term impact on recidivism?
3. Does EM reduce the prison population?
4. Does EM save money?
5. Which offenders does EM work for? Evidence is particularly required in relation to certain groups of offenders including: minority ethnic groups; younger offenders; women, offenders with psychiatric conditions; gang affiliated offenders; and when EM is combined with other sentences/conditions.
6. What are the social consequences of having large numbers of offenders on EM?

He went on to suggest that there were some research questions where evidence in relation to RF tagging is plentiful and therefore further studies were unnecessary. However, evidence in relation to tracking was more limited. He summarised what is already well known as:

- Offenders tolerate EM;
- EM does not destroy families;
- Offenders do not become depressed;
- Offenders feel burdened by EM;
- Offenders released early from prison welcome the use of EM;
- In general, the equipment works; and
- Agency workload increases in most cases.

Marc then reviewed the two studies which, in his view, were the most valid research on EM in the last two years. The studies were Lapham et al (2007) and Marklund and Holmberg (2009). Lapham et al (2007) is a US study of recidivist drunk drivers with random allocation to four combinations of sanctions. Where EM was included in sanctions outcomes in terms of recidivism were better than when EM was not included. However, the study

tells us nothing about why this might be the case. Only qualitative research can provide this information which did not form part of this research project. The second study (Marklund and Holmberg, 2009) was a matched design carried out in Sweden on offenders released from prison early on EM. Several methods were used to increase the validity of the findings through triangulation. They found that after three years reconviction rates were less for offenders subject to EM than other sanctions and the differences were statistically significant for older offenders.

Marc concluded his review by calling for further research. He believed that this was essential for the survival of EM. He also suggested that research should be funded by a range of organisations including contractors, NGOs and governments.

## Conclusions

Michiel van der Veen (Chair of the preparatory group) made a number of observations about the conference proceedings which included that:

- probation plays a central role in EM particularly in relation to compliance;
- investment in research was vital to enhance EM credibility. He saw private sector funding of research as a positive development;
- probation must adapt to the existence of EM;
- victims perspectives and their safety is as important as the rehabilitation of offenders;
- the number of countries implementing EM continues to grow and that assistance should be given to maximise the potential of EM; and
- ethical issues are a continuing challenge. New technologies are likely to pose further challenges in the future.

He stated that it was important that these issues do not detract from the achievements and benefits of EM which he outlined as:

- EM is not over controlling;
- Private contractors are willing to engage in constructive dialogue;
- EM is compatible with rehabilitation;
- EM has reduced prison use and the time spent in prison for many offenders; and
- We have learnt to be modest about EM but its full potential has yet to be maximised.

Leo Tigges concluded the conference by saying that it has been a great success. He thanked delegates for contributing to a lively conference which was more interactive than previous conferences. He said that the presentations had provided evidence that EM can have positive impacts upon offender supervision, stabilising offenders' lives and reducing prison populations. He suggested that attention should now turn to how EM can contribute to desistance and compliance, how it interacts with other elements of probation supervision and how breach procedures operate.

He closed the conference by thanking the sponsors and the preparatory group. Michiel thanked Martine Herschel for her work on the conference generally and particularly her support for the preparatory group.

Feedback about the conference was generally positive. The high standard of most of the presentations and workshops was highlighted along with the opportunity to discuss a wide range of issues relating to EM. The conference was also viewed as a forum for the collection of a range of information about

EM including providing the opportunity to meet with EM companies. Several participants suggested that the venue for the next conference should be elsewhere in order to provide improved facilities and increased space enabling more delegates to attend. Comments were also made about the UK dominating the discussions and the limited translation of proceedings (currently most of the conference takes place in English with translation into French).

## References

- HM Inspectorate of Probation (HMIP), HM Inspectorate of Court Administration (HMICA) and HM Inspectorate Constabulary (HMIC) (2008) *A complicated business: a joint inspection of electronically monitored curfew requirements, orders and licences*, London: Ministry of Justice available at: [http://www.justice.gov.uk/inspectors/hmi-probation/docs/electronic\\_monitoring\\_thema1-rps\(1\).pdf](http://www.justice.gov.uk/inspectors/hmi-probation/docs/electronic_monitoring_thema1-rps(1).pdf)
- Lapham, S. C., C'de Baca, J., Lapidus, J., & McMillan, G. P. (2007) 'Randomized sanctions to reduce re-offense among repeat impaired-driving offenders', *Addiction*, 102, 1618-1625; 1618.
- Marklund, F. and Holmberg, S (2009) 'Effects of early release from prison using electronic tagging in Sweden', *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 5: 41-61.

## Appendix



**6TH EUROPEAN ELECTRONIC MONITORING CONFERENCE:  
NEW DEVELOPMENTS; MEDIA, MYTHS, AND MANAGING  
EXPECTATIONS**

**7-9 May 2009  
EGMOND AAN ZEE, THE NETHERLANDS  
PROVISIONAL CONFERENCE PROGRAMME**

**Thursday 7 May**

- 12:00 - 13:30     **Lunch**
- 13:30 - 14:00     **Introduction and welcome**  
*Mr. Leo TIGGES*, Secretary General of CEP,  
*Ms. Dineke TEN HOORN BOER*, Director-General Prevention,  
Juvenile Justice and Sanctions of the Ministry of Justice, The  
Netherlands  
*Mr. Sjef van GENNIP*, Director, Probation Service, The  
Netherlands
- 14:00 - 14:45     **New developments in ethics, policy, and technique**  
*Professor Mike Nellis*, University of Strathclyde
- 14:45 – 16:00     **New users of Electronic Monitoring**  
*Mr. Jan-Erik SANDLIE*, Deputy Director of Correctional  
Services, Norway  
*Ms. Anne KRUUSEMENT*, Advisor Ministry of Justice, Estonia  
*Professor Charl CILLIERS*, Law Faculty -University of South  
Africa  
Chair: *Mr. Barry SNELGROVE*
- 16:00 – 16:30     **Sponsors' plenary**  
Group4Securicor – *Mr. Mark GRIFFITHS*  
Guidance Monitoring Limited – *Mr. Keith PHILLIPS*  
Chair: *Mr. Barry SNELGROVE*
- 16:30 – 17:00     **Tea**
- 17:00 – 18:00     **Victims perspectives on Electronic Monitoring**  
*Professor Edna EREZ*, University of Illinois, Chicago, US  
*Ms. Inka WENNERBERG*, Senior Administrative Officer,  
National Police Board, Sweden  
Chair: *Mr. Michiel van der VEEN*
- 18:00             **Close & Opportunity to visit sponsors' displays**  
**Pre-dinner drink sponsored by Group4Securicor in the  
lounge**
- 19:30             **Dinner sponsored by ElmoTech in "de Zilte Zoen"**

## **Friday 8 May**

- 09:00 – 10:15     **1<sup>st</sup> Series of Workshop sessions**
- 10:15 – 10:45     **Coffee**
- 10:45 – 12:00     **2<sup>nd</sup> Series of Workshop sessions** (workshops repeated)
- 12:00 – 13:00     **Electronic Monitoring in South Africa: ethics, law and technology**  
*Judge Eberhard BERTELSMANN*, South African Supreme Court  
*Mr. Derek HOUSE*, Chief Operating Officer Shadow Tagging Systems  
Chair: *Mr. Mike NELLIS*
- 13:00 – 14:15     **Lunch**
- 14:15 – 15:45     **'Good practice' with Electronic Monitoring for Probation**  
*Mr. Kjell CARLSSON*, Manager Electronic Monitoring, Sweden  
*Mr. Dominik LEHNER*, Head of penitentiary service, Justice Department, Switzerland  
*Dr. Anthea HUCKLESBY*, Senior Lecturer, University of Leeds, UK  
Chair: *Ms. Lara DANGUY DES DÉSERTS*
- 15:45 – 16:15     **Sponsors' plenary**  
Elmo-Tech Ltd – *Ms. Tami MAZEL*  
Serco Monitoring – *Ms. Vicky O'Dea*  
Chair: *Mr. Barry SNELGROVE*
- 16:15 – 18:00     **Close, Tea and Opportunity to visit sponsors' displays**
- 19:30                 **Dinner sponsored by Group4Securicor in van Speijkzaal, hotel Zuiderduin**
- 22:30                 **Drinks sponsored by Serco in "the PUB", hotel Zuiderduin**

## **Saturday 9 May**

- 09:15 – 10:45     **Media and managing expectations**  
*Mr. George BARROW*, Head of Communications – Criminal Justice Group, Ministry of Justice, UK  
*Mr. Richard MORRIS*, Managing Director G4S, England and Wales  
*Mr. Michiel van der VEEN*, Manager Program Redesign Program Recognition, Probation Service, The Netherlands  
Chair: *Mr. Mike NELLIS*
- 10:45 – 11:05     **Coffee**
- 11:05 – 12:05     **Research requirements**  
*Professor Marc RENZEMA*, Criminal Justice, Kutztown University, US  
Chair: *Mr. Mike NELLIS*
- 12:05 – 12:45     **Summary of the conference and closing speech**  
*Mr. Leo TIGGES*, Secretary General of CEP  
*Mr. Michiel van der VEEN*, Chair Preparatory Group EM Conference
- 12:45             **Lunch and depart**

### **Workshops:**

- A:     **EM in prisons:**  
       Mr. Kjell CARLSSON, Mr. Ernst DUVERT  
       (chair: Mr. Michiel van der Veen)
- B:     **Gains and Risks of Public/Private:**  
       Mr. Andy HOMER, Mr. Benoit GRANDEL  
       (chair: Ms. Susana Pinto)
- C:     **Offender Tracking in the United States:**  
       Mr. George DRAKE  
       (chair: Mr. Leo Tigges)
- D:     **Remote alcohol monitoring: what does practitioners want and ethical issues**  
       Mr. Ruud BOELEN, Ms Tami MAZEL  
       (chair: Ms. Inka Wennerberg)
- E:     **Young People - The Opportunities and Challenges of Tagging:**  
       Ms. Mary WYMAN, Ms. Susan WALKER, Mr. Jos ter VOERT  
       (chair: Mr. Mike Nellis)
- F:     **Norway: New approach in Offender Management:**  
       Ms. Marianne OSTER, Mr. Tony ROERBU, Mr. Keith PHILLIPS  
       (chair: Mr. Barry Snelgrove)
- G:     **Satellite Tracking and probation supervision:**  
       Mr. Brian BARTON, Mr. Jan VERHOEFF  
       (chair: Mr. Steve Birkett)