

## YEF Focused Deterrence Delivery Guidance: Evidence to Decision Framework

This Evidence to Decision framework explains the decisions that underpin the recommendations in the Youth Endowment Fund's (YEF's) *Focused Deterrence Delivery Guidance: guidance on how to deliver focused deterrence to keep children and young people safe from involvement in serious violence*. For each recommendation, we answer the following questions:

- a. What is the evidence warrant for this recommendation?**
- b. Is this recommendation feasible to deliver?**
- c. Does this recommendation support the most vulnerable children and disproportionately affected groups?**

As the framework explains, this guidance report draws upon the best available international evidence on how to prevent children's involvement in violence. This evidence includes the YEF Toolkit. The YEF Toolkit uses rigorous, independent and systematic methods, drawing from over 2,000 studies to summarise the evidence associated with over 30 different approaches to preventing children's involvement in violence.

A consultative group of international experts in delivering focused deterrence (FD) have also steered the guidance, using their knowledge of practice to ensure our recommendations are feasible. They are acknowledged at the start of the guidance report.

If you have any questions about this document and the evidence underpinning the guidance, please contact Dr Freya Glendinning ([freya.glendinning@youthendowmentfund.org.uk](mailto:freya.glendinning@youthendowmentfund.org.uk)).

**Please note, this document is not the guidance report; the guidance report can be found here:**  
[https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/2025/03/Focused\\_Deterrence\\_Guidance.pdf](https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/2025/03/Focused_Deterrence_Guidance.pdf).

<b>Recommendation 1</b>	<b>Determine whether you have a serious violence problem that involves children and young people and whether it could be addressed by delivering FD.</b>
<b>What is the evidence warrant for this recommendation?</b>	<p><b>There is a strong evidence warrant for ensuring a clearly defined serious violence problem exists before implementing an FD strategy.</b> A systematic review by Braga, Weisburd and Turchan (2019),<sup>1</sup> including 24 evaluations, found that FD strategies reduce violent crime by an average of 33%, with the greatest effects observed in contexts characterised by persistent, group-based violence, where a small number of individuals are responsible for a disproportionate share of serious violence.</p> <p>International research on FD also underlines that achieving a clear understanding of the specific local violence problem requires a structured, data-driven assessment of local violence trends, patterns and drivers.<sup>23</sup> As a practical benchmark (set following discussion with our expert panel), this recommendation proposes a sustained rate of at least 50 police-recorded cases of violence per 100,000 population over two consecutive years to indicate whether FD is warranted. This threshold reflects the levels of serious violence observed in prior FD programmes and provides a guide for when FD becomes a viable and proportionate use of resources. It is not, however, intended to serve as a strict cut-off. Where a sustained but concentrated serious violence issue persists below this threshold – such as in smaller geographic areas or among specific networks – FD may still be appropriate. Conversely, short-term spikes in violence may reflect temporary issues that are more effectively addressed with alternative, lower-intensity interventions, particularly given the six-to-12-month lead-in time typically required to establish FD delivery.</p> <p>Before implementation, organisations are advised to conduct a strategic needs assessment (SNA) of the local serious violence problem. Evidence from the YEF-commissioned UK FD review,<sup>4</sup> along with SNAs conducted by Violence Reduction Units (VRUs) in the UK,<sup>5</sup> demonstrates that a robust understanding requires the analysis of police data and, where available, integration with multiagency data from healthcare, youth justice, social care, education and the community. The SNA enables local partners to assess the frequency, nature and drivers of violence and to identify patterns of individuals or networks contributing to serious harm. An upfront assessment of violence is also embedded in US implementation guidance,<sup>67</sup> where it is consistently described as the essential first step in setting up FD delivery. Given the significant resource</p>

<sup>1</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies' effects on crime: a systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1051>

<sup>2</sup> Braga, A. A., & Kennedy, D. M. (2021). *A framework for addressing violence and serious crime: focused deterrence, legitimacy, and prevention*. Cambridge University Press.

<sup>3</sup> Braga, A. A., MacDonald, J. M., Douglas, S., Wade, B., & Struhl, B. (2024). Focused deterrence, strategic management, and effective gun violence prevention. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 23(4), 919–946. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12682>

<sup>4</sup> Tuschick, E., Armstrong, E., Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., Lloyd, A., & Newbury-Birch, D. [in press]. A rapid systematic review of qualitative literature about focused deterrence for violence prevention with a focus on the UK

<sup>5</sup> Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Violence Reduction Network. (n.d.). *Reports*. Retrieved from <https://www.violencereductionnetwork.co.uk/reports>

<sup>6</sup> O'Donnell, M., & Aviles, L. (2017). *Group violence intervention: a guide for project managers*. National Network for Safe Communities. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Assistance. Retrieved from [https://nnscommunities.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/PM\\_Guide\\_final\\_web.pdf](https://nnscommunities.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/PM_Guide_final_web.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> Braga, A. A., & Kennedy, D. M. (2021) *A framework for addressing violence and serious crime: focused deterrence, legitimacy, and prevention*. Cambridge University Press; Circo, G. M., Krupa, J. M., McGarrell, E., & De Biasi, A. (2020). Focused deterrence and program fidelity: evaluating the impact of Detroit Ceasefire. *Justice Evaluation Journal*, 4(1), 112–130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24751979.2020.1827938.65>.

	investment and targeting requirements involved (outlined further in Recommendation 2), this recommendation reflects the practical need to ensure that FD is implemented only where it is likely to have impact and where resources can be used efficiently and proportionately.
<b>Is this recommendation feasible to deliver?</b>	<p><b>We believe this recommendation is feasible because it builds on existing capabilities within local areas, particularly the analytical capacity of VRUs, police forces and local authorities, to assess patterns in serious violence.</b> Many areas already undertake an SNA as part of their violence reduction strategy, often using police-recorded crime data and health-related indicators. This recommendation simply formalises and focuses that work to determine whether the local violence problem aligns with what FD is designed to address: persistent and significant serious violence driven by individuals or groups.</p> <p>While access to multiagency data varies, many FD programmes in the UK have demonstrated the ability to draw on it to support this analysis. In the YEF and Home Office-funded (YEF-HO) trial of FD across five cities in England, each site was able to undertake a robust analysis of the serious violence problem using multiagency data in their area.<sup>8</sup></p>
<b>Does this recommendation support the most vulnerable children and disproportionately affected groups?</b>	<p><b>Children from certain ethnic groups are disproportionately likely to be represented in the criminal justice system and to become involved in violence, including as victims.</b><sup>9</sup> This recommendation supports disproportionately affected groups by ensuring that FD is only used in areas where there is a clearly defined and significant serious violence problem (and is focused on the individuals directly involved). A rigorous SNA allows organisations to understand the context-specific patterns of violence and the intersecting vulnerabilities and subsequent needs of those most affected. By encouraging areas to gather community insights, the recommendation also supports more equitable delivery. Community insights can provide an understanding of group conflicts, local drivers of violence and barriers to trust (often rooted in past experiences of racism or discrimination), helping areas to shape more culturally responsive and proportionate strategies.</p>

<b>Recommendation 2</b>	<b>Before delivering FD, check that you have the required resources, team and buy-in.</b>
<b>What is the evidence warrant for this recommendation?</b>	<p>This recommendation is informed by evidence suggesting that a priori planning is essential when delivering FD programmes.<sup>10</sup> The Flint FD programme illustrates the risks associated with inadequate preparation.<sup>11</sup> In Flint, a lack of early planning led to repeated delays, frustration among partners and a loss of community trust. The YEF and Home Office FD trial sites also required approximately 12 months of preparation before delivery could begin. Taken together, these findings support the recommendation of six to 12 months of preparation time, taking into account local variations in existing networks and capacity to draw upon.</p> <p>The systematic review by Braga, Weisburd and Turchan (2019)<sup>12</sup> highlights that implementation failure is a common occurrence in FD programmes. Further research emphasises that FD is “notoriously difficult to implement and sustain” due to its complexity and the high level of</p>

<sup>8</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> Youth Endowment Fund. (2025). *Racial disproportionality in violence affecting children and young people: five first steps for the new government*. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/reports/racial-disproportionality/>

<sup>10</sup> Braga, A. A., MacDonald, J. M., Douglas, S., Wade, B., & Struhl, B. (2024). Focused deterrence, strategic management, and effective gun violence prevention. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 23(4), 919–946. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12682>

<sup>11</sup> Saunders, J., Ober, A. J., Kilmer, B., & Greathouse, S. M. (2016). *A community-based, focused-deterrence approach to closing overt drug markets*. RAND Corporation.

<sup>12</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies' effects on crime: a systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1051>

	<p>coordination and resourcing required.<sup>13</sup> FD programmes require strong coordination across multiple agencies, including police, youth justice, social care, and voluntary sector and community organisations. If key components are under-resourced or if key partners are uncommitted, the intervention is likely to fail. For instance, the Kansas City FD programme had to overcome a lack of leadership and poor communication among partner agencies before the programme could be properly implemented.<sup>14</sup> Additionally, the rapid evidence review of FD in the UK identifies issues such as misaligned priorities, a lack of understanding of FD’s purpose across partner agencies and constraints on partner capacity or analytical support as factors that can disrupt programme delivery.</p> <p>Conversely, successful FD delivery has been linked to strong leadership, multiagency collaboration and thorough planning.<sup>16</sup> Although research does not specify an exact minimum resourcing standard, the combined learning from international implementation findings<sup>18</sup> provides a reasonable and practice-informed basis for this recommendation. Specific elements, such as dedicated police and analytical resources for real-time monitoring, enforcement coordination functions to ensure swift consequences, and credible support options for participants, are drawn from these findings as well as feedback from the expert advisory group convened to support the development of this guidance.</p>
<p><b>Is this recommendation feasible to deliver?</b></p>	<p>We believe that ensuring the recommended resources and partnership buy-in is feasible but requires a significant upfront investment of time. The recommendation suggests allocating at least six to 12 months for planning in order to provide sufficient time for organisations to secure partner buy-in, staff and analytical capacity and to resolve data-sharing hurdles. Securing multiagency buy-in to the programme is achievable through engagement strategies that are outlined in this recommendation. This recommendation provides examples of engagement used in UK practice,<sup>20</sup> such as providing clear briefings and role definitions to each partner and fostering open communication to align everyone on the goals of FD. Greater Manchester’s case study in the guidance report demonstrates that while obtaining full support is challenging, it is deliverable by establishing a shared goal for programmes and strong communication among partners. These pilots demonstrate that when senior leaders across the multiagency partnership are bought in to FD’s value, they can mobilise resources (e.g. dedicating officers, hiring “navigators” to support individuals and commissioning support services).</p> <p>With senior-level commitment and buy-in across multiagency partners, resource and data infrastructure can be mobilised to enable effective delivery (e.g. securing dedicated police resources, employing navigators and commissioning a breadth of support services). Securing dedicated police analysts or staff has precedent: several UK FD programmes have successfully assigned dedicated enforcement coordinators</p>

<sup>13</sup> Braga, A. A., MacDonald, J. M., Douglas, S., Wade, B., & Struhl, B. (2024). Focused deterrence, strategic management, and effective gun violence prevention. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 23(4), 919–946.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12682>

<sup>14</sup> Braga, A. A., MacDonald, J. M., Douglas, S., Wade, B., & Struhl, B. (2024). Focused deterrence, strategic management, and effective gun violence prevention. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 23(4), 919–946.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12682>

<sup>15</sup> Fox, A. M., Novak, K. J., & Yaghoub, M. B. (2015). Measuring the impact of Kansas City’s no violence alliance. *Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology University of Missouri–Kansas City*.

<sup>16</sup> Tuschick, E., Armstrong, E., Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., Lloyd, A., & Newbury–Birch, D. [in press]. A rapid systematic review of qualitative literature about focused deterrence for violence prevention with a focus on the UK

<sup>17</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D. L., & Turchan, B. (2018). Focused deterrence strategies and crime control: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 17(1), 205–250.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12682>

<sup>18</sup> Braga, A. A., MacDonald, J. M., Douglas, S., Wade, B., & Struhl, B. (2024). Focused deterrence, strategic management, and effective gun violence prevention. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 23(4), 919–946.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12682>

<sup>19</sup> Tuschick, E., Armstrong, E., Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., Lloyd, A., & Newbury–Birch, D. [in press]. A rapid systematic review of qualitative literature about focused deterrence for violence prevention with a focus on the UK

<sup>20</sup> Tuschick, E., Armstrong, E., Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., Lloyd, A., & Newbury–Birch, D. [in press]. A rapid systematic review of qualitative literature about focused deterrence for violence prevention with a focus on the UK

	<p>and police data analysts to their FD teams, leading to more timely intelligence and stronger coordination across partners.<sup>2122</sup> Establishing effective data-sharing environments can be challenging due to the complexities of obtaining data-sharing agreements. However, the guidance provides practical steps and includes a case study showing how to negotiate partnership agreements early to prevent significant delays.</p>
<p><b>Does this recommendation support the most vulnerable children and disproportionately affected groups?</b></p>	<p>The guidance warns that without careful design, FD could exacerbate existing racial disparities and disproportionately affect children and young people from Black, Asian and other minority ethnic communities. Proper resourcing and multiagency buy-in provide a solid foundation for an equitable FD programme. Adequate preparation time, which includes workforce development and training on race equity, is essential for creating a racially equitable approach. The guidance stresses the importance of identifying knowledge gaps relating to anti-racist and racially equitable practice and providing evidence-based training to address these gaps. This ensures FD teams are culturally competent, better equipped to address bias and able to engage effectively with children and young people involved in violence.</p> <p>The guidance also recommends recruiting a team that is representative of the population being served. This includes hiring navigators who have lived experience of violence and come from the same communities as the individuals in the programme, which will help to build trust between delivery staff and programme participants, leading to increased engagement with the programme.<sup>2324</sup></p> <p>Securing buy-in from all partners, including the community, is critical to ensuring that community voices are embedded from the outset. This inclusion can help prevent unintended harm to vulnerable groups and ensure the programme aligns with community needs. Community leaders, especially those from Black, Asian and other minority ethnic communities, can act as advocates and provide scrutiny over programme elements that could disproportionately harm their communities. The guidance provides specific steps for overcoming barriers to community engagement to ensure that communities are actively involved in programme design and delivery. This includes addressing mistrust between communities and statutory services, which is often rooted in previous experiences with short-term, temporary programmes that failed to address long-term needs, leaving communities feeling that their concerns were not adequately addressed. This mistrust, coupled with experiences of racism and oppression from statutory services, can make communities hesitant to engage.</p> <p>The guidance highlights the need to establish sufficient analytical capacity with race equity expertise. This will enable FD teams to monitor outcomes by different racial and ethnic groups; identify disparities in identification, implementation and outcomes; and adjust practices accordingly.</p>

<sup>21</sup> Simanovic, T., Brennan, I., Holmes, E., Larigkou, I., Powrie, M., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., & Graham, W. (2024). *Another chance fund focused deterrence programme: a multicentred randomised controlled trial interim report* [unpublished report].

<sup>22</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>23</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>24</sup> Simanovic, T., Brennan, I., Holmes, E., Larigkou, I., Powrie, M., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., & Graham, W. (2024). *Another chance fund focused deterrence programme: a multicentred randomised controlled trial interim report* [Unpublished report].

<b>Recommendation 3</b>	<b>Establish a multiagency working group that coordinates between the police, community and support services.</b>
<b>What is the evidence warrant for this recommendation?</b>	<p><b>The multiagency working group is a key operational component of FD.<sup>25</sup> This dedicated group of senior representatives provides the necessary infrastructure to manage this complex, multifaceted intervention.</b> The working group relies on strong partnerships to facilitate effective coordination and collaboration across agencies to deliver a unified response to serious violence. Implementation findings highlight that this requires trust, shared accountability and the capacity to work together toward a common goal.<sup>26</sup> Braga and colleagues (2024)<sup>27</sup> found that FD programmes in Baltimore, Minneapolis and San Francisco “unravelling rapidly” due to political conflicts and a lack of a multiagency partnership. International evidence emphasises that the working group should be made up of senior representatives from key agencies, such as police, youth justice, health, education and community, who have decision-making authority and can mobilise resources, allocate budgets, manage staffing and address operational challenges.<sup>28,29</sup></p> <p>Research suggests integrating the multiagency working group into appropriate governance structures to sustain the FD programme.<sup>30</sup> This ensures comprehensive oversight, scrutiny and accountability at multiple leadership levels, enabling the programme to run smoothly and remain aligned with its objectives, even when key members transition to different roles. In the UK, Leicestershire embedded FD within the existing Strategic Partnership Board of the Violence Reduction Network. This integration ensures the programme benefits from systems leadership and strategic coordination for violence prevention efforts across Leicestershire and Rutland.</p> <p>Including community representatives in the FD working group strengthens the programme’s legitimacy and responsiveness to local needs. Tuschick and Colleagues (in press)<sup>31</sup> found that involving the community in decision-making helps overcome initial distrust and ensures the programme aligns with local priorities. The evaluation of London’s Shield pilot showed that community members in oversight roles helped transform early opposition into ongoing engagement.<sup>32</sup> Also, in Leicestershire, a community oversight group was embedded within the governance structure to ensure the programme remained accountable to the needs of the community.</p>
<b>Is this recommendation feasible to deliver?</b>	Setting up a multiagency working group is highly feasible. Many areas already have multiagency partnerships within VRUs or Community Safety Partnerships into which FD can be integrated, as demonstrated in the YEF-HO trial. In the US, FD programmes engaged agencies within existing

<sup>25</sup> Braga, A. A., MacDonald, J. M., Douglas, S., Wade, B., & Struhl, B. (2024). Focused deterrence, strategic management, and effective gun violence prevention. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 23(4), 919–946.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12682>

<sup>26</sup> Braga, A. A., MacDonald, J. M., Douglas, S., Wade, B., & Struhl, B. (2024). Focused deterrence, strategic management, and effective gun violence prevention. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 23(4), 919–946.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12682>

<sup>27</sup> Braga, A. A., MacDonald, J. M., Douglas, S., Wade, B., & Struhl, B. (2024). Focused deterrence, strategic management, and effective gun violence prevention. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 23(4), 919–946.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12682>

<sup>28</sup> Tuschick, E., Armstrong, E., Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., Lloyd, A., & Newbury-Birch, D. [in press]. A rapid systematic review of qualitative literature about focused deterrence for violence prevention with a focus on the UK.

<sup>29</sup> Moore, M. (2002). *Recognizing Value in Policing*. Police Executive Research Forum.

<sup>30</sup> Braga, A. A., MacDonald, J. M., Douglas, S., Wade, B., & Struhl, B. (2024). Focused deterrence, strategic management, and effective gun violence prevention. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 23(4), 919–946.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12682>

<sup>31</sup> Tuschick, E., Armstrong, E., Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., Lloyd, A., & Newbury-Birch, D. [in press]. A rapid systematic review of qualitative literature about focused deterrence for violence prevention with a focus on the UK.

<sup>32</sup> Davies, T., Grossmith, L., & Dawson, P. (2016). *Group violence intervention London: an evaluation of the shield pilot*. MOPAC. Retrieved from [https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gvi\\_london\\_evaluation270117.pdf](https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gvi_london_evaluation270117.pdf)

	<p>violence prevention networks by showing how their shared goal of addressing serious gang violence could be strengthened and amplified through collaboration.<sup>33</sup> This approach was key to the early success of Greater Manchester’s efforts to secure partnership buy-in.</p> <p>Ensuring multiple levels of accountability has been shown to be feasible in the UK. In Leicestershire, FD was integrated into an existing Strategic Partnership Board within the Violence Reduction Network, making FD part of the broader multiagency violence prevention strategy. Using existing frameworks improves the feasibility of embedding governance structures.</p> <p>Ensuring effective partnership working within the working group is feasible but may be challenging. It can be achieved through strong leadership, clear communication and role definition. Convening the group well before delivery begins allows time to define responsibilities, clarify roles and document agreements in operating manuals. The guidance offers strategies to ensure effective partnership working, as well as ways to secure buy-in from key partners.</p> <p>Another challenge is ensuring meaningful community representation. This can be achieved by actively engaging community representatives in decision-making about the project’s delivery and adapting the project based on community feedback. Leicestershire’s use of an existing community oversight group within its governance structure demonstrates this approach. Similarly, London’s pilot initially struggled with community buy-in, but by formally involving community members in governance, they built enough trust to move the programme forward.<sup>34</sup></p>
<p><b>Does this recommendation support the most vulnerable children and disproportionately affected groups?</b></p>	<p>This recommendation supports the most vulnerable children and disproportionately affected groups by establishing a multiagency working group that explicitly includes community representatives. It suggests that the working group should consider race equity from the outset, reflect the demographics of the relevant communities and develop a race equity plan with potential input from race equity experts.</p> <p>The recommendation also highlights the need for the working group to conduct an equality impact assessment to identify potential harms that the programme could cause to Black, Asian and other minority ethnic communities. These safeguards help address disproportionate impacts and ensure fair access to the support on offer.</p> <p>By embedding a diverse working group with meaningful community representation, this recommendation helps ensure that the perspectives of communities most affected by violence are incorporated into decision-making processes, supporting an equitable and culturally competent programme design.</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 4</b></p>	<p><b>Use high-quality data and intelligence to identify the right people to focus on.</b></p>
<p><b>What is the evidence warrant for this recommendation?</b></p>	<p>The YEF’s <i>Key Facts About Violence</i> report highlights that a small number of individuals are responsible for a disproportionate amount of violent crime. For example, in one study, 1% of the total population accounted for 63% of all convictions for violence. Amongst those who commit any</p>

<sup>33</sup> Braga, A., Turchan, B., & Winship, C. (2019). Partnership, accountability, and innovation: clarifying Boston’s experience with pulling levers. In D. Weisburd and A. Braga, eds., *Police innovation: contrasting perspectives*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, pp. 227–250.

<sup>34</sup> Davies, T., Grossmith, L., & Dawson, P. (2016). *Group violence intervention London: an evaluation of the shield pilot*. MOPAC. Retrieved from [https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gvi\\_london\\_evaluation270117.pdf](https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gvi_london_evaluation270117.pdf)

crime, offending is further concentrated within a smaller group of people who have committed many offences. A large amount of the violence that happens is carried out by a subset of people who commit many offences.<sup>35</sup>

FD is built on this principle and must, therefore, concentrate on those actively involved in serious violence, requiring precise identification processes underpinned by high-quality, multiagency data.<sup>36</sup> This approach is supported by a systematic review of FD interventions, which found an average 33% reduction in violent crime when programmes used robust data and analysis to target individuals driving serious violence.<sup>37</sup>

The use of multiagency data, for example, from police, social care, youth justice, education, probation, health and community networks, to develop a more complete understanding of the local drivers of serious violence is consistent with international evidence. Research by Braga and Colleagues (2019)<sup>38</sup> and Papachristos and Kirk (2015)<sup>39</sup> highlights that multiagency data and social network analysis improve the precision of identifying which individuals and which groups are driving violence, in as close to “real time” as possible. Tools such as social network analysis and group audits, which were applied in both US and UK contexts, are highlighted as practical methods for identifying relevant individuals and group dynamics.<sup>40</sup>

The eligibility criteria for selecting individuals for the programme, as set out in the guidance, are drawn from a rapid evidence review and primary research on UK implementation.<sup>41</sup> These criteria summarise how programmes across England have developed eligibility thresholds to ensure the right individuals are selected for FD. Findings from the UK highlight the need for a multiagency review process to ensure informed decisions are made on which individuals should be included.<sup>42</sup> The London Gangs Matrix example in this recommendation illustrates the risks of neglecting such criteria and processes: relying solely on police intelligence without transparent, evidence-based thresholds led to the disproportionate inclusion of young Black men on the basis of weak associations rather than proven involvement in serious violence.<sup>43</sup>

Actions to keep data relevant, accurate and reliable are drawn from the rapid evidence review of FD implementation in the UK, highlighting the need for continuous real-time data collection, multiagency verification and routine audits to maintain quality.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>35</sup> Youth Endowment Fund. (2024). *Key facts about violence*. Retrieved from [https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/YEF\\_KeyFactsAboutViolence\\_6.pdf](https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/YEF_KeyFactsAboutViolence_6.pdf)

<sup>36</sup> Braga, A. A., & Weisburd D. L. (2012). The effects of focused deterrence strategies on crime: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 49(3), 323–358.

<sup>37</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies' effects on crime: a systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1051>

<sup>38</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies' effects on crime: a systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1051>

<sup>39</sup> Papachristos, A. V., & Kirk, D. S. (2015). *Changing the street dynamic: evaluating Chicago's Group Violence Reduction Strategy*. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 14(3), 525–558. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12139>

<sup>40</sup> Braga, A. A., & Kennedy, D. M. (2021) *A framework for addressing violence and serious crime: focused deterrence, legitimacy, and prevention*. Cambridge University Press

<sup>41</sup> Simanovic, T., Brennan, I., Larigkou, I., Powrie, M., Holmes, E., Newbury-Birch, D., & Tuschick, E. [n press]. A rapid review of UK qualitative literature and primary data collection and analysis about focused deterrence for violence prevention.

<sup>42</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>43</sup> Densley, J. A., & Pyrooz, D. C. (2020). The matrix in context: taking stock of police gang databases in London and beyond. *Youth Justice*, 20(1–2), 11–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473225419870801>; Amnesty International. (2018). *Trapped in the matrix: secrecy, stigma, and bias in the Met's gangs database* [report].

<sup>44</sup> Tuschick, E., Armstrong, E., Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., Lloyd, A., & Newbury-Birch, D. [in press]. A rapid systematic review of qualitative literature about focused deterrence for violence prevention with a focus on the UK.

<p><b>Is this recommendation feasible to deliver?</b></p>	<p>Developing robust, high-quality multiagency data processes is feasible, although it requires dedicated resources, the negotiation of data-sharing agreements and buy-in from all senior leaders within the multiagency partnership.</p> <p>Evidence from UK implementation<sup>45</sup> demonstrates that multiagency data arrangements can be successfully established in FD, provided there is early agreement on protocols for sharing information about identified and named individuals. While this can be challenging, the guidance offers insights through a UK case study on data-sharing barriers and practical steps to address them. The Serious Violence Duty<sup>46</sup> can also support feasibility through its statutory framework, which requires partner agencies to share data to tackle serious violence, providing a strong legal basis for information-sharing.</p> <p>The guidance further highlights the need for investment in analytical capacity, including dedicated analysts who can conduct real-time violence monitoring, have access to police data and are skilled in working with both quantitative and qualitative data. Securing this capacity as well as access to police data may be challenging, particularly for partnerships led by both statutory and voluntary sector organisations, but can be supported by prioritising strong relationships with police partners and involving them directly in programme delivery.<sup>47</sup></p> <p>The early implementation report highlights that multiagency review meetings to discuss individuals eligible for FD are feasible in practice, with many areas holding them on a weekly or biweekly basis.<sup>48</sup></p> <p>The guidance also points to the <i>FD Data and Intelligence Implementation Tool</i>, which provides a step-by-step guide to help areas understand this critical aspect of FD delivery. This tool offers practical advice on developing robust, equitable and transparent data processes, from preparation through to monitoring. By supporting practitioners with clear actions and examples, it makes establishing high-quality multiagency data arrangements more feasible in practice.</p>
<p><b>Does this recommendation support the most vulnerable children and disproportionately affected groups?</b></p>	<p>This recommendation clearly shows that robust multiagency data processes are critical for ensuring race equity and preventing racial disproportionality because police data can contain racial biases due to factors such as racial profiling, which may unfairly identify individuals from Black, Asian and other minority ethnic communities for the programme.<sup>49</sup> Without careful checks, these biases can be amplified during programme selection and create a risk of net-widening, where individuals with only weak or peripheral involvement in serious violence are included unnecessarily, subjecting them to additional police involvement. The London Gangs Matrix is presented as a cautionary example of</p>

<sup>45</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>46</sup> Home Office. (2022). *Serious Violence Duty*. GOV.UK. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/serious-violence-duty>

<sup>47</sup> Simanovic, T., Brennan, I., Holmes, E., Larigkou, I., Powrie, M., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., & Graham, W. (2024). *Another Chance Fund focused deterrence programme: a multicentred randomised controlled trial interim report* [unpublished report].

<sup>48</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>49</sup> Amnesty International. (2018). *Trapped in the matrix: secrecy, stigma, and bias in the Met's gangs database* [report].

	<p>this, where young Black men were disproportionately included on the basis of weak or peripheral associations without robust evidence of their direct involvement in serious violence.<sup>50</sup></p> <p>To mitigate the above risks, this recommendation encourages the use of multiagency data drawn from youth justice, social care, education and health to enable a more comprehensive understanding of individuals' involvement in crime and violence, their background and their circumstances, including vulnerabilities and individual needs. Furthermore, involving community perspectives in the design and validation of eligibility criteria can further strengthen equity by introducing critical checks against cultural or contextual blind spots that statutory organisations might overlook.</p> <p>The report also advises conducting an equality impact assessment on data analysis processes to assess how these processes may affect individuals from different groups (e.g. age, gender, race) and to ensure that these processes do not unfairly discriminate against any group. The report encourages organisations to assess data sources for potential biases and to actively monitor emerging disproportionalities.</p> <p>The multiagency review for selecting individuals for FD supports race equity by bringing together diverse professionals to critically examine police data and challenge any assumptions about the individuals identified before they are confirmed as being eligible for the programme. This approach helps to ensure that decisions are based on multiple sources of information and not driven by biased interpretations. The <i>FD Race Equity Implementation Resource</i> aims to support areas in developing data processes that are fair and transparent, helping them identify individuals for FD without reinforcing racial disproportionality and providing practical steps to monitor and address any emerging biases.</p>
--	---

<b>Recommendation 5</b>	<b>Involve families, residents, leaders and organisations from the local community in programme development and delivery.</b>
<b>What is the evidence warrant for this recommendation?</b>	<p>Community engagement is a core component of the FD strategy, alongside deterrence and support.<sup>51</sup> International evidence highlights that involving communities increases a programme's credibility and legitimacy,<sup>52</sup> even though existing studies typically measure the combined effects of all three elements, making it difficult to isolate the specific contribution of community engagement alone.</p> <p>In the US, community engagement has often involved creating opportunities for neighbourhood associations, youth organisations and faith leaders to communicate their experiences of violence, share moral norms and reinforce anti-violence messages.<sup>53</sup> These efforts aim to mobilise informal social control, increase engagement with the programme, build relationships between the community and the police, and enhance police legitimacy.<sup>54</sup> However, adapting this strategy to UK contexts requires careful consideration, as the influence of community members,</p>

<sup>50</sup> Densley, J. A., & Pyrooz, D. C. (2020). The matrix in context: taking stock of police gang databases in London and beyond. *Youth Justice*, 20(1-2), 11-30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473225419870801>; Amnesty International. (2018). *Trapped in the matrix: secrecy, stigma, and bias in the Met's gangs database* [report].

<sup>51</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies' effects on crime: a systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1051>

<sup>52</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies' effects on crime: a systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1051>

<sup>53</sup> Braga, A. A., & Kennedy, D. M. (2021) *A framework for addressing violence and serious crime: focused deterrence, legitimacy, and prevention*. Cambridge University Press;

<sup>54</sup> Braga, A. A., & Kennedy, D. M. (2021) *A framework for addressing violence and serious crime: focused deterrence, legitimacy, and prevention*. Cambridge University Press;

	<p>their relationships with individuals involved in violence and their willingness to endorse police-led interventions can vary widely between areas.<sup>55</sup></p> <p>Early UK implementation shows promising adaptations of this approach. In Leicestershire, for example, navigators employed from the community have acted as credible messengers, sharing their own experiences of violence and the criminal justice system, conveying perspectives on violence and linking participants to local activities.<sup>56</sup> Greater Manchester has used community surveys to gather residents' views of the programme and to shape local implementation. Similarly, findings from the London Shield pilot and other UK sites show that involving trusted community members in governance and oversight roles can transform initial opposition into sustained engagement and support for FD.<sup>5758</sup></p> <p>Community engagement is especially important given the persistent tensions between some communities and statutory services, which are often rooted in negative experiences of repeated short-term interventions that have failed to address longer-term needs.<sup>59</sup> These concerns are particularly relevant among migrant and culturally diverse communities, who have reported longstanding mistrust linked to experiences of poverty and social exclusion.<sup>60</sup> UK-based research suggests embedding community engagement throughout programme design and delivery to build trust, identify local strengths and co-produce culturally relevant responses.<sup>61</sup> Expert advisors recommended careful consideration of which community figures are engaged and who holds meaningful influence over participants to ensure cultural fit and legitimacy.</p> <p>Overall, embedding families, residents, community leaders and grassroots organisations in programme design, delivery and oversight aligns with FD theory, promising UK practice and the advice of the expert advisory group.</p>
<p><b>Is this recommendation feasible to deliver?</b></p>	<p>We believe this recommendation is feasible because although community involvement was still developing at the time of the early implementation report,<sup>62</sup> the findings showed that community engagement was being incorporated, for example, through navigators and trusted local organisations, who build relationships with participants and reinforce anti-violence messages. Updated reports showed further</p>

<sup>55</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>56</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>57</sup> Davies, T., Grossmith, L., & Dawson, P. (2016). *Group violence intervention London: an evaluation of the shield pilot*. MOPAC. Retrieved from [https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gvi\\_london\\_evaluation270117.pdf](https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gvi_london_evaluation270117.pdf)

<sup>58</sup> Tuschick, E., Armstrong, E., Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., Lloyd, A., & Newbury-Birch, D. [in press]. A rapid systematic review of qualitative literature about focused deterrence for violence prevention with a focus on the UK.

<sup>59</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>60</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>61</sup> Tuschick, E., Armstrong, E., Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., Lloyd, A., & Newbury-Birch, D. [in press]. A rapid systematic review of qualitative literature about focused deterrence for violence prevention with a focus on the UK.

<sup>62</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

development across the trial sites; for example, the Leicestershire programme began using libraries and community centres as safe spaces for programme activities to help strengthen individuals' community ties.

The London Shield pilot evaluation similarly demonstrated that involving community representatives in governance roles can help shift initial opposition, which had previously derailed the programme, into constructive engagement.<sup>63</sup> Qualitative research indicates that UK programmes can effectively adapt community involvement through culturally competent and locally relevant structures while retaining fidelity to FD.<sup>64</sup> The guidance draws on examples from this review and wider UK evaluations to outline practical ways to overcome challenges, such as negative past experiences of statutory services or distrust of police-led programmes, when adapting community influence to the UK context.

Although historical mistrust, particularly among Black, Asian and other minority ethnic communities, presents challenges, the international evidence suggests that with community involvement in governance structures combined with meaningful engagement prior to launching the programme, local areas can draw on existing networks of credible community leaders and organisations to build legitimacy and deliver this element of FD effectively.<sup>656667</sup>

The *Race Equity Implementation Resource* that accompanies the Guidance Report supports engaging Black, Asian and other minority ethnic communities by setting out practical steps to embed race equity from the outset, including by involving community members in planning, delivery and governance; working in partnership with community-led organisations; valuing lived experience of crime and violence; and ensuring meaningful influence over decision-making to build trust and culturally relevant responses.

---

<sup>63</sup> Davies, T., Grossmith, L., & Dawson, P. (2016). *Group violence intervention London: an evaluation of the shield pilot*. MOPAC. Retrieved from [https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gvi\\_london\\_evaluation270117.pdf](https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gvi_london_evaluation270117.pdf)

<sup>64</sup> Tuschick, E., Armstrong, E., Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., Lloyd, A., & Newbury-Birch, D. [in press]. A rapid systematic review of qualitative literature about focused deterrence for violence prevention with a focus on the UK.

<sup>65</sup> Braga, A. A., MacDonald, J. M., Douglas, S., Wade, B., & Struhl, B. (2024). Focused deterrence, strategic management, and effective gun violence prevention. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 23(4), 919–946. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12682>

<sup>66</sup> Tuschick, E., Armstrong, E., Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., Lloyd, A., & Newbury-Birch, D. [in press]. A rapid systematic review of qualitative literature about focused deterrence for violence prevention with a focus on the UK.

<sup>67</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies' effects on crime: a systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1051>

<p><b>Does this recommendation support the most vulnerable children and disproportionately affected groups?</b></p>	<p>The recommendation recognises that Black, Asian and other ethnic minority communities are often overrepresented among those affected by serious violence and may have experienced prior racism and discrimination from statutory services. It, therefore, underlines the importance of embedding robust equity considerations when engaging with these communities.</p> <p>This recommendation sets out actions for using community engagement to address race equity risks, ensuring that key historical factors – such as experiences of over-policing and abuses of power – are considered and addressed. It describes ways to amplify diverse community voices, support culturally relevant opportunities for participants to strengthen community ties and promote shared ownership of programme delivery. Involving local community figures, grassroots organisations and people with lived experience in programme design, delivery and governance can help ensure that FD is equitable, proportionate and sensitive to cultural contexts and power imbalances.</p> <p>Feedback from the expert advisory group for this guidance reinforced the need to proactively identify which community members hold influence and legitimacy with participants – including those from Black, Asian and other minority ethnic communities – to ensure credible messaging about the programme. This recommendation also highlights how utilising navigators with lived experience of violence, who are representative of participants’ communities, can strengthen engagement with the support offer.</p> <p>The <i>Race Equity Implementation Resource</i> supports this by emphasising that involving community representatives, particularly those with lived experience of violence who are from Black, Asian and other minority ethnic communities, is essential to identify and challenge racial bias, promote fairness and ensure the programme is culturally relevant and legitimate.</p>
---	---

<p><b>Recommendation 6</b></p>	<p><b>Communicate clearly and frequently with individuals about the programme, the support on offer and the consequences for continued violence and re-offending.</b></p>
<p><b>What is the evidence warrant for this recommendation?</b></p>	<p>This recommendation is based on deterrence theory, which highlights that <i>certainty</i> of enforcement is a critical factor in changing the behaviour of those directly involved in violence.<sup>68,69</sup> It is further based on research from UK and international studies showing that clear, credible and repeated communication is essential to increase the perceived certainty of consequences.<sup>70,71</sup> This body of evidence makes it clear that individuals must fully understand why they have been identified, what consequences will follow continued violence and offending, and what support is available to help them desist to increase the legitimacy and perceived fairness of the programme.</p>

<sup>68</sup> Nagin, D. S. (2013). Deterrence in the twenty-first century. *Crime and Justice*, 42(1), 199–263. <https://doi.org/10.1086/670398>

<sup>69</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D. L., & Turchan, B. (2018). Focused deterrence strategies and crime control: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 17(1), 205–250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12682>

<sup>70</sup> Braga, A.A., Kennedy, D.M., Waring E.J., & Piehl, A.M. (2001). Problem-oriented policing, deterrence, and youth violence: an evaluation of Boston’s Operation Ceasefire. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 38(3), 195–225. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0022427801038003001>

<sup>71</sup> Tillyer, M. S., Engel, R. S., & Lovins, B. (2010). Beyond Boston. *Crime & Delinquency*, 58(6), 973–997. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128710382343>

The recommendation highlights one-to-one meetings, written letters and call-in sessions as communication methods based on research from previous FD programmes.<sup>727374</sup> The use of call-ins, where the most influential people within crime networks receive messages about the programme, is underpinned by deterrence theory and research, which highlight the potential for social networks to spread messages about available support and the consequences of violence.<sup>7576</sup> However, UK experience has shown challenges with call-ins, including a lack of legal mechanisms to compel attendance, difficulties in finding neutral venues for rival groups and messages becoming overly enforcement-focused.<sup>77</sup> Based on research on UK implementation, the guidance recommends adapting communication strategies to local contexts, for example, by using smaller, more localised meetings or involving trusted community organisations to encourage voluntary attendance.<sup>7879</sup> It also identifies other methods that have shown greater promise in UK settings, such as direct outreach by navigators and face-to-face meetings in neutral spaces or individuals' homes.<sup>80</sup> In these roles, navigators can act as credible messengers, reinforcing deterrence messages while also communicating the community's perspectives on violence.

In addition, research suggests that messages should be carefully tailored for Black, Asian and other minority ethnic communities, where past experiences of discrimination, institutional racism and harmful stereotypes may heighten feelings of stigmatisation – especially if communications from authorities are seen as confrontational.<sup>81</sup> For instance, in one FD programme, early messaging required greater sensitivity due to local concerns about policing practices, and opposition emerged when this was not adequately considered.<sup>82</sup>

Recommended actions based on research include co-developing communications with trusted local organisations, employing diverse navigators, addressing language barriers and creating opportunities for feedback to overcome these challenges.<sup>83</sup> The guidance also advises careful planning about where and by whom first contact is made. It describes how *reachable moments*, such as during custody or a hospital admission, can be used for initial or repeat contact.<sup>84</sup> The choice of communicator also matters: emerging evidence suggests that navigators

<sup>72</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>73</sup> Rowe, M., & Sogaard, T. F. (2019). 'Playing the man, not the ball': targeting organised criminals, intelligence and the problems with pulling levers. *Policing and Society*, 30(2), 120–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2019.1603226>

<sup>74</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D. L., & Turchan, B. (2018). Focused deterrence strategies and crime control: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 17(1), 205–250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12682>

<sup>75</sup> Reichert, J., Smith, V., Adams, S., Hill, L., & Escamilla, J. (2018). *Focused deterrence: a policing strategy to combat gun violence*. Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.

<sup>76</sup> Ariel, B., Englefield, A., & Denley, J. (2019). 'I heard it through the grapevine': a randomized controlled trial on the direct and vicarious effects of preventative specific deterrence initiatives in criminal networks. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 109(4), 819–856. <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc/vol109/iss4/3>

<sup>77</sup> Davies, T., Grossmith, L., & Dawson, P. (2016). *Group violence intervention London: an evaluation of the shield pilot*. MOPAC. Retrieved from [https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gvi\\_london\\_evaluation270117.pdf](https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gvi_london_evaluation270117.pdf)

<sup>78</sup> Davies, T., Grossmith, L., & Dawson, P. (2016). *Group violence intervention London: An evaluation of the shield pilot*. MOPAC. Retrieved from [https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gvi\\_london\\_evaluation270117.pdf](https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gvi_london_evaluation270117.pdf)

<sup>79</sup> Tuschick, E., Armstrong, E., Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., Lloyd, A., & Newbury-Birch, D. [in press]. A rapid systematic review of qualitative literature about focused deterrence for violence prevention with a focus on the UK.

<sup>80</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>81</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>82</sup> Davies, T., Grossmith, L., & Dawson, P. (2016). *Group violence intervention London: an evaluation of the shield pilot*. MOPAC. Retrieved from [https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gvi\\_london\\_evaluation270117.pdf](https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gvi_london_evaluation270117.pdf)

<sup>83</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>84</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

	<p>with lived experience or strong community links can build trust more effectively than police-based navigators, who may face initial trust barriers. To address challenges evidenced in the UK context, the guidance also recommends an option of a two-role approach, where statutory workers deliver deterrence messages while navigators focus on supportive relationships, helping to maintain trust with participants and clarity regarding their role.<sup>85</sup></p>
<p><b>Is this recommendation feasible to deliver?</b></p>	<p><b>We believe this recommendation is feasible because clear and frequent communication has already been implemented in UK FD practice.</b></p> <p>The early implementation report of the YEF-HO trial of FD demonstrates that navigators and statutory partners have effectively used one-to-one meetings to explain why individuals have been identified, what support is available and what consequences will follow any further involvement in violence.<sup>86</sup> The report highlights that this method may be more effective in building rapport and understanding and increasing the likelihood of engagement.</p> <p>The recommendation proposes multiple methods of communication: call-in sessions as well as other methods that have been used more successfully in UK implementation, such as written letters and one-to-one meetings. Although call-ins in the UK have faced challenges, the recommendation sets out some practical mitigations that have been used in previous UK FD programmes. The recommendation also points to publications that discuss the use of call-ins in more detail and within the UK context.<sup>87</sup></p> <p>Tailoring communication for Black, Asian and other ethnic minority communities is also achievable. The guidance advises working with trusted community partners to design communication materials, using navigators who reflect participants' backgrounds, addressing language barriers and creating opportunities for feedback. These approaches are consistent with existing community engagement practice within the UK.<sup>88</sup></p> <p>One challenge noted in the US literature comes from the Rochester Ceasefire FD programme, which was negatively affected by poor interagency communication, leading to limited enforcement actions and an inadequate delivery of deterrence messages to targeted groups.<sup>89</sup> A similar challenge identified in the UK is that navigators, particularly those with lived experience, may struggle to deliver deterrence messages while also providing a supportive role, as they are concerned that it would risk damaging built-up trust. Findings from the early implementation evaluation describe that some sites moved towards a two-role model to address this, where statutory workers (e.g. police or probation) focus</p>

<sup>85</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>86</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>87</sup> O'Donnell, M., & Aviles, L. (2017). *Group violence intervention: a guide for project managers*. Bureau of Justice Assistance; Graham, W. (2022). From Cincinnati to Glasgow: a case study of international policy transfer of a violence reduction program. In D. Weisburd, ed., *Translational criminology in policing*. Routledge, p. 18.

<sup>88</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>89</sup> Delaney, C. (2006). *The effects of focused deterrence on gang homicide: an evaluation of Rochester's Ceasefire program* [master's thesis]. Rochester Institute of Technology.

	<p>on deterrence messaging, while navigators or mentors concentrate on building supportive relationships. This separation of roles was seen as a promising adaptation that may maintain trust with participants while ensuring the clarity and credibility of the deterrence element of FD.<sup>9091</sup></p> <p>Peer influence can be adapted from traditional US FD delivery, which delivers credible messages through influential individuals within group networks, to instead using peers or community members with lived experience to increase the credibility and impact of messages in the UK context.<sup>92</sup></p>
<p><b>Does this recommendation support the most vulnerable children and disproportionately affected groups?</b></p>	<p><b>This recommendation provides actions to help address the risk of exacerbating previous experiences of institutional racism, targeted discrimination and harmful stereotypes.</b> It suggests involving trusted local community organisations in the design and delivery of communication strategies, employing navigators whose backgrounds reflect the diversity of the community, addressing potential language barriers and embedding opportunities for ongoing feedback from participants. These actions aim to ensure that messages about support and consequences are clear, proportionate and culturally appropriate. In addition, the guidance highlights the importance of carefully selecting who should deliver messages about the programme, including considering utilising individuals with shared or lived experiences of violence and strong connections to participants' communities.</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 7</b></p>	<p><b>Prepare immediate, certain and proportionate consequences, which are coordinated by the police, for continued violence and re-offending.</b></p>
<p><b>What is the evidence warrant for this recommendation?</b></p>	<p><b>This recommendation is based on systematic reviews that highlight that the certainty of enforcement is a critical factor in changing the behaviour of those directly involved in violence.</b><sup>9394</sup> Clear, credible and repeated communication is essential to increase the perceived certainty of consequences and must be followed up swiftly to ensure the credibility of the programme.<sup>9596</sup></p> <p>Braga and Colleagues (2019)<sup>97</sup> noted that successful FD programmes had well-coordinated enforcement actions that were seen as fair and certain by participants. Conversely, programmes that fail to follow through on consequences may have less impact.</p>

<sup>90</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>91</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>92</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>93</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D. L., & Turchan, B. (2018). Focused deterrence strategies and crime control: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 17(1), 205–250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12682>

<sup>94</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies' effects on crime: a systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1051>

<sup>95</sup> Braga, A. A., Kennedy, D. M., Waring E. J., & Piehl, A. M. (2001). Problem-oriented policing, deterrence, and youth violence: an evaluation of Boston's Operation Ceasefire. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 38(3), 195–225. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0022427801038003001>

<sup>96</sup> Tillyer, M. S., Engel, R. S., & Lovins, B. (2010). Beyond Boston. *Crime & Delinquency*, 58(6), 973–997. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001128710382343>

<sup>97</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies' effects on crime: a systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1051>

International implementation findings highlight the importance of securing police commitment, resources and buy-in to the programme to ensure the swift and certain delivery of consequences.<sup>9899</sup> Early implementation findings from the UK show that this has been supported through establishing a dedicated police role to coordinate the deterrence strategy.<sup>100</sup>

The early implementation report of the UK FD trial<sup>101</sup> highlights that combining deterrence with support can be challenging in practice. In the UK, tensions emerged between those delivering deterrence and those delivering support, who often held different perspectives on how best to engage individuals. As mentioned in Recommendation 6, some FD programmes reported that delivery staff were hesitant or resistant to delivering a clear deterrence message, perceiving it as conflicting with their supportive role, which contributed to inconsistent delivery of the deterrence element. Separately, the early implementation report found that inconsistent information-sharing meant support staff were sometimes unaware of deterrence activities taking place, creating confusion and risking damage to trust with participants.<sup>102</sup> These findings suggest that a clear process and communication plan are needed to ensure support and deterrence work in tandem without undermining each other.

The recommendation provides examples of appropriate consequences for violence, drawing on measures available within the UK context and supported by UK-based implementation evidence.<sup>103104</sup> Systematic reviews also highlight that consequences in FD do not need to rely solely on legal sanctions, as legal enforcement alone can have a limited impact on deterring continued involvement in crime and violence.<sup>105106</sup> FD programmes can also draw on wider partnership resources to deliver consequences, including tenancy enforcement, civil measures coordinated through housing services or actions taken in collaboration with the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency.

Consequences within FD must be fair, transparent and tailored to individual circumstances to uphold safeguarding duties, protect children's rights and maintain trust in the programme. Research shows that consequences perceived as overly harsh, arbitrary or unfair can undermine

<sup>98</sup> Braga, A. A., & Kennedy, D. M. (2021) *A framework for addressing violence and serious crime: focused deterrence, legitimacy, and prevention*. Cambridge University Press

<sup>99</sup> Tuschick, E., Armstrong, E., Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., Lloyd, A., & Newbury-Birch, D. [in press]. A rapid systematic review of qualitative literature about focused deterrence for violence prevention with a focus on the UK.

<sup>100</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund.

Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>101</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund.

Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>102</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund.

Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>103</sup> Tuschick, E., Armstrong, E., Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., Lloyd, A., & Newbury-Birch, D. [in press]. A rapid systematic review of qualitative literature about focused deterrence for violence prevention with a focus on the UK.

<sup>104</sup> Simanovic, T., Brennan, I., Holmes, E., Larigkou, I., Powrie, M., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., & Graham, W. (2024). *Another Chance Fund focused deterrence programme: a multicentred randomised controlled trial interim report* [unpublished report].

<sup>105</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D. L., & Turchan, B. (2018). Focused deterrence strategies and crime control: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 17(1), 205–250.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12682>

<sup>106</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D. L., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies' effects on crime: a systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1051>

	<p>programme credibility and reduce engagement with available support.<sup>107</sup><sup>108</sup> Enforcement involving children and young people should take account of their welfare, proportionality and best interests and should not expose them to further harm or unnecessary criminalisation. These expectations align with the wider principles of FD, which aim to improve perceptions of police legitimacy and procedural justice within the community.<sup>109</sup> These principles are reflected in UK youth justice and safeguarding practice standards, which emphasise consistent, proportionate and procedurally fair responses to offending. Ensuring these standards are met is critical to maintaining the legitimacy, credibility and overall effectiveness of FD. In the UK, this is being achieved through a comprehensive multiagency review, whereby any time an individual commits an offence, their case is discussed and their background and circumstances are considered before initiating deterrence activities.<sup>110</sup></p>
<p><b>Is this recommendation feasible to deliver?</b></p>	<p>This recommendation is feasible to deliver, provided there are dedicated police resources, strong partnership buy-in for the deterrence component and robust coordination of deterrence activities.</p> <p>In terms of deliverable consequences, this recommendation offers examples drawn from UK FD programmes to illustrate how deterrence responses can operate in local contexts. Police can also deploy tools such as Gang Injunctions or Criminal Behaviour Orders for serious offences. If the Crown Prosecution Service is engaged early, it can help to expedite prosecutions. Additionally, the recommendation encourages the use of College of Policing tactics for disrupting serious and organised crime, which police forces in England and Wales can readily adopt.<sup>111</sup></p> <p>In terms of delivering proportionate consequences, the recommendation includes a detailed case study from an FD programme to help areas consider what an enforcement model could look like in practice. Nottingham established a dedicated enforcement coordinator to monitor offences and enable rapid responses, supported by a Neighbourhood Safeguarding Disruption Panel (including police, schools, social services and navigators) to review incidents and agree on proportionate sanctions collectively.</p> <p>It should be noted that this component can present challenges in the UK context. Early implementation findings highlighted a lack of predictable and consistent enforcement pathways in the initial stages of delivery, which risked weakening the deterrence message. Over time, this improved through clearer deterrence messaging, clearer communication pathways and more structured multiagency decision-making.<sup>112</sup><sup>113</sup></p>
<p><b>Does this recommendation support the most</b></p>	<p>This recommendation has the potential to support the most vulnerable children and those disproportionately affected by violence by helping to establish robust processes for fair and proportionate deterrence activities. The Nottingham tiered enforcement model demonstrates how</p>

<sup>107</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D. L., & Turchan, B. (2018). Focused deterrence strategies and crime control: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 17(1), 205–250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12682>

<sup>108</sup> Engel, R. S., McManus, H. D., & Isaza, G. T. (2019). Moving beyond 'best practice': experiences in police reform and a call for evidence to reduce officer-involved shootings. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 683(1), 146–165. DOI:[10.1177/0002716219889328](https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716219889328)

<sup>109</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies' effects on crime: a systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1051>

<sup>110</sup> Simanovic, T., Brennan, I., Holmes, E., Larigkou, I., Powrie, M., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., & Graham, W. (2024). *Another Chance Fund focused deterrence programme: a multicentred randomised controlled trial interim report* [unpublished report].

<sup>111</sup> College of Policing. (n.d.). *Disrupting serious and organised criminals – menu of tactics*. College of Policing. Retrieved from <https://www.college.police.uk>

<sup>112</sup> Simanovic, T., Brennan, I., Holmes, E., Larigkou, I., Powrie, M., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., & Graham, W. (2024). *Another Chance Fund focused deterrence programme: a multicentred randomised controlled trial interim report* [unpublished report].

<sup>113</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<b>vulnerable children and disproportionately affected groups?</b>	<p>applying consequences through individualised assessment – taking account of factors such as age, background, engagement with support and risks of exploitation – can help avoid disproportionate or discriminatory enforcement.</p> <p>Involving multiagency decision-making panels, which include navigators who engage directly with individuals, can help ensure that consequences are culturally responsive and incorporate safeguarding considerations. The recommendation also encourages regular monitoring for racial inequities in who is referred for deterrence to prevent bias, address structural inequalities and ensure responses remain appropriate and transparent. This recommendation aims to promote safety and reduce the risk of harm by ensuring deterrence operates in tandem with accessible support.</p> <p>The guidance further directs practitioners to the <i>FD Race Equity Implementation Resource</i>, which provides practical insights on examining who is being identified for deterrence activity, monitoring and challenging potential disproportionality, and ensuring that processes are fair, transparent and culturally sensitive. It offers insights into involving Black, Asian and other minority ethnic communities in designing and overseeing deterrence pathways, building trust through partnerships with community-led organisations and putting in place processes to prevent discriminatory practices or perceptions of unfairness.</p>
--	--

Recommendation 8	Provide a breadth of timely and appropriate support options.
<p><b>What is the evidence warrant for this recommendation?</b></p>	<p>Providing a breadth of timely and appropriate support to help individuals desist from violence and stay safe is a core component of FD.<sup>114</sup><sup>115</sup><sup>116</sup> Children and young people identified for FD are often highly vulnerable, with their involvement in violence driven by multiple unmet needs, as well as experiences of exploitation, victimisation and the need for self-protection. Effective FD programmes therefore build a support offer that can address a wide range of needs across domains such as psychological and therapeutic services, education, employment and housing, as well as providing necessities (e.g. food, shelter and clothing).<sup>117</sup> This support is designed to reinforce the deterrence message by offering credible and positive alternatives to crime and violence.</p> <p>The guidance outlines a variety of support services delivered by statutory and voluntary sector organisations that previous FD programmes have successfully used.<sup>118</sup><sup>119</sup> For example, implementation findings in the UK have shown that providing financial support for positive activities (such as gym memberships) can improve engagement, and supporting access to stable housing is crucial for sustaining employment opportunities and maintaining relationships with support staff.<sup>120</sup></p> <p>Utilising navigators for direct support is an emerging practice in the UK that shows early promise.<sup>121</sup> Navigators typically provide flexible, practical and relational support, including offering behaviour management, meeting daily needs and connecting individuals to statutory services where required, while also serving as positive role models. Initial findings from the YEF-HO early implementation report suggest that some young people value navigators for helping with behaviour change and for respecting their cultures, for example, checking in during Ramadan, which helped build trust and rapport.<sup>122</sup></p> <p>Additionally, evidence supports tailoring support to local needs and ensuring its timely delivery.<sup>123</sup> The guidance recommends using local data on the drivers of crime and the needs of participants and communities to develop a support offer that is fit for purpose and responsive to individuals.<sup>124</sup> For example, substance misuse services might be prioritised if drugs are a local driver of violence, or engagement strategies could be adapted for neurodivergent participants who may require less formal communication or assistance accessing Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service for diagnoses.</p> <p>Quick access to services is vital to maintain the credibility of FD, as delays in delivering promised support can undermine trust in the programme and weaken the overall deterrence message.<sup>125</sup> The expert advisory group advised developing an 'early ask' from support services and building strong relationships to ensure their capacity to deliver timely support. FD programmes in the UK have built strong relationships with youth justice, education, employment and voluntary sector services to provide efficient referral pathways into support.<sup>126</sup></p>

<sup>114</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies' effects on crime: a systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1051>

<sup>115</sup> Tuschick, E., Armstrong, E., Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., Lloyd, A., & Newbury-Birch, D. [in press]. A rapid systematic review of qualitative literature about focused deterrence for violence prevention with a focus on the UK.

<sup>116</sup> Braga, A. A., & Weisburd, D. L. (2015). Focused deterrence and the prevention of violent gun injuries: practice, theoretical principles, and scientific evidence. *Annual review of public health*, 36, 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031914-122444>

<sup>117</sup> Braga, A. A., & Weisburd, D. L. (2015). Focused deterrence and the prevention of violent gun injuries: practice, theoretical principles, and scientific evidence. *Annual review of public health*, 36, 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031914-122444>

<sup>118</sup> Tuschick, E., Armstrong, E., Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., Lloyd, A., & Newbury-Birch, D. [in press]. A rapid systematic review of qualitative literature about focused deterrence for violence prevention with a focus on the UK.

- 
- <sup>119</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>
- <sup>120</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>
- <sup>121</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>
- <sup>122</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>
- <sup>123</sup> Braga, A. A., & Weisburd, D. L. (2015). Focused deterrence and the prevention of violent gun injuries: practice, theoretical principles, and scientific evidence. *Annual review of public health*, 36, 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031914-122444>
- <sup>124</sup> Braga, A. A., & Weisburd, D. L. (2015). Focused deterrence and the prevention of violent gun injuries: practice, theoretical principles, and scientific evidence. *Annual review of public health*, 36, 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031914-122444>
- <sup>125</sup> Braga, A. A., & Weisburd, D. L. (2015). Focused deterrence and the prevention of violent gun injuries: practice, theoretical principles, and scientific evidence. *Annual review of public health*, 36, 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031914-122444>
- <sup>126</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<p><b>Is this recommendation feasible to deliver?</b></p>	<p>We believe this recommendation is feasible to deliver, provided there are strong partnerships with statutory and voluntary sector support providers, sufficient capacity to deliver support and clear support referral pathways. Findings from the early implementation report show that most areas were able to identify or adapt existing support services, although gaps remained in consistent availability and responsiveness, particularly for specialist mental health and neurodiversity provision.<sup>127</sup></p> <p>Dedicated navigators are used in most UK FD programmes and can help coordinate multiagency support while connecting children and young people to opportunities that are meaningful and relevant to them. Some programmes have provided appropriate training for navigators to ensure they are well-equipped to deliver direct support themselves, for example, through mentoring and helping participants to manage their emotions.<sup>128</sup></p> <p>FD programmes can utilise existing services and interventions, coordinating them around the FD cohort. The FD working group can use the SNA to map these resources against the needs of participants to ensure relevant and proportionate support is available. However, some UK sites have reported challenges with information sharing, for example, due to data protection or consent issues, which can create uncertainty or delays in coordinating support. Thresholds for accessing services were sometimes too high for young people with complex but sub-threshold needs, leaving them without timely help.<sup>129</sup> In addition, fragmented commissioning arrangements meant that services were not always joined up or easy to navigate, creating barriers to delivering a coordinated support offer. The guidance, therefore, recommends establishing strong partnerships with statutory and voluntary sector services early on, for example, with youth justice, education and employment pathways, which can help ensure capacity and commitment to deliver support when needed. The expert advisory group also highlighted the importance of engaging support agencies from the outset, so they understand the aims of FD and can work collaboratively to deliver a timely support offer.</p>
---	---

<sup>127</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>128</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>129</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<p><b>Does this recommendation support the most vulnerable children and disproportionately affected groups?</b></p>	<p>This recommendation recognises that Black, Asian and other ethnic minority children and young people are often overrepresented among those affected by serious violence and may face barriers to accessing support, including experiences of discrimination and mistrust of statutory agencies. The guidance recommends partnering with organisations that have a strong track record of supporting these communities, with experience in eliminating racism, understanding cultural differences and engaging effectively with children and young people. It also advises considering how protected characteristics (such as age, race and gender) influence the accessibility of services, acknowledging that past practices may have created barriers to engagement, particularly within statutory agencies.</p> <p>Cultural expectations, including a stigma around seeking help or a strong emphasis on independence, may further limit access. Employing navigators who are part of or connected to participants' communities can help overcome these barriers, build trust and ensure support is delivered in a way that feels relevant and respectful. The <i>Race Equity Implementation Resource</i> provides practical guidance on how to commission and work with organisations with a proven record of supporting Black, Asian and other minority ethnic communities, ensure culturally competent practice and involve community voices in designing and overseeing support services to promote equitable outcomes.</p>
---	---

<p><b>Recommendation 9</b></p>	<p><b>Track the progress of individuals and monitor operational delivery</b></p>
<p><b>What is the evidence warrant for this recommendation?</b></p>	<p>Continuous monitoring is essential to determine whether FD is achieving its aims and to allow for programme adaptations. FD programmes with strong monitoring components are better able to maintain effective responses to violence. For instance, regular data reviews and performance meetings in Cincinnati's FD programme helped identify a spike in violence early and adapt the strategy in order to sustain violence reductions.<sup>130</sup> Monitoring individual progress (e.g. whether individuals are re-offending, engaging with support and meeting their personal goals) provides real-time feedback on the programme's effectiveness in addressing the needs of the cohort.<sup>131</sup></p> <p>Monitoring is also crucial for accountability and learning: documentation of actions taken and results observed enables partners to be held accountable and lessons to be captured for future implementations. Systematic reviews support this, showing that programmes with stronger implementation fidelity, often ensured through consistent monitoring and adherence to core principles, achieved better crime reduction outcomes.<sup>132</sup><sup>133</sup> Additionally, in the UK context, the early implementation report<sup>134</sup> highlighted that inconsistent data systems for tracking participants and offending patterns made it difficult to coordinate support and deliver consistent deterrence messages, risking the integrity and credibility of the intervention.</p>

<sup>130</sup> Braga, A. A., & Weisburd, D. L. (2015). Focused deterrence and the prevention of violent gun injuries: practice, theoretical principles, and scientific evidence. *Annual review of public health, 36*, 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031914-122444>

<sup>131</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>132</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D. L., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies' effects on crime: a systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 15*(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1051>

<sup>133</sup> Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D. L., & Turchan, B. (2018). Focused deterrence strategies and crime control: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Criminology & Public Policy, 17*(1), 205–250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12682>

<sup>134</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

	In sum, robust monitoring is warranted to provide information that can help determine whether FD is addressing the identified violence problem and promptly detect any issues, such as racial disproportionality or programme delivery drift.
<b>Is this recommendation feasible to deliver?</b>	<p>We believe this recommendation is feasible to deliver, provided there is sufficient investment in data infrastructure, analytical capacity and an effective case management system to support staff in quickly reviewing an individual's history and engagement with the programme. Some FD programmes have achieved this through a centralised dashboard combining information from multiple agencies. This is particularly important because some areas reported a lack of integrated systems to share information between partners, which undermined coordination.<sup>135</sup></p> <p>The guidance sets out recommendations on how frequently teams should meet to review data, as well as the types of monitoring that are required. It also provides links to resources on developing a theory of change, helping teams identify measurable activities and outcomes for the programme.<sup>136</sup></p> <p>The <i>Race Equity Implementation Resource</i> offers additional guidance on using data to monitor potential disproportionalities, while the <i>Data and Intelligence Implementation Tool</i> provides practical, step-by-step advice to help areas build a robust, joined-up monitoring system to support FD delivery.</p>
<b>Does this recommendation support the most vulnerable children and disproportionately affected groups?</b>	<p>This recommendation recognises the importance of embedding race equity within monitoring and evaluation processes to ensure that FD does not reinforce existing disproportionalities.</p> <p>The guidance advises that data systems should be designed to track referrals, engagement, outcomes and enforcement actions by ethnicity, age, gender and other protected characteristics so that any unintended disparities can be identified and addressed early. It also recommends involving Black, Asian and other minority ethnic communities and those with lived experience in designing what is monitored and how data are interpreted to improve legitimacy and build trust.</p> <p>The <i>Race Equity Implementation Resource</i> provides further practical tools for monitoring equity within FD, including guidance on collecting and analysing data disaggregated by ethnicity, setting up transparent reporting processes and engaging communities to sense-check and contextualise findings. These steps help ensure that monitoring supports proportionate, fair and culturally responsive delivery for all participants.</p>

<sup>135</sup> Brennan, I., Simanovic, T., McFarlane, P., Sutherland, A., Graham, W., Powrie, M., Larigkou, I., & Holmes, E. (2024). *Focused deterrence randomised controlled trial: early implementation report*. Youth Endowment Fund. Retrieved from <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/YEF-FD-Early-Stage-Implementation-Report.pdf>

<sup>136</sup> Early Intervention Foundation. (n.d.). *Theory of change*. Retrieved from <https://evaluationhub.eif.org.uk/theory-of-change/>