

Report

**CEP Workshop
Electronic Monitoring in Europe
Egmond aan Zee, Netherlands
8-10 May 2003**

ELECTRONIC MONITORING IN EUROPE

The third CEP Workshop on Electronic Monitoring in Europe was held on 8th-10th May 2003 at Egmond aan Zee, Netherlands.

The event built on previous workshops, held in 1998 and 2001 and reflected the current and growing level of use of EM throughout Europe. Earlier workshops have concentrated on starting a new scheme (1998) and on developing best practice and coordinating research (2001). This third event considered current and future possibilities, technological developments and the continuing need to learn from each other's experience.

The workshop was largely sponsored by a group of six equipment manufacturers, software specialists and service providers, all of whom are active in EM schemes in Europe. We are grateful, not just for their financial support, but for the contribution their staff make to the workshop as a whole. They are:

**BI Incorporated
ElmoTech Ltd
On Guard Plus Ltd
Premier Geografix Ltd
Reliance Monitoring Services Ltd
Securicor Justice Services Ltd**

The workshop was planned and organised by Ralf Bas (Belgium), Ruud Boelens (Netherlands), Kjell Carlsson (Sweden), Dominik Lehner (Switzerland), James Toon and Dick Whitfield (England and Wales).

Administration was undertaken by Martine Dikmans, Executive Officer CEP and additional help at the conference and in preparing this final report, by Christa van der Flier. We are very grateful to both of them.

The workshops act as an information exchange/contact point far beyond the event itself. For this reason, e-mail addresses are shown in the participants list. Speakers have also indicated a willingness to provide copy papers, on request.

INTRODUCTION

The workshop was opened and a formal welcome extended by Han van der Leek, Vice President of CEP and Director General of the Netherlands Probation Service, and Michele Blom, Director of Sanctions, Probation and Victim Care in the Netherlands Ministry of Justice.

Ms Blom set the scene by referring to the previous workshops organised by CEP in 1998 and 2001, but adding "the years of experimentation..... are now behind us." She posed two questions for delegates. What can we do to ensure that current applications function better? and what applications do new technological developments have in store for us? She drew together the legal, ethical and sociological dimensions as well as the economic and technical issues and emphasised the opportunities that EM now presents.

She added. "Our times require radical solutions, with the point of departure the question "what works?". It was a challenge which set the scene for many of the discussions over the next two days - and to which we hope this report will do justice.

WHERE ARE WE NOW?

The details of current European schemes were circulated in advance, individual correspondents having agreed to complete a standard questionnaire. This gave a good factual background and enabled this first plenary session to take a more general and analytical look at the current world of Electronic Monitoring.

EUROPE

Dick Whitfield said it was now fairly evident that three sequential phases of development could be identified in electronic monitoring schemes - pilot programmes, followed by national schemes, followed by more diverse applications. Thus, the first three countries to experiment - Sweden, the Netherlands and England and Wales - had already moved to the "diversity" phase, with at least two and up to seven different applications. Other countries, including Belgium, Catalonia, Portugal, Scotland, Spain and Switzerland had moved to phase two, while France and Finland were amongst those still in the pilot programmes phase. There was no reason why countries must inevitably move through all three developments and Germany and Italy had, so far, not built on pilot programmes. But once the infrastructure was in place and staff, politicians and others were familiar with schemes, it seemed very likely that they would develop in this way. The opportunities for expansion were considerable.

But developments had not been as originally envisaged. At first, the emphasis was on "front door", court based schemes. In fact, the major growth has been in prison early release schemes, the so-called "back door" programmes. In March 2003, around 9200 offenders were being tagged on a daily basis in Europe and nearly half (46%) were on back door programmes. Electronic monitoring has become the politically acceptable way of dealing with prison population crises. Does this matter? Is it the best way to long-term, sustainable growth? He looked at the overall impact electronic monitoring has had on criminal justice systems generally, on sentencing policy and practice, on attitudes to new technology (especially in relation to community penalties) and on prison populations.

In summary he concluded: the impact on community penalties has been much less than expected. Probation and community service have continued to grow and social work practice has been in no way dominated by the new technology. There is, indeed, evidence from Switzerland, the Netherlands and elsewhere that EM has made a real contribution to developing supervision practice and often in working with people who would otherwise be regarded as too risky for community supervision.

Attitudes to new technology have certainly changed and EM has broken a number of important barriers. It is a useful tool in itself and has facilitated the potential introduction of other new technologies like satellite tracking or biometrics. We should not underestimate the importance of this, even if the use of "next-generation" systems is still not clear.

The effect on sentencing policy and practice, however, has been very limited, although we should not be surprised by this. The main influences are shaped by politics, media campaigns and perceived public opinion and have little to do with the effectiveness of individual sanctions, research, or the views of criminal justice agencies.

Prison populations had continued to rise at an alarming rate, even though the introduction of EM has been intended to achieve the opposite effect. The pressure to "get tough" on crime had, simply, produced a much more punitive climate, whatever the national starting point. Yet ironically, prison population pressures have also provided the opportunity for the rapid expansion of post release schemes and there was increasing awareness and confidence in other applications.

Good information to sentencers and the public; realistic expectations and careful targeting remain the keys to long-term sustainable growth. There was still much to do, but in Europe a very solid base had been achieved.

USA

Professor Bob Lilly provided an interesting - and typically combative - counterpoint to the European experience. The current usage of EM in the USA was difficult to determine because of the very large number of local schemes and the absence of precise or collated information. The best informed estimate was of a daily average caseload of between 70,000 and 100,000 - but it could be as high as 150,000 - on R/F EM programmes. Satellite tracking (GPS) systems will account for a further 1500 to 2500 individuals.

Despite the numbers, very few studies have addressed how EM had changed offenders behaviour. There are notable exceptions, however, and in general terms it seems that when EM is combined with treatment, positive results may be found. Well-designed programmes of restorative justice were particularly relevant.

But EM had not grown as expected and had lost much of its visibility. It had developed largely in the context of prison overcrowding and was viewed as a promising patch on a system that was rupturing beyond imagination. In 30 years, from the early 1970s, the number of state prisoners increased by 500 percent. But budget deficits were now forcing the closure of prisons - 31 had closed between 2001 and 2003 covering almost 10,000 prisoners - to achieve savings of over 150 million dollars.

In this environment EM has an excellent opportunity to become as attractive as it was in the late 1980s. But would it do so, and would it avoid the overselling and unrealistic expectations that has characterised its past? Was the failure to expand - for it had not really done so in recent years - because it did not sit easily with the American civic tradition of autonomy and anonymity?

The arrival of new technology, especially GPS, could well make existing R/F based systems marginal, if not obsolete. This is not simply because new technology always replaces older technology - in surveillance we do not always do everything we can do, whether it is because of constraining political conditions or a resistance to change because of inertia. But R/F based electronic monitoring could soon become "redundant surveillance" because we simply had too much general surveillance. Increasingly, following 9/11, the USA had become obsessed with security, protection and surveillance. Consider the following.

Over 11 million surveillance cameras have been installed in the USA, from a total of 26 million worldwide. One estimate is that the average citizen is filmed by more than 300 cameras each day. Yet it had been estimated that video surveillance of this kind represents less than 1% of overall surveillance. Other non-video forms of monitoring will, astonishingly, grow even faster. In a process that mirrors the unplanned growth of the Internet itself, thousands of personal, commercial, medical, police and government databases and monitoring systems will intersect and intertwine. Ultimately, surveillance will become ubiquitous, networked and searchable. Unmonitored public space will, effectively, cease to exist. "In this context, who would even need to be tagged? Only the very poor, and marginalised, immigrants and other excluded populations.

It was not all about Big Brother, or big business. The ordinary citizen's desire for security, control and comfort was also a significant factor. Extensive surveillance had, in short, come into existence because people also liked it and wanted it.

There will, of course be huge problems of data base errors when efforts are made to integrate such disparate sources of information. But the Total Information Awareness Programme, a US Defence Agency project, exemplifies the trend. It aims to merge hundreds of data sources to create an unprecedented repository of information about both US citizens and foreigners with US contacts.

R/F EM might well be on the verge of becoming redundant in the USA, with expansion in the next few years primarily in Europe and elsewhere.

TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENTS

and a view from the sponsoring companies:

Material from sponsoring companies, as with the current position of national schemes, had been provided in advance. Each company also had exhibition space where participants could view equipment and programmes, including some impressive demonstrations of GPS technology, and - more importantly perhaps - talk to staff about current preoccupations and future possibilities.

In this session, each company gave a brief presentation as a forerunner to making the most of later contacts during the event. Participants could distinguish between manufacturers, service providers, fully integrated companies etc and start making comparisons between approaches. There were some interesting insights, ranging from reporting booths using biometrics to confirm the identity of the offender, to the increasing variety of ways in which basic EM can be supplemented and enhanced; the use of reverse tagging in domestic violence cases in Scotland; re-entry programmes in the USA for high-risk offenders (violent offenders who had attracted sentences of ten years or more) which are showing impressive results; remote alcohol monitoring and Web access by supervising officers.

There were also some threads emerging about the growing size of the market and the scope for increased specialisation; for development of improved R/F systems as well as GPS, and developments in Asia and South America. The contrast - and the confidence - of this session and its companion in the last workshop was marked. This is an industry which has grown up.

THE WORKSHOPS

Workshop sessions were planned as the main vehicle for more detailed learning and the chance to cover a wide variety of topics which were known to be of current interest to all concerned, or had been chosen by participants themselves at an early session in the event. The reports below give a good indication of the growing complexity of EM schemes and the range of issues, from targeting to follow up research, which need to be taken into account. They also look at a range of solutions in which tagging takes place alongside other programmes.

We are grateful to the colleagues who provided summary reports from the workshops they attended and which are reproduced below. Not every workshop has such a report - there were one or two in which the material provided by the presenter stands so well on its own that it would be preferable to reproduce it in full for those who are interested.

The full range of workshops was as follows:

- Court based schemes
- EM and juveniles
- Ethical issues
- Post release schemes
- Remote alcohol testing
- Sharing experience
- Starting a new scheme
- The ICCP project - EM and social work
- What Works and EM

WORKSHOP REPORTS

EM and Juveniles

In this workshop, Tom Burnham described the work being undertaken by the Youth Justice Board in England and Wales, who are the only organisation with substantial European experience in this field.

He outlined the structure of the Board and the range of work it undertook and he said they had piloted EM in 1997 with sentenced juveniles and in 2002 with juvenile bail cases. They had four aims: first, to reduce reoffending, second, to reduce the use of custody; third, to increase young people's compliance with community orders (using surveillance as a support function) and fourth, to provide reassurance to courts and the community. EM could be used with a range of orders, both pre and post release. 8000 juveniles have now been tagged - some 14 percent of the England and Wales total so far.

There were special problems in dealing with juveniles - the higher demands they generally made on supervisors, the worry about whether wearing a tag would be seen as a "trophy" or indeed as unnecessarily stigmatising; (this has been more positive than expected and a tag is more likely to be used as an excuse not to join in group offending); the lack of stable accommodation for many juveniles and, finally, additional issues of dealing with family dynamics.

The current flagship use of EM is as part of the Intensive Supervision and Support Programme (ISSP). This was a very demanding and intensive scheme, intended to be a really credible alternative to custody. It was based on "What Works" principles and was being rigorously evaluated. It was being introduced gradually but should cover the whole of England and Wales by the end of 2003. There have been 4000 starts so far, with a current caseload of 1100. Current feedback from two important groups - sentencers and police - has been overwhelmingly positive.

The supervisors had a choice in determining the component parts of this order and, in terms of surveillance, could use conventional tagging, voice verification or human checks by the police or other agencies. 72% had chosen tagging and that number is still rising. Although the research is not due to be published until early 2004, the scheme is seen very positively and young people appear to welcome the structure provided.

There were strict criteria for going on this very demanding programme, to avoid net widening and the overall order is very flexible in terms of trying to take individual circumstances into account. Despite voice verification being available it is not much used and it seems as if more training is needed to show how active monitoring of this kind can be best used.

Ethical Issues

Dominik Lehner introduced this topic and looked at the ethical issues of EM in the context of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The various articles of the European convention were looked at in order to compare how rights are violated either by a prison sentence or by EM. This resulted in a good discussion about what the effect is of EM on the lives of offenders and how this compares to the effects of detention. Many rights are clearly violated by detention as well as by EM, although in a somewhat less severe way.

The general conclusion was that the European convention simply doesn't fit with electronic monitoring. Some core values, identified by the Correction Service of Canada, were used to illustrate an alternative approach. They comprised statements like: respect for the dignity of individuals, the offender's potential to live as a law-abiding citizen, the sharing of ideas, knowledge, values and experience to achieve the agency's mission; and managing the service with openness and integrity.

There was agreement that every correctional agency should not only have stated ethical values but that everyone working there should be aware of them. Also, technology changes and ethical debate has to be held constantly in the midst of that change. People should know where the technology is going.

Post Release Schemes

This workshop was based around the contrast in experience from England and Sweden. Kjell Carlsson talked first about the "front door" scheme in Sweden because the experience with that had directly influenced the later development of the post release scheme. This had started in 2001 and some of the first results are becoming available now. Those eligible are offenders with a prison sentence of over two years who seem to have the highest needs but who are not available for another intensive supervision programme. The scheme in England and Wales has been running rather longer - since 1999 - and has dealt with very large numbers of early released prisoners, but always very short monitoring periods. Some of the differences between the two schemes were fundamental: the probation service in Sweden is responsible for running the entire scheme, but in England and Wales private sector companies manage the systems and undertake direct contact with offenders. Only in some cases is a probation officer involved as well. In Sweden, EM is always offered in combination with intensive supervision but in England and Wales this applies only to prisoners who have had a sentence of over 12 months.

Different political agendas, as well as criminal justice considerations like pressures on the prison system, have clearly influenced and shaped the different schemes. The workshop did not attempt to come to any conclusions - and schemes tended not to be measured by effectiveness - but as a growth area there is clearly a good deal more to be considered in the context of using EM as a bridge back into the community.

Remote Alcohol Testing

In this session we had a particularly good example of a way that additional requirements for features can be integrated with EM. We looked at two areas - first, the technology and possibilities it offers and, second, the way a programme is run and its impact in criminal justice terms. Both ElmoTech and BI offer a remote alcohol testing device and Felix Comeau, of Alcohol Countermeasure Systems Group described how the technology had developed and its current capability. This was followed by Karen Burkey of Minnesota Monitoring Inc, who described her organisation's role in service provision.

Minnesota has around 30,000 DUI offenders a year, of whom about half are second or subsequent offenders. 8400 were made subject to remote alcohol monitoring orders last year, either pre conviction as a condition of bail or post conviction as a requirement of an overall supervision programme. The length of time monitored may be relatively short - for bail offenders, typically one week to two months depending on how quickly the case is dealt with; for post conviction offenders, typically 30 to 60 days - but checks are intensive. Normally there will be three tests per day to limit the chances of evasion. Tests must be at least four hours and not more than 12 hours apart. If a reading is positive, two further checks are made within a short period to eliminate any possible error and those are accepted as evidence. If the offenders have the means they must pay between 10 to 14 dollars per day for the service.

A lively discussion followed about most aspects of the scheme and led, inevitably, to the question of remote drug testing, which is not yet possible. An interesting description of hair testing for drugs (which is reckoned to be more accurate, time related and impossible to adulterate) followed. It exemplified the overall value of the session - new information, time to think about new applications and, most of all, a chance to explore the links between alcohol, drugs and crime which still require major effort.

It also continued the theme of "layered technology" - of combining several features in a single product or scheme - so that a graduated response to varying levels of risk could be used.

What Works and EM

Six distinct issues were discussed during the session, although the discussion actually ranged somewhat wider.

- In terms of what Works, most members felt that evaluations of EM programmes to date have failed to consider the differential effects on the monitored populations, ie, they have looked for improbable global effects rather than the more likely impacts on particular types of offenders.
- The impact on other parts of the criminal justice system should be considered when the impact of EM is discussed. It works on the whole system, not just offenders. The impact on community penalties as well as on prison needs to be considered.
- It was suggested that EM "works" because members could not provide instances where an established programme has been discontinued - but this was countered by those who noted that few if any jurisdictions had applied it to more than 2% of the offenders for whom it might be deemed appropriate. Sweden and England and Wales were probably be only jurisdictions which were exceptions to this generalisation.
- An appropriate question might be "what does not work"? Originally it has been thought that juveniles would be an inappropriate usage but that could not be sustained. The use of EM for very short durations was regarded as unproductive by any standard of success.
- The issue was raised of whether EM works better as a front door or a backdoor option. Several participants noted that the most powerful predictors of successful completion on the offenders were age and legal status ie, the stage in the system in which the offender finds himself. Unfortunately no one could provide evidence that programme completion proves long-term behaviour change.
- The clearest, quickest consensus was achieved on the issue of consent. Members felt strongly that the offender and the significant others in the offender's environment **MUST** consent for both practical reasons and liability avoidance. It was noted that soliciting volunteers was less likely to produce consent than a policy where EM becomes the default disposition for some types of cases unless the offender assertively declines it.

Intensive Control and Change Programme/ Social Work and EM.

Barry Snellgrove outlined the nature of the ICCP and its political rationale. 18 to 20-year-olds - a high risk group responsible for 1/5 of all crime - are selected according to criteria of persistence, risk, high need and major obstacles to change. ICCP is intended as a credible alternative to custody.

Controlling elements in the programme are the tag, police surveillance, a curfew and graded levels of supervision. The change elements are in effective programmes, partnership arrangements covering education, employment and other factors; community punishment and reparation and compensation. It has been described as "toughness with a purpose".

Attitudes in different national probation services were discussed and it was noted that there is a 25 year tradition in England and Wales of trying to make supervision more intensive and credible. There is no evidence that, for instance, intermediate treatment programmes of an intensive nature were dramatically better at reducing reoffending than custody - but it was more humane, less stigmatising and cheaper. There were also concerns that the involvement of the police in ICCP was inconsistent with social work.

A lot of discussion took place about the "ethical grey area" of minor breaches and other offences which took place during the course of an intensive order of this kind. There are no easy solutions to this kind of dilemma.

ICCP is not just an attempt to link EM with "What Works" based programmes - although that is long overdue in itself. It has many other elements but overall is untried and is not wholly evidence led.

Sharing Experience

The workshop enabled participants from Switzerland, the USA, the Netherlands, Germany, Belgium, and England and Wales to exchange information about specific features of schemes in their country and to assess the value of these. Even where schemes look relatively similar there are features which are very different, not least because of different legal frameworks and because of the priorities which existed when the scheme came into operation.

Topics covered included the need to "promote" EM to judges and the courts, because the level of understanding about what can be realistically expected from an order still needs to be improved markedly. This, together with public perceptions, has been a theme running through all workshops run by CEP and it is clear that it remains a major task.

The advantages and disadvantages of different systems of management were also discussed. In England and Wales the private sector is responsible for the day-to-day management of the scheme, including the management of breach proceedings in the courts. Other countries, including Belgium, use the public sector exclusively for this and still others have a hybrid scheme. The real need is for clarity in the different roles which are required - there is no right answer and all the above can be made to work well.

The workshop also looked at the length of time supervised - in Belgium, offenders may be on EM for more than 12 months and the decision on when to end the period tagged rests with the prison director.

The feeling expressed from American participants was that Europe had a 'second chance' with EM. We could learn from what went wrong in the first phase of tagging in the USA, without some of the pressures that are now being experienced there. Budgets are shrinking and agencies are being forced once again to use technology to manage caseloads. It has become a control device, not a rehabilitation tool or goal. The hope was that Europe could demonstrate some better possibilities and longer term gains.

RESEARCH ISSUES

There were two inputs into this plenary session - first from Professor Marc Renzema on the work he is undertaking on a meta-analysis of EM schemes for the Campbell Consortium. Second, from Eva Olkiewicz of Sweden, on the initial outcomes of her research into the post release scheme in her country.

Marc Renzema described first the protocol inclusion standards for the EM meta-analysis. There had to be some subjects on EM, a comparison group, at least one dependent variable related to reoffending and adequate description of all groups. The results have been disappointing. For a database of over 500 published reports only 18 had so far met the criteria for inclusion, although there were still 13 "fugitive" or untranslated documents. There was only immediate need for help with translation from Dutch and Swedish.

One of the problems for any researcher was that EM evolved largely without theory, so assessing what it should do has been difficult to determine. Several outcomes seemed possible - it might worsen recidivism, suppressed recidivism during the period tagged, and reduced recidivism if used to modify other criminogenic factors; or possibly reduce recidivism post EM without other treatments.

His preliminary reading of results had led him to the following conclusions, although quantitative analysis might modify these:

- There was no impact on post EM recidivism.
- There may be some suppression during the period of EM.
- The dominant intent of users in the USA is for cheap punishment with control the major aim
- Treatment oriented EM was rare in both the USA and Canada.

The urgent need is for good quality research to try and take these conclusions forward but it was clear that the political imperatives in using EM as a prison numbers control device would not make this any easier. Any additional evidence would be welcomed.

Eva Olkiewicz described the study in which she was still involved. The scheme applied to all prisoners serving long-term sentences (over two years) and so all were included in the study. About 20 percent of these - approximately 150 offenders - had been granted EM and the period monitored was likely to have been between two and four months. Supervision is very intensive, usually involving four home or workplace visits per week. Only six percent of the participants violated the rules during the period monitored and all were returned to prison.

The study looked at the additional help needed for the released prisoners in the fields of housing, work or education and finance - but showed that the great majority (usually more than three-quarters) did not need such help, usually because it had been provided in prison. This may show that the people whose applications for EM are successful are probably the people who need it least. Certainly there is a feeling that only safe cases have been selected so far, but that more risks can be taken now that the scheme has settled well.

Offenders have been very positive in general terms about their experience on EM, with family and work advantages high on the list. The worst part, they said, was that there was very little time for unstructured activity and there was also the constant stress to keep to a very strict schedule. It was felt that the early release period from prison could now be extended to six months and that the "free time" could also be increased.

LOOKING FORWARD

The final plenary session looked at the likely shape of things to come. The two main speakers were Professor Ken Pease from England and Richard Nimer, formerly of the Florida Department of Corrections and now Director of Business Development for Pro-Tech Monitoring, who provide the GPS systems for the Florida tracking scheme.

Prof Pease provided a lively introduction in looking at the way crime has changed and will go on changing. But the lessons of history were that technical innovations always came first and these improvements often failed to acknowledge or prepare for the crime response which came with them. It was then always the case of doing too little too late - "retrofit solutions" which tried to answer the problems which had been created. Crime prevention had employed technology to good effect in terms of using photographs on credit cards, tax on shop goods and call tracing to reduce obscene telephone calls, for incidents; but there were far too many alternative examples where technology had produced improvements but failed to anticipate crime problems which resulted. Solving crime is not about finding someone to blame (the offender) but about ensuring the crime, or the circumstances leading to it, are resolved or do not recur.

Target hardening, increasing the risks of offending and reducing the rewards are all part of primary crime prevention. Technology has an increasingly important part to play. We now know that it can, equally, help in terms of dealing with offenders afterwards and because repeat victimisation is such an enormous problem there are some obvious avenues to develop. What we have to ensure is that the technology does not, through poor use, also become part of the problem.

Technology may be helping us to deal with offenders but it is also helping to create a new range of crimes. Identity theft is likely to be a major issue in years ahead and we already know that the Internet has spawned a whole new variety of offences. Retro solutions are always a poor second best. The challenge is to design out the crime before it takes hold.

The Florida Experience

Richard Nimer then gave a comprehensive account of the Florida experience in using satellite tracking as part of their use of electronic monitoring. By way of background he said that the state had 55 prisons and some 75,000 prisoners, together with 175,000 people on community supervision. Electronic monitoring started in 1986/1987 and in 1997 Florida moved to the first large-scale use of GPS equipment.

At present there are still some 11,000 people on house arrest of whom 900 are on some form of electronic monitoring. 650 to 700 of these are on satellite tracking, the remainder on conventional R/F systems. The current caseload for an officer monitoring GPS offenders is 25 and there must be three personal contacts per week. There are moves to increase this to 35 but he thought that was ill-advised - the system of personal contacts remains very important.

Florida was not, of course, the only state to be using GPS systems - 160 jurisdictions in 30 states, together with another in Canada, were now using satellite tracking but most were very small or experimental.

Florida had invested in a matched control group study to compare both GPS and R/F tracking and tagging with non monitored offenders. Over a two-year follow-up period the difference in re conviction rates was marked - it was 6.6% for the non monitored offenders and 2.1% for those being monitored. The latest innovation was to compare parallel data on satellite tracked offenders with reports of serious crimes and their locations. This "CrimeTrax" programme built on all the advantages which it was clear that GPS and technology offered - the ability to custom design inclusion and exclusion zones, to send the offender messages to correct behaviour, and immediate notification to a victim or law enforcement agency if needed. The cost of GPS systems was about double that of R/F systems but was already falling and was likely to fall still further as systems grew. The forecast a 25 percent reduction in crime rates with the implementation in full of GPS and Crime Trax and on that basis it came with its own money back guarantee. A lively discussion followed and it is clear that we are all watching the developments on the other side of the Atlantic while governments wait in Europe for systems that are sufficiently robust to be implemented here.

CONCLUSION

This was the last of CEP's three European workshops on electronic monitoring, but there was no sense that this would prove to be the end of close European co-operation. CEP's role had - given its major interest in developing community penalties - always been in helping to assess what role EM could play in developing best practice and in encouraging good quality research. The landscape has changed enormously in the last six years, even though all the early questions have not yet been answered. What is clear is that shared experience and shared ideas still have much to offer in ensuring that joint learning is swift and effective. And, although primarily Europe based, we have gained much from the wider perspective is that participants from North America and Australia have provided.

Some form of continuation group has already been discussed and support from the industry has, hopefully, being promised to make it happen. A different format, with different approaches, is probably appropriate now.

So what have we learned so far? EM has demonstrated its reliability, its strengths and its limitations. Individual schemes have shown that it can make a dramatic impact on prison populations, on criminal justice system costs and - when well targeted - on reconviction rates, too. But it still has to show how it can help influence shape and change offending behaviours, not just monitor them. Its use as a short-term prison numbers reduction device is increasingly popular with politicians - its long-term future

probably lies more with its capacity for effective use in conjunction with more intensive, longer term programmes. Its role with higher risk offenders and - conversely - as a low risk monitoring tool which will enable probation staff to concentrate on those who need their help most, and as a flexible tool in a graduated range of sanctions have still a long way to go on before their potential is fully realised.

The constant message has always been programmes should drive the technology and not technology the programmes. The seductive possibilities offered by new technologies, including satellite tracking, reinforced this point. We hope that CEP's involvement in this series of events has helped in the overall development of good practice in EM in Europe. We shall certainly watch its continuing growth with enormous interest.

Dick Whitfield
Christa van der Flier