

## Grippa Working Paper

# Risk Assessment for Grippa Evaluation

6/10/06



Arts & Humanities  
Research Council

The Grippa research programme, mainly funded by AHRC, is a collaboration between the Design Against Crime Research Centre, Central Saint Martins College of Art & Design, University of the Arts London, and the UCL Jill Dando Institute of Security and Crime Science. Papers and other materials from the programme are at [www.grippaclip.com](http://www.grippaclip.com) and wider practical and research material on preventing bag theft at [www.inthebag.org.uk](http://www.inthebag.org.uk)

*Risk assessment for Grippa evaluation #1 6/10/06*

*Event (details below): Clips marketed independently of evaluation, at some point before evaluation after-period is complete.*

Stage	Threat/consequence	Given occurrence, Likelihood of harm occurrence Seriousness Lo Lh S Lo*Lh*S	Prevention	Mitigation
<b>Intelligence</b>	Might commercial considerations restrict info retailers are willing to supply? I> Poorer design E> less efficient selection of sites, info for design requirements capture			
<b>Intervention</b>				
<b>Implementation</b>	<i>IPR issues?</i> >I designers unwilling to participate? >E ?			

	<p><b>Involvement</b></p> <p><i>Alerting of retailers (senior mgt, local mgt, staff) to grips</i></p> <p>I&gt; boost involvement hence level/quality of implementation?</p> <p>E &gt; But this then becomes part of context of trial and hence generalisability of findings... but maybe no bad thing? We risk users not using these things anyway.</p> <p><i>Alerting of users to grips</i></p> <p>I&gt; boost involvement hence implementation?</p> <p>E&gt; But this then becomes part of context of trial</p> <p><i>Alerting of offenders to grips</i></p> <p>I&gt; impact - deterrence/ discouragement from ?area, ?target, ?MO... and displacement? ...</p> <p>E&gt; with possible effects on target and/or comparison sites hence masking/exaggerating impact?</p> <p>E&gt; With <i>change</i> of effect during evaluation period-confound?</p>	
<p><b>evaluation</b></p>	<p><b>Impact and its</b></p> <p><i>Loss of non-fitted comparison sites</i></p> <p>E&gt; statistical weakness</p> <p><i>Bias in remaining non-fitted comparison sites</i></p> <p>E&gt; distorted conclusions</p> <p><i>Wave of fitting other grips during evaluation period</i></p> <p>E&gt; inferential weakness from background changes</p>	
	<p><b>Other</b></p>	

**Other observations**

1. Maybe the grips produced/distributed by these mfrs will be lower quality – effectiveness/ usability?
2. Better to maintain our involvement with these mfrs in order to secure some sort of control (as well as other benefits beyond this study)?

Discussion KB-PE 6/10/6

1. Issue of endorsement by DAC of these preliminary grips. Should head off possible arguments post-evaluation by saying that 'DAC doesn't endorse these designs, they may not be the best, better ones should emerge from our project design process and the evaluation may demonstrate shortcomings/less effectiveness of preliminary designs - so manufacturer wd need to accept that risk.
2. Given we dk what's coming, best to opt for mfrs with whom we have some influence.
3. Could learn from this episode as a case study or pilot for designs/protocols/ implementation tracking procedures
- 4 If grips become more widespread, may alleviate mgrs' concern that they cd lose out to other bars without grips, due to highlighting risk in users' eyes
5. What's the proposed marketing strategy?
- 6 Need to try and get producers to keep records of when and where fitted in London
7. Can we get our host bar companies to hold off installing anywhere in action/comparison sites?
8. Chelsea Grip is around already, so maybe selling this one not such a leap