

# Framework for developing quantitative agent based models based on qualitative expert knowledge: an organised crime use-case

Frederike Oetker<sup>1\*</sup>, Vittorio Nespeca<sup>1</sup>, Thijs Vis<sup>2</sup>, Paul Duijn<sup>3</sup>, Peter Sloot<sup>1,3</sup>, Rick Quax<sup>1,3</sup>

## Abstract

In order to model criminal networks for law enforcement purposes, a limited supply of data needs to be translated into validated agent-based models. What is missing in current criminological modelling is a systematic and transparent framework for modelers and domain experts that establishes a modelling procedure for computational criminal modelling that includes translating qualitative data into quantitative rules. For this, we propose FREIDA (Framework for Expert-Informed Data-driven Agent-based models).

Throughout the paper, the criminal cocaine replacement model (CCRM) will be used as an example case to demonstrate the FREIDA methodology.

For the CCRM, a criminal cocaine network in the Netherlands is being modelled where the kingpin node is being removed, the goal being for the remaining agents to reorganize after the disruption and return the network into a stable state. Qualitative data sources such as case files, literature and interviews are translated into empirical laws, and combined with the quantitative sources such as databases form the three dimensions (environment, agents, behaviour) of a networked ABM. Four case files are being modelled and scored both for training as well as for validation scores to transition to the computational model and application phase respectively.

In the last phase, iterative sensitivity analysis, uncertainty quantification and scenario testing eventually lead to a robust model that can help law enforcement plan their intervention strategies. Results indicate the need for flexible parameters as well as additional case file simulations to be performed.

**Keywords:** *methodological framework, criminological modelling, computational networks, validation methods, mixed methods*

<sup>1</sup>Computational Science Lab, Institute of Informatics, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands

<sup>2</sup>Regionale Eenheid Amsterdam, Nationale Politie van Nederland, Amsterdam, Netherlands

<sup>3</sup>Institute for Advanced Study, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands

\*Corresponding author Frederike Oetker, f.oetker@uva.nl



# 1. Introduction

Building simulation models that capture the behavior of criminal networks can support law enforcement, by facilitating the investigation into the effectiveness of intervention strategies aimed at network disruption. Therefore, having a reliable and validated network modelling framework is imperative. Such a framework needs to be able to incorporate both qualitative and quantitative data sources, because in domains such as organized crime modelling it cannot be expected that the quantitative data is complete and accurate. This is often not only a matter of simply gathering more data; in many domains it is not even feasible to gather sufficient quantitative data for uniquely identifying computational models, due to complicating matters such as context dependence of human behavior, ethical concerns, and the difficulty or even ill-definedness of measuring for instance cognitive psychological processes [[Maxwell 2020](#)]. A framework that attempts to address these shortcomings by incorporating qualitative data in a systematic manner does not yet exist, which at least in part explain the still limited use of computational models in a variety of biopsychosocial domains.

Much research has been carried out regarding the use of Agent-Based Models (ABMs) in modelling criminal networks. ABMs allow for the incorporation of causal mechanisms and capture both qualitative and quantitative data, which is important when data is sourced through networks captured at a specific point in time. Protocols such as ODD+D [[Müller et al. 2013](#)] and TRACE [[Grimm et al. 2014](#)] for project management and modelling exist, but fall short in two aspects. First, they do not fully and unambiguously identify an ABM or acknowledge the data needed for training and validating the model, and secondly, they do not specify the procedure of how to fit the resulting into the context of the project, including boundaries and limitations of the model [[Wood 2017](#)].

## Proposed Framework

In the previous paragraph, we discussed the need for a framework that addresses gaps in qualitative modelling. FREIDA (Framework for expert-informed Data-driven Agent-based models) is a framework that addresses these gaps by combining both quantitative and verified qualitative information inputs in a confirmatory or complementary way. This step-by-step methodology helps to reduce ambiguity and ensure that the resulting model is both trained and validated, offering a solution that allows for more accurate and reliable qualitative modelling.

Qualitative data inputs include case files, structured and unstructured expert interviews and scientific literature which conceptualizes relevant processes or describes related case studies. These qualitative data inputs are processed into the model design (e.g., research questions or context), agent attributes, behavioral rules, training statements, and validation statements. Quantitative data is split into training, test, and validation sets [[Evans et al. 2008](#)]. Through four phases (knowledge acquisition, application, validation and iteration), a conceptual and then a computational model is created. In the final phase, sensitivity analysis and uncertainty quantification are carried out with the goal of assessing potential model improvements or simplifications, completing one modelling cycle [[Schulze et al. 2017](#)]. In

case no more significant improvements or simplifications are possible, the modelling procedure completes.

Our framework heavily relies on the involvement of domain experts who, together with modellers, inform design decisions, serve as qualitative data sources themselves (e.g., through a structured interview), or identify and interpret external qualitative data inputs. We also describe a guideline to forming an effective team of domain experts.

Throughout the methodology section we will illustrate the use of FREIDA in a practical way by describing a running example focused on criminal cocaine networks in the Netherlands.

## 1.1. Background

In the following we review in more detail existing works on protocols for developing ABMs that is applied to develop models capturing criminal networks. Overall we find that models for criminal contexts tend to be built based either purely on quantitative data to distill agent rules, for example Róses et al. collecting openly available data sources to build a static and dynamic geographical and temporal virtual environment [[Rosés et al. 2021](#)], or on qualitative data to define environments and contexts of the agents, for example Stevanović using document analysis for understanding social ties between cocaine trafficking networks in Europe [[Stevanović 2020](#)]. In addition, when qualitative knowledge is used, the procedure through which this knowledge is elicited to inform model choices tends to be unstructured, implicit, and difficult to verify [[Bruch and Atwell 2015](#)].

### 1.1.1 ABMs and their relevance for organized crime models

To understand the relevance of ABMs as a tool for the modelling of criminal networks, we can follow Duxbury and Hainy's twofold argumentation [[Duxbury and Haynie 2019](#)].

The first argument is related to data sourcing. Since data for organized crime networks is typically sourced through captured networks at a specific point in time, comparing networks before and after disruption is difficult [[Bright et al. 2019](#)]. By formulating rules and behaviours through the data and using them to create a simulation in the form of an ABM, the model is used for computational criminology, for example to compare interruption strategies.

The second argument regards the experimental design of ABMs. Statistical analysis consists purely of correlative associations and thus cannot capture the explanatory mechanisms of the outcomes, whereas ABMs are able to incorporate causal mechanisms resulting from micro-macro and macro-macro interactions [[Johnson and Groff 2014](#), [Antosz et al. 2022](#)]. Causal effects are investigated in controlled settings, making the evaluation of strategies or entire organized crime networks possible. Duxbury and Hainy call it the "optimal analytic strategy for evaluating criminal network responses to disruption". In an ABM the three crucial factors of the simulation, rules, environment and agents, are controlled [[Calderoni et al. 2022](#)]. Agents interact according to specified rules within a simulated environment [[Ahrweiler et al. 2016](#)]. Real world networks are simulated in a logical way through a

simulation, which represents an advantage compared to simple statistical analysis. Additionally, ABMs present the advantage of assigning agency to the nodes within, as well as agents being able to interact with both each other and their environment and hold motivations.

A third argument to be made that was not mentioned explicitly by Duxbury and Hainy is that besides causal effects and data input, ABMs also enable to capture both qualitative and quantitative data. Input from stakeholders such as domain experts is gathered in an ABM and modelled for calculating and displaying hypotheses and beliefs. From there on, cumulatively modelled through an ABM, the outcome is evaluated and validated through scenario testing or model assumptions as supplied by the experts. Qualitative data enables not only the development of the structure of an ABM. Through statements capturing the expected system's behavior under given scenarios, qualitative data can also be employed to calibrate and validate the model.

### **1.1.2 Existing protocols**

To determine the project direction and information input at the beginning of a modelling project, existing protocols are frequently used. We will introduce two common protocols, ODD+D and TRACE, as well as their advantages and shortcomings. By recognizing the diversity of modelling structures as well as the need to introduce less obvious steps within the modelling process, the ODD+D as well as the TRACE protocols managed to unify modelling perspectives within their frameworks. However, Troost et al. [[Troost et al. 2023](#)] recognized that a consensus over which modelling methods to apply to highly contextualized ABM applications had not been reached.

#### **ODD + D**

A well known protocol for model description is the ODD+D (Overview, Design Concepts, Details + Decision making) [[Müller et al. 2013](#)], with which the modeling process is planned out through conducting structured expert interviews with provided questions.

The ODD+D approach has its origins in the ecology field. The ODD+D protocol was introduced as an extension of the ODD protocol by Müller et al. Expanding the protocol from Overview, Design Concepts and Details to include the aspect of decision making allows for a continuation of the protocol into the modelling process. The addition of the “+D” allows the protocol to be used to foster and capture decision making and information intake from experts and project partners. Additionally, the ODD+D protocol also incorporates a section on ‘Theoretical and Empirical Background’ to encourage model designs and model assumptions that are more closely related to theory. While the ODD+D protocol is helpful for shaping the model development procedure, it does not provide indications or instructions on how to collect and analyze data to inform this procedure.

#### **TRACE**

Within the field of ecology, Schmolke et al., developed the TRACE (TRANSPARENT and Comprehensive Ecological modelling documentation) protocol [[Grimm et al. 2014](#)]. While

ODD+D is a protocol that focuses on structured expert interviews and decision making, while TRACE is a comprehensive documentation tool that aims to provide evidence of good modeling practice. TRACE is described as a tool for planning, performing, and documenting good modeling practice. TRACE documents should provide convincing evidence that a model was thoughtfully designed, correctly implemented, thoroughly tested, well understood, and appropriately used for its intended purpose. TRACE documents function as a link between the stakeholders, decision makers and developers of policies to the modelers. It functions as a protocol for individuals both involved or only interested in the model process to revise and understand the modelling process, but does not give clear instructions on the modelling process itself. By utilizing a chapter-like documentation structure, the modelling process is easily understandable. There are no instructions within TRACE however as to how data is used to form a conceptual or computational model, nor the specific validation or verification steps for an ABM are illustrated. Schmolke et al. specify that following the TRACE documentation alone does not constitute good modelling practice.

### **1.1.3. Existing Networks: Organized crime networks**

#### **Building upon the existing ABMs**


In the following section, we review existing ABMs of organized crime dynamics that we consider exemplary and identify the knowledge gap addressed by FREIDA. Much research has been carried out regarding the development of ABMs for organized crime. Here we describe the knowledge gap in organized crime literature but we expect that other application areas within the biopsychosocial domain face similar challenges. For example, Roks et al. investigated the usage of the socio-spatial relations in the port of Rotterdam through qualitative research in 2021 [[Roks et al. 2021](#)]. By using qualitative data, the authors constructed a conceptual model about the individuals within the trafficking spaces at the port. Utilizing mainly interviews, though, the final model could not be translated into a computational model and the research did not demonstrate the usage of a validated framework for conceptual model building. To incorporate possible existing qualitative data and to verify and probe a translated computational model, FREIDA could have been utilized. Brünger et al. proposed an ABM crime prediction model using historical crime data [[Kadar et al. 2017](#)]. The proposed architecture was used to build a model predicting property crimes in Switzerland. Quantitative crime data and environmental data was used to derive simulation parameters. The resulting ABM was then compared to real crime occurrences, and after performing a score on the initial parameters, they were adjusted iteratively as well as additional environmental data incorporated. The resulting ABM model tracked the movement of offenders through spatial-temporal evolutions in the provided crime data of 5 years, using 4 years to develop the model and preserving the last year for validation. Both data on the offences and offenders as well as data on the locations where crimes took place were considered. Brünger et al. describe the data selection process as challenging due to the balance between complexity and accuracy in the simulation. Brünger et al. did not involve domain experts in their process and thus could not mitigate the potential limitations of their quantitative criminal data sets. As crime data notably does not

correspond to real-world scenarios, given that networks might be up to 20% bigger than their data indicates, involving domain experts could have grounded the model in reality [Lopes et al. 2022]. By not incorporating quantitative data sources, the opportunity for secondary validation or formation of a conceptual model was eliminated. The usage of a protocol or framework for model creation could have benefited the model additionally.

Gerritsen formulated an approach for developing ABMs in criminological contexts consisting of two phases, contrastingly to the four phases of FREIDA, namely a phase of conceptualisation and formalisation followed by a phase of simulation and evaluation [Gerritsen 2015]. Gerritsen specifies the modeller needing to undergo a formulization step by defining their research questions and gain an idea of which processes to simulate firstly. Secondly, the concepts, which will be defined using a machine-readable language, are represented in variables with attached values (mathematical approach) or state property statements (statements with a true or false answer for logic-orientated approaches). Gerritsen suggests running multiple simulations whenever the model contains stochastic elements and/or parameters of which the values are uncertain. Finally, in the evaluation step the model is being verified according to its accuracy to the originally proposed modelling scenario. Using comparisons to theory or external data, a discussion about the behaviour and characteristics is done, distinguishing between quantitative and qualitative properties of the model. What is missing in this approach is the specification on the data input. Through the process of machine-learning translation, it is unclear whether quantitative data should be used exclusively, or qualitative data could be translated, and if so which dynamics shall be used for this. Additionally, a distinction is made in the verification step between qualitative and quantitative properties of the model, but not the types of verification that could be applied to each.

## 2. Methodology

The proposed framework consists of four phases: information acquisition, application, validation, and iteration (figure 1). Throughout these four phases, the initially gathered information supports the development of a conceptual model, which is then translated into a computational model. This model is then calibrated and validated based on training and validation statements provided by domain experts. Next, the modelling cycle is concluded through the iteration step in which sensitivity analysis and uncertainty quantification inform the modeller's decision regarding the necessity for another modelling cycle.





*Figure 1: FREIDA framework, with the four methodology phases, information acquisition, application, validation, and iteration.*

## 2.1 Phase I (Information)

### Outcome phase I

The outcome of phase I is the collection of data that will provide the inputs for the model. To reach this goal, we first collect knowledge from experts (in the first step) through the use of the ODD+D, and collect data as determined in the ODD+D in the second step.

In the following, the two steps of the first phase are illustrated.

### 2.1.1 Knowledge acquisition

In phase I, step one (knowledge acquisition) we define the research question of the model as well as the design choices for the project. To make these choices, we utilize the ODD+D protocol, at first together with a core group of domain experts, and secondly with additional domain experts. Expert knowledge is gathered through the ODD+D protocol (cf. Appendix III for a full overview of the protocol), which is filled in by a core group of domain experts and the modellers [Antosz et al. 2022] for example through a focus group. Specifically, throughout this process, the following points need to be discussed: (a) the research question to be answered through the model, (b) the system of interest and its boundaries (e.g. criminal cocaine network of the Netherlands), and (c) key initial design choices concerning the ABM.

Within the focus group, both the modellers and domain experts contribute differently. While domain experts supply information about open challenges in their field (potential research questions) as well as about the topology of the network, modellers provide technical expertise. For instance, modellers initiate a discussion regarding the necessary parameters, scales and variables, and assess the computational feasibility of the model. Modellers are also responsible for ensuring that all terms used are eventually well defined and quantifiable. A term such as ‘economic situation’ could for instance be replaced by a term like ‘GDP’ or ‘wealth inequality’, depending on the domain and demographic context. Additionally, the modellers are responsible for defining the boundaries and granularity of the context. This is expressed as a clear definition of the model environment and domains, and expressed for example in the definition of a domain being ‘crime’ and a process being ‘the cocaine market’.

Design choices as determined through this structured interview format will then influence which data source needs to be acquired in the second step of the first phase (Information Input). Along with case files, unstructured expert interviews and literature, the qualitative data for the model is supplied through the structured questions provided by the ODD+D.



Next, the research question and design choices are determined. In the ODD+D, specifically, questions such as II.1.d (*II.1.d If the model / submodel (e.g. the decision model) is based on empirical data, where does the data come from?*), II.1.e (*II.1.e At which level of aggregation were the data available?*) and III.3.a (*Does the model use input from external sources such as data files or other models to represent processes that change over time?*) inform the temporal and spatial scales of the model. This is important because these scales will be used to decide whether a particular data source is included in the resulting ABM. After refining the ODD+D through the domain expert loop (see Table 1), the modelling can proceed to the next step of information input.

In the ODD+D protocol, a series of questions are raised in which the project group details the environment and behaviour of the simulation. Using these, the scope and scale of the network to be modelled is defined [[Savona 2016](#)]. The context, the environment of the agents, their behaviour and their ties are accounted for. The duration and time steps, as well as the size and density of the network is considered here. Between the domain expert and ODD+D tiles in the framework, an iterative process (loops) is established. Based on the research direction and specific topics and needed expertises as defined in the ODD+D, the modellers create an expertise table and correlate the expertises to the domain experts available (table 1). Through the score of experts per expertise, the domains that are underrepresented are identified. Underrepresented domains can subsequently be removed or reduced in the ODD+D, and new or additional domains incorporated. By following the guidelines of the ODD+D, the project boundaries and design choices are set.

To ensure a thorough formulation of the model direction and verified sourcing of the data, a core group of experts with primary knowledge of the relevant agent behaviours, environmental factors, and scales (the three factors of an ABM) should be chosen as initial domain experts and stakeholders. Beyond these stakeholders, additional experts should be incorporated using the expertise table (described above). This redundancy will ensure that the information provided is validated across the opinion of different experts. Table 1 displays the fitness of the subdomains corresponding to the ABM's general components (three factors of an ABM, environment, behaviour and agents). Utilizing the expertise table, the resulting domain experts can cover a large variety of components. In the Y axis of the table, the domains of relevance for the project are listed, while in the X axis the available experts are displayed. While an expert can hold knowledge in multiple domains, a domain is only chosen when a sufficient score (at least of 1) is achieved for this domain. If a score below sufficiency is achieved, the domain is evidently not accessible for this project, and the project and thus the ODD+D must be adapted to exclude this domain (and focus more strongly on domains with higher scores). In the example in Table 1, domain 3 and 6 would have to be excluded from the project.

While it is possible to work with two separate groups of experts, one for the ODD+D, covering the general knowledge base for the project, and one for the interview and information types acquisition as described above, we recommend working with one group for both tasks if possible. This ensures the second task being carried out based on the ODD+D,

and the experts being clear on the objectives of the project. A well defined ODD+D document should be able to guide a (new) group of experts through the required tasks and topics. At the same time, as evident in figure 1, the ODD+D document and the domain experts are closely connected through a loop in column one.

*Table 1: Example of an expertise table to determine the fitness per subdomain category for the inclusion into the modelling process. Subdomains are evaluated by the sum of the expertises per domain, and modellers can assess underrepresented categories when moving forward in the modelling process.*

<b>Subdomains</b>	<b>E1</b>	<b>E2</b>	<b>E3</b>	<b>E4</b>	<b>E5</b>	<b>Score per domain</b>
Domain 1	1	1	1	1	1	5
Domain 2	1	0	0	1	1	3
Domain 3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Domain 4	1	1	0	1	1	4
Domain 5	0	0	0	0	0	0

Once the domain experts are determined, the relevant data is determined. The domain experts are responsible for providing this data, such as case files, databases, as well as participating in interviews. The outcome of this first step is the model direction and research question, which are defined through the loop built with the ODD+D and the domain experts, and steered by the modellers. The most important aspect to take into consideration defining the project is whether the research question is fit to the available data sources, thus is possible to be addressed.

### **2.1.2 Data Acquisition**

After deciding on the direction of the model and the domains represented, the information input, namely qualitative and quantitative data, is sourced. When identifying cases for the formulated research question(s), it is furthermore important that they fall within the defined model and research scope, or that it is clearly identified which parts of a case file are to be included in the process and which are to be omitted within the scope as defined in the ODD+D. In the previous step, the connection between domain experts and data input was explained. Required data types are chosen on the basis of the design choices (do the design choices fit the data input and vice versa) as well as the available domain expert data. We include case files, databases, interviews and literature under data types for FREIDA (cf. the second column of the first phase in figure 1). In the following, we describe these data types in detail. Once all relevant information inputs are considered as dedicated in the design choices, the framework is advanced to the next phase. In there, qualitative data (such as databases) as well as quantitative data (case files, (structured) interviews, literature). The data input is directly dependent on research questions and design choices and thus the available experts.

## **2.2 Phase II (Application)**

In the application phase, the three ABM factors, environment, agents and behaviour are formulated in line with the project direction through their respective data inputs (see arrows in figure 1), thus forming a conceptual model. In the second step, using model assumptions and training statements, a trained ABM is created. After the research direction is defined and the data input determined, the modelling phase can proceed. First, a preliminary conceptual model is designed, including the three aspects of an ABM (environment, agents and behaviour) as well as the ties among agents. Second, the conceptual model is translated into a computational model (ABM) using training statements. Training statements are obtained by distilling case files, specifically the agent behaviour as well as demographics from the database for the model starting conditions. By deciding together with the domain experts on suitable cases and design choices, the appropriate data is selected in the first phase.

### **Outcome phase II**

To inform the model, the qualitative information input is primarily used to inform model design choices such as operationalizing concepts into measurable variables, as well as formulating agent-behaviour rules. Qualitative data inputs include literature, (structured) interviews as well as case files, and are primarily used to create the agents and behaviour of the ABM. An untrained ABM is converted to a trained ABM through training statements, which are derived from the data input obtained in the previous phase. The quantitative information (in the form of a database) is additionally used in the design of the environment of the ABM, including network topology, agent roles and as a guide in training the model and to formalize model concepts; as well as used during model calibration and validation. The specific types of data will be detailed below. At the end of the second phase, a trained ABM is achieved and ready for validation. We will discuss briefly the three key factors of an ABM, namely agents, behaviour and environment, and their main data inputs.

### **2.2.1 Conceptual model**

The three components of an ABM, agents, behaviour and environment, are distilled from the data inputs. We briefly explain the three components now.

#### **Agents**

In the context of an ABM, the functionalities of an agent, as in their motivations, are determined in the agent component, while the results of these motivations are expressed in behaviour. Concretely, the connections that agents form through ties, as well as the agents interactions resulting in changes of the topology or functionality of the network are enveloped in this section. Agents in the ABM represent the nodes in the network, they are categorized in their different roles and demographic backgrounds and are additionally defined by their edges to one another. For the agents, as well as behaviour, in criminology, case files are vital to provide qualitative information with respect to agents (e.g., demographics, role, and other attributes), agent behaviours and how their behaviours are formed or influenced by other agents and environmental factors, within a certain context. Another important qualitative data input are interviews. While case files might describe the agents and behaviour, interviews can give a closer look at the agents and the resulting topology of the

network. Similarly to the case files, the database is another key input for agents. To see a breakdown of the database used in the CCRM, please see appendix II.

### **Behaviour**

In an ABM, the behaviour determines the interactions between agents, as well as emergent properties of the model. Concretely, case files inform the behaviour of the agents as well as (unstructured) interviews. Given that apart from role changes and ties between agents, databases are not informative on agent behaviour, qualitative data inputs are the primary information sources for this component. However, it is vital that multiple sources are used for this component to ensure a validated outcome.

### **Environment**

In the model, agents exist in a contextual environment. This includes overarching functionalities, layers and clusters, as well as intrinsic model motivations. While the nodes (agents) have an agency and behaviour of their own, they are influenced by their environmental circumstances (e.g. violence in the network). All ties together form the topology of the model, which along with time steps and context forms the three functionalities of the environment of an ABM. The main information input sources for the environment are the case files and database, with literature and (un)structured interviews being dependent sources.

In the conceptual model, the three aspects of an ABM (agent, behaviour, environment) are connected to the respective data inputs [[Calderoni et al. 2022](#), [Ahrweiler et al. 2016](#)], as described above. Through the distinction between contextual variables (as applied to agents and their behaviour), and context in the terms of the functionalities of the environment, a measure such as a causal loop diagram or pseudocode is employed to conceptualize the model. However, the ODD+D itself as created in the first phase is treated as a conceptual model in itself. Institutional grammar 2.0 is based on strategies, norms and rules [[Frantz and Siddiki 2021](#)] and Frantz and Siddiki defined strategies to be described as norms, norms to be rules with an (generally informal) injunctive signal, and rules to undergo a collective action process. By applying a strategy of compatibility, detail and theoretical embedding, Institutional Grammar 2.0 utilizes pseudocode to form conceptual models ready to be translated into computational models.

In FREIDA, emphasis lies on the agents' attributes and behavioral rules being clearly described as well as their relations to each other detailed. Static attributes (e.g., demographics, dynamic attributes (e.g., role in a crime script) are extracted from quantitative data, while dynamic variables (e.g., amount of capital) are usually extracted from qualitative information inputs. Case files for example can typically provide behavioral rules for the model, as well as contextual variables.

Contextual variables are important to make behavioral rules conditional or to control their parameters. For instance, the rule “an agent's trust value is reduced by  $X\%$  after observing a liquidation in the local network” could have a different value for  $X$  depending on whether the agent was associated through the social network (e.g., a brother) or the business network (e.g., an accomplice). Also,  $X$  could potentially diminish as a function of network distance, i.e., if someone is liquidated one step away in the network it could have more effect than

someone liquidated two steps away, and so on. An important consideration for deciding complicated and non-linear effects, such as network and distance dependence, is whether sufficient data and/or expert (training) statements are available to base the corresponding model design choices and parameter values upon. That is, if the data (and expert statements) would not be available to make such distinctions, the model should not include them, since the model is supposed to be a representation of the data and the expert knowledge, not of unfounded and ill-informed model design choices by the modeller. If some data or statements is available to make such a model design choice, such as from one or two relevant events in case files, but it is not sufficient to decide the corresponding parameter value(s), then the design choice is made but the parameter(s) be left partly or wholly uncertain (see Phase IV for more details on uncertainty quantification). Structural validation is used to determine the validity of the assumed connections and behaviours. Burns and Musa [[System Dynamics Society 2001](#)] determined eight validation criteria for CLDs, amongst others clarity, cause sufficiency, and tautology. However, continuous structural validation through the core domain experts is provided throughout the modelling process. Once the conceptual model is validated, it is translated into a computational model. Regarding the configuration of a conceptual model, we would lastly like to touch on two alternative methods for a conceptual model formulation, the causal loop diagram (CLD) and AgroDEVS [[Pessah et al. 2022](#)]. Within the system dynamics domain, a conceptual model would be almost always represented through a CLD. There currently is no standard way of expressing a conceptual model for agent based models, though the DEVS framework is presenting a viable alternative to express a model flow without computational means. It is thus at the modeller's discretion to formulate a CLD, DEVS, or other alternative at the stage of the model conceptualization that extends beyond the ODD+D. For a detailed overview of the data types including the methodology to translate case files, please consult appendix II.

### **2.2.2 Computational model**

As an initial step in this column, the conceptual model is translated into a computational model. For this, we first determine the model assumptions, and fit them into an ABM simulation. To adapt its functionalities into a trained ABM ready for validation, training statements are utilized. Wallace et al. stated that the specification of the model is dictated by theory, prior knowledge, and other inputs that determine which features of a given process to highlight and which to leave out [[Committee on the Assessment of Agent-...](#)]. In this case, this stage is covered during the information input step. These model assumptions give an indication about what happens in the context and conditions under which the ABM is executed. Inferred from the model assumptions, the untrained ABM allows the modellers to take a first look at the incorporation of the information without any restraints in regards to training or verification. The modelers can take this opportunity to make sure the computation of the ABM is running properly. Another measure to take are training statements, which are a necessary step to ensuring the information inputs correspond to model behaviour.

#### **Training statements**

Training statements are formulated through the extraction of network parameters in the data (mostly through quantitative data inputs). Training statements are used for the fitting of the model, whereas validation statements, later used in the next phase, are for the evaluation of

the model. Training statements are formed using the case file and database knowledge and are specific to the behaviour and agent design within an ABM. Demographics and temporal variables are usually extracted from a database. In the absence of a database however, training statements are formulated from the expert knowledge and case files and serve as rules for the model. The functionality of the ABM (in terms of agents, behaviour and environment) is compared to the training statements and when necessary adapted. Training statements have the advantage of fitting the model without yet involving a validation step, thus they are not under the scrutiny of the iterative validation. Instead, they help experts organise their thoughts into concrete model building statements, and thus are regarded similar to the ODD+D, but with a direct application for the network. There is no score to be achieved but rather general guidelines for the ABM creation in order to move towards the later validation step. In order to formulate training statements, we can shortly introduce pattern oriented modelling (POM), which are utilized as a tool for multi-criteria design of models for complex systems [[Grimm and Railsback 2012](#)]. When identifying underlying mechanisms, weak and strong patterns within the input data are identified, typically either in the form of quantitative data (for strong patterns) or qualitative data (weak patterns). Weak patterns are considered easier reproducible and the objective is to obtain a model that can reproduce the patterns considered essential for the model. In this regard, pattern oriented modelling can help understand the function of training statements. By forming a loop with the training statements, the final ABM for phase II is not a linear but rather an iterative process. Only when the training statements as well as the ABM are adapted to the full satisfaction of both modellers and domain experts can the validation phase begin.

## 2.3 Phase III Validation

### Outcome phase III

In this phase, the trained model is validated through validation statements, scenario testing and hold out data. While a trained ABM simply takes into account training data to give the model predictability, a validated ABM is able to reproduce statements. Troost et al. described validation as “challenging and substantiating the premises on which the conclusions from simulation analysis are built”. [[Troost et al. 2023](#)] The main difference between training statements and validation statements is that validation statements are not used for model fitting, but rather for evaluating the model. During validation, a score is inferred based on the number of correctly answered validation statements, which provides insight into the performance of the model. It is important to note that scenario testing through hold out data and additional case files can enhance the validation phase. The purpose of validation statements is to express the expected behaviors of the model during evaluation. Contrary, scenario testing challenges the model to reproduce behaviour that is not explicitly described throughout the training phase. We would briefly like to touch on structural and behavioural validation at this point. While the scenario testing is mainly aiming at the behavioural validation, with the agent behaviour at the center of the validation and structural properties of the network emerging through the behaviour, validation statements addressing the network structure address the emergent behaviour and topology of the network. Lastly, hold out data is

a complimentary data usage to scenario testing, in which reserved data from the original dataset is compared with the statistical outcomes of the model [[Bruch and Atwell 201](#)].

### **Validation statements**

Crielaard et al. used validation statements as a method according to the SDM (Systems Dynamics Model) designed in their research [[Crielaard et al. 2022](#)]. Validation statements should thus be formulated concretely and concern measurable behaviour and model outcomes (such as statistical output) and statements should be fulfilled or not, creating a validation score. Behavioural validation investigates whether the dynamic behaviours of the agents match the expectations coming from either the data (next subsection) or the experts [[Crielaard et al. 2020](#)]. The experts' collective expectations are formulated into validation statements which are gathered through interviews, structured group model building sessions, and literature. Statements gathered from literature are approved by the experts in the project, since the model is supposed to be a reflection of the common knowledge of the associated experts, not of the authors of related literature. It is paramount that validation statements have minimal overlap with the training statements. Analogous to (statistical) model validation by using hold out data, the validation data is meant to be independent from the data used to train the model in the first place. After all, this step is intended to test the model's generalizability beyond the training data. In the extreme case of using validation statements which are the same as the training statements, the model will always perform as well as is possible (the same as during the training phase), which is trivial and therefore would make the validation step useless. In general, though, this is more difficult to ensure for qualitative statements derived from experts than it is for data sets, since the same set of experts is used to generate both training and validation statements. We argue that a good rule of thumb to ensure non-overlapping statements is to make a distinction between 'local' statements and 'global' statements. Local statements assert something about one or a few factors in the conceptual model, or about one or a few (connected) agents in the simulation. An example could be: "Whenever an agent is liquidated, all directly connected agents will have a period of at least 50% reduced trust in all other agents, if and only if they are unaware of who performed the liquidation." In contrast, a statement at the global level is supposed to somehow capture the result of factors of a large part or the entire model interacting with each other, possibly over an extended period of time. For instance: "If a kingpin is liquidated, and another agent exists in the network with the same or even better social and criminal capital within a network distance of 4 links, then eventually, but within one year, one such agent has become the new kingpin." Or vice versa: "If a kingpin is liquidated, and no other agent exists with a minimum of social and criminal capital required within network distance 4, then the criminal network will disintegrate and the crime script will stop functioning, within a period of one year." These statements are a result of multiple or potentially all agents in the network, who are supposed to share information with each other about who they know in order to find a new candidate kingpin, despite having for instance reduced trust directly following liquidations (as per the example training statement). In other words, simulations in which all agents happen to decide to stop communicating or have the wrong information about other agents, should be penalized (not receiving a score for this statement) since the underlying assumption is that because of the high importance of the criminal business continuing, eventually agents will reach out further and further and even risk exposure when trying to improve their



information position. Both validation statements still allow for intermediate processes, such as new candidate kingpins who turned out to not possess sufficient social or criminal capital and who are subsequently liquidated by rivals or more powerful candidates (which is captured by other statements). In this way, the validation statements will tend to be non-overlapping with the training statements by construction.

Statements should be formulated with the intention to be evaluated as ‘true’ in the ideal simulation. The simplest method of scoring a particular model is to count 1 point for each statement that is reproduced, and 0 otherwise. In some cases, a partial score is defined, such as when a value should be as close as possible to what is considered to be realistic. For example, if it is known that the prevalence of a certain type of crime has been stable at 4% then the model's prevalence is compared when simulating until it stabilizes. The score is kept in the [0,1] range by, e.g, the softmax function.

Using training and validation statements, an error rate with specific error ranges for the data need to be determined in order to ultimately validate the model. One way, used by Crielaard et al., is to construct a null hypothesis score distribution of random models, and assess whether the calibrated model performs at least significantly better than an uncalibrated and or randomly structured model.

### **Hold out data and scenario testing**

Another standard way of validation that is recommended through FREIDA is to utilize hold out data. This step helps validate the model during the training process and is giving the modellers an estimate of the model performance during the initial calibration. It should be used as a last validation step. Generally, about 20% of the data (in this case general information input) should be reserved as hold out data, with the remaining 80% used for the calibration of the model. When possible, a second set of case files must be held out and used for validation [[Awwalu and Nonyelum](#)]. To perform scenario testing using the hold out case files, the initial parameters of the case should be inserted into the model (number of agents, time scale, time steps, environment, relation of the removed node) and the model run to the specification of the first initialization according to the distilled information. Both data from qualitative and quantitative information inputs are used for the hold out method. If quantitative data is available to the modellers, a similar null hypothesis test can be performed. In addition, a common rule of thumb is that a calibrated model should perform roughly equally well on the hold out data as on the training data, especially if the hold out data was randomly selected. In order to move on to the last phase, the validation phase needs to be finished with satisfying validation scores as well as scenario testing and the utilizing of hold out data. The outcomes of these scores and scenarios should be discussed with both the modellers and domain experts in regards to the expectations set in the ODD+D in phase I. In case the validation scores are not satisfying, the modellers have the option to iterate the previous phase of model conceptualization and computation, specifically the construction of the computational model in terms of the individual components of the ABM, as well as the training statements. It is vital to discuss with the domain experts whether specifically case files (which importantly contribute to both training statements as well as the validation measures in the third phase) have been interpreted correctly in the previous phase, as they

largely are responsible for the outcome of the validation scores. If the validation scores are still not satisfactory after a modification of the ABM components, and the casefile dependant input, we recommend moving into phase I again and determining the structure of the model through the ODD+D with the new insights, as well as sourcing more data in the second step of the first phase, then following the framework linearly again.

## 2.4 Phase IV, Iteration

### Outcome phase IV

The outcome of phase IV is an evaluated ABM which has undergone sensitivity analysis and uncertainty quantification. Thus, once the fourth phase is finished, the model and project can be reasonably ended, if the model withstands the two tests in the last phase. If the sensitivity scores and general validation is not satisfactory, the model must undertake another loop through the FREIDA phases, selectively improving on specific stages. A positive outcome would be a model that is not only satisfactory in terms of the tests undertaken in the previous phase, but also withstands sensitivity analysis and uncertainty quantification, and most importantly, aligns with the project outcome as specified in the ODD+D in the first phase. Contrary, a negative outcome would be a model notwithstanding these tests, and additionally being rejected by the domain experts in terms of application potential. In this case, another iteration of FREIDA would have to be performed with the model. A reliable way to determine whether another loop is necessary is the sensitivity and scenario testing scores achieved. If unsatisfactory, the hold out data would not be able to reproduce the tested models reliably. Additionally, the domain experts will give their feedback on the model and indicate a real world usability. If this is not achieved, the modellers and the domain experts together are responsible to identify data gaps in the following loop. Validation scores, uncertainty quantification, and sensitivity analysis indicate whether the framework needs to be further iterated (returning to the first phase) [[Crielaard et al. 2020](#)]. The four phases are regarded as one loop of network simulation. After the fourth phase, the network should be evaluated as to whether more loops are necessary to update or change the model. This is done by accessing the model outcomes against case files and having them reviewed additionally by the domain experts to determine the closeness to the real-world-functionalities as well as through validation scores that are clearly lacking, the modellers receive an indication whether to reiterate the framework. In the next loop, additional information can be included in the model by following again through the four phases if deemed necessary. In the last phase, sensitivity analysis and uncertainty quantification are performed, the final indications of whether to reiterate the model or not.

### Sensitivity Analysis

The sensitivity analysis aids in determining which subparts and parameters of the model are essential. Uleman et al. describe sensitivity analysis as a technique applied to the simulation model which is used to identify which of the connections are important for model predictions and which would require additional data in order to be estimated with high confidence [[Uleman et al. 2021](#)]. Future research or improvements can thus be identified.

For the purpose of this framework, the following application is proposed: Each of the agent rules is put under scrutiny and investigated for their relevance in regards to the eventual outcome of the model simulation. Multiple data inputs must be compared and verified in order to recognize the most relevant data source. This has to be evaluated both for the model environment and overall simulation outcome. For this, the individual behaviour roles as identified through the ODD+D will be challenged by either changing them when appropriate (drastically changing the given value) or pausing them altogether. The resulting simulation will be compared to the simulation as run with all the proposed rules. Based on the outcome of these runs, and the feedback through the experts and comparison with case files, the importance of the rules can be identified. When a rule is identified to be not relevant for the overall simulation outcome, it shall be discussed with the experts and when agreed upon removed or muted during this particular simulation. This is reinstated when a different simulation outcome is desired. There should also be a short analysis as to which data input has lead to the rule.

### **Uncertainty Quantification**

Secondary, uncertainty quantification should be performed to probe the model. Within the FREIDA model, we must both account for input uncertainty and model uncertainty. Incomplete knowledge of model input parameters or uncertainty in the data used for the initialization of the model having some sampling variability leads to input uncertainty. Comparably, the model uncertainty regards unverifiable assumptions about the key parameters, associated with the architecture of the model. The uncertainty implies that with altered input parameters, the model outcome would be different, which means that the inputs would not be validated. A validated input would imply the same model outcome every time [[Iman and Helton 1988](#)]. After all four phases are performed, and the reiteration discussed and possibly performed, a validated ABM in the field of criminology is the result of following FREIDA. In the following section, we will be discussing the example of a criminal cocaine replacement model (CCRM) and the results of FREIDA.

## **3. Case Study - Criminal Cocaine Replacement Model (CCRM)**

The Criminal Cocaine Replacement Model (CCRM) investigates the recovery of a criminal network for cocaine trade in the Netherlands after the removal of a central node (kingpin or murderbroker) within the organised crime network acting as an organiser for the other agents and holding superior criminal capital, as well as the selection process for a new kingpin (for a breakdown of the roles including brief descriptions, please consult Table III.1. in appendix III). The model is primarily based on the input of a selection of textual documents describing particular cases (i.e. case files) of kingpin removal. Further, we also relied on knowledge elicited from experts and the database. The databases detail the persons involved with a police encounter, including their primary market (for example cocaine trade, human trafficking, etc.), their role (for example dealer, transporter, assassin, etc.),

demographic details about their person (age, gender, nationality, background, etc.) as well as details of the encounter (date, time, etc.) and links between persons (by shared arrests). In the following, we will demonstrate the use of FREIDA through the example of the CCRM model. Given that criminal computation utilises mixed data inputs (both quantitative and qualitative input as well as multiple sources of each) as well as a limited understanding of validation of criminal simulation models, FREIDA is primarily designed for the criminal computation field. We will illustrate for each phase (see figure 1) how the CCRM example was applied in FREIDA, resulting in a functional and verified simulation model. The data collection and knowledge elicitation, analysis, and their translation into a validated model were guided by the FREIDA methodology.

## **3.1 Phase I (Information Acquisition)**

### **Outcome Phase I**

In the first phase, the modellers and a core group of domain experts come together to define the project direction and questions, refining them through what we call the expert-loop (with the assistance of the expertise table, see Table 1). The direction of the project and the availability of the experts determines the data input.

### **3.1.1 Knowledge Acquisition**

In the following, we illustrate the role of modellers and that of domain experts in creating the ODD+D document which provides the input required for the next phase.

#### **Modelers**

The modellers together with the domain experts define the project direction (research question and project design) through the means of an ODD+D. It is the modellers that must determine the initial direction of the project using the expertise table (see table 1) and ODD+D, as well as the input from the core domain experts. The expertise table was not refined in the case of the CCRM given the large expertise of the domain experts.

The modellers are responsible not only for the computational implementation of the model but also the project management. Specifically, modellers are in charge of tasks such as sourcing the domain experts required based on the expert table.

#### **Domain experts**

Two law enforcement experts from the Amsterdam Police and National Police Academy were involved. One expert provided demographical and individual insights about members of the criminal networks. The qualitative data input thus is translating into the agent's roles and behavioural rules with the criminal cocaine network of the Netherlands. The domain experts also provided data such as case files and databases that was crucial to inform the model development. The other expert provided information about tie strength and tie changes in the criminal cocaine network of the Netherlands. Both interviews were analyzed to inform the design of the ODD+D.

Even though a larger panel of experts can be beneficial e.g. to cover different domains of expertise and triangulate findings, the knowledge elicited from these two experts was considered adequate given the exploratory nature of this study.

### ODD+D document

Together with the domain experts, an ODD+D document has been created for the CCRM using the medium of a focus group consisting of the domain experts. The identified purpose of the model is for law enforcement to simulate post-liquidation scenarios within small subnetworks in the cocaine market of the Netherlands. Further details, such as context and identified relevant environmental variables, are found in the ODD+D document in appendix III.

*Table 2., an excerpt of the ODD+D protocol used for the CCRM. Below, questions of the first section (I. Overview) are detailed. The remainder of the ODD+D for the CCRM are found in Appendix III. For a short description of orphans, brokers, and other relevant roles, please review section 3.2.*

		Guiding Questions	Answers
<b>I. Overview</b>	<b>I.1 Purpose</b>	I.1.a What is the purpose of the study?	To create an informed model for node replacement in criminal cocaine networks, in order to inform law enforcement of potential intervention results.
		I.1.b For whom is the model designed?	For law enforcement to simulate behavior of criminal networks undergoing interventions within the cocaine market, as well as researchers, data scientists and visualization experts.
	<b>I.2 Entities, state variables and scales</b>	I.2.a What kinds of entities are in the model?	Every role related to a cocaine network, this will include all necessary agents within a cocaine network value chain (every agent that is needed to be connected for executing their own personal task)
			The ties between the agents (multiple type of ties, such as social ties, business ties, and including the trust the agents have for each other)
		I.2.c What are the exogenous factors / drivers of the model?	Intervention by removal of one agent (specialist or kingpin) and inherent motivation of the criminal agents to return to a stable functioning system.

	<b>I.3 Process overview and scheduling</b>	I.3.a What entity does what, and in what order?	1 <sup>st</sup> : Intervention takes place and selected agent is removed 2 <sup>nd</sup> : Nodes are left with severed connections 3 <sup>rd</sup> : Orphans are looking for a successor within 2 connections from themselves 4 <sup>th</sup> : If a successor is not available in the personal downline, orphans give brokers the task to find a successor in their own downline 5 <sup>th</sup> : Potential successors are accessed based on a threshold of parameter values. 6 <sup>th</sup> : The orphans “vote” for the new successor 7 <sup>th</sup> : New successor assumes 70% of the old connections including all orphans 8 <sup>th</sup> : New successor is evaluated based on fitness over time (regarding the minimum threshold for fitness parameters)
--	--	---	---

### 3.1.2 Data Acquisition

#### Case files

Case files were used to inform the development of the behavioural rules for the replacement model in cocaine networks. Such rules included the progression from Police intervention to the removal of the kingpin node, the reaction by the surrounding orphaned nodes, and the replacement process of the kingpin. This is followed up by an evaluation that was performed once the model had undergone timesteps equating to one year. This evaluation takes place in the form of training and validation scores. Case files are selected for the model by the relevant domain experts. In Table III.3 in Appendix III, a guide on how information from case files is extracted can be found. The fitness of the case file is evaluated by the modellers together with the providing domain expert on the basis of the research question and project design, taking into account the finished ODD+D. Only when the entities as well as time scale and general environment match the description in the ODD+D, are case files taken into account for the model. The state of the network and possible changes after the initial replacement are detailed, as well as supported by closer details on the backgrounds, relations and motivations of the most relevant nodes. Each case file describes an individual network and sequence of events. A second set of case files (encompassed in the validation and hold out data) can serve as a validation of the model outcome. Table 3 includes the selection criteria for case files as used by the Amsterdam Police, as composed by the domain expert from the police, the specific selection criteria regarding a case file used in the CCRM being organized according to the required types of information input. A brief description of the case files are found in Appendix III, which details the validation statements derived. Case files are labelled A, B, C, D, and describe briefly an intervention and replacement scenario for a cocaine network.

Table 3: Selection criteria for a case file in the example of the CCRM as per the police Amsterdam

ABM component	Model component	Case File Details
Behaviour	Behavioural rules	The behaviour of the orphans is analyzed. In the direct days / weeks following the intervention (T=1).
	Personal Dynamics	A clear delineated network that is active in cocaine trafficking can be observed. The network is analysed twelve months after the original intervention (T=2) and ultimately the kingpin and crucial actors are determined.
Agents	Roles	Actors with a crucial role (someone with scarce criminal capital, such as access to wholesale sellers of cocaine, cartels in South America or with corrupted officials in key ports of entry) are described.
	Specific Agents	A kingpin (someone who organizes and/or finances the cocaine logistics) is described (before and after determining the replacement).
	General agents	No information provided.
	Network	Individuals form the core of the selected network. The network consists of target or crucial actors. Direct contacts between the contacts that are structurally active in the cocaine network form the structure of the network.
Environment	Context	No information provided.
	Time Steps	In the selected network (detailed in the case file), an intervention has taken place This takes form in either an arrest of the kingpin / crucial actor or the assassination of such a person (at T=0).
	Demography	Case files will always include a short narrative in which the above mentioned elements are briefly covered. Specific focus is given to the decision making process of the orphans.

### Database

The models' starting conditions are extracted from the database as provided by the police. The data spans a period of 1997 to 2021, and has been collected under privacy law. Within the data, the embeddedness of organized crime networks at a national level is represented. Information about organized crimes are obtained from two main sources: informants, who could be either from within criminal networks or civilians and wire-tapping, which is mainly used to validate the information obtained. The main purpose of the database is to store the



connection between criminals, their roles and activities in organized crime networks. The data provided includes all personal information and details of the crimes committed per person, with a total of 226638 entries. By focusing on the case files as the main input for the model, the database was used for cross referencing in regards to general agent roles and ties.

### **Interviews**

While the ODD+D are created using a focus group of domain experts, missing information is extracted using unstructured interviews were held with two domain experts. Primarily, the domain expert that provided the database and case files was interviewed to fill in gaps in the understanding of the agent interactions and environment. Examples of these are parameters set in the model to describe criminal capital, violence capital, financial capital and trust amongst agents (described in 3.2.1). Unstructured interviews ensured their model to be grounded in a deep understanding of the subject matter. For an overview of the chosen parameters per agent role in the CCRM, please consult the appendix, Table III.4.

The results of the interviews conducted with the experts regarding the structural agent topology for the CCRM are detailed in Table 3. The CCRM network consists of agents divided into three general groups (organisers (agents in higher ranking roles important to the functionality of the network), experts (agents with specific skill sets that are difficult to replace, therefor holding central roles within the network) and workers (agents reliable on organisers for their tasks and in abundance, with low skill level) that each are crucial for the functionality of the network. The network is clustered in terms of these roles and their shared edges, as well as their abundance within the network. For example, worker-agents tend to cluster around organiser-nodes, as roles are dependent on each other.

### **Literature and existing models**

While existing models and literature were reviewed to gain an understanding in the field as well as contextually, the CCRM itself is not based on existing models. For an overview of existing literature, please review 1.1.

## **3.2 Phase II (Application)**

### **3.2.1 Conceptual Model**

The CCRM is a conceptual model used to simulate the replacement process of a criminal network after a disruption such as the removal of a kingpin. The model consists of three parts: agents, behavior, and environment. The behavior of the criminal network is modeled as a cycle of four stages: stable, intervention, who-done-it, and cooldown. The agents in the model operate under two different dynamics, stable and replacement, depending on the stage of the cycle. The agents have roles and attributes that determine their function and worth in the network. The environment of the network is divided into two layers, business and social, which correspond to the decision-making process of the agents. The model is simulated for one year, with one simulation day equivalent to one real day. The CCRM was developed through unstructured interviews and analysis of case files, and the model structure was informed by the domain experts.


While the ODD+D is considered a rudimentary conceptual model, in the following we will describe the three parts of the conceptual model, agents, behaviour and environment, as well as their respective origins in terms of data input. For the CCRM conceptual model, one step of simulation corresponds to one day in the model. The duration of the simulation is one year

### **Environment**

In the CCRM, the simulation remains active for the steps of one year (1 step equals one day). During the replacement model, the network remains isolated from other networks within the larger cocaine network in the Netherlands. However, we operate under the assumption that during the stable phase, the network would interact with other networks.

The network in this study has two layers, the social layer and the business layer (figure 2). The social layer includes bonds like familiar ties, trust, and friendship, while the business layer involves agents assuming roles in the network with attributes like violence, criminal capital, and financial power. The social layer is determined by social roles and trust ties, determining the social embeddedness into the network [[Morselli 2013](#)], while the business layer is determined by operational requirements. The replacement process is influenced by both layers, with orphans preferring replacements that fit the operational requirements on the business layer and share social similarities on the social layer. Agents occupy space on both layers.

Agents in the CCRM are simultaneously embedded into two separate layers in the network, assuming predetermined roles and forming ties in each one. This is a result of the domain experts' unstructured interviews, and serves as a marker for the model structure. The layers represent the business and social side of the network, both important for the decision making of the individual agents. Tie connections will be made on the basis of trust, which is prevalent on the social layer, while business decisions are primarily taking effect through the consideration of the fitness of the individual, which is considered a business decision. The layers are discussed in detail under 'Environment'. A depiction of the multiplicity of the layers is found in figure 2.



*Figure 2: Depiction of the different edge types within one network. A red edge is a family edge, purple is a friend edge and blue is a neutral edge. The opacity of the edge indicates the strength of the trust (less opacity equals higher trust).*

### **Model narrative**

In table 4, the leftmost step shows the conceptual set-up of the model, detailing the translation to the computational model, including event-enticed stage, a description of the network and agent behaviour and the time scale. Per time step, the model undergoes the changes in tie-connectivity and orphan-behaviour as described previously. We begin with the initialization phase according to the specifications as set by the modellers and domain experts. The four stages (initialization, removal of the kingpin, searching stage, and finally instating of a new kingpin) follow in succession, and return the network back into the stable state it began with (see figure 3). The phases are briefly described in Table 4.


Table 4: A brief overview of each phase of the CCRM, with a short description as well as an overview of the time of commencement for the respective phase

Conceptual stage	Computational stage	Description	Time scale
Stable stage	Initialization	All agents and ties are being initialised into the model according to their initialization specifications.	Step 0
Intervention	Removal of the kingpin	The initial kingpin and his ties are removed. This step marks the dynamic beginning of the simulation.	Step 0
Who-done-it	Searching phase	The orphans evaluate the potential replacements until a suitable replacement is found.	Commences between 10 and 30 steps after kingpin removal.
Cooldown	Instating of a new kingpin	The new kingpin officially gets picked and changes roles from their old role to the new role.	Commences when new kingpin is picked.
Cooldown/ Stable stage	Model updates	Updates according to the new change in the network.	Commences after the new kingpin is picked

The created model contains the cases of four provided case files, and accurately describes the events of the agents within the case files throughout one year. Specifically, the removal of the kingpin or murderbroker commences at step 0, the events within step 1 (up to 31 days after removal) are followed closely, and the model is once again assessed after 365 days (from step 0). The four separate models are regarded as an example for modelling as well as proof of concept for the FREIDA methodology.

### Behaviour

We must first understand the stages that the criminal network undergoes facing a disruption as well as the inherent underlying motivation of the agents to return to a stable stage to understand the replacement strategy of any criminal network. This is considered the behaviour of the agents. This is part of the conceptual modelling of the network. We introduce a cycle composed of four stages, with the network returning to its original state after completing the cycle. This has been found from the empirical observation of drug networks obtained through the unstructured interviews and the analysis of the case files (especially those from the Amsterdam's police). The cycle is illustrated in figure 3.



*Figure 3: Cyclical stage diagram of the criminal cocaine network as determined by the domain experts and case files*

It is important to note as well that the agents operate under two distinctively different dynamics. When in the stable stage, the agents carry out behaviour associated with their respective roles. However, when not in a stable phase, the agents switch their behaviour to the replacement dynamics detailed in table II.2 in the appendix. During the stable stage, the network has found an equilibrium between security and efficiency and is operating in its preferred ideal state of productivity. This is confirmed by the case files used in the CCRM. It must be noted that we model the CCRM in a vacuum and do not (as of yet) fit it in the contextual environment of the entire crime network of the Netherlands. Criminal networks prioritize efficiency over security due to their focus on productivity and increasing financial gains, which is reflected in their shorter time-to-task compared to terrorist networks. [Morselli 2013]. Next, in the intervention stage, the network is experiencing its primary disruption, in the form of the removal of the kingpin. Following, the remaining orphans are undergoing a state of who-done-it, in which possible endangerments from within the network are examined as well as the orphans undergoing steps of personal protection measures. Lastly, there is the cooldown stage, in which the network settles back into a productive state. During this stage, the replacement is found, and the network under the guidance of the orphans reorganizes into a functioning system again. Ultimately, the stable stage is achieved again and the cycle is complete. Our simulation mostly focuses on the cooldown stage, also known as the replacement stage, with the intervention marking the beginning of the simulation. The simulation remains running for one year.

### **Agents**

Agents are defined by their roles, attributes and edges. In the section of ‘Behaviour’, some of the attributes are explained. However, to understand the type of different agents regarding their roles and motivations present in the network, we first have to briefly introduce some terminology for the agents present in the network. In the network, agents have specific roles which both represent their function for the network as well as define their motivations and are defined through a set of parameters (see table III.1 in appendix III for a detailed description of each role). The agents closely connected to the original kingpin, who holds the most

organizational power as well as criminal capital in a network, are called Orphans, as they are “orphaned” when the kingpin is removed. Orphans each have their own business role, most commonly as organizer, financier or coordinator, thus a role with a high overall criminal capital as well. Commonly, orphans are connected to the kingpin by friendship or family ties. In some case files, instead of a kingpin, a murderbroker is removed. A murderbroker is a role which organizes other assassins and connects them to other agents. Generally, a broker is an agent that will connect different roles to each other and act as a middle man for their specific expertise. The actors close to the old kingpin are generally more centralized within the network.

Each agent assumes a fixed rule on both the social layer and the business layer. As the agents are mainly operating on the business layer, their roles there determine their function for the network, while the social roles determine the trust in each other and their behaviour when it comes to connecting to other agents. The roles on the business layer are grouped by their function (see table III.1 in the appendix III). Only a member of the organizer group can become the new kingpin. Each role has an assigned criminal capital, which corresponds to their worth in the network and the ease of replacing them. One agent will have one role on the social and one role on the business layer, though roles are not tied to each other. Only the organizer roles correspond to family roles, and only a member of a family-role on the social layer is part of the organizer-group on the business layer. Trust develops within familiar and friendship levels, oftentimes tied to a shared or similar demographic and background, and the social layer reflects this. To calculate trust between two agents, formula 1.1. is utilized. The attributes of the agents correspond to the role description, with for example a financier holding large financial power, while a role in the worker-group would hold low trust. When picking a new potential kingpin, the four attributes of any agent are added up in value and the node with the highest total attribute score is taken into consideration to be the new kingpin by the orphans. Orphans are the inner circle of agents, which are part of an organizer-group that were close to the original kingpin. The orphans are responsible for finding a replacement for the original kingpin. This means that an agent that lacks the highest score in one of the categories make up for this by being exceptionally high in another. All attributes except for trust are hosted on the business layer, with trust hosted on the social layer due to its attachment to familiar and friendship connections. Concretely, the agents will have one of three mindsets, “neutral”, “chaotic”, “uncertain”, based on the phase of the model. Additionally, they perform an overarching activity, which is either set to “normal” or “searching”, as well dependent on the model stage. Each agent will have a business role (for an overview of business roles and their parameters, see table III.1 in appendix III) and a social role. The social role is either “friend”, “family” or “neutral” and is determined from the perspective of the original kingpin. The social role is expressed through the edges. Another edge-tag is trust, which is expressed between two agents. Trust is anywhere between 0 and 1. The three parameters unique to the individual agents are their violence capital, financial capital and criminal capital (between 0 and 1). Minimum thresholds of each parameter determine the fitness of the agents to perform specific tasks and roles ( $\neq$  for the kingpin candidate) (see table III.1 in the appendix).

### 3.2.2 Computational Model

Based on the above described data input, the conceptual model was initialized into a computational agent based model. For this, the appropriate variables and parameters were chosen from the data input. Initial choices regarding the model dynamics are found in table III.1 in the appendix. The four case files (described in appendix III) were translated into training statements, as well as validation statements, and using case files, interviews and to a degree the provided database, the replacement dynamics extruded.

#### Trust

The trust ( $T$ ) between two agents increases over time ( $t$ ) at rate  $\psi$ . However, this slows down as the time since the removal ( $K$ ) increases but increases for two agents with close distance ( $D$ ) depending on their trust values  $b$ , donating the agent pair. Additionally, if the agent pair is in the same family, the binary variable  $F_{ij}$  and coefficient  $c$  is used for updating edges of this type. Lastly, noise is introduced through a Wiener process donated by  $\varepsilon(t)$ . The factor  $\tau$  is used to scale the dynamics of the model. It should be denoted that trust has been conceptualized from domain interviews, however, multiple mechanisms to denote trust as well as other relevant parameters are possible to include. Additionally, uncertainty has not been accounted for as of yet.

$$dT_{ij}/dt = \tau * (\psi * 1/(K+1) * 1/D_i * b(T) + F_{ij} * \varphi * c(T) + \varepsilon[t]) \quad \mathbf{1.1.}$$

For an overview of the parameters and their values after optimization, please review appendix III (table III.4).




Figure 4: Trust attributed per edge over time for case A. The removal of the kingpin has been performed at step 60 (indicated by dotted line) to allow for trust development. Kingpin trust



*edges are indicated in red, organizer edges in orange and all other edges in green. An example of new edges being formed can be found at marker A, while edges falling below the minimum trust to maintain an edge can be found at marker B. Between markers C and D, an uptrend of trust of organizer edges after kingpin removal can be detected.*

In figure 4, we note that all trust edges of a kingpin (indicated in red) are removed when the kingpin is removed (day of removal indicated by dotted line). Other trust edges discontinue when the trust sinks below 0.1 (around marker B). However, it is noteworthy that throughout the simulation, trust edges are added as well (marker A). Particularly, after the removal of the kingpin, new edges are formed immediately. This corresponds with the forming of a conclave 3-10 days after the removal of a kingpin, and the subsequent adding of new edges to a new kingpin candidate. Another noteworthy mention is that while organizer edges remain roughly in a 0.2 trust range throughout the simulation, with only minor fluctuations, green non-organizer edges experience a higher fluctuation, and a visibly more frequent discontinuation as compared to orange edges. Lastly, as observed between markers C and D, organizer edges which start between 0.5-0.7 trust after kingpin removal are uptrending in trust over the course of the simulation.

### **Replacement Dynamics**

Table 4 describes the model transition from conceptual to computational. In the computational simulation, the model undergoes distinct phases according to the state it has progressed into. These are inferred roughly from the conceptual stages as described in figure 3. To select a new kingpin, nodes with specific markers form a conclave, in which the searching process is started as well as new kingpin candidates evaluated according to minimum thresholds of parameters ( $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ). Model parameters are inferred by adding and removing edges to other nodes. An edge is removed when the trust is below the trust-threshold. The entire node is removed when no more edges connect it to other nodes. Concretely, replacement parameters are defined through a series of model rules. These are in table III.1. in appendix III. It must be noted though that there are default parameters chosen for model calibrated, which are adjusted through model validation and specifically sensitivity analysis.

### **Training Statements**

Training statements are formed using the case file and database knowledge and are specific to the behaviour and agent design within an ABM. In the case of the CCRM they regard the qualities of the replacement candidate, the productivity of the network, the tie changes between agents, and more. The training statements for the replacement model are found in Table 5 below. Case files A, B and C were used to extract training statements, while case file D was used for validation. Using the training statements, the computational model is trained and the functionalities adapted according to the statements.

Table 5: Training statements distilled from the expert knowledge for the criminal cocaine replacement model (CCRM). Case files A, B and C were used for training of the model.

	ID	Training Statements	Maximum score
A	I	Correct person is new kingpin by the end of the simulation	1
	II	Correct person is kingpin directly after conclave	1
	III	Person G should not be there anymore at the end of the simulation	1
	IV	A trusts B and C the most	1
	V	All high trust values (>0.8) should have increased or at least remained the same directly after the killing	1
	VI	The average violence capital among the orphans increases after the liquidation (measured at 1 week after)	1
	VII	Average trust among the orphans increased after 1 year	1
	VIII	Connectivity and/or trust values among the non-kingpin nodes changed significantly (at least 0.1)	1
		<b>Total possible score case A</b>	<b>8</b>
B	I	Correct triplet of persons is together the new kingpin by the end of the simulation	$\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}$
	II	Correct person is new kingpin by the begin of the simulation (i.e. Y selected at first)	1
	III	The average trust among the orphans increases after the liquidation (measured at 364 days after)	1
	IV	Person Y should not be there anymore at the end of the simulation	1
	V	A trusts B and C the most	$\frac{1}{3}$
	VI	B trusts A and C the most	$\frac{1}{3}$
	VII	C trusts A and B the most	$\frac{1}{3}$
	VIII	All high trust values (>0.8) should have increased or at least remained the same directly after the killing	1
		<b>Total possible score case B</b>	<b>6</b>
C	I	Correct person is new kingpin by the end of the simulation	1

	<b>II</b>	Correct person is kingpin directly after conclave	1
	<b>III</b>	Y trusts A and B the most	1
	<b>IV</b>	All high trust values (>0.8) should have increased or at least remained the same directly after the killing	1
	<b>V</b>	The trust between the orphans increases by 15% before the new replacement is chosen	1
	<b>VI</b>	The trust between family members has an average of at least 75%	1
		<b>Total possible score case C</b>	<b>6</b>




Figure 5. Case A generated as a network. Persons A to G are present in the network and assume business roles, as well as the Kingpin Main. The figure represents the network upon initialization. Red edges represent family ties, purple edges represent friend ties, blue edges represent neutral ties. Trust edges are represented through the opacity of the edge color; low opacity represents low trust. Criminal capital is represented through the node lightness (lighter nodes represent a higher criminal capital), violence capital is represented through node size. Financial capital is represented through a squared node (with a threshold of 0.5 for shape changing).

### Using training statements to calibrate the model

The idea behind training statements is that they are used to achieve model calibration, in addition to (or as replacement of) using quantitative data in the usual way. Here we illustrate how the model calibration is achieved through using training statements only.

Within the simulation, the case files are initialized including their respective agents and edges. Each case file then includes a set of training statements which have a (partial) score per statement. When the simulation is initialized, the statement can be scored or not, and the final score per case file is given. Throughout multiple model runs, an average score per case file can be calculated, as well as investigated if there are any training statements which consistently score or not score. Figure 6 illustrates the global optimum in the objective function landscape.

The most common first step is to perform a global optimization procedure in the parameter space. We will consider 7 free parameters, thus spanning a 7-dimensional parameter space.  $\beta$  the minimum threshold for an edge's trust to participate in the kingpin-search,  $\kappa$  denoting the minimum kingpin attributes in order to assume the role,  $\gamma$  denoting the minimum trust to become a kingpin,  $\tau$  denoting the constant to control the time scale of trust dynamics (smaller  $\tau$  results in slower changes),  $\psi$  denoting the constant to control how strong the updating of trusts is following the kingpin removal,  $\varphi$  denoting the constant to control how strong this family-tie trust updating (to higher values) is, regardless of whether a kingpin was removed or not, and finally  $\zeta$  denoting temperature, indicating noise ( $\zeta$  equal to 0 results in the conclave selecting the best suited candidate, while  $\zeta$  approaching infinity results the conclave selecting uniformly random amongst available candidates). The challenge with our model is that it is stochastic, meaning that many standard optimization procedures will not work well. Therefore we use a stochastic optimization procedure, abbreviated SPSA [[Nocedal and Wright 1999](#)]. This algorithm attempts to estimate the amount of stochasticity in the objective function, averaging over multiple objective function calls as needed, in order to decide the next iteration. Details of how we ran the SPSA algorithm are found in Appendix III.

The global optimum that we found is illustrated in figure 6. In the optimized model, some values of the optimum have been taken out, including the minimum capital values for becoming a kingpin ( $\kappa$ ), which is set to 0. This means that it is possible for someone with no capital to become a kingpin, which makes sense given that case A already had a kingpin with only 0.2 capital. Another value that has been adjusted is the temperature T, which is around 0.75 in the new optimum. This means that if someone has an average capital that is 0.1 higher than someone else, they have a higher chance of being chosen as the kingpin, with a factor of  $\text{Exp}(0.1, 0.75)$ . However, the noise in this factor is relatively high, indicating that small differences in capital may not have a significant impact on the chances of being chosen as the kingpin. This could be attributed to the low capital in case A and the three equally likely kingpin candidates in case B, which may have affected the model's optimization.

### Objective function around optimal solution




Figure 6. Illustration of the global optimum in the objective function landscape. The height of the landscape is quantified by the number of training statements that ‘failed’ (not reproduced by the model), averaged over the four cases. Shown is a two-dimensional slice of the 7-dimensional landscape, represented by the abstract coordinates  $x$  and  $y$ . The global minimum is located at  $x=y=0$ . It is clearly visible that the objective function is stochastic, even after averaging over 48 model runs per SPSA iteration. Figure 6 is smoothed using 2D gaussian smoothing filter covariance matrix  $((0.01, 0), (0, 0.01))$ .

Some of the described training statements in table 5 are not achieved currently in the model. This for example concerns statement BI, the forming of a triumvirate in place of a single kingpin node. This particular model dynamic is not implemented yet in the simulation, and thus this training statement is not scored at the moment. This is visible in figure 6, where the failed training statements are represented through axis  $F(x,y)$ . Figure 6 clearly exemplifies that the global optimum scores the best, but that various other parameter sets score almost as well. This is covered by the concept of parameter sensitivity analysis, which is discussed in Section 3.4.1. For now, we mention that it is important to not only consider the single globally optimal parameter set, but also sample over other parameter sets (weighted inversely by their objective function value) in order to generate model predictions along with their uncertainties.




Figure 7: The optimal values of the training statements in regards to cases A, B and C. Figure 7.a. (top left) showing the optimal value of  $x$  over  $\phi$ , 7.b. (top right) showing the optimal values for the minimum attributes to become the new kingpin ( $x$  over  $\kappa$ ) and 7.c. (bottom center) showing the minimum trust to become the kingpin ( $x$  over  $\tau$ ).

In figure 7, the optimum values of the parameters of  $\phi$ ,  $\kappa$  and  $\tau$  are depicted. Starting with 7.a., we can denote the optimal value to be around 9, with large deviations regarding noise. In 7.b, the optimal value is 0, with low noise, and in 7.c. the optimal value is at 8.5.

### 3.3 Phase III (Validation)

By employing validation statements to determine the out-of-sample validation score of the model, the generalizability and real-world-applicability are investigated. In our running example, case file D has been withheld during training (Section 3.2.2) to be used for the

validation. A visual representation of the network structure depicted in this case file is shown in figure 8.

### Validation statements

In Table 6, the validation statements for the replacement model are found. The validation statements are intended to be scored in exactly the same way as the training statements. The exception is that we do not explore the parameter space anymore; instead, we evaluate only the global optimum. (For a better way of taking into account the uncertainty of the global optimum, multiple optima could be sampled and a distribution of the validation score could be collected.) It is important that the validation score is computed independently from the training score. For the CCRM, most validation statements were similar to the training statements in their formulation. The independence comes from computing them for case file D, which depicts quite a different scenario from case files A-C. A brief description of case file D is found in appendix III.

*Table 6: Validation statements distilled from the expert knowledge for the criminal cocaine replacement model (CCRM). Case file D was used for validating the model. Each validation statement represents a (partial) score point.*

	ID	Validation Statements	Maximum score
D	<b>I</b>	Y is new murderbroker by the end of the simulation	1
	<b>II</b>	Y is murderbroker one month after conclave	1
	<b>III</b>	Y trusts C and B the most by the end of simulation	½
	<b>IV</b>	Z trusts Y the most by the end of simulation	½
	<b>v</b>	All high trust values (>0.8) should have increased or at least remained the same directly after the killing (partial score possible)	1
	<b>VI</b>	Person A should not be there anymore at the end of the simulation	1
		<b>Total possible score case D</b>	<b>5</b>






Figure 8. Case D generated as a network. The figure represents the network upon initialization. Purple edges represent friend ties, blue edges represent neutral ties (no family edges are present).. Trust edges are represented through the opacity of the edge color; low opacity represents low trust. Criminal capital is represented through the node lightness, violence capital is represented through node size. Financial capital is represented through a squared node.

### 3.4 Phase IV Iteration

Now that we have identified a validated model, we can either apply the model in practice or start the next iteration on model development and/or data gathering. In both possibilities, sensitivity analysis and uncertainty quantification are important, which we explain next.

#### Applying the model in practice

In the context of model development, it is important to assess the reliability of the model by checking its validation score against its training score. If the validation score is considered similar enough to the training score, then the model is considered good and reliable for making predictions. However, if there is a significant difference between the validation and training scores, it indicates that the model is not performing well on unseen data, and further development are necessary. In some cases, adding the problematic cases that cause the score discrepancy to the training data can improve the model's performance. This is not the case as case D is similar to case B in terms of the removal of a murderbroker. Alternatively, new cases can be collected for validation to ensure that the model's performance is reliable.

It is also important to note that with only four case files, it is not entirely unexpected to encounter discrepancies between training and validation scores. Therefore, further data collection and model refinement are necessary to improve the model's reliability. For further

validation, we plan on adding additional case files. We anticipate that some training statements, such as BI are not feasible at the moment, as a triumvirate is not encoded as a possibility for kingpin replacement in the model. Additionally, uncertainty quantification (UQ) is commonly considered in model development. The most common approach to UQ is forward UQ, which not only considers the global optimum but also other potential parameter sets that score similarly well. This acknowledges the uncertainty in the parameter values, which should be reflected in the model predictions. A straightforward method for incorporating these uncertainties is to sample from the parameter space, weighted inversely by the objective function, and create a distribution of model predictions [[McCulloch et al. 2022](#)]. In this forward UQ, sensitivity analysis is used for efficiency. That is, parameters that have every low sensitivity need not be sampled over to perform UQ, since the outcome will hardly change. This leads to fewer computations to be performed.

### **Start next iteration**

For the current iteration, no formal sensitivity analysis was performed, as this would have been done by removing and changing the used parameters (found in appendix III) until the model is coarse grained to work with the minimum amount of parameters but performing by resulting in the same outcomes. If a formal SA was performed, we expect parameters that are currently repetitive in the training and validation statement to be removed. This for example concerns training statements BIII and BVIII, which test similarly the increase of trust after kingpin removal in the entire network as well as in the conclave. It would be anticipated that removing one or both training statements would result in the same model outcome. Additionally, increasing or decreasing the parameters XIV and XV set for the kingpin or murderbroker candidate (appendix III, table 3.III) is not expected to change the model outcome, given that the final kingpin or murderbroker parameters (XVI and XVII) determine the fitness of the ultimate candidate. Candidates clearing the first set of parameters but not the second can not currently become the final kingpin or murderbroker. Edmonds argues for example that while formal understanding of a model is desirable but should not be prioritized over model adequacy, of which SA is one of the means to check the model's reliability. Using only a partially understood model and performing SA on it is thus still preferable to not modelling at all or accepting unreliable models [[Edmonds 2023](#)].

### **3.4.1 Sensitivity Analysis and Uncertainty Quantification**

Sensitivity analysis and uncertainty quantification have only been applied to the CCRM in a limited manner. A satisfying sensitivity analysis score would be a set of parameters that must not be changing the outcome of the model. Given that the current validation score for case file D is not satisfactory, for the CCRM, another loop is scheduled for assessing the model parameters. While the current model relies on financial, criminal and violence capital, as well as trust edges, to determine model dynamics, the specific thresholds and parameters per role need to be scrutinized still. A possible change in the model would include changing the individual agent parameters, as well as replacement parameters and thresholds. The anticipated result from the sensitivity analysis would be remaining or improved validation scores for a changed set of parameters. In figure 9.a. and 9.b. we can compare the impacts of global and local sensitivity. For this, the input parameters of the four case files were tested for

their impacts of variations on the output of the model (across the entire range of the input parameters for global sensitivity analysis, figure 9.a., and for small variations for local sensitivity analysis, figure 9.b.).




Figure 9: A visual representation of global (figure 9.a. on the left) and local sensitivity (figure 9.b. on the right) of each of the seven model parameters throughout the four training cases.

As visible in figure 9.a., the minimum kingpin attributes ( $\alpha$ ) exhibit the maximum sensitivity out of all the seven model parameters. A high sensitivity score denotes the tested parameter having a large impact on the model outcome when changed. Global sensitivity is estimated by calculating the 95% confidence interval range of the objective function values over the whole range of each parameter. This approach considers the impact of variations in the input variables across the entire range of possible values, and therefore provides a comprehensive measure of sensitivity.

Global sensitivity is expressed as

*Global sensitivity = 95% CI range of the objective function values over the whole range for each parameter*

Contrary, beta (the minimum threshold for an edge's trust to participate in the kingpin-search) exhibits the highest sensitivity in the local sensitivity analysis (figure 9.b.). Local sensitivity is estimated by calculating the local derivative, which is obtained by evaluating the objective function at the minimum value of the parameter of interest, and then at the minimum value plus or minus 5% of the parameter range. Specifically, local sensitivity is expressed as:

Local sensitivity =  $f(\text{minimum}) - f(\text{minimum} \pm 0.05 * \text{parameter\_range})$

Both analyses utilize OAT (one-at-a-time-analysis), in which only one parameter is changed per model run while the other parameters are kept constant.




Figure 10: The average x-values with SEM error bars calculated from 176 objective function values, for gamma (minimum trust to become kingpin) .

The optimization process duration is 3000 steps to achieve global optimization. Figure 10 shows average x-values with SEM error bars calculated from 176 objective function values for the gamma parameter (see Table III.4.). The dashed line is drawn by fitting a spline to the data, which is first smoothed using Gaussian filtering with a  $\Sigma$  (sigma) value of 1/15 times the difference between the upper and lower bounds of the parameter range and reflective boundaries. An interpolating first-order spline is then fitted through the smoothed points.

## 4. Discussion

This article fills a gap in criminal modelling by introducing a new framework that enables modellers to produce validated ABMs in accordance with domain expertise for criminal and law enforcement simulations. Much research has been carried out regarding the development of ABMs for organized crime. However, the insights from quantitative and qualitative data analysis are seldomly used in combination to develop and validate models in the criminological domain [Miles et al. 2018]. This is attributed to the scarcity of data in the criminal field. Models scarcely have the opportunity to utilize both qualitative and quantitative data, instead focussing on one type. In this article we propose the FREIDA framework and introduce a mixed method for combining and verifying both qualitative and quantitative data.

Freida addresses the gap in criminological modelling by providing a framework that allows to incorporate not only domain experts into a computational modelling process, but also work with mixed methods data input. However, we must consider that the CCRM is only a limited model, in which some FREIDA steps such as phase IV as well as the training-loop were glossed over. Additionally, case files served as the main source for the training and validation of the model. It is reasonable to assume that with the incorporation of quantitative data, such as initial statistical conditions as distilled from the database, the training of the ABM would be more successful in terms of training scores. Likewise, with the incorporation of multiple case files, and a larger training and validation set, the training of the model would be expected to be more accurate.

## **Results**

Through FREIDA we developed the CCRM (Criminal Cocaine Replacement Model), which demonstrates the usage of multiple data inputs by creating an ABM (agent based model) which simulates the removal of a kingpin node in a criminal cocaine network. Domain experts from Dutch law enforcements were used as consultants as well as supplied real life case files and databases from criminal cocaine networks in the Netherlands. Using the input of these files and data (both by applying natural language processing as well as tie strength analysis), and unstructured interviews. The current problem of exclusivity of qualitative and quantitative data usage without means of validation is evident in criminal modelling, and a need for a framework addressing these shortcomings is apparent. FREIDA is determined to serve as this framework. In the first phase of FREIDA, the Information Acquisition phase, the project is defined in two stages, first by acquiring domain experts and filling in an ODD+D in tandem, and secondly by sourcing the relevant information input in the form of qualitative and quantitative data. In the second phase, the Application phase, the data inputs are translated into the three aspects of an ABM (agents, behaviour and environment) in the form of a conceptual model. By using the ODD+D and optional methodologies such as Causal Loop Diagrams (CLD) or pseudocode, the conceptual model is subsequently turned into the computational model. In the third phase, validation, the untrained model is probed using validation statements as well as hold out data in order to determine its usability. Subsequently, in the fourth and last phase, Iteration, the model undergoes sensitivity analysis and uncertainty quantification. If the model passes the assessment by domain experts as well as analysis scores, the framework loop is complete, if not, another loop undergoing the four phases should be started to improve the model. We regard quantitative data as most useful for the initialization of starting conditions including agent relationships for the beginning stage of the model for the CCRM, and criminal ABMs in general.

Regarding the domain expert interviews, while for the CCRM we utilized the unstructured interview method, we would recommend starting with semi-structured interviews and moving towards unstructured interviews in a secondary step within the second step of phase I due to the unstructured interviews being supplementary in case of gaps. Jamshed referred to unstructured interviews as a “controlled conversation” whereas semi-structured interviews are defined by preset open-ended questions [[Jamshed 2014](#)]. This would be additional to the ODD+D step. Not only can FREIDA be applied in a criminal computation, usability for other

fields is envisioned. For example, we expect that other application areas within the biopsychosocial domain face similar challenges.

Next, we briefly touch on the framework's potential for multiplicity. Many frameworks and techniques focus either on event-driven or time-driven simulations, specifically gearing themselves towards a static or dynamic model. This excludes modellers of the opposite category from using their frameworks, narrowing their potential users and thus potential improvers. While specific niche-techniques are important and have their place, we propose FREIDA specifically to offer a broad user spectrum for a validated modelling technique. The implication is that FREIDA is a starting point for a multiple of envisioned outcomes, and that switching or adjusting the model expectations, or refining them through the initial design formulations, is facilitated by the more open structure.

Regarding the results of the model training, figure 6 illustrates that the minimum criminal capital value (the optimum) required for becoming a kingpin is set to 0. This means that in case A, there is a kingpin made with only 0.2 capital, which is possible because the minimum capital value is set to 0. This implies that even with very little capital, it is still possible to become a kingpin in the model. Additionally, in figure 9.a.,  $\kappa$  exhibits the most sensitivity out of all seven model parameters. This means that a small change in  $\kappa$  would significantly change the modelling results. Given that  $\kappa$  denotes the minimum attributes to become kingpin, this is logical as lowering or raising the parameter threshold for the possible replacement would include or exclude a larger candidate pool, thus changing the outcome of the model drastically.

### **Implications for the field**

FREIDA essentially proposes a tight coupling of two well-known processes: the modelling cycle (MC) [[Van Buuren et al.](#)] and model-based design of experiments (MBoE) [[Franceschini and Macchietto 2008](#)]. Although for certain processes such as for kinetic processes [[Recker et al. 2013](#)], frameworks such as TRACE or RAT-RS have been proposed previously, to the best of our knowledge this is the first framework for ABM development that enables criminal networks modellers to incorporate insights from both quantitative and qualitative data analysis. focused on ABMs and expressly incorporating qualitative knowledge. The integration of quantitative and qualitative methods enables modellers to address what we identified as a key challenge in developing models in domains with sparse quantitative data such as criminal networks., namely that any first model that is developed is very likely to identify uncertainties.

As introduced at the beginning of this paper, the TRACE protocol is a complementary method alongside the ODD+D. We leave it as an optional protocol to run alongside the FREIDA framework, since our goal is to describe how to perform the modelling process and guide towards simulations and not how to perform satisfying stakeholder management. Another important recommendation is to take into account the RAT-RS reporting standard for improving the documentation of data use in agent-based modelling. Achter et al. motivate the need for a reporting standard that takes into account different data inputs as well as the compatibility of mixed methods [[Achter et al. 2022](#)].



### **Future work and limitations**

We use the CCRM to demonstrate how FREIDA allows modellers to create simulations in the criminological computing domain. Several future projects for this are in the work, amongst others a study on prison dynamics in the Netherlands, as well as intervention dynamics from the police on criminal cocaine networks [[Berlusconi 2022](#)]. However, besides improving the framework through continuous usage, there are three concrete concepts that we will briefly discuss which are either in the works or an optional addition that can improve FREIDA.

A project that is currently in the works as an asset for the FREIDA framework is the translation of case files through natural language processing. Natural language processing (NLP) for criminal data exploration is as of yet not explored to its full potential, especially regarding case file analysis. However, it is an excellent option to transform qualitative data in the form of case files into quantitatively verifiable rules. [[Yu et al. 2018](#)] Berlusconi et al. [[Berlusconi et al. 2016](#)], developed an approach based on network topology analysis, to predict missing links in criminal networks, working on a dataset obtained from real investigations. Community analysis was exploited to predict which subgroup in a criminal organization a specific individual belonged to [[Calderoni et al. 2017](#)]. Topological centrality was used to assess leaders in criminal networks [[Grassi et al. 2019](#)] and Tomáš Diviák et al. [[Diviák et al. 2022](#)] proposed an approach based on descriptive measures of network cohesion and undirected stochastic models, to study the effect of police interventions in two Dutch Jihadi networks. However, the above studies fail to prioritize criminal roles and demographic features which are an essential component of tie formation in criminal organized groups.

A subsequent project to transform qualitative case files into quantitative rules for integration into the FREIDA network is a new feature-based link prediction algorithm which utilizes, criminals' individual features and behavioral rules, extracted from police case files through Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques in order to evolve the network over time.

Lastly, in a future iteration of FREIDA, another additional step is to formulate the agents' behavioural rules empirically. Given that empirical rules should be disproven by observations or experiments, the empirical laws should be formulated in accordance with the ABM that has been created [[Janssen and Ostrom 2006](#)]. However, taking into account the availability of training and validation statements, and the intention to create models that are continuously evolving, we do not consider this step essential for modellers.

## **5. Conclusion**

The aim of this framework is to provide modellers in the criminal computational domain with tools to create verified, relevant agent based models for mixed data inputs. We show, using a running example, that even in the absence of quantitative data we can formulate, train, and verify a model, by involving domain experts in every phase and translating qualitative case file descriptions to testable training and validation statements. We also give direction on how

to improve either the model or the data in further modelling cycles, focusing each time on the most important (sensitive and uncertain) parameters.

Today, models of organized crime generally do not incorporate both qualitative and quantitative data. At the very least, this limits their trustworthiness and generalizability. We argue that this is a big miss, since – as we show – a model forces one to be concrete about supposed behaviors and causal relationships; combines multiple experts' views into one coherent object (shared mental model); can simulate complex scenarios systematically where humans cannot; allows to test one's assumptions and hypotheses; and facilitates returning to either the supposed causal relationships, the assumptions, or the data in case a hypothesis turns out to be false. Therefore we believe our framework to be a significant step forward in supporting domains with little quantitative data with a computational modelling component.



# References

- [1] Maxwell, Joseph. (2018). The Value of Qualitative Inquiry for Public Policy. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 26. 10.1177/1077800419857093.
- [2] Müller et al., Describing human decisions in agent-based models - ODD+D, an extension of the ODD protocol, 2013
- [3] Transparent and Comprehensive model Evaluation, Towards better modeling and decision support: Documenting model development, testing, and analysis using TRACE, 2014
- [4] George Wood, The structure and vulnerability of a drug trafficking collaboration network, *Social Networks*, Volume, 2017
- [5] Hoekstra et al., 2008 The application of multiscale modelling to the process of development and prevention of stenosis in a stented coronary artery *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A*.3663343–3360
- [6] Thober, Jule & Müller, Birgit & Groeneveld, Jürgen & Grimm, Volker. (2017). Agent-Based Modelling of Social-Ecological Systems: Achievements, Challenges, and a Way Forward. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*. 20. 10.18564/jasss.3423.
- [7] Raquel Rosés, Cristina Kadar, Nick Malleon, A data-driven agent-based simulation to predict crime patterns in an urban environment, *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, Volume 89, 2021
- [8] Stevanović, Kosara. (2020). Social ties between criminal networks in cocaine trafficking in Europe. *Crimen*. 11. 325-345. 10.5937/crimen2003325S.
- [9] Bruch E, Atwell J. Agent-Based Models in Empirical Social Research. *Sociological Methods & Research*. 2015;44(2):186-221
- [10] Duxbury, Hainy, Criminal network security: an agent based approach to evaluating network resilience, *Criminology*, 2019
- [11] Bright, David & Malm, Aili & Koskinen, Johan. (2019). Illicit Network Dynamics: The Formation and Evolution of a Drug Trafficking Network. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*. 35. 10.1007/s10940-018-9379-8.
- [12] Johnson, Shane & Groff, Elizabeth. (2014). Strengthening Theoretical Testing in Criminology Using Agent-based Modeling. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 51. 509-525. 10.1177/0022427814531490.
- [13] Patrycja Antosz, Timo Szczepanska, Loes Bouman, J. Gareth Polhill & Wander Jager (2022) Sensemaking of causality in agent-based models, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 25:4, 557-567, DOI: [10.1080/13645579.2022.2049510](https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2022.2049510)
- [14] Calderoni, Francesco & Campedelli, Gian Maria & Szekely, Aron & Paolucci, Mario & Andrighetto, Giulia. (2022). Recruitment into Organized Crime: An Agent-Based Approach Testing the Impact of Different Policies. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*. 38. 10.1007/s10940-020-09489-z.
- [14] Gilbert, Nigel. (2007). Agent-Based Models. *The Centre for Research in Social Simulation*. 10.1007/978-0-387-35973-1\_39.
- [16] Christian Troost, Robert Huber, Andrew R. Bell, Hedwig van Delden, Tatiana Filatova, Quang Bao Le, Melvin Lippe, Leila Niamir, J. Gareth Polhill, Zhanli Sun, Thomas Berger, How to keep it adequate: A protocol for ensuring validity in agent-based simulation, *Environmental Modelling & Software*, Volume 159, 2023

- [17] Roks, Robert & Bisschop, Lieselot & Staring, Richard. (2021). Getting a foot in the door. Spaces of cocaine trafficking in the Port of Rotterdam.. Trends in Organized Crime. 24. 10.1007/s12117-020-09394-8.
- [18] Rosés Brüngger, Raquel & Kadar, Cristina & Pletikosa, Irena. (2016). Design of an Agent-Based Model to Predict Crime (WIP).
- [19] Lopes, Diego D., Bruno R. da Cunha, Alvaro F. Martins, Sebastián Gonçalves, Ervin K. Lenzi, Quentin S. Hanley, Matjaž Perc, and Haroldo V. Ribeiro. 2022. “Machine Learning Partners in Criminal Networks.” Scientific Reports 12 (1): 15746.
- [20] Gerritsen, Charlotte. (2015). Agent-based modelling as a research tool for criminological research. Crime Science. 4. 10.1186/s40163-014-0014-1.
- [21] Antosz, Patrycja & Bharwani, Sukaina & Borit, Melania & Edmonds, Bruce. (2022). An introduction to the themed section on ‘Using agent-based simulation for integrating qualitative and quantitative evidence’. International Journal of Social Research Methodology. 25. 511-515. 10.1080/13645579.2022.2052651.
- [22] PSavona, E. 2016. “PROTON. Modelling the Processes Leading to Organised Crime and Terrorist Networks.” Brussels: European Commission.
- [23] Frantz, Christopher K., and Saba Siddiki. 2021. “Institutional Grammar 2.0: A Specification for Encoding and Analyzing Institutional Design.” Public Administration 99 (2): 222–47.
- [24] Burns, James & Musa, Philip. (2001). Structural Validation of Causal Loop Diagrams.
- [25] An Integrated Ecological-Social Simulation Model of Farmer Decisions and Cropping System Performance in the Rolling Pampas (Argentina) Sebastián Pessahl , Diego O. Ferraro1 , Daniela Blanco2 , Rodrigo Castro, Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation 25(1) 5, 2022 Doi: 10.18564/jasss.4772 Url: <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/25/1/5.html>
- [26] Committee on the Assessment of Agent-Based Models to Inform Tobacco Product Regulation; Board on Population Health and Public Health Practice; Institute of Medicine; Wallace R, Geller A, Ogawa VA, editors. Washington (DC): [National Academies Press \(US\)](#); 2015 Jul 17.
- [27] [Grimm Volker](#) and [Railsback Steven F.](#) 2012 Pattern-oriented modelling: a ‘multi-scope’ for predictive systems ecology Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B367298–310
- [28] Crielaard L, Uleman JF, Châtel BDL, Epskamp S, Sloot PMA, Quax R. Refining the causal loop diagram: A tutorial for maximizing the contribution of domain expertise in computational system dynamics modeling. Psychol Methods. 2022 May 12
- [29] Crielaard et al., 2020, Social norms and obesity prevalence: From cohort to system dynamics models.
- [30] Awwalu, Jamilu & Ogwueleka, Francisca. (2019). On Holdout and Cross Validation: A Comparison between Neural Network and Support Vector Machine. 6. 2394-9333.
- [31] Uleman et al., “Mapping the multicausality of Alzheimer’s disease through group model building
- [32] Iman, Ronald & Helton, Jon. (2006). An Investigation Of Uncertainty And Sensitivity Analysis Techniques For Computer-Models. Risk Analysis. 8. 71 - 90. 10.1111/j.1539-6924.1988.tb01155.x.
- [33] Morselli, Carlo & Petit, Katia & Giguère, Cynthia. (2006). The Efficiency/Security Trade-Off in Criminal Networks. Social Networks. 29. 10.1016/j.socnet.2006.05.001.

- [34] Calibrating Agent-Based Models Using Uncertainty Quantification Methods
- [35] Nocedal, Jorge, and Stephen J. Wright. n.d. *Numerical Optimization*. Springer New York. Accessed April 6, 2023.
- [36] Edmonds, Bruce. 2023. “The Inevitable ‘layering’ of Models to Extend the Reach of Our Understanding.” *Review of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*. February 9, 2023. <https://rofasss.org/2023/02/09/layering/>.
- [37] *Qualitative Data Analysis. A Methods Sourcebook*, Miles, Huberman, 1994, Sage Publications
- [38] Jamshed S. Qualitative research method-interviewing and observation. *J Basic Clin Pharm*. 2014 Sep;5(4):87-8. doi: 10.4103/0976-0105.141942. PMID: 25316987; PMCID: PMC4194943.
- [39] Buuren, Onne & Ellermeijer, Ton. (2011). A modelling learning path, integrated in the secondary school curriculum, starting from the initial phases of physics education.
- [40] Franceschini, Gaia and Sandro Macchietto. “Model-based design of experiments for parameter precision: State of the art.” *Chemical Engineering Science* 63 (2008): 4846-4872.
- [41] Sebastian Recker, Nimet Kerimoglu, Andreas Harwardt, Olga Tkacheva, Wolfgang Marquardt, On the integration of model identification and process optimization, Editor(s): Andrzej Kraslawski, Ilkka Turunen, *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering*, Elsevier, Volume 32, 2013,
- [42] Sebastian Achter, Melania Borit, Edmund Chattoe-Brown & Peer-Olaf Siebers (2022) RAT-RS: a reporting standard for improving the documentation of data use in agent-based modelling, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 25:4, 517-540
- [43] Berlusconi, Giulia (Jan. 2022). “Come at the king, you best not miss: criminal network adaptation after law enforcement targeting of key players”. In: *Global Crime* 23.1, pp. 44–64. issn: 1744-0572, 1744-0580. doi: 10.1080/17440572.2021.2012460.
- [44] Cavallaro, Lucia et al. (Aug. 2020). “Disrupting resilient criminal networks through data analysis: The case of Sicilian Mafia”. In: *PLOS ONE* 15.8. Ed. by Leto Peel, e0236476. issn: 1932- 6203. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0236476.
- [45] Yu K, Lung PY, Zhao T, Zhao P, Tseng YY, Zhang J. Automatic extraction of protein-protein interactions using grammatical relationship graph. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*. 2018 Jul 23;18(Suppl 2):42.
- [46] Giulia Berlusconi, Francesco Calderoni, Nicola Parolini, Marco Verani, and Carlo Piccardi. 2016. Link prediction in criminal networks: A tool for criminal intelligence analysis. *PloS one* 11, 4 (2016), e0154244
- [47] Francesco Calderoni, Domenico Brunetto, and Carlo Piccardi. 2017. Communities in criminal networks: A case study. *Social Networks* 48 (2017), 116–125.
- [48] Rosanna Grassi, Francesco Calderoni, Monica Bianchi, and Anna Torriero. 2019. Betweenness to assess leaders in criminal networks: New evidence using the dual projection approach. *Social Networks* 56 (2019), 23–32
- [49] Tomáš Diviák, Casper S van Nassau, Jan Kornelis Dijkstra, and Tom AB Snijders. 2022. Dynamics and disruption: Structural and individual changes in two Dutch Jihadi networks after police interventions. *Social Networks* 70 (2022), 364–374.
- [50] Janssen, Marco & Ostrom, Elinor. (2006). Empirically Based, Agent-based models. *Ecology and Society*. 11. 10.5751/ES-01861-110237.

# Appendix

## Appendix I: glossary

In the following, some terms used in this paper are presented with their intended meanings.

**Data** = Information used for analysis of decision making

**Phase** = Distinct period within overall model-process

**Step** = Single action within series of actions in which agents assess and change their current state

**Framework** = Structured system for incorporating and organizing complex data into an ABM

**Methodology** = Set of procedures to translate qualitative and quantitative data into an ABM

**Variables** = Factors that are changeable used for the model

**ABM** = Agent based model (computational model)

**Model** = Simulation of real-world example (CCRM in this case)

**Loop** = Repeated modelling step performed within FREIDA

**Data origins** = The source of data, is traced back to the providing entity (qualitative origin or quantitative origin)

**Knowledge** - Understanding or awareness of a subject

**Information** = Pure data input

**Verification** = Proving accuracy and reliability of the utilized data

**Validation** = Proving accuracy, usefulness, and relevance of methods and models

## Appendix II: Data types

### Case Files

For our modelling purposes, each case file should include the three crucial aspects of an ABM: agent behaviour, agent demographics, and environmental factors. For this it is important that domain experts facilitate the translation of the necessarily context-dependent case file(s) to the (usually) different or more general context that is envisioned in the model. For a detailed overview of the case file information distilling process, please see Table III.2. However, as indicated in figure 1, the environmental details in a case file are utilized for context, whereas through analysis as well as natural language processing (NLP), agent and behaviour details are the main information inputs relevant from this data type.

### Database

On the quantitative data side, databases containing relevant markers and statistical information about the model and agents. Additionally, the database influences the environment as well. The database can give expertise over the roles and network of the agents as well as large parts of the environment of the ABM. It is important to determine already in the design choices which type of quantitative data, including the specific variables within the database, are necessary to include in the model. The domain experts can then supply the corresponding database if available.

### Literature

The final qualitative data input is scientific literature. This again is dedicated to the modellers to acquire, though domain experts are welcome to contribute. After taking directions from the ODD+D, the literature support will be selected according to the research direction. Scientific literature, similar to unstructured and structured interviews, can correspond to all three parts of the ABM as long as selected accordingly. Typically, the modellers will select the appropriate type of scientific literature (as indicated with a green tile in figure 1) after determining the gaps of knowledge after having collected databases, case files and the ODD+D. Unstructured interviews and scientific literature fill this gap. We consider scientific articles as well as other publications in this framework. This precludes articles detailing databases. Scientific literature is thus regarded as qualitative data for FREIDA.

### Interviews

In the FREIDA framework, the modellers conduct interviews with the domain experts. It is advised to conduct several interviews over the course of the data accumulation period. They should, if possible, first follow a semi-structured format with open-ended questions, and when necessary be reiterated using the unstructured interview format [[Jamshed 2014](#)]. This way, questions that arise from other types of data regarding the domain or expert knowledge is addressed and give the modeller a better understanding, resulting in more accurate representation in the final model. In the context of FREIDA, the ODD+D is seen as a type of structured interview with a set of predetermined questions.

Unstructured interviews are designed to fill in the gaps and details that are left by the ODD+D. For both the ODD+D and unstructured interviews, in phase I the soliciting step for domain experts is crucial. By going into modelling detail beyond the directive questions of the ODD+D, as well as being able to use undirected interview styles, modellers can gain a better transfer understanding of the organized crime networks, given that the ODD+D is not designed with this domain specifically in mind. The main components that the interview will bring clarity for are the agents, with the behaviour and environment having a marginal influence through the interview as well. Because of the more unstructured format of interviews carried out at this stage compared to the ones done based on the ODD+D, the domain experts can even touch on the other pieces of data such as explaining case files or putting information into context. However, interviews should be conducted with at least two separate experts in order to avoid bias.

## Appendix III: Information input

Table III.1.: An overview of the parameters extracted per role through structured interviews with domain experts used in the CCRM.

Role	Criminal Capital	Violence Capital	Financial Capital	Description
(Corrupt) customs officer	0.6-0.7	0.3-0.5	0.05-0.15	Ensures that the cocaine is not detected when entering the import country
Gatekeeper	0.85-0.95	0.2-0.3	0.4-0.6	Decides what and who gets through certain gates at (air)ports
Transporter	0.05-0.15	0.3-0.5	0.4-0.6	Transports the cocaine from the country of origin to the import country
Distributor	0.4-0.5	0.4-0.6	0.5-0.6	Person distributing the cocaine through the network
Coordinator	0.9-1	0.4-0.6	0.5-0.8	Coordinates the transport within the country of origin and the country of import
Exporter	0.3-0.4	0.4-0.6	0.5-0.6	Exports the cocaine from the country of origin (usually in South America)
Financer	0.75-0.85	0.3-0.5	0.8-1	Finances cocaine operations
Kingpin	0.75-0.85	0.4-0.6	0.5-0.7	Most authoritative and important person in the criminal network, with a high criminal capital
Producer	0.85-0.95	0.4-0.6	0.5-0.7	Produces cocaine
Organizer	0.9-1	0.4-0.6	0.5-0.8	Organizing operations within the cocaine network
Broker of Retrievers	0.7-0.8	0.4-0.6	0.5-0.6	Knows and hires cocaine retrievers
Broker	0.7-0.8	0.4-0.6	0.4-0.6	Knowledgeable about agents with needed roles and able to connect roles to each other
Cutter	0.05-0.1	0.05-0.15	0.05-0.15	Cuts cocaine and mixes it with other substances to increase profits or change the drugs effect
Driver	0.05-0.15	0.05-0.15	0.05-0.15	Transports the cocaine to or from the (air)ports



Placer Inland	0.05-0.1	0.5-0.6	0.05-0.15	Coordinates the amount of cocaine to be brought to each place within the import country
Stasher	0.0-0.05	0.5-0.6	0.05-0.15	Stores the cocaine until it is ready to be sold
Frontman	0.05-0.1	0.5-0.6	0.05-0.15	Represents the criminal organization and tries to make its activities seem acceptable to the public
Retriever	0.05-0.1	0.5-0.6	0.05-0.15	Often minors that take out the drugs from containers for criminal organizations
Murderbroker	0.2-0.4	0.7-0.9	0.2-0.4	Person organizing and hiring assassins
Assassin	0.2-0.4	0.8-1	0.2-0.4	Person liquidating other agents

## Description of case files

### Case file A:

#### Liquidation of a top criminal.

After liquidation, X was succeeded almost immediately by his brother who had the same criminal and social capital (all knowledge and acquaintances) and was able to continue as usual. C was immediately sent to South America and tapped into the relevant contacts there. And the other network members were also able to continue as usual. The crucial roles in the cocaine process (the gateways to South America, to the port of Rotterdam, etc.) simply remained intact and functioning.

X, was the leader of an ethnically homogeneous network. It was a medium-sized network (about 30 core members) with an important role for family relationships and old friendships. X was the head of the group. The inner circle consisted of two brothers, A and B, and a cousin, C. D, the financial man in the group, flees abroad. Another childhood friend of X, E, also goes into hiding for a while. A third, large player who can be counted among this group (but who also runs cases independently), F, keeps a low profile. At t1 he simply does not show himself. At t2, he still seems loyal to A. However, he no longer belongs to the inner circle. Lastly, G was partly dependent on X for his cocaine trade. On T2, he seems to have largely disappeared from the capital criminal milieu and sought refuge elsewhere. He also still remains connected to A and B.

### **Case file B:**

#### **Liquidation of an iconic criminal.**

This case involved a category 1 intervention scenario: the liquidation of a high-profile criminal. We call him X. X belongs to a cluster of six criminals who operate together in a much larger network active in cocaine trafficking.

Part of the network are X, belonging to a cluster of six criminals who operate together in a much larger network active in cocaine trafficking, one of X's old confidants, Y, trying to take over X's role. He is unable to take over X's role. A, with access to large consignments of coke, B, with the infrastructure for large-scale drug trafficking (including sales market), and C with the potential for violence. Additionally, a family member of X, D, and a childhood friend of X, E.

### **Case file C:**

#### **Liquidation of an image-maker.**

The liquidated, X, was the leader of an ethnically homogeneous network from Amsterdam that dealt in cocaine. His liquidation therefore comes as a complete surprise. Y immediately assumes the role of leader. The core of the network is formed by X's brother, A. An important representative of the local group, B, also belongs to the ingroup. B and C differ from Y in that they have far fewer connections, especially with the suppliers of the major parties. They rely on Y.

### **Case file D:**

#### **Arrest of a specialist (murderbroker).**

The network is large (more than 200 members), with many cultures and ethnic backgrounds. In power is a small group to which X belongs. X is an assassination broker for a powerful group. After the arrest of X, Y and Z soon become the primary hitmen. A would absolutely not allow himself to be ordered around by Y. B and C ultimately align with Y for violence jobs.

### **Distilling of the case files**

Regarding distilling behavioural rules, from a modeller's perspective there is an important consideration that we would like to highlight and that is complementary to some of the frameworks for writing case files, namely: being explicit about cause-and-effect relations. . For example, consider the following sentence: "Agent X performed action A. Two days later, agent Y performs action B.". Although suggestive, strictly speaking this sentence merely conveys a temporal ordering of events. It could in fact easily be more specific, namely specifying whether or not there was a cause-and-effect relationship. In the case of a causation, the sentence would preferably read as: "Agent Y performs action B *because* agent X performed action A". If the cause and effect is unlikely to be present, the sentence should preferably make clear that the temporal ordering is coincidental, such as: "Agent X performed action A. *Independently*, agent Y performs action B two days later." Finally, if it remains unknown whether a causation took place, this uncertainty could be appended as an

additional phrase or sentence. The reasons for these more specific phrases is that in a later stage, modellers will implement behavioural rules for the agents in the model. These are necessarily cause-and-effect statements, specifying exactly under which conditions a certain behavioural rule becomes activated (such as in the form of a sequence of if-then-else statements). Whenever it remains unspecified whether a causation took place, a modeller can either introduce bias (in case it is decided one way or the other, which is incorrect in the sense of unintended by the authors of the case file), or it can increase uncertainty (by leaving both options open by allowing multiple model structure to be equally likely) which will increase computational burden and decrease the precision of the model predictions.

The case should furthermore be annotated with sufficient spatial and temporal scale information. The goal of this is to be able to compare the described processes against the scope as defined in the ODD+D. For instance, the time scale between actions should be made clear, as well as the overall time frame of the case (a clear ending point at which the agents have been no longer observed). Additionally, phases could be identifiable in the case file when applicable these are individual periods in which the system is in a specific state which can be clearly differentiated from each other, such as waiting for a shipment or reorganizing the power structure. The added benefit of being explicit about temporal scales is that, when time delays are to be modelled, the modellers will have to be explicit about the (distribution of) waiting times that are to be implemented. Similarly, spatial scales can refer to a rough estimate of the size of a network of individuals, geographical extent, or the origin and destination of shipments or other movements.

The most relevant aspects of case files include the identification of a network topology (scope and scale of a network) and the agent and group specific behaviours (translation into behavioural rules). In Table III.2, the case files are broken down into even more specific categories and examples as well as concrete details provided.

*Table III.2.: Examples of case file translation*

<b>Concept</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Example</b>	<b>Concretely</b>
<b>Time</b>	Must include timeline, scales, jumps, end time	First week, first months, after 1 year	Months, days, etc
<b>Agents</b>	Roles, specific, descriptions	Orphans, amount of agents, etc	Specific key agents, successors, potential replacements
<b>Behaviour</b>	Agent behaviour (motivations)	Specific roles (social and business) define the agent behaviour	Roles within the network and responsibilities (orphans, three categories of roles, etc.)
<b>Rules</b>	General agent and network rules	Events happen at set timesteps, agents switch from one to other behaviour patterns using triggers	Orphans choose the new successor based on the selection-rules as determined by the case file

<b>Topology</b>	Network growth, demography of agents, etc.	Connections are added based on triggering moments	When kingpin is removed, ties change on the basis of the trust. When a new kingpin is chose, every node automatically establishes a tie with the new kingpin based on their role
<b>Ties</b>	Tie description, changes, etc	Severed ties, tie connection, social and business layer, etc.	Agent ties depending on roles, trust, financial-, criminal-capital, violence, orphan connections to new replacement

### Example case file

Below is an example case file in the style of case files A-D. The below case file has been synthetically generated using natural language processing techniques. It has not been used in the CCRM.

1. Context network:
  - 1.1. Socio-cultural scene: Moroccan and Dutch
  - 1.2. Geo scene: the Netherlands and Colombia. The network has its roots in the New West in Amsterdam.
  - 1.3. Criminal markets: cocaine, heroine and money laundering
  - 1.4. Network structure: > 100 members.
  - 1.5. Violence exposure: mild violence exposure. The network is involved in some conflicts.
2. Description X: X is of Moroccan origin and is the kingpin of a contingent of assassins. Part of those assassins comes from a Dutch background. Also X started as a killer, but he improved his skills as a network organizer. He has a particularly high IQ.
3. T0 Intervention: X is killed.
4. T1 month after intervention

Behaviour orphan A: X is replaced by A. They had a relationship of mutual respect based on criminal trust. X trained A to be aggressive and without limits and to use violence only when necessary. A takes the place of X because he is the best fusion of organization and violence.

Behaviour orphan B: B is a direct contact of A and trusted person. After X killing, B in couple with A is busy in reorganizing the network. B can be said is the main man of violence in the network.

Behaviour orphan C: C another assassin that grew up in the New West. He is the main suspect in the network of having killed X.

Behaviour orphan D: D manages cocaine imports from Colombia and exports towards european countries.

Behaviour orphan E: E is an experienced assassin, considered the right arm of X.

Behaviour orphan F: F works in strict contact with E when X is killed.

5. T2 (four months after killing)

Behaviour orphan A: he has the reputation of a reliable organizer. He is able to direct the network and being portrayed in the gangster rap scene. Although he travels a lot he goes very often to his old neighborhood, which is New West. He carries out violent jobs, even if when these jobs are risky.

Behaviour orphan B: B is in contact with A and organizes violent jobs.

Behaviour orphan C: C communicates with A and B and implements violent jobs.

Behaviour orphan D: to D is assigned the management of the cocaine imports from Colombia.

Behaviour orphan E: E works together with B and D.

Behaviour orphan F: F works in strict contact with the members of A's network.

6. T3 (years after killing)

Behaviour orphan A: he carries out an assignment, but is arrested. In restraints he cannot communicate with the rest of the network apart from B, through his lawyers. For both X and A is almost impossible to communicate with the rest of the world. This happens when a criminal is posed in EBI.

Behaviour orphan B: B communicates with A about X.

Behaviour orphan C: no communication with A.

Behaviour orphan D: no communication with A.

Behaviour orphan E: no communication with A.

Behaviour orphan F: no communication with A.

## Model parameters

Table III.3: Parameters encoded in the CCRM, applicable for all four cases.

ID	Related to	Description	Rule
I	Node parameters	Time steps until a node that has been disconnected (no edges to other nodes) will be removed from the model	Time steps before removal = 7
II	Replacement parameters	Defining the agents that are aware of the removal of the kingpin	Agents with a distance of 1 to the removed kingpin are aware of the removal
III	Replacement parameters	Defining the agents that are actively searching for a replacement	If the agent has both been connected to the removed kingpin, and aware of a needed replacement (as part of the conclave), the agent is prompted to search for a new replacement
IV	Replacement parameters	Maximum time to form a conclave	Between 10 and 30 steps, a conclave is formed
V	Replacement parameters	Time frame to change potential kingpin to main kingpin	Between step 25 and 45, the potential kingpin is replaced to main kingpin if the parameter values are sufficient
VI	Behavioural parameters	Only if the connected agent is trustworthy are they asked to aid in search of the new kingpin	Minimum trust needed to include connected agents in search for new kingpin is 0.5
VII	Behavioural parameters	Only if the connected agent is trustworthy are	The minimum trust value for replacement

		they being considered as a potential replacement suggestion	suggestion is 0.3
<b>VIII</b>	Replacement parameters	Maximum time since kingpin removal to begin the search for a replacement.	The maximum time since kingpin removal to begin the search for a replacement is 30 steps.
<b>IX</b>	Replacement parameters	The tie distance influences the availability of nodes for the search of a new kingpin.	The maximum distance to search for a kingpin is 5
<b>X</b>	Replacement parameters	Only agents with predetermined business roles may be participating in the search for a new kingpin.	The business roles that may participate in the search are the organizer and the coordinator role.
<b>XI</b>	Replacement parameters	Only agents with a predetermined distance to the old kingpin may be participating in forming a conclave to evaluate a kingpin candidate.	The agents that may participate in a conclave may only be 1 distance away from the old kingpin.
<b>XII</b>	Replacement parameters	Only agents with predetermined business roles may be considered as a new kingpin.	The business roles that may participate in the search are the organizer, murderbroker, assassin and the coordinator role.
<b>XIII</b>	Replacement parameters	The minimum parameter attributes for a kingpin.	Violence capital: 0.5 Criminal capital: 0.5 Financial capital: 0.4
<b>XIV</b>	Replacement parameters	The minimum parameter attributes for	Violence capital: 0.2 Criminal capital: 0.2

		a kingpin candidate.	Financial capital: 0.2
XV	Replacement parameters	The minimum parameter attributes for a murderbroker candidate.	Violence capital: 0.85 Criminal capital: 0.5 Financial capital: 0.2
XVI	Replacement parameters	The minimum parameter attributes for a murderbroker.	Violence capital: 0.85 Criminal capital: 0.5 Financial capital: 0.2
XVII	Replacement parameters	The minimum parameter attributes for a murderbroker candidate.	Violence capital: 0.1 Criminal capital: 0.2 Financial capital: 0.2
XVIII	Replacement parameters	A newly created edge from an agent to a new kingpin must have a defined social role.	The default social role for a new edge between an agent and the new kingpin is neutral.

$$dT_{ij}/dt = \tau * (\psi * 1/(K+1) * 1/D_i * b + F_{ij} * \varphi * c + \varepsilon[t]) \quad 1.1.$$

Table III.4. Below the parameters used in formula 1.1. as well as throughout the model are detailed. In the rightmost column, the parameter values used in the CCRM are given.

Parameters	Explanation	Parameter values
<b>Beta (<math>\beta</math>)</b>	The minimum threshold for an edge's trust to participate in the kingpin-search	0.5
<b>Kappa (<math>\kappa</math>)</b>	The minimum kingpin attributes in order to assume the role	For kingpin: Violence capital: 0.5 Criminal capital: 0.5 Financial capital: 0.4  For murderbroker: Violence capital: 0.85 Criminal capital: 0.5 Financial capital: 0.2
<b>Gamma (<math>\gamma</math>)</b>	The minimum trust to become a kingpin	0.3
<b>Tau (<math>\tau</math>)</b>	The constant to control the time scale of trust dynamics (smaller $\tau$ results in slower changes).	0.01



	The unit of tau is seconds (s)	
<b>Psi (<math>\psi</math>)</b>	The constant to control the strength of the updating of trusts is following the kingpin removal	3
<b>Phi (<math>\varphi</math>)</b>	The constant to control how strong this family-tie trust updating (to higher values) is, regardless of whether a kingpin was removed or not	1
<b>Zeta (<math>\zeta</math>)</b>	The temperature, indicating noise ( $\zeta$ equal to 0 results in the conclave selecting the best suited candidate, while $\zeta$ approaching infinity results the conclave selecting uniformly random amongst available candidates)	Random (0.0, 1.0)
<b>Ti,j</b>	Trust value from agent i to another agent j. The trust is symmetric	Trust is determined through the social role of an agent: Social role family: (0.5, 1.0) Social role friend: (0.3, 0.9) Social role neutral: (0.0, 0.5)
<b>K</b>	The number of days since kingpin was removed (if not removed yet then $K=\infty$ ; $K \geq 0$ )	Random (10, 30)
<b>Di</b>	The distance to removed kingpin ( $D=\infty$ if kingpin not yet removed; $D \geq 1$ )	Maximum 5
<b>b</b>	The coefficient with which trust will be updated, as function of the current trust value T (following the kingpin removal). Making its unit seconds (s).	Dependent on T(s)
<b>Eps (<math>\varepsilon</math>)</b>	A Wiener process for randomness (noise) which is independent of t	Random (0.0, 1.0)
<b>c</b>	The coefficient with which trust will be updated if the edge is a family tie	A derivative of T, activated when family tie is present
<b>F</b>	Defining an edge as a family tie (1 if family tie otherwise 0)	0, 1

## ODD+D protocol

Table III.4.: ODD+D concept with categories and sub-categories (Müller et al., 2013)

Category	Sub-Category
<b>I. Overview</b>	I.1 Purpose
	I.2 Entities, state variables and scales
	I.3 Process overview and scheduling
<b>II. Design Concepts</b>	II.1 Theoretical and Empirical Background
	II.2 Individual Decision Making
	II.3 Learning
	II.4 Individual Sensing
	II.5 Individual Prediction
	II.6 Interaction
	II.7 Collectives
	II.8 Heterogeneity

	II.9 Stochasticity
	II.10 Observation
<b>III. Details</b>	III.1 Implementation Details
	III.2 Initialisation
	III.3 Input Data
	III.4 Submodels