



THEMATIC SEMINAR

REPONSES OF CITIES TO INSECURITY

Prague, 19-20 may 2006

Background report

May 2006
Elizabeth Johnston
FESU
Paris

johnston@urbansecurity.org

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION	3
I. SECURITY ISSUES AND POLICIES AT THE EUROPEAN LEVEL.....	5
I.1. The emergence of a European crime prevention policy.....	5
I.2. The recognition of the role of local authorities.....	10
I.3. The need for exchanges.....	10
II. FINDINGS FROM THE URBACT PROJECTS: LESSONS LEARNED	13
II.1. Defining security.....	14
II.2. Assessing insecurity	16
II.3. Responding to insecurity.....	17
II.3.1 Combining approaches	17
II.3.2. Building partnerships	20
II.3.3. Adapting public services.....	22
II.3.4. Positioning local elected officials.....	23
II.3.5. Facilitating relationships with the police.....	24
II.3.6. Encouraging and sustaining citizen participation.....	25
II.4. Evaluating.....	27
III. KEY QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATTED.....	29
III.1. First workshop session	29
III.2. Second workshop session.....	30
III.3. Third workshop session	30
III.4. Closing session	31

INTRODUCTION

In order to stimulate and favour capitalisation and dissemination, both within the URBACT Programme itself and in relation to a wider audience of outside players interested in sustainable urban development, URBACT thematic seminars are organised on topics that are common to several URBACT projects. The thematic seminars bring together for two days URBACT projects who are working on the same theme but have a different approach to it. They enable each project to build on its work and develop, at the level of the programme, the conditions for a collective European reflection on urban problems.

Insecurity is a central issue only for a small proportion of URBACT projects but many have touched upon it, to varying degrees. Whether it is addressed directly or indirectly, security is a key component of cities' urban development policies, which are central to URBACT preoccupations.

A thematic seminar devoted to responses of cities to insecurity seemed necessary in order to

- allow each project to learn about the current state of reflections in other URBACT projects dealing with the theme of security, about the results emerging from the activities of these projects, and on this basis, to develop exchanges with the other projects;
- formalise and disseminate recommendations and products as they emerge from the exchanges of the projects, distributing them both within the Programme and to outside players (at the local, national and European levels).

In order to maximize the seminar's potential, projects have been asked to respond to a questionnaire, and this preliminary report has been prepared.

The aim of the preliminary report is to offer a background document to position debates of the seminar, by describing issues to be addressed and presenting a synthesis of the work of the URBACT projects. Participating cities are encouraged to add to and amend this report, which will serve as a basis for the final report following the seminar.

The report is introduced by a brief overview of crime prevention policy at a European level. Key pieces of legislations as well as definitions and concepts are presented, and the central role of cities and exchanges between them are underlined.

The main part of the report is devoted to the findings of URBACT projects. Responses to the questionnaire that was sent out to projects have been unequal in lengths and degree of detail, reflecting the diversity of the extent to which security was addressed. **For key questions structuring our report, findings from the projects have often been introduced by a presentation of the state of reflection at a European-scale, integrating knowledge from outside the URBACT projects.**

The report describes the findings of URBACT projects following the general rationale of the questionnaire, itself based on the various steps and components of a city's strategy (diagnosis, partnership, implementation of actions, evaluation...).

During the seminar, the content of exchanges and workshops will be contributed primarily by the projects.

This is why the seminar's debates should greatly enrich this introductory background paper.

The results of the work will be summarized, along with practical case studies, and will be disseminated to URBACT partners and also the decision-makers of other European cities through the website.

I. SECURITY ISSUES AND POLICIES AT THE EUROPEAN LEVEL

Because security is a top-ranking priority and a daily concern for European citizens, especially in urban areas, responding to insecurity is high on the political agenda of most cities and has become central to urban management. It has indeed become one of the main issues in cities, alongside cultural, environmental and health issues, a prerequisite for the renewal and life of a city. Social concern with regard to crime and insecurity challenges us to re-examine the causes of tension in our cities, the inequalities, the contradictions which characterise them. Confronted to the increase in minor and major crime, citizens expect rapid actions and concrete solutions from politicians in charge. This situation, in which most European countries find themselves, means that security has become a primordial stake in political elections; elected representatives at all levels of governance must react to the preoccupations of their fellow citizens.

While notions and concepts may differ from one country to another, the fight against crime has become a priority, on the local, national and European levels.

I.1. The emergence of a European crime prevention policy

The European Urban Charter¹, proclaimed in 1992 and which brings together a series of principles on proper urban management, is a precursory document. Indeed, it constitutes a major effort in the elaboration of a body of action principles concerning crime prevention meant to transcend national policies by basing itself on the pertinence of this policy at the city level.

¹ European Urban Charter, Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe (CLRAE), European Council, 1992.

European Urban Charter (Excerpts)

Theme 6. Urban Safety and crime prevention

PRINCIPLES

1. A coherent Safety and crime prevention policy must be based on prevention, law enforcement and mutual support.
2. A local Safety policy must be based on up-to-date comprehensive statistics and information.
3. Crime prevention involves every member of the community.
4. An effective urban Safety policy depends on close co-operation between the police and the local community.
5. A local anti-drug policy must be defined and applied.
6. Programmes for preventing relapse and developing alternatives to incarceration are essential.
7. Support for victims is a key component of any local urban Safety policy
8. Crime prevention must be recognised as a social priority and command increased financial resources.

Concerning the European Union, the development of a crime prevention model came later. While the Stockholm Conference (1996) examined the link between crime prevention and social exclusion, it was the Amsterdam Treaty (1997) that marked an important step in the area of crime prevention at the European Union level. Indeed, in its Article 29 it mentions crime prevention amongst the policies of the European Union working towards an area of freedom, security and justice.

Treaty of Amsterdam (Excerpts)

Article 29

Without prejudice to the powers of the European Community, the Union's objective shall be to provide citizens with a high level of protection within an area of freedom, security and justice, by developing common action among the Member States in the fields of police and judicial co-operation in criminal matters and by preventing and combating racism and xenophobia.

That objective shall be achieved by preventing and combating crime, organised or otherwise, in particular terrorism, trafficking in persons and offences against children, illicit drug trafficking and illicit arms trafficking, corruption and fraud [...].

Subsequently, the European Council of Tampere (1999) stressed the importance of this objective in its conclusions, calling for the integration of crime prevention in the strategies for combating crime and setting study priorities, which would then be taken up by the *European Union Crime Prevention Project* and the European funding lines.

European Council of Tampere (Excerpts)

VIII. Preventing crime at the level of the Union

41. The European Council calls for the integration of crime prevention aspects into actions against crime as well as for the further development of national crime prevention programmes. Common priorities should be developed and identified in crime prevention, in the external and internal policy of the Union, and be taken into account when preparing new legislation.

42. The exchange of best practices should be developed, the project of competent national authorities for crime prevention and co-operation between national crime prevention organisations should be strengthened, and the possibility of a Community-funded programme should be explored for these purposes. The first priorities for this co-operation could be juvenile, urban and drug-related crime.

In 2001, the Council of the European Union set up a **European Union Crime Prevention Network**, grouping institutional representatives (from the ministries of Justice and/or the Interior), researchers as well as representative associations of each of the Union's member countries. The importance was focused on the identification of crime types, good practices inventory, methodology development for further crime prevention project facilitation, monitoring and evaluation of national policies and the adjustment to statistical procedures in order to make them comparable on the international level.

In the Council Decision, all bodies and levels involved in the prevention of crime are discussed, and it is explicitly stated that local authorities are also involved as an important authority.

“Society as a whole must be involved in the development of a **partnership between national, local and regional public authorities, non-governmental organizations, the private sector and citizens**. The causes of crime are multiple and must therefore be dealt with by measures at different levels, by different groups in society, in partnership with the players involved who have different powers and experience, including civil society. The Project shall contribute to developing the various aspects of crime prevention at Union level and shall support crime prevention activities at local and national level.”

The launching, the same year, of a budgetary line by the Justice and Home Affairs directorate of the European Commission aimed at supporting initiatives in the specific area of crime prevention, constitutes another strongpoint in the orientations that have been taken.

In its 2004 [Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament CRIME PREVENTION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION](#), the Commission proposes to use the

definition of crime prevention presented in the Council Decision of May 2001 establishing the European Union Crime Prevention Project (EUCPN).

According to that definition, "... crime prevention shall cover all measures that are intended to reduce or otherwise contribute to reducing crime and citizens' feeling of insecurity, both quantitatively and qualitatively, either through directly deterring criminal activities or through policies and interventions designed to reduce the potential for crime and the causes of crime. It includes work by government, competent authorities, criminal justice agencies, **local authorities**, specialist associations, the private and voluntary sectors, researchers and the public, supported by the media".

In November 2004, the European Council adopted **the Hague Programme**, which set the objectives to be implemented in the area of freedom, security and justice in the period 2005-2010.

The Commission presented in May 2005 an action plan with a set of detailed measures and a calendar to implement the programme adopted in the Hague, which was approved and serves as a frame of reference for Commission and Council work over the next five years.

This Action Plan identifies **10 key areas** for priority action:

1. Fundamental Rights and citizenship
2. The fight against terrorism
3. Migration management
4. Internal borders, external borders and visas
5. A common asylum area
6. Integration ; the positive impact of migration on our society and economy
7. Privacy and security in sharing information
8. The fight against organised crime
9. Civil and criminal justice
10. Freedom, security and Justice: sharing responsibility and solidarity

To establish a connection between the Hague Programme and adequate financial resources, the Commission proposed three **Framework Programmes**, coinciding with the new Financial Perspectives (2007-2013). These are:

- **Solidarity and Management of Migration flows** (covers integrated management of the Union's external borders and common policies on asylum and immigration)
- **Security and Safeguarding Liberties** (covers operational cooperation in the fight against terrorism, including its consequences, organised crime and **general crime**, as well as support to the provision of intelligence on a European scale and to strengthening the **prevention of crime** and terrorism)

- **Fundamental rights and Justice** (which includes development and implementation of judicial cooperation in civil and criminal matters, support for democratic participation and for the fight against violence and the fight against drugs).

In conclusion, objectives and priorities in the field of crime prevention should be according to the European Union:

- reducing the opportunities that facilitate crime;
- attenuating the factors that facilitate entering into crime as well as relapse;
- avoiding victimisation;
- reducing the feeling of insecurity;
- promoting a culture of legality;
- preventing the infiltration of economic structures by criminal elements.

Priority areas emerging from the Tampere council (1999, quoted above) have remained pertinent today, as they define the scope of the European Union Crime Prevention Network's mandate. They are:

1. juvenile delinquency:
 - the risk factors: alcohol, drugs, limited economic and social resources;
 - the impact of programmes aimed at behaviour modification;
 - judicial and reparative practices;
 - the partnership between the police and social services for preventing juvenile delinquency.

2. Urban crime

Here, the Commission mentions 'the events that affect life at the local level', more particularly: burglaries, criminal acts against automobiles and persons as well as graffiti and vandalism. Priority measures will concern social mediation (resolution of conflicts), the reduction of crime through urban renewal and architecture plans.

3. Drug-related crime

- Law-enforcement and prevention measures;
- Prevention through health and social policies

Based on the assessment of crime prevention policies undertaken in the Member States (and as we will see later, in European cities), European institutions encourage

- the development of an interdisciplinary approach;
- the articulation of safety and accompaniment policies (social and educational policies, etc.);
- the development of the partnership between prevention players with the motive that prevention is effective only if based on all components of society (notion of co-production);
- the development of approaches that favour proximity to citizens (plans of community policing and justice).

I.2. The recognition of the role of local authorities

In addition to the cross-disciplinary nature of all the policies that have been stimulated, the interest being accorded to the local level by national and European policies must be stressed.

The pertinence of the local level in dealing with crime appears as of the early 1990s in the work of European and even international institutions. The above-mentioned European Urban Charter (European Council, 1992), emphasised the necessity of setting up, at the local level, joint instances of dealing with crime. Similarly, the Salish Report 'Report on Petty Crime in Urban Agglomerations and its Links with Organised Crime' (European Parliament, 1993) insisted on the necessity of dealing with crime locally. The Petrozavodsk Conference (Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe, 1999) also acknowledged the contribution of local authorities in cross-border co-operation on the themes of prevention, crime and urban safety. Finally, the Nairobi International Forum on Urban Poverty (U.N., 1999) integrated the necessity of crime prevention in the running of cities, in order to promote social integration.

The principle that the European Commission supports is that *crime prevention is a matter that must be firstly addressed at the local level*. The principle of subsidiarity has to be applied. Yet, there are sufficient common areas between national criminal issues to draw up a common approach to the problem.

At the same time, many policies implemented by the European Union can have a direct impact on the criminality as, for example regional development programmes that aim to improve urban environment or reinforce social and economic cohesion.

I.3. The need for exchanges

Despite the institutional constraints, the complexity of the local scene obliges its players to both go beyond established frameworks (which are proposed or imposed on them) and, if need be, to invent them. In reality, they use the tools placed at their disposal as much as local specificities. In this sense, all the policies carried out in cities are innovative and the expression of the ability of a territory and its players to act. The existing differences do not prevent comparing and exchanging local experiences because these concern individuals (perpetrators, victims or citizens) and places, which are often similar.

It is therefore not surprising that a considerable amount of work carried out in Europe concerning crime prevention comes to the conclusion of the necessity of developing exchanges of know-how and experiences. This theme of exchange has become recurrent at all levels, leading to the development of various projects and means for knowledge transfer.

Since its creation in 1987, the **European Forum for Urban Safety**, a non-governmental organisation bringing together nearly three hundred European local authorities, has focused its activities on exchanges between European stakeholders working in the field of safety. The *Safety and Democracy Manifesto*² constituted an important step in the recognition of the pertinence of dealing with crime locally for the cities of this project, which enacted principles of joint action regarding crime prevention. To help local elected officials build inclusive and comprehensive policies, the EFUS favours transfer of expertise and exchange of experiences according to the model of “cities helping cities”.

The aforementioned **European Union Crime Prevention Network** specifically aims to

- identify good practices in crime prevention and to share knowledge and experience gained between member countries
- accumulate and evaluate information on crime prevention activities
- improve the exchange of ideas and information within the Project
- develop contacts and facilitate cooperation between Member States
- contribute to developing local and national strategies on crime prevention
- promote crime prevention activities by organising meetings, seminars and conferences.

The EUCPN’s work programme, which consists of projects or activities relating to specific areas of crime prevention, is determined by Member States, in relation with Research and Civil Society contact points. The EUCPN is also in charge of organising the European Crime Prevention Award (ECPA), an annual contest which aims to reward the best European crime prevention project.

Exchanges about security issues also take place in non-specialised projects, such as URBACT.

² *Manifesto of the ‘Safety & Democracy’ cities*, European Forum for Urban Safety, Naples, December 2000.

The URBACT Community Initiative Programme has been set up to facilitate projecting between cities from all the Member States around three larger objectives:

- Develop trans-national exchanges between URBAN I and URBAN II cities, those cities having benefited from an Urban Pilot Project, and all cities with more than 20.000 inhabitants in the New Member States of the Union.
- Draw lessons from the analysis of their experiences, policies implemented locally and propose innovative approaches to those difficult issues.
- Disseminate towards the actors in all European cities the experiences in those different areas, the lessons learned and the resulting proposals for approach.

The website <http://www.URBACT.org/> constitutes the prime platform of exchange between cities, the presentation of analytical summaries of examples of practice, the process of capitalisation and the principal tool of their dissemination.

Meetings of projects, of working groups and cross-cutting seminars such as the “Cities’ responses to insecurity” seminar of Prague reinforce this process of exchange between cities.

As previously mentioned, the European Commission has set up specific **funding streams** ([EUROPA - Justice and Home Affairs - Funding - European Commission](#)) to finance exchanges between practitioners involved in crime prevention and/or reduction. These include Daphne, INTI, ..and principally Agis. One of the explicit purpose of the AGIS programme is “to promote and strengthen networking, mutual co-operation <in the field of freedom, security and justice>, the exchange and dissemination of information, experience and best practices, local and regional co-operation and the improvement and adaptation of training and technical and scientific research.”

(not worth getting into too much detail since all is going to change in the next few months, AGIS being replaced, etc..)

This non-exhaustive overview of projects and European funded programs demonstrates the demand on all parts for knowledge building and exchange in the field of crime prevention.

II. FINDINGS FROM THE URBACT PROJECTS: LESSONS LEARNED

Within URBACT, only one project (SecurCity) and one working group (SUDC) explicitly consider security to be their central theme. **SecurCity** has concentrated on “the improvement and effectiveness of policies and actions to combat the (perceived) insecurity” in its participating cities. **SUDC** has focused on designing public policies which ensure the right to safety and respect cultural diversity.

Other projects have tackled the question of insecurity in more or less direct fashions. **Euromediation Secucité** has given security as such a secondary place considering that its priority was social cohesion. While mediation is a measure of conflict prevention and impacts on the feeling of security, it should not be perceived only as a means to attain security but a goal in and of itself. The overarching goal of cities in this project is to improve community relations and strengthen “social links”.

ISN, a project focused on the role of information society in promoting social inclusion and cohesion, has dealt with security directly through the case study of a program of prevention and fight against domestic violence which uses technology as one key tool, as well as indirectly, in discussions about identity confirmations.

Udiex has addressed insecurity as one of the obstacles to economic development of neighbourhoods.

For the **Partners for Action** project which focuses on Public-private partnerships, security has not been addressed independently as a specific topic. However, it has been discussed as a component of a multi-faceted development and regeneration strategy.

The **Urbanitas** project aims to explore strategies to improve quality of life and urban environment. It integrates the issue of security within the work on public spaces required by a global regeneration and urban development scheme. This project has also examined the impacts of the built environment on residents and users of public spaces, and recognizes interactions between the physical structures and human and social elements of cities.

Insecurity has not been a central issue of the **Young People, from Exclusion to Inclusion** project but it has been addressed as a possible consequence of social exclusion. Indeed, the place of young people within institutions, notably schools, has been considered influential in determining their attitude towards society and norms.

II.1. Defining security

There is no single European definition of security as it is a complex, culturally-specific and subjective concept. European institutions previously cited evoke the absence of crime, violence, incivility, and fear of crime, as well as the sense of belonging to a community.

Depending on their primary focus, Urbact projects have defined security differently, but their general conceptions tend to form a consensus. It is seen a quality of life issue, a condition for urban development, and a notion including absence of both crime and fear of crime.

SUDC has strived to combine objective and subjective perspectives, to include both security and feeling of security.

In the field of domestic violence illustrated by a case study of the ISN project, security and feeling of security have been considered inseparable. The experience of domestic violence creates a permanent fear of crime, which must also be taken into account when designing responses.

For Urbanitas, security was defined as a series of factors enabling all citizens to benefit from a good living environment. The project seeks to address physical regeneration and to fight against social exclusion. This also includes the feeling of insecurity indirectly because it addresses causes and not only consequences. A disenfranchised zone generates insecurity and feeling of insecurity. Insecurity is therefore perceived as a consequence of disenfranchised environments. Poorly kept public spaces for instance may generate antisocial behaviour and fear of crime. Insufficient lighting may facilitate crime.

For the Partners for Action project, security is perceived as one of the goals to attain in an urban regeneration scheme. It is also used as an argument to motivate and mobilize private partners such as real estate owners, as well as residents.

It is a key component of a multi-faceted development and regeneration strategy. This includes working on the built environment in terms of architecture and facilities as well as on the mix of activities.

For instance, the City of Brussels cites various aspects of security: those affecting housing (buildings and living conditions), people (with crime and fear of crime), road traffic..

The city of Rotterdam, involved in the SecurCity and Udiex projects, has defined insecurity as crime and the fear of crime. The scope of a security policy should include communication with local authorities and with the police.

For SecurCity, urban safety is an important location factor for people and businesses, especially SMEs. It is a criteria to attract new residents, new economic activities. “It is a precondition for urban economic and social development”.

Within this project, security was addressed through five sub-themes:

- youth crime, prevention, education;
- commercial investment in a public setting;
- Drugs, insecurity, and anti-social behaviour;
- citizen participation;
- fear of crime, disorder and the environment.

The SecurCity project indeed also focused on perceived safety, and its corollary fear of crime, which is closely linked to safety itself. Increased levels of safety do not automatically translate into increased feelings of safety, as coined by the concept of “reassurance gap”. This will lead cities to work on the improvement of their physical environments, on “clean and safe” issues (which include environmental degradation, and anti-social behaviour).

For Euromediation, security problems are perceived first and foremost as symptoms of social and economic tensions. While the project has not yet precisely defined security, the policies it has discussed related to the issue are those favouring access to citizenship, rebuilding of social links, victim support, conflict resolution between citizens, empowerment strategies.

In conclusion, for URBACT networks, security is a relatively wide notion, which cannot be defined solely in terms of public order and repression of crimes, although those aspects are necessary.

II.2. Assessing insecurity

Safety audits, based on specific methodologies, have become staples of most urban safety policies in European cities. In a field which can often lead to emotional reactions from residents, as well as politicians, it is essential to base crime prevention and reduction programs on “hard” facts. A serious diagnosis and audit phase is indispensable for cities to design and implement crime prevention strategies that are adapted to local needs as well as to local resources.

Although the measure and assessment of insecurity is not a topic that has been examined in depth in the responding URBACT projects, cities indicate the existence of a variety of methods.

In Turin, the province has an inter-institutional partnership that shares data, and the region mandates a private association to produce an annual report on security based on statistics, surveys, and questionnaires.

For SUDC, the most classic method is to base assessment on the evolution of crime data, completed by surveys on the level of quality of life.

The city of Roubaix for instance holds a monthly meeting during which all partners share key data and analyse most important events. This mostly concerns statistics issued by local and national police forces, public transport authorities, housing authorities, Justice, Schools.

The city of Lyon completes its Observatory by an annual survey of the population and a victimisation survey.

For the Partners for Action project information regarding security originates from residents and is gathered through public meetings and surveys. Regular meetings with representatives of the local authority provide empirical data.

Statistics can be obtained from:

- police services, criminal justice
- victim services' reporting (Ex: case study of the ISN project: very precise data on the profile of women who are attended to is generated)

They are to be completed by the results of questionnaires, surveys carried out by local authorities, partner universities...

Some cities have developed “clean and safe” indices, in order to map the presence of certain issues across the city. SecurCity held a specific seminar on “clean and safe” indicators (reference URBACT website).

The combination of these mapping techniques, hard crime data, residents’ opinion surveys provide cities with a comprehensive view and help decision makers in allocating resources and prioritising.

II.3. Responding to insecurity

One finds, to varying degrees in all the projects responding to the questionnaires, common problems that refer to identical publics (juvenile delinquency, women, minorities, etc.) or to the same places (city centres, shopping areas, etc.). Despite the diversity of cities involved, this allows for bringing out a common body both on the level of problems as well as on the general organisation of crime prevention, and enables us to identify some trends in cities’ responses to insecurity.

II.3.1 Combining approaches

As States and the European Union do, cities distinguish **different approaches to prevention**, which are not exclusive one of the other. They differ depending on whether they concentrate on victims, perpetrators, persons or groups at risk, or on risky situations. They include :

- **social crime prevention**: supporting individuals and communities through social, economic, health, educational measures. Social development approaches will tend to focus on promoting the well-being of people and encouraging pro-social behaviour.
- **Situational prevention and victimization prevention**, to prevent the occurrence of crime. This covers strategies based on environmental design, to reduce opportunities, increase risk of being apprehended, limit benefits, as well as strategies based on information and assistance to potential victims.
- **Prevention of recidivism**, by the support given to the reintegration of offenders.

Crime prevention or reduction programs can choose to target either a specific area or a specific group of the population. In the first case, an area can be designated as a target because the use of public space is problematic: different groups come into conflict over the occupation of a town square or a building

entrance... Other strategies choose to focus on a segment of the population considered at-risk of being victims or perpetrators. Specific programs are then designed to address the needs and behaviours of young people, or women, or the elderly.. A particular attention to the public it aims to serve will increase the efficiency of such a policy.

Some of the projects, because of their own focus, have privileged a particular approach.

Urbanitas for instance works on urban revitalisation through an integrated approach, based on a wide acceptance of the notion of urban regeneration, which takes into account physical, social, historical parameters of cities. The link established by Urbanitas between the physical structures and human and social elements of cities advocates for an **integrated approach** of urban planning and regeneration. In this case, the approach is territorial, focusing on specific zones of cities which are considered particularly disadvantaged. However, in an effort to be comprehensive in its approach, the project plans to also explore the fight against anti-social behaviour.

The City of Brussels, member of the **Partners for Action** project, has given a strong priority to its urban regeneration and developed an integrated strategy. Beyond the field of physical renovation and building, a prevention strategy has been implemented. This includes the development of a community policing approach, as well as the recruitment of prevention agents.

While urban revitalisation has been the priority focus of the Partners for Action project, social prevention strategies, which for instance include cultural activities, have been identified as key components in cities like Brussels or Copenhagen.

For the Ala Kondre project, Rotterdam, tackling insecurity and the fear of crime goes through business development. This approach is based on the notion that there is less crime and less fear of crime in areas where businesses thrive.

Social inclusion, a proactive approach towards including young people and therefore social prevention has been the key priority of the Malmo project. The project identified that young people at the borders of exclusion are very often a specific target group for crime, which could justify specific programs to prevent their victimization.

The Women Anti-Violence project, featured case study of the **ISN project** focuses on domestic violence but targets not only women victims but families (in its educational component), professionals who may be confronted to the issue (in awareness raising and training component)... This is an illustration of an integrated approach within a particular policy field.

Finally, **projects focused on security** like SecurCity promote the combination of approaches, as a means to address a greater number of issues and to involve a greater number of partners.

SecurCity's approach focused both on groups (youth, drug users, homeless people, prostitutes, residents...) and territories: commercial areas, neighbourhoods.

In their local policies, partner cities particularly targeted at-risk youth, considering education and prevention to be priorities.

The projects featured in the SecurCity project "demonstrate that a holistic understanding of the issues and broad cooperation are needed".

For Euromediation as well, cities must combine social prevention, urban regeneration and situational prevention. The project suggests that these three approaches should form a "process" rather than a program or project, suggesting an ongoing dynamic.

Although cities within the **Euromediation** project each establish priorities that are specific to their local reality, the wide scope of programs shows that mediation can target groups that are considered particularly at-risk: migrants, victims, minors, isolated individuals, as well as places within the city: schools, specific neighbourhood. As the example of the Night correspondent in Angers shows, a mediation program can also be time specific, targeting night time during which people may be particularly vulnerable in terms of insecurity and feeling of insecurity.

In the fight against crime, cities of the project have focused their actions towards women, the elderly, youth, foreigners, as well as towards neighbourhood needing regeneration.

The issue of target groups has been widely discussed within **SUDC** which is focused on the right to security and cultural diversity. The group has collectively chosen a very inclusive definition of the notion of minorities. Cultural diversity refers not only to ethnic groups but also to gender, age, social and economic group, behaviour...For instance, a mediation scheme led by Night correspondents is targeted towards those who share a 'night culture' as opposed to social mediators working during the day. Most case studies chosen by **SUDC** have chosen to target territories and not groups of individuals, so as to avoid stigmatization. Therefore, projects will mostly pay attention to a geographical area

considered at-risk or dangerous. The Urban Renewal program of the city of Liege offers a variety of social and preventative activities within three “priority” neighbourhoods of the city.

In order to reach a consensus on key principles, the SUDC group debated and adopted the “Safety and Democracy manifesto”, issued from the international conference of Naples (2000).

SUDC has focused on a social prevention approach, considering that while they are necessary, repressive approaches are not sufficient to tackle insecurity in cities. Urban regeneration and situational prevention strategies exist in partner cities but they were not particularly discussed here.

The examination of various approaches to crime prevention lead us to recognise that on a local level, they are most often combined, leading to the establishment of multi-agency partnerships.

II.3.2. Building partnerships

Most European countries have developed crime prevention strategies based on contractual arrangements between different levels of governance involving a variety of sectors. National legislations to encourage and favour local multi-agency coalitions have been passed in Italy, Belgium, France, the Netherlands, Denmark, the UK to name only a few.

As URBACT projects have made clear, a multi-faceted approach is necessary to tackle an issue as complex as security. Combating crime at a local level calls for the development of multi-sectoral bodies rather than single agencies. A comprehensive urban safety strategy requires the participation of many different partners, and can take various forms. Partnerships are required to solve a problem in its complexity, from different angles, represented by different agencies.

The list of concerned partners can be very long according to the variety of problem to be solved. Politicians, private and voluntary sectors, media, schools, universities, police, youth and sport, social and health agencies, prison administration, judicial system, youths councils, social housing agencies, tenants’ associations.....

Specific partners were mentioned by URBACT projects.

For instance, the City of Brussels for instance uses the Neighbourhood contracts which, on the basis of a City/region partnership invest in public housing, social prevention, public facilities... These strive to reinforce **social cohesion**, and therefore also promote citizen as partners.

The main partners in the Ala Kondre project are the entrepreneurs of the neighbourhood, who are at the initiative of the action. Rotterdam has worked with non-profit organisations involved in fields of drug prevention, school violence, public transport, sports, youth... Consultants and other agencies also play an active role.

In a domestic violence project, case study of the ISN project, partnerships were established between public institutions, with the aim of coordinating agencies' activities in this field, as well as between these public institutions and the relevant community organisations. Local, regional and national governments cooperated on this project.

SecurCity case studies partners include the municipality, the police, schools, judiciary, residents, associations from the voluntary sector, housing corporations

Euromediation case studies feature partnerships between sectors of the municipality, other levels of governments (region, national), Youth Judicial services, non-governmental associations..

The SUDC group examined local safety partnership and contracts involving local authorities, social services centres, police services, probation services, cultural centres, judicial system...

Forms of partnerships

In SUDC cities, the initiative is most often public, as security remains of the responsibility of the public sector. The operational aspect of these partnerships was discussed more than their financial aspect. Partnerships can exist within an institution, as multidisciplinary teams lead common projects. Although they belong to the same authority, eg the municipality, different services contribute in complementary fashions to a common goal. Partnerships described by SUDC can also be created by those sharing the use of a geographical area: in Lyon, the municipality, housing authorities, public transport system, local

employers have created a shared prevention service to regulate and mediate the use of public spaces in a given neighbourhood.

Questions raised around partnership

While partnership is considered by all respondents, a necessity, it is not always easy to implement and sustain, as partners can have differing goals and methods.

SecurCity underlines the potential difficulties of cooperation between police, judiciary and mental health care professionals. To solve this, SecurCity partners recommend that « engagements should be made about the exchange of knowledge and information, and about harmonizing of working methods. Active commitment and support of the management and the boards of the participating partners is essential.»

Some of the partnerships described in Euromediation case studies are ongoing while others are project based and limited in time.

Cities which have set up these local partnerships have often been confronted to the difficulty of mobilizing institutions and partners who are not used to work together and continue to operate according to their own rules, around a common project. Numerous partners need to be managed following a certain methodology. This can entail organizing groups, defining objectives collectively, implementing evaluation processes. The appointment of a local policy coordinator can be necessary to overcome such difficulties.

II.3.3. Adapting public services

Adapting public services was one of the sub-themes chosen by the SUDC group and led by the city of Genoa and Liege, which both have developed innovative strategies in this field. The city of Genoa has a “social regulation plan” which aims to compare, coordinate, improve, modify, and promote its public services to better orient them towards citizens. Satisfying citizens’ social demand should become the goal of public policies: therefore all services aimed at the quality of life of citizens, including the sector in charge of security, are concerned by this strategy. An increasing number of cities are developing schemes to better evaluate citizens’ demands and the municipal services’ capacities to respond. These can include regular citizen surveys in priority neighbourhoods, like in Lyon.

The SUDC group as a whole considers it is not only up to the citizen to integrate and adapt to the environment. Public services must also evolve, so as to meet citizens' needs and capacities, whilst aiming to empower them. The city of Liège, like others throughout Europe, uses native tongues of residents, namely Arabic and Turkish, in family mediation programs, when necessary and as a temporary solution before language courses can be effective.

Another expression of the adaptation of public services is the change in the nature of services provided by the city. The group has examined some examples of public services being developed in order to address issues that had been only taken into account by the voluntary, non-governmental sector, because considered too marginal. The field of support to asylum-seekers is a clear illustration of a public disengagement, which can then be regretted and modified by cities faced with both humanitarian and security problems linked to the presence of this group.

The City of Brussels has created either within its administration or through partner associations, services to accompany its strategy of regeneration: advice to citizens regarding safety, participation... The police has also opened two stations in the historical center, to respond to local demand.

The Anti-Violence plan case study of the ISN project illustrates a strategy aimed at better treatment and follow-up of individual cases and facilitation of victims' contacts with administrations. New technology has been used to improve interdepartmental coordination, through the sharing of data on victims. Furthermore, the police have provided women at risk with telephones enabling geo-localisation. The fact that the police themselves get in touch with the women on a weekly basis to see if there is anything to report indicates a change, if not a reversal, of attitudes towards the victims of crime

II.3.4. Positioning local elected officials

As local authorities have emerged throughout Europe as the pertinent level to implement crime prevention strategies, mayors and their deputies saw their role in this field, as well as expectations from the population, increase. The city council is directly elected by the population and is often held accountable for issues that go beyond its competency. Basing their legitimacy on democratic vote and on the pertinence of local action, elected officials have throughout the years managed to impose themselves in the field of crime prevention, which was traditionally considered that of the State.

Notwithstanding the importance of their role, responding URBACT projects seemed to have barely touched upon the topic of the role of elected officials with regards to security policies.

Within the SecurCity project, politicians are perceived as important mostly for support.

In other cases, they are seen as initiators and promoters of security policies. For instance, in Brussels, elected officials have been very involved in the process of urban regeneration, and in its security aspect, since the Mayor is the head of the police force, and directly held accountable for security. It is interesting to note the city of Brussels considers that a clear and visible political will to tackle these issues has contributed to lowering the fear of crime in the city.

In Spain, elected representatives from the local, regional and national authorities have made the fight against gender-based violence a priority, and are at the origin of the Violence prevention plan, giving it continuing support and legitimacy.

Elected officials, motivated by the need to respond to citizens' demand for security, seemed to have played a key role in the design and implementation of practices studied by the SUDC group. In some cases, elected officials from other levels of governments have played an active role.

II.3.5. Facilitating relationships with the police

Neither the police force nor local authorities can conduct crime prevention policies without active mutual consultation and co-operation. In some countries, legislations make it obligatory to form partnerships between local authorities and national police forces. Such co-operation can include matters such as decisions about police zoning and local beats of mobile patrols, as well as giving advice to citizens on how to reduce opportunities for crime and theft. In other countries, municipal or regional police forces have been created.

While the relationship between local authorities and the police was rarely addressed directly by responding URBACT projects, the police appear to be a regular partner of many projects in cities.

In the Netherlands, as well as in Belgium, because it is a municipal competency, the police has been actively involved in prevention strategies. Cooperation is greatly facilitated in these cases. Regardless of legal frameworks, community policing seems to be widespread, as the demand for security calls for police visibility and proximity with citizens. This naturally leads the police to be involved in prevention projects.

The cooperation between the police and local authorities can concern data exchange, providing decision-makers with statistics regarding security. This exchange of information often takes place within local safety partnerships, and can be institutionalized by various protocols.

A second level of cooperation is more operational and concerns programs led by the police and different agencies, like schools, housing authorities, public transport... Common training and awareness raising sessions can be held, as described by SecurCity case studies. Conflict resolution schemes such as those examined by Euromediation and SUDC see the police and mediators cooperate in that the latter resolve cases brought to them by police forces.

The police initiated and ran most of the projects presented by the Violence Prevention sub-theme of SUDC: in those, the police forces devised innovative strategies to address problems encountered on the field. (Reference to Liège Case study “Actors of the Place”).

In all cases, police forces are subject to the same appeal for proximity and local involvement. They are increasingly expected to take into account concerns expressed by the public, to be familiar with local conditions and to communicate with local inhabitants on crime prevention issues, so as to build a climate of trust.

Local authorities can play a key mediating role in the police – community relationship, which is still often conflict-ridden. Tensions between police forces and minority groups (including youth) are particularly vivid in many neighbourhoods of our cities: recreational and educational programs can be set up by cities to encourage a dialogue and to build trust between these groups.

II.3.6. Encouraging and sustaining citizen participation

It is almost unanimously recognized throughout Europe that the participation of inhabitants is required to develop programmes for community and social development of neighbourhoods whether dealing with environmental improvement; developing or improving public services; reinforcing social cohesion. Cities share a desire to involve people in the search for solutions and in their implementation

The involvement of citizens in local policies, including security policies, is presented as an important goal by most responding URBACT projects. It is often even considered a necessary condition for the success of policies.

Thorough information of citizens is the first and indispensable step towards participation. Raising awareness of a specific target group or of the general population on a specific issue can be a program objective, as is the Aviles case study of ISN, which alerts and informs citizens with regards to gender-based violence.

It is increasingly acknowledged that citizens who are also “users” of public services and public spaces must take an active part in what concerns their daily life. Such participation enables a policy to fit the actual needs of its beneficiaries and to become self-sustainable.

However, the format and the degree of citizen participation vary. As the Urbanitas project points out, for many partner cities, involving citizens is neither obvious nor easy.

Many, if not most cities, have set up forms of Citizens’ Participation Councils, encouraging individual citizens as well as of citizens’ organisations, to gather to discuss and try to resolve local issues, such as security. In some cases, these councils or ad hoc groups created within the community play an actual role in designing and implementing a program.

The forms of participation tested by the Euromediation project included neighbourhood meetings aiming to identify difficulties and/or risks, as well as collective action with residents.

To encourage citizen participation, cities can

- support neighbourhood watch schemes and other mechanisms which encourage citizens to mobilise themselves for their community, protect their own safety and welfare and recognize their civil duty to combat discrimination and take a positive stand against crime
- in co-operation with housing authorities, develop approaches for creating defensible space and making housing more secure, cleaning and maintaining residential areas to discourage vandalism and disorder, encourage local tenancy-management initiatives
- regularly seek the views of residents through surveys, open days, neighbourhood forums and questionnaires to continuously assess the public’s perception of crime and fear of crime
- develop an active communication strategy using all possible techniques, making use of leaflets and newsletters, procedure for dealing with complaints, public meetings

It is of the responsibility of cities to maintain a balance between the interests of citizens that can sometimes be diverging and contradictory and to protect the rights of all residents, even the most marginalised. The degree to which citizens can and should be empowered is subject to debate.

An important finding from the SecurCity project concerns the balance between bottom-up activity and public sector driven initiatives. Indeed, cooperation between citizens and cities should be a “mutually respectful and supportive relationship”, which does not stifle citizens’ initiatives nor takes away public responsibility. The balance is not necessarily easy to attain, nor to maintain. Because citizen participation has only recently been encouraged in this field, this remains a challenge for cities, as they have no long-standing tradition on which they can rely.

As pointed out by various projects, citizen participation requires a change in the culture of all those involved – citizens and institutions.

“The police needs to move from an internally oriented culture to a participative culture. Local government needs to move from ‘knowing better’ to a listening culture. Politicians and decision-makers need to engage in the processes in a listening and supportive way. But there is also a challenge for the citizens and communities to move from a passive to an active culture, taking responsibility of their environment and building local identity.” *SecurCity questionnaire.*

The categories that were most involved were residents from underprivileged neighbourhoods, but mostly the elderly, women, shopkeepers, public and private social workers, and volunteers working in non-governmental organisations.

II.4. Evaluating

The combination of an increasing demand for safety and limited resources of cities has created a need for monitoring and evaluation schemes. Politicians and decision-makers are faced with questions of ‘What works? How is our money best used? What are the direct and indirect effects of our policies? Who are the real beneficiaries?’

Monitoring and evaluation can be formalized procedures which are built in from the start.

For instance, a specific monitoring commission has been set up to analyse the results of the Spanish plan against gender-based violence ISN Project.

Other cities have more informal evaluation methods. Brussels evaluates its strategy on the satisfaction of residents, measured by their contacts and letters to the local authority, the number of inhabitants (which has increased), and the number of abandoned, vacant spaces... Public meetings can also be a means to measure public satisfaction and opinion.

Evaluation can also be linked to the audit and survey phase described earlier. Some cities have developed indicators that can be used to establish a diagnosis and then an evaluation of a policy. For instance the city of Rotterdam has established a “Safety index” which integrates recorded crime data with resident’s perceptions and grades each of the city’s 62 neighbourhoods. Local action plans are designed according to these indexes.

The Hague combines quality of life surveys among citizens, a Liveability national survey, and a monitoring system for the 27 hot spots (least safe areas).

Globally, it is fair to say that while local crime prevention councils have developed many competencies to audit the reality and to analyse the perception of urban safety, evaluation remains insufficient. Because it is most often not a compulsory stage in the implementation of an action –on which financing would depend for instance – evaluation is not systematic.

III. KEY QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The seminar will have a strong participatory approach, building upon existing findings included in this report, which has aimed to highlight and explore some key issues, and calling upon participants' expertise.

On each of the key issues, participants will be asked to present both their network's conclusions and relevant case studies, when existing. Input concerning content of policies as well as their methodology will be encouraged. Proposals for recommendations can also be prepared in advance.

Because of their small size and informal character, workshop sessions will also be an opportunity for participants to freely express and debate unresolved or controversial questions. Results from each workshop will be shared in plenary sessions, and conclusions and recommendations integrated into a final report.

The seminar will be structured in three main workshop sessions and a closing plenary.

III.1. First workshop session

The first workshop session is devoted to **defining concepts and scope**. Far from being technical and neutral questions, these definitions reflect the values and political framework underpinning cities' actions.

Key questions include

- **The definition of insecurity by cities**

How broad is the notion of insecurity for cities?

Who defines security for whom? Residents or Newcomers? Inhabitants or business-owners?

Minority or majority?

- **The inclusion of the fear of crime**

Are decision-makers seeking an objective or subjective picture of insecurity?

What importance should be given to perceptions of security, as opposed to "hard facts"?

- **The measurement of insecurity**

What methodologies are used? What are the most appropriate tools to combine different perspectives in the assessment of insecurity?

How can fear of crime be measured and/or apprehended?

III.2. Second workshop session

The second workshop session will deal with the **stakeholders** of cities' responses to insecurity. Having recognised the need for a multi-faceted approach, cities mobilise various actors susceptible of contributing to the prevention or resolution of a problem. Partnerships in charge of designing and implementing responses will be described and analysed.

Participants will discuss, among other questions,

- **The composition of partnerships**

Is the composition of partnerships permanent or does it vary according to issues?

Can a partnership include actors with conflicting interests?

What is the place of citizens? Should they systematically be involved?

- **The status of city-level partnerships**

Should partnerships be made mandatory?

Is the city a partner among others or does it have a leadership role and specific responsibilities?

Are city-region-state partnerships in security policies empowering or burdening for cities?

- **The difficulties and obstacles in establishing and sustaining partnerships**

How can cities reconcile differing and sometimes conflicting objectives of partners?

Are there specific methods or tools to sustain partnerships over time?

III.3. Third workshop session

The third workshop session is aimed at **establishing recommendations**, on the basis of URBACT findings and of the seminar's discussions.

On the basis of their presentation of most promising practices, whether they are innovative or more classic, participants will discuss

- **Evaluation**

Do cities aim to evaluate effectiveness, cost/benefit, direct and indirect effects of policies?

What methods are available for cities and among those, which are actually used?

- **Factors of success**

What are the determining elements that make a practice successful?

What lessons can be learned from the practices presented during the seminar?

- **Transferability**

What can cities learn from practices presented by others?

What findings in terms of content or method are transferable?

III.4. Closing session

A final concluding session held in plenary; will address the challenge of **mainstreaming security into urban regeneration**, in order to ensure the sustainability of cities' responses to crime and fear of crime.

Whilst security is the object of specific policies at the local, national and European levels, it should also be integrated into wider policies of urban regeneration, which tackle quality of life and of environment aspects.

- What are the current links between urban safety and urban development policies at a local level?

On a practical level, do the persons in charge of these fields work together and coordinate their strategies?

- How can the issue of security be integrated at the various stages of an urban regeneration strategy?

Discussion of each stage: audit, planning, design, implementation, evaluation

- How can cities create a synergy between urban regeneration and urban security policies?

What constraints would such mainstreaming add?

How can this synergy be beneficial for all involved?

The cities of Anderlecht and Kirklees will present Urbanitas network's perspective on this challenge of mainstreaming security into urban regeneration. Indeed, focusing its work on urban ruptures, be they physical, topological, landscaped, social, identity-based or behavioural, the Urbanitas network has addressed cities' efforts to physically regenerate urban sites and combat social exclusion.

During the seminar, all participants will be asked to contribute both questions to be submitted to the Urbanitas network and opinions regarding the theme of the closing plenary.