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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

It is now well established that the majority of the world’s population live in cities, and that urbanization is increasing at an exponential rate. Rates of urban crime and violence have also been increasing with urban growth, especially in developing countries. It is also evident that the design, infrastructure and governance of cities have major implications for the safety and security of all their residents, and their ability to access the benefits of urban life. This means that sustainable urban development will only be achieved when well-planned city-wide, community-based, integrated and comprehensive urban crime prevention and safety strategies have been put in place.

In 2011 and 2013 the Governing Council of UN-Habitat mandated its Safer Cities Programme to begin preparations for a new set of normative guidelines on safer cities, in consultation with UNODC (the UN Office on Drugs and Crime) and other UN agencies.¹ A resolution of the UN General Assembly in 2013 similarly mandated UNODC to contribute to their development.² The purpose of the guidelines is to provide policy makers at national and local levels with a clear normative framework which builds on accumulated knowledge about the development of safe cities, and provides a practical basis for practitioners implementing them. The new guidelines will complement the two existing sets of guidelines on urban safety: the Guidelines for the Prevention of Urban Crime ECOSOC Resolution 1995/9; and the Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime, ECOSOC Resolution 2002/13.

As part of the development of the new UN Guidelines on Safer Cities, Women in Cities International (WICI) was asked by UN-Habitat to facilitate a series of consultations with safer cities partners to document their concerns, experience, and recommendations. WICI has drawn on its extensive experience in Safer Cities programming and its network of experts and practitioners in all regions of the world to successfully carry out the consultations in an inclusive and participatory way.

METHODOLOGY

The partners’ consultation was held with a diverse range of stakeholders from different regions, including city administrators, urban safety and crime prevention experts, international and community-based women’s organizations, and youth engagement specialists. The consultations were performed using Fast Talks methodology; a four step process that began with desk research and face-to-face meetings with the Global Network on Safer Cities (GNSC) and during the seventh World Urban Forum (WUF7), followed by semi-structured individual Skype interviews, a widely disseminated online survey, and finally four “fast talks” moderated discussions. Findings from each step of the process contributed directly to the content of the following phase so that themes and issues raised could be continue to be explored in greater depth in order to build consensus.

¹ GC Resolution 23/14 2011; GC Resolution 24/10 2013.
THE GUIDELINES

These guidelines should build on the momentum leading up to the third United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat-III) in October, 2016 and utilize indicators from the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for 2030. They must incorporate lessons from the earlier guidelines on crime prevention and expand their scope to focus on social integration (not poverty) and how diversity can contribute to a city. Overall the issues of equality, social inclusion, and human rights were recognized as key themes. Urban design and planning must serve the purpose of reinforcing both spatial integration and social cohesion as a way to promote safety, especially in public spaces. Participants agree this means the guidelines should make a strong statement about the “right to the city” framework because it defines equal access to services and participation as a prerequisite to build strong citizenship values and inclusive cities. Throughout the consultations dissemination, implementation, and evaluation were common concerns of participants. Main ideas include:

- There is no “one size fits all” strategy due to the diversity of contexts and people involved in the implementation of the guidelines.
- A handbook or toolkit should be developed to operationalize guidelines along with the creation of a sharing platform to facilitate the exchange of ideas and good practices.
- Guidelines should take the shape of a two-way document that incorporates feedback from cities as they are being implemented as part of a long-term process.
- Urban safety programmes and crime prevention measures should be institutionalized as way to ensure their sustainability despite any municipal or national political instability.
- Guidelines should emphasise the importance of the effective evaluation of safer cities strategies as a prerequisite to improve, enhance and disseminate good practice, knowledge, and skills.
- Participants agree that all the data collection should be systematically disaggregated (by at least gender and age) in the diagnosis of safety and the perception of safety.
- The importance of local participation by a diversity of people, including women and girls is crucial from the initial stages of data collection and problem diagnosis all the way through the evaluation and monitoring of programmes and their outcomes.

Many participants felt that the audience should extend well beyond crime and safety policy makers and practitioners in order to address the “compounding factors that enable crime, insecurity and a culture of fear” (FT3). Participants believe that the audience for the guidelines should include:
1. Government
   i) Involvement of mayors
   ii) Strong local authorities and political leaders
   iii) Governance councils and security committees
   iv) National government
   v) Police

2. Urban Shapers
   i) Policy makers
   ii) Practitioners (architects, urban designers, planners)

3. Civil Society and NGOs
   i) The community
   ii) Groups who experience exclusion (youth, migrants, etc.)
   iii) Academic institutions
   iv) Religious leaders
   v) UN agencies
   vi) INGOs

4. Private Sector
   i) Private companies
   ii) Economic Actors

CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CITIES TODAY
The city is a useful scale of analysis for considering safety, however the concept of the “city” needs to be understood beyond its geographic and political borders to account for informal settlements and metropolitan areas. In the context of rapid urbanization and increased migration, cities can be overwhelmed and unable to absorb the influx of people while ensuring the provision of safety and services. The guidelines need to consider more than the official boundaries of the city because the “real boundaries are not defined by the municipality but by its people,” therefore undefined areas and informal settlements must be part of a city-wide planning strategy for urban safety (Fast Talk 1). The guidelines need to take a city-wide safety policy that is crosscutting, integrated, and multi-level that accounts for the fluid political boundaries and how unique and diverse each city is.

INCLUSION AND DIVERSITY
The inclusion of the local community and the most excluded populations in the diagnosis of urban safety is essential. Cities can provide a cooperative framework that puts the local population of all ages, including women and girls, at the center of the design, planning, implementation, and monitoring of the process in order to incorporate their crucial input. Inclusion and the intersection of different identities (gender, race, age, culture, ethnicity, and social and economic status) and how these impact exclusion must be understood and addressed throughout the guidelines. The guidelines should pay specific attention to ‘at risk’ groups, meaning groups at risk of offending and/or at risk of being affected by crime and violence. Young men and adolescents are particularly affected by urban violence as they are often inflicting violence on one another.

IDENTITY
Strengthening the identity of people with their city and creating a sense of belonging starting at the local level (neighbourhoods), was promoted as an effective way to build local democracy and engage people in the production and maintenance of urban safety. It was important that the guidelines address how different groups view the same neighbourhood, in addition to how different groups are viewed from the perspective of others, in order to create a collective vision of safety. Large cities are often part of metropolitan areas, but can also be defined by their neighbourhoods as a basis to build identity and sense
of belonging. This means the guidelines should identify the diversity within and between city neighbourhoods and recognize that strategies are not always transferable.

**GENDER AS A CROSS-CUTTING ISSUE**

Fast talk participants stressed that the guidelines should define urban safety as a strategy that goes hand-in-hand with gender because both are cross-cutting issues that should be mainstreamed in urban policy and all levels of government. Participants highlighted that gender was not mentioned in the principles of the earlier guidelines and insisted that “gender needs to be front and center in the document” (FT1). There must be recognition that the city is experienced differently by females and males, therefore gender and differentiation should be mainstreamed throughout the guidelines and “incorporated in each of the local governance and safety principles” (FT4). It was recommended to stress gender equality and intersectionality in the guidelines and to push for the participation of women and girls in every stage of city safety efforts.

**CITIZEN PARTICIPATION**

Strengthening participation from local actors will support the realisation of better social integration and the construction of citizenship values, understanding that a citizen is not only the inhabitant of a city but also someone who takes part in city life and decision-making. Guidelines should address that there are not always systematic mechanisms to foster citizens’ participation in urban planning and design to improve safety. The women’s safety audit tool has been effective in facilitating citizen participation in diagnosing safety issues rooted in urban design, and in offering solutions. Involving the community at an early stage will result in a sense of ownership and shared responsibility of the process to make the city safer and support social cohesion. Overall, it is important that citizens identify themselves with the city they live in because “getting involved and caring about their community is what will create safety” (Individual interview).

**MULTI-LEVEL COOPERATION**

The guidelines are being designed for cities, however they must also “insist on an alliance between the three levels of government and look at the role of the city and citizens’ participation” (FT4). Multi-stakeholder cooperation and multi-level partnerships with defined roles are crucial to the success of the guidelines. Among different stakeholders and levels of government (local/municipal/national) there needs to be an articulation of responsibilities that promotes and equal balance between actors and accounts for their varying levels of resources and competencies when developing safety strategies. In cities that are weak or fragile, the support of higher levels of government is a necessity.

**THE IMPORTANCE OF PARTNERSHIP**

It was suggested that cross-sectional and multi-layered partnerships be emphasized, with a special attention to bottom-up partnerships that give importance the local neighbourhood level. Civil society organizations (CSOs) “need to be explicitly included: they are key partners, particularly at the regional and local level who hold vital expertise and often stand as a bridge to local community issues” for political
leaders and policy makers (FT1). Formalising partnerships with community-based organisations, youth and women’s organisations in particular, is important to address the needs of the most excluded communities. It is recommended that the guidelines address the issue of capacity-building more specifically as an empowering tool and condition to support the co-production of safety. Members of private sector can also be strong partners, but should be chosen with caution to ensure business interests do not compromise safer cities goals and objectives.

**IMPACT OF MIGRATION, CLIMATE CHANGE, AND CONFLICTS**

The guidelines should more specifically address the consequences that climate change, natural disasters, and civil and ethnic conflicts can have on the mobility of people and their level of insecurity. In a time of massive urban migration (from rural areas) and international migration, it is important to highlight the impact these phenomenon have at city-level and use them as an opportunity for social development. After a disaster or conflict, vulnerable populations are more exposed to and affected by violent risk factors aggravated by the sudden breakdown of local institutions, the debilitation of the rule of law, and the loss of social control that can result in the rise of criminal behaviours that threaten sustainable development. In terms of methodology, there exist synergies between peace-building efforts, and other fields like conflict and city resiliency, and safer cities methods.

**CONCLUSION**

The findings from this consultation process underline that it is not only the local authorities and public municipal stakeholders in cities around the world who are responsible for implementing public safety and security policies and who will benefit from the UN Guidelines on Safer Cities, but also national government representatives, urban practitioners, crime prevention professionals, community members, other UN agencies, and international NGOs. The consensus among participants is that the guidelines are a normative framework which sets out important principles for action without being overly detailed. To overcome this challenge, it is recommended that the guidelines be widely disseminated, understood, and promoted by various actors (civil society organizations, advocates for minority groups etc.) who will in turn persuade city governments and other official stakeholders to take action and be held accountable for creating safer cities.

Based on the findings of the partners’ consultation, we can identify safety as a basic need in the context of short-term crisis and safety as part of a strategy to achieve sustainable development and social cohesion in the long-term. The guidelines should be conscious of the use of the city as a conceptual framework and use an intersectional lens to understand the nuances of urban safety and people in the community. Guidelines should reinforce the nexus between urban safety, social inclusion, and sustainable development as part of a wider strategy to strengthen and disseminate the guidelines, clearly linking them with the sustainable development goals and the 2030 agenda. The dialogue in the guidelines should strengthen the connection with the community and the diversity of people within, applying a gender-inclusive lens that stresses the importance of creating a sense of belonging and a unique identity in the city. A shared identity and responsibility for safety will further the realisation of the co-production of safety among the diverse actors involved in safer cities programmes and policies.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community based organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil society organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNSC</td>
<td>Global Network on Safer Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUA</td>
<td>New Urban Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HABITAT-III</td>
<td>Third United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICLEI</td>
<td>International Council of Local Environmental Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>International non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLG</td>
<td>United Cities and Local Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-HABITAT</td>
<td>United Nations Human Settlements Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAWG</td>
<td>Violence against women and girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICI</td>
<td>Women in Cities International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUF7</td>
<td>World Urban Forum 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 INTRODUCTION

It is now well established that the majority of the world’s population live in cities, and that urbanization is increasing at an exponential rate. With rates of urban crime and violence increasing with urban growth, it is evident that the design, infrastructure, and governance of cities have major implications for the safety and security of all their residents and their ability to access the benefits of urban life. This means that sustainable urban development will only be achieved when well-planned city-wide, gender-sensitive, community-based, integrated and comprehensive urban crime prevention and safety strategies have been put in place. In 2011 and 2013 the Governing Council of UN-Habitat mandated its Safer Cities Programme to begin preparations for a new set of normative UN Guidelines on Safer Cities, in consultation with the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and other UN agencies. A resolution of the UN General Assembly in 2013 similarly mandated UNODC to contribute to their development. These new guidelines are commonly referred to as the “guidelines” in this report.

Two sets of guidelines relating to crime prevention already exist, both of which were developed by UNODC and UN-Habitat: the Guidelines for the Prevention of Urban Crime ECOSOC Resolution 1995/9; and the Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime, ECOSOC Resolution 2002/13. The purpose of the new guidelines is to provide policy makers at national and local levels with a clear normative framework that builds on the earlier guidelines and on accumulated knowledge about the development of safe cities, and provides a practical basis for practitioners to implement them. The call for new guidelines reflects the recognition of the rapid changes affecting cities, and the benefits of incorporating recent knowledge and tools into crime prevention approaches, while embracing the benefits of new technologies. The draft guidelines are expected to be presented for adoption at Habitat III to be held in Quito, in October 2016. To further the impact and relevance of the new guidelines, they are being strategically aligned with the already adopted Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the New Urban Agenda (NUA) which is being prepared for Habitat III.

In an effort to ensure that the new guidelines are inclusive and participatory, Women in Cities International (WICI) was asked by UN-Habitat to facilitate a series of consultations with Safer Cities partners to document partners’ impressions, inputs, and suggestions for the new guidelines. Drawing on its extensive experience in Safer Cities programming and its network of experts and practitioners in all regions of the world, WICI was well equipped to carry out the partners’ consultation successfully. The partners’ consultations were held with a diverse range of stakeholders from all regions, including city administrators, urban safety and crime prevention experts, international and community-based women’s organizations, and youth engagement specialists. The consultations were conducted using a variety of tools, including individual interviews, an online survey, and a series of ‘Fast Talk’ moderated discussions.

---

4 GC Resolution 23/14 2011; GC Resolution 24/10 2013.
with representatives from key stakeholder groups, to explore some of the themes and issues raised in greater depth.

The overall aim was to inform UN-Habitat of the range of views and areas of concern raised by Safer Cities partners on the crucial components for urban safety, both now and for the future. This consultation process has sought to engage diverse stakeholders in an effort to articulate the distinct value-addition of such guidelines as well as the needs of cities in order to maximize utility and potential uptake of safer cities strategies around the world. This report summarizes the main findings and recommendations from the partners’ consultation, with the hope that they will be reflected in the new UN Guidelines on Safer Cities. The report also provides concrete recommendations to help UN-Habitat and its partners strategically position the issue of safer cities on the international development agenda and in preparation for Habitat III.
2.0 METHODOLOGY

FAST TALKS CONSULTATION PROCESS

Figure 1: Fast talks consultation process

STEP 1: PRELIMINARY CONSULTATIONS AND MEETING

WICI and UN-Habitat began the consultations with two days of meetings with the Global Network on Safer Cities’ (GNSC) key partners. Meetings continued during the seventh World Urban Forum (WUF7) that took place in Medellin, Colombia on April 5-11th, 2014, in order to build a consensus around the foundation for the consultative process. These events facilitated the exchange of knowledge and experience between experts, academics, and safer cities practitioners on the various facets of Safer Cities Programming.

STEP 2: INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS

After in-depth desk research on Safer Cities Programmes, community safety initiatives, and urban crime prevention WICI conducted a series of individual interviews with eight key partners in order to identify issues and topics that needed to be addressed during the consultation process (Annex 1). A semi-directive questionnaire was used to interview select experts in order to gain deeper insight into the potential use, limitations, and value-addition of the guidelines (Annex 2). The interviewees were asked to identify what are, in their opinion: i) the greatest challenges cities are facing today in terms of their safety and inclusiveness, ii) the most important guiding principles that should be emphasized in the guidelines, iii) the particular groups or places the guidelines should draw specific attention to, and iv) the challenges related to the implementation and the sustainability of the guidelines.

STEP 3: ONLINE SURVEY

The findings from the interviews and continued desk-research informed the design and content of questions for a short online survey. The survey was distributed electronically to safer cities partners, stakeholders, practitioners, and academics (Annex 3). It was also disseminated through some of WICI’s network partners to reach a maximum of respondents. About one third of those contacted directly responded to the online survey (51 people out of approximately 150). The feedback from survey
participants contributed greatly to the development and organization of the subsequent Fast Talks, particularly in guiding research topics and the content of questions.

**STEP 4: FAST TALKS**

The final step of this project involved facilitating a series of four “Fast Talks” with selected experts, with between four and eight participants per talk (see Annex 6 for list). Fast Talks are a cost-effective means for experts to consider and discuss thematic issues, aim for consensus, and generate primary data. The purpose of the Fast Talks was to generate a more detailed and in-depth discussion on some of the issues raised in earlier stages of the project. WICI produced a short background document to inform participants of the Fast Talk process (Annex 8.2), and developed two sets of research questions: one for the first three Fast Talks that took place in December, and a second for the final cross-cutting fast talk in January (Annex 5.1 and 5.2). Participants were asked to give written responses to these questions as part of the Fast Talks process. The questions highlighted specific gaps in knowledge and inconsistencies or different points of view which emerged from the earlier stages of the project.

The first set of research questions that were distributed to participants of the first three Fast Talks addressed the following topics: i) the audience and the objective of the guidelines; ii) communication issues and how to increase awareness of and use of the guidelines; iii) other key issues to be addressed by the guidelines; and iv) implementation and evaluation of the guidelines. The questions also explored issues related to the role of the city and the importance of diversity and differentiation. Responses to these questions contributed to the development of an outline to guide the discussion during the first three Fast Talks (Annex 7).

The second set of research questions emerged from the written responses of the first set and from the findings of the first three Fast Talks. These questions sought to explore these unresolved issues in greater depth:

- the cross-cutting issues of city boundaries and jurisdiction;
- the sense of belonging and ownership at the local level;
- the actors involved in urban safety (with a particular attention to the civil society organizations);
- dissemination and evaluation of the guidelines; and
- gender and urban safety

The final Fast Talk participants’ responses to the second set of research questions helped to identify issues of contention or agreement from the first three Fast Talks, and led to the development of a discussion outline for the last talk (Annex 7). The final Fast Talk brought together experts from various related areas to discuss the findings from the previous three Fast Talks and the overall partners’ consultation process, including individual interviews and the online survey. In addition to the questions and background documents, participants of the final Fast Talk also received a September 2015 draft of the new guidelines so that they could comment and make suggestions on the document in its informal form.
To summarize, face-to-face meetings with the GNSC and during WUF7, desk research, individual Skype interviews, and the online survey served to generate the information required to inform the basis of the fast talks. The results of these various research and data collection methods are consolidated in this final report. The different steps of this consultation process fed into each other, and enabled the views from a wide range of experts and stakeholders to be taken into account, thus ensuring the pertinence of the project.
3.0 DEMOGRAPHICS AND RESULTS FOR EACH STEP

In an effort to be as inclusive as possible during the consultation, we contacted a diverse range of stakeholders from different regions, including city administrators, urban safety and crime prevention experts, international and community-based women’s organizations, community members, and youth engagement specialists.

3.1 INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS

A. PARTICIPANTS

During the first stage of the consultations, we targeted experts in the areas of urban safety and inclusion and individuals who have already worked on Safer Cities Programmes for interviews. Of the eighteen individuals we reached out to, four men and four women were available for interviews (listed below and in Annex 1). Interview candidates came from Africa, Europe, North America, and South America and were active in different UN agencies, grassroots organizations, international NGOs, universities, research centres, and international networks on cities and safety.

![Interview Participants Map](image)

Figure 2: Interview participants map
### INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SECTOR/EXPERTISE</th>
<th>REGION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juma Assiago</td>
<td>UN Habitat, Coordinator, Safer Cities Program</td>
<td>Nairobi, Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Cauchy</td>
<td>INGO, crime prevention expert</td>
<td>Montreal, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes De Haan</td>
<td>UNODC, crime prevention and criminal justice</td>
<td>Vienna, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Johnston</td>
<td>INGO, urban safety expert</td>
<td>Paris, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alana Livesey</td>
<td>INGO, gender and youth specialist</td>
<td>Toronto, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Peterson</td>
<td>INGO, women and community engagement</td>
<td>New York City, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Segovia</td>
<td>INGO, gender, safety, and planning expert</td>
<td>Santiago, Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz Vanderschueren</td>
<td>Academic, former UN, independent urban safety expert</td>
<td>Santiago, Chile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Interview participants table

### B. RESULTS

The informal interview format provided a wealth of insight and different perspectives on the guidelines and laid the basis for the following steps of the partners’ consultation. Below are some of primary issues and suggestions expressed by the interview candidates.

- The guidelines should build off of momentum leading into the Habitat-III conference and be linked to its outcome, the **New Urban Agenda** (NUA). They should also connect to the **Sustainable Development Goals** (SDGs), the United Nation’s 2030 agenda for sustainable development, especially goals 11.7 and 16 on safety and inclusion. Indicators in the guidelines should be developed with these agendas and goals in mind, be similar to those used in other UN agencies, and correspond with existing global indicators for violence against women and girls.

- Some questions were brought up around the utility of making a new set of guidelines. Extensive work has already been done on crime prevention by the UNODC and other organizations, yet it has not been put in place. Any new work should build off of the 1995 and 2002 guidelines because they have established norms that are already agreed upon by member states. Interview participants especially agreed that the **principles** from the 2002 guidelines are still valid today and that the new guidelines should expand on these and incorporate lessons learned from Safer Cities Programmes.

- The purpose of the guidelines as a **normative document** for policy makers needs to be made clear, it should not be treated as a handbook that is operational. However, it would be helpful to develop a **handbook** along with the guidelines, as well as some sort of **sharing platform** where good practices and information can be exchanged.

- All interview candidates said that **gender** and the experience of women and girls needs to be incorporated into the guidelines. Guidelines must go beyond the perspective of viewing women and girls as vulnerable and marginalized groups and aim to be inclusive in every step of the process. Data must be **disaggregated** so that the different experiences of women and girls can be recognized, as well as the unique experiences between them.

- The **dissemination**, **sustainability**, **evaluation**, and **financing** of the guidelines must be well-planned if they are to have a lasting impact. Which actors are responsible for what steps and tasks,
now and in the future, must also be clearly defined. **Time** is also very important. There must be a balance between short-term and long-term goals and a realistic timelines to realise change.

- Interview candidates took a strong **social perspective** and many focused on **social crime prevention**. They expressed the need to address the deep-rooted social norms that cause crimes and exclusion and look at what causes inequalities (gender, income, opportunity, education, etc.). The focus of the guidelines is social integration (not poverty) and how diversity can contribute to a city. Guidelines should address specific factors and groups at risk, those at risk of offending (recidivism) and victims of crime, areas with social inequalities, public spaces, etc. Also the **Right to City** concept and ideals must be explored.

- The impact of **technology** needs to be explored. Not only its use and how the internet and mobile phones affect public space and the feeling of safety, but also how it can be used to mobilize girls and women. The limitations of technology must also be recognised, cameras and security systems do not make cities safer. Applications like SafetiPin⁶ are helpful, but not an end solution.

- The city is the primary actor in putting in place the guidelines, but they need to appeal to national governments who will be adopting them. **Multi-level** cooperation between levels of government is important. For the guidelines to be successful, there also needs to be strong **leadership** from the mayor or other community leader who will champion their implementation. **Community** engagement and participation is crucial. A bottom-up and **multi-stakeholder** approach to crime prevention, where police forces and other experts are working with the local community to adapt to their needs is important.

### 3.2 ONLINE SURVEY

The interviews’ results provided us with valuable knowledge and advice that guided the development of the online survey. We made the survey available in three languages (English, French, and Spanish) in order to reach out to as many partners as possible in different regions of the world. The demographics of the survey participants are outlined below. **Please note that they are not statistically significant.**

#### A. PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>OCCUPATION &amp; SECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Respondents come from a variety of professions: academics, researchers, practitioners, government officials, community organizations, non-profits, NGOs and UN agencies are represented in the survey. These represent both the private and public sectors, as well as individual experts and community members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

B. RESULTS

The survey expanded on the results of the interview stage and provided new information from a more diverse body of participants. Because questions in the survey were based on the results of the interviews, the same themes and concerns mentioned above returned in the survey but with more varied responses (a summary of the survey results can be found in Annex 4). Some of the interesting findings that emerged from the survey are:

- Overall, around 60% of the survey participants had heard of the previous UNODC Crime Prevention Guidelines from 1995 and 2002. Those who were aware of the guidelines used them directly as part of the Safer Cities Programme, as an approach/tool in their own crime prevention and advocacy work, as a way to add credibility to their work, to define the direction of new initiatives, and to assess existing work.

- Like the interview candidates, nearly 80% of survey participants agree that the new UN Guidelines on Safer Cities should be strategically positioned with Habitat III and be promoted as a pillar of the New Urban Agenda. The guidelines should go hand in hand with the new SDGs and have similar indicators, especially (in order of relevance):
  - SDG 11: Make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable with attention to Target 7: “By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities”
  - SDG 16: Promote just, peaceful and inclusive societies
- SDG 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
- SDG 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages
- SDG 8: Promote inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and decent work for all

A majority of participants agree that the audience for the guidelines are municipalities (88%) and national governments (86%), closely followed by urban planners (82%) and police/law enforcement (80%). Most participants also see mayors (76%) and community/grassroots organisations (74%) as the audience, while fewer believe they are addressed to international organizations (67%).

47 of 51 participants said it was “very” or “extremely” important to take gender differences into account in the new guidelines. This shows that it is not only gender equality specialists and participants who work with women and girls who recognise that gender issues are important, but the large majority practitioners and experts in all fields related to urban safety.

When asked to rate various topics based on their importance in making cities safer and their relevance to the guidelines, community based (local) crime prevention and social integration arrived strongly at the top. This represents the need to localise crime prevention strategies and the importance of considering the social factors in making cities safer. Multi-level engagement ranked third, supporting the idea that the guidelines are a collaborative effort. Gender differentiation was fourth, showing that safe cities will not be effective if they are gender-blind. Fear of crime arrived in second to last place, which is contrary to the view of interview participants who stressed the importance of addressing fear because it can have a greater impact on individuals than the actual occurrence of crime. Situational crime prevention was considered the least important factor, representing a shift to more social and economic approaches to prevention.

3.3 FAST TALKS

The Fast Talks represented the culmination of the partners’ consultation and provided a forum to discuss unresolved issues which surfaced from desk research and during the online survey and interviews. Connecting with partners from around the globe opened fruitful and informative discussions that allowed for the documenting of a diverse range of perspectives on the issues and themes in a short period of time.

A. PARTICIPANTS

Scheduling the Fast Talks with participants’ different availabilities and times zones was a challenge, but in the end twenty-eight individuals with different backgrounds and areas of expertise were gathered from six different regions of the world. Four of these participants were unable to join one of the Fast Talks due to time conflicts or technical difficulties, but sent in answers to the preparatory research questions anyway. Their comments have been included in our findings. Women represented just over two thirds of the participants, this was an unplanned outcome resulting from the availability and response of those who were contacted. Many of the participants are involved in multiple sectors and activities, however they
were only marked for their most recent involvement or how they introduced themselves in the Fast Talk. A list of the participants of each Fast Talk can be found in Annexes 6.1-6.4.

Figure 6: Fast talks participants map
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Base map created by Raf Verbraeken, person by Jens Tärning from the Noun Project

Figure 7: Fast talks participants table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South/Central America</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South East Asia/ Australia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UN staff</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Researcher/expert</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Four of the participants were unable to participate in a fast talk, but contributed sending in answers to the preparatory research questions

B. RESULTS

The Fast Talks provided a forum where different issues and questions from earlier phases of the consultations could be discussed from multiple perspectives at the same time. Here are some ideas that were new, or developed in greater detail during the Fast Talks.

- There needs to be a good communication strategy from the beginning of the implementation of the guidelines. It must be clear that the guidelines are part of a long-term process that depends on the involvement of local governments and stakeholders in order to be sustainable. Clear policy
developed from guidelines will help people, CSOs, and local organizations understand that initiatives have been developed from a specific framework, rather than a short term political agenda (Hélène Dupré, Mexico). Various stakeholders need to be involved (private companies, universities, institutions) to bridge the gap with government and create a nuanced communication strategy that shows how everyone benefits from implementing the guidelines (Suneeta Dhar, India). Short-term advantages should also be highlighted.

- When discussing what the city is today and how to define it in the guidelines, the question of scale was very important. How can the guidelines adapt to small and mid-sized cities, not just larger ones? At the same time the guidelines need to address how rural and urban areas are mixing. It is no longer just the core and its suburbs, now outer villages are becoming part of the city creating a certain type of “urban chaos” (Kalpana Viswanath, India). Mónica Sánchez Torres (Mexico) does not believe in city boundaries, but rather in a metropolitan mission. Her home of Guadalajara is no longer just a city but eight incorporated municipalities. In her opinion, the metropolitan area needs to be responsible for safety, the first goal is to make safety agencies and one police for all eight municipalities.

- When asked who are the key actors involves in implementing the guidelines, Cynthia Nikitin (USA) responded that because safety is such a cross-cutting issue they impact every department. Each department could be responsible for supporting the guidelines in their respective area, approaching safety in the same way that departments manage their own budgeting and financing now. The most important thing is to target those who are lowest on the proverbial implementation “food-chain,” because small differences on the ground add up to make big changes. Kalpana Viswanath (India) agreed that every department needs to look the relationship of safety to their work (transport, planning, etc.), but that in addition to mainstreaming the guidelines in all departments there should be a standalone unit that focuses on urban safety.

- The new guidelines need to be more visible and reach out to vulnerable populations and all public audiences through a multimedia sharing platform that can be adapted to include all different groups (Lena Simet, USA). The earlier guidelines have been referenced a lot, but they are not easy to find online or very digestible to read. Irvin Waller (Canada) agrees that the guidelines are very dense and that there should be a press release or one page summary to act as a teaser, which would attract more people to look at the document. He also recommends the use of social media and taking advantage of time specific events and international meetings to disseminate them. In order to reach those who cannot read or do not have internet, more creative solutions like the use of prominent singer or artist to strategically share information in public spaces, parks, libraries, trains stations, or wherever people gather, could be adopted (Cynthia Nikitin, USA). Kalpana Viswanath (India) suggested that a comic or visual version of key points could be disseminated (especially for use in schools and universities), and that a summary would be especially useful to reach out to young people.

- In order to address diversity and the intersection of identity markers in the city that effect safety, the guidelines need to take a multicultural approach that includes indigenous populations. According to Olenka Ochoa (Peru) cities in South American are working on taking a new, more cultural, approach, one that identifies with the culture of young people. This is important because young people are the ones producing new cultures and because boys and girls in different areas have very different experiences.
In terms of creating a sense of belonging, there is a need to look at urbanism and public spaces. It is essential to keep people involved in design for urban public spaces through participatory design that is inclusive of all populations. Men and women feel more ownership in the space and represented when they take part in its development.

An area that remains unresolved is how the guidelines should approach migrants in the city. Some argued that the focus should be on residents, because migrants become residents. However, in certain cities migrants are excluded from the city or are in refugee camps and need to be considered another stakeholder group. The impact of transit migrants is also very important (Franz Vanderschueren, Chile). One cause of urbanization is rural to urban migration, inclusion of these people is essential. There is also the challenge of how to address illegal immigrants in a formal UN document, because whether illegal or not these populations impact the city.
4.0 THE GUIDELINES

4.1 CONTEXT

There was some frustration about the lack of implementation and efficiency of the previous guidelines for crime prevention. Some partners argued that efforts should be made to reinforce the previous guidelines to make them work rather than creating new ones. However, one participant believed that the Guidelines on Safer Cities are actually too narrowly focused on crime prevention and do not make enough links to the need for better urban policies (FT3). The challenge is how to broaden this focus and be more forward thinking and innovative while maintaining the support of the member states who will be adopting the guidelines.

THEORETICAL CONTEXT:

Safer Cities is multi-sectorial and multi-disciplinary approach concerned with integrating urban development and security. It is rooted in a:

“Prevention policy frame advocating for safety as a ‘public good’ and with public space as the arena for the co-production of safety for all and the site for the construction of citizen’s values and manifestation of citizens’ rights for all and particularly for the most vulnerable. At the heart of the safer cities approach is ‘attitudinal change’ and the “co-production of security for all” which requires the leadership and vision of the mayor and the concerted effort of a wide range of local government departments working together with national government and non-state actors to identify the causes of crime and insecurity, develop a coordinated response at the community level and supported by a national level policy framework.”

For the purpose of this consultation, it was important to redefine the concepts of security vs. safety. For example, Olenka Ochoa (Peru) reminded us that the difference between the two terms is not clear in Spanish (“seguridad” means both safety and security). Therefore, it is important to be aware of the conceptual differences between the term “security” which refers to a static definition of individual human security that must be guaranteed by the State or the police, and “safety” which refers to a more dynamic notion involving the community as a whole. Here, it is important to specify that the previous guidelines for crime prevention address the issue of “community safety” and the “perception of safety” but the new guidelines should offer a complementary approach that is more inclusive and integrated in the context of the city and define crime prevention as a prerequisite for sustainable development.

SPATIAL CONTEXT

The “city” has been deliberately used in Safer Cities Programming because it emphasises the city as the “unit of analysis and the primary role and function in which local government plays a key role within a

cluster of other state and non-state actors.” When these units are well-planned and governed they create the conditions where crime prevention efforts can succeed. Large cities can be part of metropolitan areas (Mexico for example), but can also be defined by its neighbourhoods as a basis to build identity and sense of belonging. This means the guidelines should also recognize diversity within cities - neighbourhoods are different from one another and strategies are not always transferable. Sometimes neighbourhoods and informal settlements within the city’s municipal area are isolated or disconnected from the rest of the city (slums in the city of Delhi for example). Guidelines must address the issues of these vulnerable and at risk neighbourhoods too. Further, people within neighbourhoods are diverse and consideration of age, gender, and other identity markers that impact their inclusion must be considered. Often, there is a strong feeling of distrust between the government and the population in these areas.

The guidelines should also address the diversity of cities within and outside its official boundaries more clearly. The real “boundaries of a city are not defined by the municipality but by its people,” therefore informal areas and human settlements must be part of a city-wide planning strategy for urban safety (FT1). “A city perspective per definition should include a focus on informal settlements, because lack of access to public services, income inequality between the informal settlements and other areas of the city and marginalization are all risk factors for crime and violence” (FT4). One participant (FT2) also highlighted that the peripheral neighbourhoods, suburbs, small towns and even rural areas outside of the city core face similar challenges and that it is critical to include them into the scope and definition of the city. Therefore, the terminology and language in the guidelines may need modifications to reflect this and address how rural and urban areas are mixing. To quote another participant (FT2), it is important to keep a “fluid definition of the city as it is constantly evolving with peri-urban areas and villages bordering cities.” Guidelines should acknowledge the importance of the diversity of migration patterns, the situation of migrants (whether they are considered legal or illegal by the national jurisdiction) and its impacts at the city-level in terms of safety (FT4).

SOCIAL CONTEXT

The concept/definition of a “city” must be as inclusive as possible and embrace human settlements and spaces (sometimes considered ‘informal’) when addressing safety issues. All participants agree there is not “one city” and that the guidelines should promote a broader definition of the city that supports a comprehensive and holistic approach to urban safety. To quote one of the fast talk participants “people are not only defined by spaces and therefore the boundaries of a city should be translucent” (FT1). People go in and out of a city for multiple reasons, as part of their daily life or to pursue a personal achievement. Migration fluxes must be understood both in the temporary sense (workers coming from peri-urban areas during the day) and long-term sense (people coming from rural areas or other countries to seek opportunities and improved quality of life). There needs to be a shift from the focus on people who live in a city to those who use it throughout the day and night, with a special attention on the differences of use and access to the city according to a person’s identity (gender, age, etc.). In other words, it is important to view the city from a socio-political perspective and look beyond its physical construction and official boundaries. “No city is an island,” said one fast-talk participant (FT4). The city, its people, and the

---
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surrounding areas act as an interconnected organism and cannot be separated from each other. Safety “guidelines should emphasize the ‘social’ aspects of cities, rather than just focusing on urban infrastructures and the built environment” (FT3).

Along with the issue of urban safety, the issues of use and access to the city are of primordial importance, especially for the most marginalized people and the “non-recognized citizens” (for example the people living outside of the city in refugee camps and slum dwellers). It is especially important here to highlight the influence of gender, women and girls do not use the city in the same way as men and boys nor do they have the same access. The issues of universal access to services (such as water and sanitation, transportation, health and education) and civic participation were raised multiple times in the case of marginalized communities, women and girls, and people living in the “grey zones” of the city. Along with access, the question of the availability of public spaces is a concern. The city needs to provide and maintain an adequate amount of safe public spaces so that there is a place for social integration and cohesion to take place.

It was suggested during the final fast-talk that migrants be considered ‘residents’ and that the city makes special efforts to provide a universal access to its public services. Urban design and planning must serve the purpose of reinforcing both spatial integration and social cohesion. In this way, it was suggested that the guidelines make a strong statement about the “right to the city” framework, because it defines equal access to services and participation as a prerequisite to build strong citizenship values and inclusive cities. The “distinct and direct parallels between safety and universal accessibility are worth exploring” further (FT2). Furthermore, a participant from the final Fast Talk advocated for pushing beyond the safer cities approach and incorporating a human rights lens. Strengthening the human rights framework will help the guidelines address the issues of violence and inequality more clearly, with a specific attention to gender-based violence and inequality.

### 4.2 Principles

Many of the survey respondents want to put stronger emphasis on social inclusion, cooperation, and partnerships in the principles of the guidelines. There was also a call to expand differentiation and directly recognize gender equality in the principles and more broadly, in the development of all Safer Cities Programming and policies. Civil society participation (especially of women, girls and youth), the co-production of safety, and a shared vision of a safe city needs to be strengthened in the guidelines according to survey participants. A greater emphasis is needed on the importance of the measurement of effectiveness and evaluation of safer cities strategies as a prerequisite for improving, enhancing and disseminating good practice knowledge and skills.

---

Other suggestions include:

- Diversity and intersectionality
- Adaptation
- Contextualisation
- Human security and safety
- Cross-border collaboration
- Power change
- Justice
- Urbanization
- Ethics in politics
- Data and evidence-based policy making
- Equity in economic development,
- Understanding and embracing complexity
- Rules of engagement

Overall, the issues of equality, social inclusion and human rights were recognized as key principles of local governance and urban safety (rather than key operational approaches on urban safety and violence prevention) that should be included in the guidelines.

### 4.3 AUDIENCE

Participants believed the primary audience is the **local authorities, political leaders and municipal stakeholders**, because they play a key role in addressing and enhancing urban safety. Some participants added the importance of including national governments and the police who can have a significant stake in implementing the guidelines. Secondly, policy makers, practitioners, architecture and urban designers, in other words all people involved in the design and planning of public spaces where safety and security problems can arise. Finally, the civil society organizations, academic institutions, religious leaders, UN agencies, international non-governmental organizations and the community at large, with particular attention to the vulnerable groups (youth advocates and indigenous networks for example). A few participants also included private companies and economic actors to be included in the audience of the guidelines. Interestingly, some participants believed that the main audience for the guidelines are the citizens first because “these guidelines are defined for them and will be finally implemented by them” (FT3). Others believed that the audience should be multi-sectoral and extend well beyond crime and safety policy makers and practitioners because otherwise it would fail in addressing “the compounding factors that enable crime, insecurity and a culture of fear” (FT3). Because these factors are interrelated, it is important that the guidelines be disseminated to a wide range of actors focusing on other issues such as housing, education, economic development, public health etc. thus supporting a holistic approach to urban safety.
4.4 DATA COLLECTION

It was suggested through all stages of the consultation that all the city data collection should be systematically disaggregated by at least gender and age in the diagnosis of safety as well as perceptions of safety, and that the community strongly participates in this process (with a special attention to the most marginalized populations). Inclusive data-gathering is important to set clear indicators of evaluation. As one participant stated “data collection, including qualitative and quantitative sources, is critical for developing effective and targeted interventions” (FT2). The local population must strongly be involved in the monitoring and evaluation of results as well, holding their governments accountable. Furthermore, processes of diagnosis and identification of crime and insecurity can be developed into universal tools even though the guidelines should not be universally implemented, but rather localised first (FT3).

4.5 DISSEMINATION

The dissemination and popularization of the guidelines poses a challenge as well. Ensuring that the document reaches a large audience that is not too technocratic must be addressed in the new guidelines. The idea of creating a platform where best practices, tips, and advice can be shared between different actors was repeatedly suggested during all stages of the consultation. Seeing what has worked in other cities and sharing successes encourages solidarity and follow through and provides a valuable source of new ideas. It was suggested that the adoption of the guidelines be followed by a strong campaign to disseminate and increase awareness of the guidelines. The guidelines should be mainstreamed as widely as possible in the daily work of municipal leaders and key stakeholders to ensure they are applied and integrated into plans. Also, guidelines should be translated in as many languages as possible, and accompanied by a collection of case studies showing culturally appropriate application of the guidelines.

Global networks of cities (such as United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG), GNSC, the National League of Cities, the Metropolis), virtual and multimedia platforms (such as Citiscope, Next City, and Metropolis’ Policy Transfer Platform), universities and other networks of practice, as well as non-traditional
dissemination methods (comics, art, songs, C4D, and social media) can be useful to communicate the guidelines and reach out to a wide range of audiences including youth and illiterate people. Information about the guidelines must be accessible and visible to as many people as possible. Guidelines must be clear and simple to understand, using key messages and adopting less technical and more inclusive language, as part of a social media campaign (using Facebook and Twitter). Various stakeholders could act as “bridgers” between the government and the local community (CSOs, grassroots women, private companies, universities, think tanks, research centres, religious leaders, etc.) and support the dissemination of the guidelines through trainings, workshops, webinars and curricula. Also, capitalizing on the communication channels of various civil society organizations who have their own targeted audience could be extremely effective to reach out to particularly excluded groups (FT2). In spite of the specific dissemination methods or tools used, it is important that they are engaging to those who are most excluded in society. Women’s organizations - both grassroots and international - appear to be a key point of dissemination and of reaching local communities. The guidelines could also be showcased in specific women’s’ networks but also in various circles of influence and communities of practice around safer cities. For example, inter-agency platforms such as the UN-World Bank Partnership, UNODC, World Health Organization, or regional platforms such as the European Forum for Urban Safety and the African Forum of Urban Safety. It is worth considering using south-south exchanges to illustrate global experiences on effective crime and violence prevention with strong community-based interventions. Peer-to-peer platforms of mayors and practitioners using the guidelines and implementing safer cities programmes could also be created (trainings, toolkits and online resources could help supporting peer-to-peer exchange, city cooperation and sharing of best practices).

Additionally, since the guidelines are closely linked to the SDGs and the New Urban Agenda, it will make it easier to disseminate the guidelines during key global events such as Habitat III, the Commission on the Status of Women meetings, and the World Urban Forums etc. One participant suggested that the guidelines be “UN-system wide and that they should take into account the mandates of relevant UN entities as they relate to urban safety and security” (FT4). Sharing best practices to make cities safer would help support communication on the pertinence of the guidelines. A few “star cases” inspired by the guidelines could be promoted to attract the attention of other cities and stakeholders. Using examples of projects that proved effective and showed positive results could support the dissemination of the guidelines to a wide range of actors, beyond just safety experts. “Building liaisons with local governments and public advocates is key in order to turn the guidelines into a political agenda” (FT2). Lastly, the guidelines should be reflected in national and municipal safety strategies aiming to enshrine its general principles in each country’s existing legislation.

4.6 IMPLEMENTATION

Participants agreed that the guidelines are a normative document, but some participants recommended that the implementation of the guidelines must be understood as a process that must correspond to each city’s profile and be part of a long-term city-wide strategy. The institutionalization of such strategy will ensure its sustainability. Additionally, one participant suggested that guidelines are a long-term process
and cannot be implemented at once. Therefore, guidelines could take the shape of a two-way document that incorporates feedback from cities as they are implementing the guidelines. To further this idea, one participant from the final Fast Talk agreed the guidelines should be dynamic and encourage periodical reviews and consultations with an evaluation three or four years after they have been adopted (FT4). In the end, the implementation of the guidelines is at the discretion of the cities even if they are approved at the national level (FT4).

Another suggestion was to incorporate the guidelines into ongoing development programmes funded by philanthropic institutions and international organizations focusing on related issues. For examples linking the guidelines to housing, transportation, education, gender equality, and climate change, thus placing safety as a cross-cutting issue. In other words, mainstreaming urban safety as a cross-cutting issue in development programmes and national departments to help with the implementation, dissemination, and continued sustainability of the guidelines.

The role of the city is huge in leading the development, implementation, and promotion of the guidelines and should be mandated to put local strategies in place. Cities are the best scale to implement guidelines and encourage other cities to do the same, much like cities are leading on climate change initiatives. They are largely responsible for providing funding, services, and personnel and should act as the primary coordinator between different actors and stakeholders. Cities are also most well suited to identify local problems, reach out to the community, assure compliance at the ground level, and monitor their impact. Essential to implementation is the political will of the city to commit to safer cities guidelines and initiatives, then reflect on experiences publically.

According to the survey respondents, the other actors that should be involved in the implementation of the guidelines include different levels of government, urban planners, mayors, locally elected officials, municipal staff, regional experts, media, religious leaders, community/grassroots organizations, women’s groups, universities and academics, police and judicial system, civil society, non-profits, private sector, citizens, and UN agencies when necessary. It is essential that community members, as well as all other actors, have a clear role from the beginning and that everyone is held accountable. There needs to be a balance of all these voices and local participation structures that include all community members- women and girls, youth, the elderly, and those who are differently-abled. Capacity building, training, advocacy, and incentives for involvement are very important at the local level as well. The victims and the perpetrators of crime must have a role as members of the wider community. These actors can connect and work together through a variety of different means. Many participants called for multi-stakeholder and multi-level partnerships with defined roles, public-private partnerships, and coordination as essential partnership frameworks. Strong leadership, governance councils, regional security committees, strong local authorities, and the involvement of mayors in international forums were also common suggestions.

In order for normative guidelines to have an impact at ground level, they need to be operationalized through the creation of an accompanying handbook or toolkit. Adaptation of the guidelines to each locale, both in context and the language, should be achieved by involving the community and grassroots organizations in their development and implementation. In other words, the guidelines should set the
principles (‘what’) and the handbook\textsuperscript{10} the means of implementation (‘how to’). The guidelines can also inform decision makers and be translated into policies and integrated into local development, security, and prevention plans. Guidelines can set expectations and inspire action, as well provide assurance to those operating in isolation that their challenges and problems are not unique. Success depends on having local government endorsement, setting realistic objectives, and using a bottom-up approach. Guidelines need to be built from the ground up, if there is a strong shared vision for the future they will have more energy behind them and continue to be relevant. Two survey participants argued that the guidelines actually have little, if any, impact at local level. It is possible for programmes developed from the guidelines to make a difference, but grassroots activism and improvements in social structures and infrastructure are more impactful.

**Risks** that might prevent the implementation of the guidelines include overconfident and inaccessible city leaders and officials. Poor management can result in discouraged community members and organizations inciting cynicism and apathy towards the guidelines and prevention methods. Also, the guidelines put significant emphasis on social and economic factors as causes of crime, this makes them desirable but also hard to achieve because of the length of time it takes to impact these factors. The challenge is to keep the guidelines relevant in the context of increasing urbanization and dynamism in cities where important social changes and political turnover are causing cities to change rapidly. There cannot be a “one size fits all” strategy due to the diversity of contexts and people involved in the implementation of the guidelines.

### 4.7 EVALUATION

In the past there has been a lack of evaluation of Safer Cities Programmes and initiatives. Though it is a challenge, there was general consensus among participants that clear indicators to monitor and evaluate are lacking and that the new guidelines should address this issue.

The guidelines can define indicators and standards that demonstrate progress, include evaluation tools and metrics, and stress the importance of partnering with universities and research centers who can provide evaluation tools. Guidelines can also establish a framework with a realistic timeline for change and integrate mayors, local councils, police, and local communities into the evaluation process. They can be worked into other initiatives, set up clear benchmarks and goals for both cities and civil society, and require annual reporting on successes and challenges in achieving them. Evaluation efforts need to take place at the proper scale (city/local) and measures must account for short-term and long-term impacts. Emphasis needs to be put on the value and importance of knowledge sharing and dissemination. Participants agreed that the identification and elaboration of indicators to measure and monitor the progress of Safer Cities Programmes is key. To make sure the indicators are relevant to the local, regional and national levels, many participants suggested they be minimally gender and sex disaggregate and

aligned with the SDGs (in particular Goals 11, 16 and 5). This will help the local community and NGOs to hold the Member States and cities accountable for enhancing safety at the city level. A fast talk participant suggested to link the indicators with the City Prosperity Index\textsuperscript{11} as well.

Specific recommended indicators and mechanisms to measure the impact of the guidelines include decreases in levels of violence and crime rates overall (against women/children/elderly), as well as a strong emphasis on the change in people’s perceptions and feelings of safety. In addition to looking at indicators of violence, socio-economic measures like income and education level need to be taken into account. Some suggest that physical changes to the city, such as lighting, bike lanes and percentage of accessible and safe public spaces for all (inclusive of and responsive to youth, women, elderly, and differently-abled). The number of active stakeholders and city departments, usefulness of the guidelines for municipal safety plans, level of awareness among public, community involvement, outcome and number of initiatives, and media attention can also indicate the impact. Suggested mechanisms included surveys (in person, online, household), data sharing, women’s safety audits, fully participative rapid-impact assessment, use of external evaluators, reporting on utility of Safer Cities Programming, and disaggregating data by sex and gender. Bi-annual victimization and fear-of-crime surveys were also put forth as tools to indicate improvements in the quality of life in cities. It is important that indicators and measurement mechanisms are directly linked to the outcomes that are trying to be achieved and the strategies that are being used to achieve those outcomes. One participant recommended making a distinction between: i) process indicators measuring the efficiency of local government and partners to implement the guidelines; ii) product indicators measuring the results of the strategy; and iii) impact indicators measuring the results of the strategy three and six years after. This same person suggested that some indicators may be common to all cities and some be adapted to the specific context of one city.

Another participant argued that the focus on the “momentum for change can sometimes be even more important than the end product”, thus suggesting taking a phased approach to evaluation, with different timelines. For example, some small and quick interventions on the physical infrastructure of a city can be more easily and rapidly evaluated than social changes that are not easy to perceive and require more time to be evaluated. Same thing with technology and mobile applications (to report sexual harassment for example) that show quick results. Showcasing short-term results can be useful to change people’s perspective about their community and restore their confidence in participating in the improvement of its safety. Therefore specific measurement tools and detailed timeframes are likely to lead to the best evaluations results. The guidelines could have an appendix that addresses the different timeframes - short-term, mid-term and long-term approaches (FT2). Also, it was suggested that the evaluation of the guidelines be part of its implementation. For example, implementation of the guidelines could be part of a 5-year plan, with periodical reviews (a short-term yearly evaluation and a 3-year evaluation).

\textsuperscript{11} The City Prosperity Index was created in 2012 by UN-Habitat to measure the sustainability of cities, it is part of the City Prosperity Initiative.
4.8 SUSTAINABILITY

The sustainability and accountability of the guidelines is threatened due to the very nature of the guidelines (they are not a binding document) and the lack of legal enforcement. It is clear that the sustainability of urban safety policies can be jeopardized by many factors, including political instability and turn-over of municipal actors – especially mayors. Many participants argued that the institutionalization and ownership of the guidelines by the community, as gauges of sustainability and accountability, both remain a challenge. Many participants believe the guidelines should focus on the process of having communities solving their own root problems of insecurity and developing their own solutions. Local men, women, boys, and girls (via civil society organizations) must be included in the data collection, planning, and implementation phases, as part of a multi-sectoral approach to safer cities.

In addition to the lack of legal enforcement, the lack of financial and technical support experienced by many cities (especially in developing countries) is considered a big challenge to the implementation and sustainability of the guidelines. Political changes and instability can also compromise the sustainability of Safer Cities Programmes and universal implementation of the guidelines. Guidelines require the strength and determination of a political figure to be effective. Participants highlighted the conflict between long-term social crime prevention efforts and the short-term political objectives. For example, repressive measures show quick results that can be used politically (for electoral purpose) despite their ineffectiveness in the long run.

To ensure the sustainability of safety policies implemented at the local level, despite municipal and national political instability, it is important that urban safety programmes and crime prevention measures be institutionalized. One participant (FT4) suggested that the “safer cities tools and mechanisms be institutionalized in local government” and that safer cities initiatives inspired by the guidelines become public policies. Also, it is important that the men and women of the community be involved in monitoring and evaluating the results of these policies with the support of a technical team. Creating strong partnerships with the local community, especially grassroots organizations, and devolving a part of the responsibility to the citizens will ensure continuity and sustainability of safer cities initiatives. In other words, there should be a reciprocal social engagement between the local communities and the municipal institutions to ensure the sustainability of urban safety policies. There must be political willingness to involve communities and make sure that programmes are tailored to their specific needs. Then diverse citizens must have the social power and control over the implementation of crime prevention and safety policies to be able to hold government accountable, with the support of a technical structure and clear evaluation indicators.

Participants recognized the need to find a way of incentivizing guidelines to encourage implementation and funding of Safer Cities Programmes. The question is how can this be done at the different levels of government, especially in the absence of legal enforcement? The link between safer cities, reduced violence, and economic development exists. As an incentive, the guidelines can explain how improving safety and reducing crime and violence can provide concrete social and financial gains that are attractive to practitioners, politicians, municipal stakeholders and funding bodies. After implementation, the use of evidence and concrete positive results of urban safety policies inspired by the guidelines must be shared.
among a wide range of actors - NGOs, local community (including men, women, boys, and girls), government stakeholders etc. – encouraging others to implement and share the guidelines. For example, an inventory of tools and best practices depending on the regional context could be attached to the guidelines. Highlighting positive city and country examples could be a very powerful tool to engage local governments to replicate, adjusting them to their specific urban setting. This could also help incentivize funding bodies to support the implementation of the guidelines through safer cities programmes. “Incentivizing the implementation of guidelines, in the absence of legal means, is the only way to encourage people to adopt them” (FT2). Strong communication strategies and public campaigns, as previously mentioned, can also work to incentivize of the guidelines.

Lastly, it was suggested that the guidelines be a pillar of the New Urban Agenda and be presented at the Habitat-III conference and linked to the SDGs. Guidelines should support the vision of safety as a cross-cutting issue and a condition for sustainable urbanization that falls into the 2030 agenda. Feedback from states and cities regarding the implementation of the guidelines as a step to achieve the sustainable development goals will support the legitimization of the guidelines. The new development agenda will be key for incentivizing the guidelines.
5.0 CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

According to our participants, the challenges cities face in terms of public safety and crime prevention are many and closely related to the root causes of crime and public violence. Causes are based on economic, social, cultural, and political, and physical factors, as well as issues related to urban areas like poorly defined public spaces and city limits. Challenges include corruption, lack of resources and social cohesion, in addition to poverty, growing socio-economic inequalities, power gaps, gender inequalities, VAWG, and oppression. A disconnect and lack of coordination between different levels of government, and unwillingness of local governments to take actions that do not yield fast results. Systemic challenges, lack of educational opportunities (especially for girls), weak civil society, unemployment, urban design, public spaces, organized crime, public transit, and gender-based violence and inequality were common responses. Challenges related to government corruption, lack of transparency and trust, insensitive police, and weak judiciary and punitive systems were also mentioned. There is a need to invest in prevention that works and to provide support for implementing tools that already exist instead of overspending on enforcement and corrections.

Population growth, privatization of public space, normalization of violence, migration, climate change, the growth of informal settlements, and poor capacity of local authorities to address the challenges of urban growth and collect adequate data (especially gender and age disaggregated data) were all put forth by survey participants as challenges. It is important to build accountable and transparent institutions, and promote the rule of law: this will help build trust between citizens and institutions, share the responsibility of building safer cities, and create a sense of belonging. Women and girls’ perceptions of the world is hugely restricted by violence and fear of violence, they must be meaningfully included in every step of a safety programme from problem identification to implementation and evaluation. Youth, the elderly, and other excluded groups also need to be recognized and be given opportunities to participate in safer cities strategies. The concept of intersectionality is very important when considering these diverse groups because of the differences among members of the same groups and the complex ways that identities can overlap. When drafting the guidelines careful attention must be paid to the type of language used in the document because different regions interpret words related to safety and security differently.

5.1 CITIES TODAY

The definition of a “city”: the concept of the city needs to be understood beyond its geographic and political borders to account for informal settlements and metropolitan areas. In the context of rapid urbanization and increased migration (across cities in search of economic opportunities, internally from rural to urban areas, globally due to mass displacements from conflict or disasters), cities can be overwhelmed and unable to absorb the influx of people while ensuring the provision of safety and services. Because of the lack of affordable and accessible housing, informal settlements can develop at the outskirts of the city with unequal access to basic services because they are not recognized as part of the city. Similarly, the need to provide immediate shelter for new refugees means both planned and unplanned refugee camps are challenged with how to deliver basic services. One of the main challenges
identified was to reflect on the management of peri-urban centres – how can we govern these human settlements if they are outside of the city jurisdiction? What governing structure should be responsible to manage these public spaces? The latest version of the guidelines put a heavy focus on a city-wide safety policy that is crosscutting, integrated, and multi-level but fails to put emphasis on equity and inclusion, and fails to account for the fluid political boundaries to include informal settlements and metropolitan areas.

The definition of institutional and administrative boundaries of a city can be a challenge. In some contexts, the metropolitan area has a role to play but this is not the case for smaller or intermediate cities. In the case of ‘mega-cities’, metropolitan areas respond to human realities (for example transit) even though its boundaries are not politically or historically designed. Metropolitan areas must be flexible and well governed to adapt to the needs of the people.\(^{12}\) In some cases, using a “metropolitan approach can be the best way to move forward” (FT4). Also, the guidelines do not address the issue of transnational crime and its links to local crime. Transnational movements, people crossing territorial and institutional borders have an impact at the city level. These can result in the disruption of urban and public spaces and shows that the boundaries of a city cannot be seen as static, but rather as dynamic and permeable. In a context where it is difficult to know where the city begins and where it ends, this can be a challenge to the theoretical conceptualization of urban safety, and more importantly, it can be a challenge to the political governance of urban safety.

Rapid urbanization is a central challenge, in particular in developing countries, it can result in urban sprawl and the loss of sense of community and belonging to the city. It can also deepen spatial and socio-economical inequalities, reinforce cultural segregation, and the marginalization of vulnerable populations. If not well-managed, rapid urbanization can be an obstacle to social cohesion and the cause of higher levels of insecurity. One participant also argued that globalization and neo-liberalism have made cities more and more anti-poor and access to affordable land and housing impossible, especially for women. This means that equal access to good jobs, wages, and affordable land and housing for both men and women must be added to the safer cities agenda. How can the guidelines address more specifically the problems posed by current trends in urbanization and globalization in terms of urban planning, safety and inclusion?

The heterogeneity of cities: It is also important to be aware that not all cities are the same and that some cities are more vulnerable than others. As one participant stated “not all cities have the same institutional makeup or context externally” (FT3). Especially in conflict or post-conflict areas, cities are more ‘fragile’. For example, a participant working in the Arab region stated that the guidelines can provide a good framework but must be regionally and culturally sensitive. Not all cities are equal in their character, there are “growing” cities vs. “decaying” cities, large and small cities (also called “secondary” or “intermediate” cities). Cities are also different in terms of governance and competence (not all cities have the political will, competency and resources to implement the guidelines).

\(^{12}\) Habitat III Thematic Conference on Metropolitan Areas, Montreal, October 6-7th, 2015
5.2 INCLUSION AND DIVERSITY

The inclusion of the community can also be a challenge, especially when trying to reach out to the most excluded individuals – including women and girls. In some contexts, the participation of the local community and most marginalized populations in the diagnosis of urban safety is very hard to achieve because of political instability and repression, in addition to institutional and cultural barriers. For example, one participant argued that it can be difficult to reach out to women in Arab countries because of their status in society (FT1). How can the guidelines address more specifically the challenges that some populations may face (i.e. young men, adolescent girls, elderly, differently-abled, migrant workers, etc.)? Lack of comprehensive data can be a challenge to map the situation of urban safety in a relevant manner.

As said previously, rapid urbanization presents its challenges but also its opportunities for sustainable development. The evolution and growth of cities is a challenge but it can also be an opportunity for the inclusion of the most vulnerable people. This is why safety strategies must be inclusive and empowering for the populations most affected by high levels of crime and violence, including young men living in informal settlements. One participant (FT4) shed the light on the need for the guidelines to strengthen citizen participation and inclusion of women - with special attention to women’s leadership. Another participant recommended there be an inclusive approach to safer cities be institutionalized into the foundations of local governance (FT4). Guidelines should emphasize the need to build strong relationships and trust between citizens and the institutions to support the co-production of safety.\(^\text{13}\)

Going beyond the question of inclusion, the recognition of the intersection of identities and how these impact exclusion is of great importance. The issue of diversity and differentiation needs to be addressed properly in the guidelines and the intersectional experience of the city acknowledged (FT2). “Intersectionality and inclusion need to be addressed throughout the guidelines, highlighting different people’s experience the city in different ways and that urban dwellers are not a homogenous group” (FT3). The intersections of gender, race, age, culture, ethnicity, and social and economic status must be understood in greater detail. Safety in urban areas cannot be fully achieved without accounting for the different needs and experiences of all people in the city. “As a first step, cities should have a spatial understanding of high crime areas and their vulnerable groups. Once all actors and stakeholders have been mapped, those particularly at risk should be directly included in the design of policies to address urban safety” (FT2). It is important to “identify the stakeholders who will be brought into the planning process and map out their interests, thus identifying gaps in the provision of services and safety for the most vulnerable” (FT3). Cities can provide a cooperative framework that puts the local population at the center of the design, planning, implementation and monitoring of the process in order to incorporate

their crucial input. One participant suggested to work from a cultural approach, paying specific attention
to the young men and women who produce “new cultures” (FT3).

Given the actual context of world migration and the mobility of people, one participant suggested that
the needs of displaced people and refugees be considered in the development of social inclusion policies.
In particular, that situation of migrants differ from each other and cannot be treated the same (transit
migrants as a consequence of human trafficking and prostitution are different than settled migrants).
Other participants suggested having a stronger focus on indigenous populations. The guidelines are a
normative document and must stay general in nature according to some participants who cautioned
against making them too detailed and running the risk of being vetoed by the governments. Instead it was
suggested that the specific needs of minority groups be addressed in special booklets. However,
participants from the final fast-talk agreed that the guidelines should strongly encourage the governments
to use disaggregated data despite the technical difficulties that this represents at the operational level
(disaggregated data according to gender, age, ethnicity, ability etc. is not always available).

Guidelines should pay specific attention to ‘at risk’ groups, meaning groups at risk of offending and/or at
risk of being affected by crime and violence. Young men, for example, are particularly affected by urban
violence because often it is young men that are killing young men. However, young men are not usually
seen as “vulnerable” (victims), but are categorized as offenders (perpetrators). It may be pertinent to
replace the category of the most “vulnerable” people by the most “affected”, avoiding generalizations i.e.
women and children are always considered “vulnerable” people as if they were minorities and
homogenous. This categorization is problematic and conflicts with the recommendation to adopt an
intersectional perspective (as mentioned above) and it contradicts the recommendation that women and
girls be seen as active agents of change in making cities safer. Also, the understanding of urban violence
as diagnosed by homicide is also problematic, as it ignores the daily experiences of violence that women
and girls face in the form of harassment (from verbal to physical). Guidelines could support this effort to
shift the focus on the most affected people by crime and violence to a broader, intersectional and gender
inclusive perspective.

5.3 IDENTITY

Strengthening the identity of people with their city and creating a sense of belonging, starting at the local
level (neighbourhoods), was promoted as an effective way to build local democracy and engage people in
the production and maintenance of urban safety. Thus it appeared important that the guidelines address
how different groups view the same neighbourhood in addition to how different groups are viewed from
the perspective of others in order to create a collective vision of safety. This means that individuals from
the community must be involved in the design of urban public spaces and the development of their city.
Community participation will help to localise the recommendations of the guidelines and make sure that
the city responds to real needs and supports a sense of ownership. Promoting the mixed use of public
spaces, putting in place participatory consultations that meaningfully include women and excluded
groups, and creating values that promote safety through trainings and school education will help
supporting the co-production of safety in the long-term. Trust-building at the very local level, neighbourhoods can reinforce the sense of belonging too.

5.4 GENDER AS A CROSS-CUTTING ISSUE

Overall, the mention of gender and women was included in the September 2015 draft of the new guidelines, not only as victims or very vulnerable populations, but also as major strategic action lines and as agents of change. This is a great advancement on the previous guidelines. However, participants in the consultations highlighted that gender and differentiation were not mentioned in the principles of the guidelines. “Gender needs to be front and center in the document” (FT1). There must be recognition that the city is experienced differently by females and males, therefore gender should be mainstreamed throughout the guidelines and “incorporated in each of the local governance and safety principles” (FT4). There is thus a recommendation from the consultation process to include gender equality and intersectionality as principles in the guidelines.

According to UN-Habitat’s holistic and multi-dimensional approach (2007), urban safety and security must be enhanced through “effective urban planning, design and governance from a gender perspective in cities.” In this sense, the systematic disaggregation of data according to gender and age should be mentioned in the guidelines as a prerequisite to mainstream gender. Fast Talk participants stressed that the guidelines should define urban safety as a strategy that goes hand-in-hand with gender, both should be mainstreamed in urban policy and governance. Both safety and gender are cross-cutting issues and should be mainstreamed in all levels of governances and areas of competences as a condition for sustainable development.

A participant from the final Fast Talk advocated that gender equality be a legal requirement for local governments, which will need to account for gender equality as an institution. During the final Fast Talk, participants recommended that the guidelines reaffirm CEDAW to make sure countries and cities are held accountable for adopting a gender perspective in their safety policies. The inclusion of CEDAW in the conceptual frame of reference of the guidelines will support the institutionalization of gender mainstreaming and gender equality in urban safety and crime prevention strategies. As a result, this will help address the deep-rooted social norms of gender-based violence and insecurity towards women and girls. Furthermore, women and girls must systematically be involved in the diagnosis of the safety of their city, from an intersectional approach.

One participant felt strongly about safer cities work needing to include responses to violence as complementary to its preventive approach. Specifically, the participant called for the guidelines to address

---


15 For example, the City of San Francisco became the first city to adopt a CEDAW ordinance into city and county governance establishing the Department on the Status of Women in 1998, although the United States of America have failed to ratify CEDAW.
the lack of inadequate municipal and higher levels of government initiatives and services to support women and children in post-domestic violence situations, or post sexual assault and trauma, etc. Though this is not specific to 'public spaces', it is related because it is hard to fully take part in the city if violence and abuse are effecting life at home.

5.5 CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

The participation of citizens in urban planning to improve urban safety is often lacking. There are not always systematic mechanisms implemented to foster citizens’ participation in urban design and planning. Guidelines should address this issue more clearly. The women’s safety audit tool has been effective in facilitating citizen participation in diagnosing safety issues rooted in urban design, and in offering solutions.

Creating a sense of belonging and encouraging social cohesion in the city is a challenge to safety in cities. This can be very difficult to do, especially in large megalopolises where socio-economic and spatial inequalities are strong. Diversity within the city and at the neighbourhood level can also be a challenge in creating a collective vision of safety.

Participants made it clear that there must be a stronger effort to systematically include inhabitants in the design and planning of their cities in order to encourage a sense of belonging, build a shared identity, and (re)appropriate public spaces. Involving the community at an early stage (through citizens’ committees for example) will result in a sense of ownership and shared responsibility of the process to make the city safer and support social cohesion. Overall, it is important that citizens identify themselves with the city they live in because “everybody getting involved and caring about their community is what will create safety” (Individual interview). Participation will result in the strengthening of the “social and institutional fabric of cities” and help prevent acts of violence from being committed against the most vulnerable people16 (McIlwaine, 2013). Strengthening participation from local actors will support the realisation of better social integration and the construction of citizenship values, understanding that a citizen is not only the inhabitant of a city but also someone who takes part in the city life and decision-making.

In this sense, local communities have an important role to play in monitoring and assessing the results of Safer Cities Programmes. As suggested previously, people must be systematically involved from the first to the last stage of safer cities’ initiatives.

5.6 MULTI-LEVEL COOPERATION

Articulation and coordination between the three levels of government (Local/Municipal/National):
Although, there was a general consensus that the local community must be more systematically involved, some participants argued that the city remains the principal coordinator with the power of action and decision. Thus, the guidelines must be implemented at the city level, with the mayor as the leader (municipal leadership). Participants working for the UN or who are familiar with how UN guidelines function, argued that the goal is to engage national governments in taking care of crime prevention and security since it is the Member States who will adopt the guidelines. Finally, other participants argued that there must be an equal balance and interdependency between the three levels of governance, which remains a challenge especially in cases of rivalry to gain political power and resources. Depending on the context, some actors may have more power and resources. There can be different levels of resources and competences among the levels of governance depending on the city or state. For example, a participant from South America underlined that national governments are very strong in this region, leaving less leeway to municipal actors to implement city-wide safety strategies. In other cases, civil society can be weak because of a strong and despotic political power. On the other hand, some states can be institutionally weak and prone to great instability. However, it is important to say that the guidelines were designed with the objective of putting cities at the forefront of urban safety with the participation of civil society actors. Guidelines should insist on the responsibilities of the city.

5.7 THE IMPORTANCE OF PARTNERSHIPS

Partnerships came up as a common theme during the consultation process. Even if the city is viewed as a main actor to implement the guidelines, the “guidelines should insist on an alliance between the three levels of government and look at the role of the city and the citizens’ participation” (FT4). This must be understood as a shared process according to the “conceptual framework of a shared culture of prevention.”17 There should be cross-sectional partnerships, to make sure the most excluded are not forgotten (FT2). It was suggested that multi-layered partnerships be emphasized, with a special attention to bottom-up partnerships, giving more importance to the local level and activism that is neighbourhood-based – by formalising partnerships with community based organisations and grassroots women’s organisations, in particular when addressing the needs of the most marginalized communities. On the other hand, some participants argued that the city should be taking the lead with the support of a technical team, working in partnership with the local community. In terms of implementation, it was suggested that the community, grassroots women’s organisations and other non-governmental organizations be used to bridge the gap between political leaders, policy makers and activists at the ground-level by facilitating networking and partnership building.

Though the former guidelines seem to be addressed to the different levels of government, participants thought they did not sufficiently address the capacity and role of civil society organisations. “Civil society organizations (CSOs) need to be explicitly included: they are key partners, particularly at the regional and local level” who “hold important expertise and often stand as a bridge to local community issues” (FT1). They should work in close partnership with a wide range of actors, starting with the political leaders at the local and municipal levels. In certain cases weak local governments will need the support of national government, however participants warned that civil society can be weakened by a strong political power and not leave space for a balanced cooperation between actors.

In light of what has been previously said about the importance of strengthening multi-levels partnerships, the participation of the local community, the need to reinforce a sense of belonging, and the inclusion of the most marginalized people; it is recommended that the guidelines address the issue of capacity-building more specifically from a bottom-up approach as an empowering tool and as a condition to support the co-production of safety. Participants insisted on building and reinforcing the capacities of the municipalities first to create “empowered cities” (FT3). Some trainings and tools could be available online (e-training courses) or dispensed by institutions (universities, municipalities, states, INGOs), but generally speaking, there must be financial resources and ongoing support properly developed prior to the implementation of the guidelines. Also, capacity-building programmes, not only for municipal governments but also for CBOs and grassroots women’s organizations organisations to be able to partner effectively and support municipal government in locally adapting and implementing the guidelines will enable a common understanding of the objectives of the guidelines among a diverse range of actors.

Partnerships with the private sector: the private sector can be a strong partner in safer cities programmes (local businesses, IT companies, insurance companies etc.). Guidelines should promote the creation of more public/private partnerships to value the social responsibility of businesses and corporations. Public private partnerships are becoming more common, but there needs to be caution of business interests that can compromise safer cities goals and objectives.

5.8 IMPACT OF MIGRATION, CLIMATE CHANGE, AND CONFLICTS

It seems important to highlight that the massive migration and movement of people across borders have impacts at the city-level. In a time of massive urban migration (from rural areas) and international migration, this phenomenon cannot be analyzed only within the framework of national states. According to the Fourth International Report on Crime and Prevention, it is important to shift the focus on migration, not seeing it as a “problem” but rather as an opportunity, moving away from the prism of security to the one of social development.

Many participants agreed that the guidelines should address other issues in addition to crime prevention and urban safety such as migration (in particular internally displaced people and refugees), and the

---

reconstruction of cities in conflict and post-conflict situations. The emerging evidence of the interaction of forced migration as a result of climate change and civil wars, and the tensions created between ethnic groups must be taken into account because it affects the sustainability of many urban environments. In terms of methodology, there exist synergies between peace-building efforts, and other fields like conflict and city resiliency, and safer cities methods. There could be a closer exchange between the tradition of integrated approaches in the urban safety field and the experiences of dialogue, trust-building, and consensus-seeking processes to resolve or manage conflict through non-violent means within the broader peacebuilding field. The use of peacebuilding tools and expertise to create safer cities and sustainable urban development could be strengthened in the guidelines. According to Jütersonke and Krause, “the ‘resilience’ of cities is a crucial feature that is often overlooked, and one that would need to be explored further from a peacebuilding perspective.”

Also, risks factors of crime and violence caused by natural disasters as a consequence of climate change should be addressed by the guidelines. Populations in vulnerable positions are more exposed to and affected by the violent risk factors aggravated by the sudden breakdown of local institutions, the debilitation of the rule of law and the loss of social control than can result in the rise of criminal behaviours. They can also be forced to migrate to another city or country. In an effort to rebuild safe communities in post-conflict or post-natural disaster situations, it is important to take specific needs into account and build resilient communities (FT1). Therefore the guidelines should more specifically address the consequences that climate change, natural disasters, and civil conflicts can have on the mobility of people and their level of insecurity. These challenges can impact urban communities causing unprecedented risks for urban safety and disproportionately affecting vulnerable groups. Finally, an intersectional lens must be adopted in order to understand these nuances and to effectively build safer and more inclusive cities.

19 Oliver Jütersonke and Keith Krause, Peacebuilding and the City: Setting the Scene, issue brief no. 9 (Geneva Peacebuilding Platform, 2013).
6.0 CONCLUSION

The findings from this consultation process underline that it is not only the local authorities and public municipal stakeholders in cities around the world who are responsible for implementing public safety and security policies and who will benefit from the UN Guidelines on Safer Cities, but also national government representatives, urban practitioners, crime prevention professionals, community members, other UN agencies, and international NGOs. Academics may also find the Safer Cities’ process interesting and help to validate the twenty years of Safer Cities practice.

The consensus among participants is that the guidelines are a normative framework which sets out important principles for action, but are not intended to provide very detailed information. To overcome this challenge, it is recommended that the guidelines be widely disseminated, understood, and promoted by various actors (civil society organizations, advocates for minority groups etc.) who will in turn persuade city governments and other official stakeholders to take action. Many participants recommended strengthening the power of civil society to inspire and hold governments accountable for creating safer cities.

It is also recommended that the guidelines strengthen the links between crime prevention, safety, sustainable urbanization and social development according to this definition of safety:

A tool for social integration, focusing on neighbourhood planning, with tools for community appropriation, access rights, and allocation of streets and public spaces as sites for the construction of citizenship values ... moving towards a more comprehensive approach to urban safety than one narrowly focused on the prevention of crime and violence alone.20

It appears that achieving urban safety in an inclusive manner is not an easy task, especially in a situation where different timelines are involved. It is particularly challenging to achieve urban safety for all using an intersectional lens given the lack of available data that is systematically collected and disaggregated by at least age and gender, never mind additional identity markers.

In other words, based on the findings of the partners’ consultation, we can identify safety as a basic need in the context of crisis in the short-term (rapid urbanization, massive migration, human displacements, transnational crime, conflict and natural disasters) and safety as part of a strategy to achieve sustainable development and social cohesion in the long-term. The guidelines should address this difference more clearly and be conscious of the use of the city as a conceptual framework, which can be understood in a very broad sense depending on a city-context.

Guidelines should reinforce the nexus between urban safety, social inclusion and sustainable development as part of a wider strategy to strengthen and disseminate the guidelines, making it clear

they are here to support the sustainable development goals and the 2030 agenda. The dialogue in the guidelines should strengthen the connection with the community, and the diversity of people within that community, from a gender-inclusive lens and stress the importance of creating a sense of belonging and a unique identity in the city. A shared identity and responsibility for safety will further the realisation of the co-production of safety among the diverse actors involved in Safer Cities Programmes and policies.
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