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This paper discusses a role for crime prevention programs as a partner in integrated urban regeneration projects. In recent years, several countries have begun to develop a new wave of urban renewal programs targeted to specific communities or urban zones. These programs represent a conceptual advance over earlier urban renewal initiatives which sought primarily to improve housing stock and public spaces, or to construct transportation corridors, and which sometimes displaced low income households and destabilized social structures and networks. The new approaches have broader objectives, a somewhat different set of actors, and may provide a new venue and opportunity for improved community safety and crime prevention.

1. **Current Situation of Crime Prevention:**

Traditional crime prevention strategies have tended to focus on crimes against property, and somewhat secondarily, on violence. Burglaries, auto theft, violent crime, drug trafficking, are often the focus of interventions, which usually combine some form of problem-oriented policing with community, private or institutional projects. In recent years city-coordinated interventions have also become a norm, often guided by a municipal crime prevention committee or community partnership.

The central concepts of crime prevention have been carefully articulated, including the kinds of intervention (situational, social, community, etc) and the roles of various actors such as the justice system, police, city governments, public institutions (eg schools) civil society, and the geographic community. Serious analytical work has gone into defining the information needs, critical analytical functions (diagnosis, evaluation, monitoring), developing tools, and exploring cost-benefit explanations. Most countries now have identified a national centre of responsibility for developing and coordinating crime prevention strategy. The International Centre for Prevention of Crime, with its network of participating countries and organizations, has been a driving force in this international learning process.

Prevention projects often broaden their focus quickly, because many of the important factors influencing individual criminal activity are related to youth development, mental health, family context or socio-economic status. The critical institutions which influence these factors are not a part of the formal justice system, so broad-based cooperation is necessary. The approach may also be broadened because an active community is considered essential for effective socialization, social-cultural integration or inclusion, and for informal control of anti-social behaviour. For the most part, the current approach to crime prevention has been developed by ministries of the interior or justice, and by local governments. Mobilizing and sustaining broad-based partnerships and community involvement has become a part of crime prevention orthodoxy, and unfortunately also part of frequent frustration in the...
implementation process. Partnerships are easier to put together than to keep operating effectively.

In recent years there has also been increasing interest among national governments in a broader and more integrative approach to social and economic regeneration of urban communities. This interest has been generated by factors which include crime and safety, but among a wider set of economic and social concerns which drive the initiatives, and to some extent, determine the funding patterns. So the question arises whether crime prevention specialists should devote more attention and resources to participating in these renewal or regeneration initiatives, as an alternative or complement to the lead role in programs built specifically around crime prevention.

2. Where have integrated urban regeneration programs emerged?

Several related concerns are driving the current focus on urban regeneration:

- At a surface level the need tends to be related to the physical, economic and social deterioration of certain neighbourhoods: inner-city areas in many countries such as the USA and UK; suburban ghettos around major cities like Paris where living in the inner city is cost-prohibitive, or where large scale social housing has been developed in particular urban zones; downtown commercial - residential areas in smaller cities and towns where large-scale retail developments in fringe areas have sent the central areas into economic decline, and urban slum growth in developing countries.
- High rates of crime are often cited in conjunction with high unemployment, poverty and social exclusion, as indicators of a need for public intervention. High levels of violence may also be cited, or concerns about a highly-visible crime economy of prostitution and drugs.
- Other reasons include the desire to upgrade the built environment, especially public housing or areas of obsolescent industry, and
- To revitalize local economies, especially in instances where the retail industry has fled, leaving an evening economy of drinking establishments primarily serving youth.

The USA is a text-book of experience, good and bad, of urban renewal. For decades, the federal Housing and Urban Development agency (HUD) has been actively engaged in promoting development, with funding packages for city governments and private organizations. Inner-city decline has been a major concern, and in the past decade, several major cities have undertaken large-scale and rather successful projects to rejuvenate their economy and make the central areas attractive for visitors and business. The extent to which these projects have generated “liveable communities”, has varied.

The UK has made urban community renewal a national priority with the formation of the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit within the office of the Deputy Prime Minister. The focus is broad, seeking progress in economic prosperity, jobs, safety, transport, education, housing and health, as well as building social capital. It aims to ensure that residents of the UK not be disadvantaged in their life opportunity by their area of residence.

In Europe the interest has been more sporadic, partly because European cities did not experience the severe economic and social declines that were generated in the USA by, among other things, dramatic suburbanization (“flight from the city”). In recent years however, almost all European countries have developed active programs, often aimed at areas where publicly-owned housing stock has deteriorated. Germany and France have both recently announced large-scale programs. Many European countries are dealing with
problems relating to the social and economic integration of historically high levels of immigration and migration. The European Union has developed a program known as the City of Tomorrow, with case studies being collected from several participating countries to develop knowledge and contribute to a possible European housing policy.ii

Urban community regeneration is of current concern in Australia as well as in Canada. These countries have some similar large-city problems, particularly in areas of new immigrant settlement and where aboriginal peoples migrate to cities, and they also share with smaller cities of the USA, problems of central area commercial decline.iii

The Government of South Africa has also established a national urban renewal program, with direct links to the national crime prevention strategy..iv The problems of integrating a formerly racially-segregated economy in a context of violence and high unemployment underlie a need for large-scale social management, and are stimulating some very innovative initiatives.

In Latin America, Asia and Africa, the rapid and often uncontrolled growth of urban centres has generated an explosion of urban slums without basic services and with multiple problems, a process headed for crisis in the near future given demographic trends. The World Bank has a large urban development program, and is working with a coalition of organizations known as the Cities Alliance, which helps to put together substantial funding packages involving multiple funders. To date, these programs have aimed at restoring or installing basic services such as water and sewage treatment. The World Bank has not implicated itself in much work of a crime prevention nature, although the Inter-American Development Bank and the Pan American Health Organization have developed active programming, especially in prevention of violence. The United Nations Development Program is active world-wide, coordinating UN agencies’ technical assistance and funding initiatives.

There is a gathering consensus that positive developments in the future – the achievement of the UN Millennium goals for example, to reduce poverty by half – or the achievement of other economic, environmental, security or social objectives, will require a major shift of donor policy to confront the increasing inequalities, and especially to construct liveable urban communities.v

3. What lies behind these developments?

A review of urban regeneration in Europe with a special focus on Denmark and the Netherlands suggests that significant social polarisation has been taking place throughout Europe, and is becoming evident in “socio-spatial segregation” in large urban communities. Market dynamics make some areas desirable and therefore expensive, with dynamic and differentiated economies. Low-income households and socially vulnerable groups such as new immigrants, become more concentrated in less attractive areas. Andersen and Kempenvi suggest that traditional national social policies, which tend to be blind to geography, have not been able to respond adequately to these spatial concentrations of poverty, joblessness, homelessness, excluded or marginalised immigrants, and other victims.
Gabriella Battaini Dragoni of the Council of Europe suggested recently that public insecurity has grown as the limitations of the welfare state to provide security have become more evident; as the global economy increases insecurity of employment, and inequalities of income and wealth increase throughout Europe. She advocates a move to a concept of a welfare society, enlarging political participation, increasing involvement of local authorities and civil society in the operations of the welfare state.\(^{vii}\) (It might be noted that the welfare state in North America has since its inception been a mixed-responsibility model, with extensive involvement of civil society... for better and for worse.)

European states have begun to intervene in vulnerable communities in an attempt to target their resources and hopefully to build social capital and social capability in those areas. European policies vary widely from country to country, but for the most part, have been aimed at reducing social and economic distance between segments of the population.

Increasing spatial concentrations of poverty, unemployment, and accompanying problems of disorder are also evident in the Americas. Canada has witnessed an increasing concentration of low income people in specific urban census districts during the 1990’s\(^{viii}\), and the concentration of poverty in specific neighbourhoods is an endemic factor in US cities.

So it would appear that the concern for urban quality of life is a global issue with differing faces. Some of it is related to increasing inequalities in income and wealth, even in face of increasing overall planetary wealth, knowledge and technological capacity. The global technological revolution provides great opportunities for individual achievements, but also supports increasing individualization of life, though self-employment, self-entertainment, and a corresponding decrease in reliance on collective activity or resources. It might be suggested, as does Robert Putman\(^{ix}\) that some societies are experiencing decreasing social interdependence, which corresponds to a decreasing influence of social or community “expectations” and consequently more feelings of insecurity. In such a context, one might speculate that dramatic events such as terrorist attacks might trigger social trauma and reactions which are also influenced by deep-seated emotional concerns for security.

In many cases concentration of poverty correlates with degradation of the urban environment, signs of disorder, and public insecurity. These have in turn become issues of major public concern, with crime- and disorder-focussed insecurity emerging consistently in public opinion surveys and in voting patterns. At the same time wealthier segments of the population are becoming more able to purchase their own security through private services and technology, in turn meaning that poorer neighbourhoods also come to experience increasing concentrations of criminal offenders and victims.

Public interventions in specific communities may also be motivated by concerns about “crime economies” where economically distressed communities become dependent on underground activities or criminal trafficking, or where formerly unorganized delinquent activity becomes progressively integrated into organized crime.

Considering the momentum of current trends, it seems likely that economic globalization, the information technology revolution, and reigning economic policy are likely to continue to
create concentrations of both wealth and poverty. As markets become increasingly differentiated, responding to the needs and desires of specific population groups, market forces will tend to reinforce the spatial segregation evident in large urban communities. The traditional tools of the nation state – especially the combination of universal public services, social insurance and income redistribution - will probably be unable to reverse these trends. There will be growing economic and political demand for states to intervene in targeted areas with objectives to create positive economic and social outcomes, and to increase public confidence. Guided by new concepts of urban governance, they will attempt to increase the impact of discretionary public funds through synchronizing the programs of a wide range of public institutions, through incentives for private sector investment, and through building sustainable community social capacity, including an emphasis on neighbourhood-level social management.

4. Examples of recent integrated urban regeneration programs:

There are many urban regeneration initiatives in action. Some of these derive from crime prevention and community safety concerns, while most reflect the broader concerns for poverty issues, economic development, or ecology. Following are some examples:

UK

Among the programs which are clearly related to crime and community safety, is the UK’s New Deal for Communities Program, delivered by the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, which reports to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. This program targets five main concerns, including housing, education, worklessness, crime and health. It is a ten-year program, funded at £2 billion, which tries to use its funds in combination with other sources, both public and private.

The New Deal Program attempts to bring disadvantaged communities to a level of being self-regenerating on a par with the general population… trying to reverse what was seen as “dependency culture.” The area focus requires ceding power to a local authority or neighbourhood-based management group to make decisions on timetables and mix of resources. This approach goes against the grain of traditional public administration where the emphasis is on expenditure control, exercised by vertically-organized departments, and initiatives are required to conform rigidly to practices and time frames defined in financial administration legislation. The new approach envisages community involvement as an essential factor for long term success, and makes some provisions to ease restrictive or unproductive regulation. Community involvement and control is also seen as a form of participatory democracy, and necessary to maintain collective faith in the institutions of government.

The program is complemented by a wave of related initiatives, including increased policing, neighborhood and street wardens programs, a new Drug Treatment Agency, and a Youth Inclusion Program, operated by the Youth Justice Board.

The UK has adopted specific outcome objectives, including decreasing burglary rates, (by 25%) and also achieving much greater reductions in the high-crime areas, such that no district should exceed the national average by more than three times by 2005. The UK points out that 40% of crime takes place in just 10% of geographic areas.
In the USA, the Empowerment Zones implemented by the Clinton administration, and building on the former Enterprise Communities of the Bush (Sr) era, were aimed at generating economic activity and relieving poverty in economically depressed communities. Crime prevention and drug prevention objectives were incorporated in these schemes, but do not appear to have played a major role in the design of programs in the communities involved. The EZ program introduced an important concept - resource bundling - which has turned up in subsequent integrated urban renewal strategies. Upon approval of a program area, a package of up to $100 million of federal social service funding was made available over a five year period, to be integrated with the funds for housing and other purposes. As with the former program, the EZ program emphasizes private sector involvement in the funding package, and offers substantial tax incentives toward this purpose. Total potential tax benefits are in the range of $22 billion for the program. More than 200 communities are participating in these initiatives, and about 1000 participate in some form of community or urban renewal with US HUD assistance.

The existing EZ's and EC's have used their Federal seed money to create partnerships that have generated jobs; provided business assistance and services; trained and educated youth and families; improved access to childcare, healthcare and transportation; and increased residents' safety and involvement in their neighborhoods.

It should be noted that, while the USA is not known for generous social benefits or income redistribution programs, substantial assistance is made available to low income households through certain highly-targeted programs. For example, US HUD provides annually some $22 billion to assist low income households to acquire affordable housing, either rental or owned. This assistance reaches about 4.8 million households annually. HUD reports that overall home ownership (which is a high priority social objective) has reached 68% in 2003, and among households under the national median income, home ownership now stands at 52%.

The USA has also witnessed a substantial history of local development initiatives which are articulated and managed by local coalitions of community based organizations. Some are referred to as Comprehensive Community Initiatives, and they have been able in many cases to gain access to substantial resources from public and private sources. These initiatives have demonstrated in some instances, a capacity for community and social entrepreneurship which can be very useful in building social capital. However, it has been observed that effective local initiative requires an enabling institutional and economic environment: The Aspen Institute reports that:

Comprehensive community initiatives have made great strides in identifying the many moving parts that have to come together to achieve change and in understanding how difficult it is to implement complex community change strategies and to acquire the capacities and resources needed to make them work effectively. They have also overestimated what community-based initiatives can be expected to do in order to overcome poverty in distressed neighbourhoods. Without sophisticated strategies for using structural, institutional, policy, and social levers for change, the work of CCI’s will be merely palliative rather than transformative.

This experience did however, inspire a recent ICPC report on evaluation, which recommended:
• moving the evaluation function closer to implementation,
• using a geographic community as the field of observation for a range of related variables,
• linking the functions of monitoring and feedback on interim objectives formulated by the community in the process of seeking desired complex changes.

Germany

In Germany there is both a substantial history of community-based crime prevention, evident in some 2000 local crime prevention councils, as well as an important social experiment in the form of the program entitled “The Socially Integrative City”. This program works on an area focus, requires substantial citizen involvement and integrated budgets and action plans. It provides funding to about 250 communities. It attempts to deal with a wide array of social and economic problems including vandalism and crime. Participating municipalities must have a long term, district-oriented plan of action developed in consultation with the community. This planning process requires the development and sharing of information on all aspects of the community, and the elaboration of shared priorities. A central goal is strengthening residents’ ability to cooperate. Labour market, employment, structural and social policy objectives are pursued, as well as fostering a more dynamic locally-based democratic society. The German Institute of Urban Affairs\textsuperscript{xvi} has been contracted to provide monitoring, guidance and information services for the initiative, and it is part of the Europe-wide review of case studies mentioned above.

The program applies a district-oriented, holistic management philosophy. It is intended to be an advance over earlier antipoverty programs, both in Germany and other European countries. It has recently undergone a midterm evaluation after three years of operation. The early results contribute to our summary of characteristics and implications.

Denmark

Denmark's new urban regeneration act enables local authorities to decide to carry out integrated urban regeneration in areas with many serious problems - building problems, social and cultural problems and traffic problems. The program is aimed at initiating and coordinating measures with a view to creating well-functioning areas and improving general quality of life. A decision on an integrated urban regeneration project is based on an approved program. In that connection, the local authority must establish binding cooperation with the parties that are going to be affected by the project.

France

France has just announced a reorganization of urban policy with a major focus on integrated urban regeneration in impoverished areas (vulnerable urban zones). The first chapter of the new law identifies the reduction of inequalities in these areas as a leading objective. This will be pursued through the investment over five years, of some 30 billion euros of new and restructured public funds, for urban renewal. Targets include constructing 200,000 new social housing units, renovating another 200,000 existing units and demolishing 200,000 degenerated structures. There is a complimentary objective to encourage job creation in these areas through tax incentives for business, as well as targeted preventive interventions to improve quality of life and reduce exclusion.
UN

Several UN agencies are involved in major projects to improve quality of life in large urban centres and megacities throughout the world. UNHABITAT is one of the lead agencies in this area, not only in their Safer Cities program but in other regeneration projects, including The Cities Alliance, a multi-agency coalition to coordinate funding and loans for large scale urban projects. UNHABITAT has recently published an important report, A Globalizing World, in which the need for developments in democratic governance is described.

The UNDP supports over 300 urban-targeted cooperation projects at the global, national and city levels, working in cooperation with national governments, mayors, NGOs and cities' associations. UNDP supports policy interventions designed to tackle urban poverty through improved urban governance, while giving attention to urban environment improvements. These interventions relate to participatory planning processes to improve housing, water and sanitation, waste management, job generation and other aspects.

These are but a few of the initiatives currently underway. There are also exciting examples at the EU level in the URBAN program, as well as in Brazil, in Australia, in South Africa, and in many other countries.

What interests us at this stage is:

• what do they have in common in approach and operating principles? and
• what does the experience to date let us think about the implications of these initiatives for crime prevention?

5. Trends in urban regeneration initiatives

The following early trends seem to emerge:

a) There are increasing efforts by governments to focus on urban regeneration, and to attempt to achieve a range of economic, social and environmental policy objectives in the process.
b) Within these efforts there is an increasing focus on urban governance and institution-building:

• “Governance” in this context signifies a change of emphasis from managing the affairs and resources of the state in defined and differentiated compartments for specific program objectives, toward orchestrating the convergence and collaboration of public, private and social resources toward desired broad population outcomes.
• “Institution-building” is emphasized, especially in the World Development Report 2003, to respond to the need to provide creative and sustainable local governance of historically large and problematic populations. Large urban areas provide opportunity for “economies of scale” with more population impact from investments. However they also present major challenges to the traditionally limited purview and infrastructure of local government.
c) It appears that one of the areas of institution-building will be found in the transformation of the urban planning functions of city government, as these departments are in many cases being identified as central coordinating points, still responsible for urban design, but with a broader role of planning support and information coordination, as well as a coordinating forum for community exchange and debate.

d) There is an increasing focus on public participation as necessary to create momentum, sustainability, democratic participation, as well as to build community capacity for social control, social management, and social capital.

“Social capital” is emerging as a central theme in several policy areas. It has appeared before with other terminology, with perhaps less of the implied economic translation embodied in the concept of “capital”. For example, the successful integration of immigrants is related not only to the public services they receive, and the economic opportunities which are present, but also to the pre-existence of “receiving cultural communities” where there are people of their own language or ethnicity who can help with their transition and integration into the new society. That is a form of social capital.

e) There is an emphasis on private sector involvement. Many governments are attempting to use public funds as a “lever” to generate increased private investment in disadvantaged areas, and/or to promote the expansion of public policy objectives (e.g. antidiscrimination objectives) into the private sector.

f) Spatial initiatives require coordination of policy and resources across government entities and among different governments. There have been in several countries, attempts to “join up government” (as expressed in Australia). Current policy issues clustered around poverty, health, economy and ecology cross over established bureaucratic mandates and require sophisticated coordination mechanisms. At the same time these issues tend to have unique spatial dimensions which require local planning and coordination as well as local political involvement. Cooperation and coordination are not easy to achieve.

g) There is clear targeting of communities. While attempting to bring more resources to bear on specific problem areas with an objective of achieving lasting improvements, this approach also permits governments to target their resources, and not be required to treat all communities equally. This may be politically sensitive in countries which favour a more universal approach to public service, but is also politically attractive because it offers the possibility of achieving visible results in the chosen areas while avoiding long term financial commitments and slow implementation processes inherent in universal programs.

h) There appears to be a shift toward achieving policy objectives through contractual arrangements. The targeting of resources and the delegation of some level of management to the community provides an opportunity to formalize policy objectives in a manner which may not be possible on a broad public basis. The community or contracting entity has to commit itself formally to these policy objectives in order to access the resources available. This also provides an opportunity for piloting policy objectives in a small area. The monitoring of policy outcomes is also a new
opportunity because services which are delivered more universally may not have been closely monitored for outcomes. However it becomes necessary in a contract environment to be more specific about expectations. This also provides an opportunity to formalise the concept of sharing of public responsibility with the private and community sectors.

i) Increasingly, broad integrative urban regeneration and improvement strategies are requiring resource-pooling and multi-level, multi-sectoral management. Concerns about crossing or changing existing lines of accountability, about active versus passive participation (of institutions and community groups), about management and governance capability in the community come to the fore. Interestingly, efforts to empower communities to manage their own development seem often to lead to pressures upon the implementing institutions to find ways to better coordinate their own planning and decision-making so that the communities can get on with their work.

6. What are the implications for crime prevention strategies?

a) These initiatives tend to require substantial funding from sectors that crime prevention programs are not always successful in tapping. So they present an opportunity to focus increased resources on the risk factors of criminality and on building social capital. Resources currently available do not match either the need or the counter-forces affecting criminality. Prevention programs often funded through discretionary expenditures, which are vulnerable to budget reductions. Combining crime prevention objectives with objectives related to housing conditions, employment, education, health, recreation, and public space, offers the possibility of enlarging the impact of intervention. It may also provide an opportunity to generate cooperation among organizations and institutions which share the objectives of crime prevention but are nervous about participating in initiatives where crime prevention is the leading concern, because of a reluctance to see their programs justified on a crime-related basis. A recent Chilean review refers to this concern among social program departments and institutions about “criminalizing social policy”xvi.

b) The fact that some cities have experienced substantial population growth in relative safety, making use of population density to achieve physical, social and economic efficiencies and develop an admirable quality of urban life, is significant. Urbanisation is not an inherently negative trend, and the management of urban populations can be successfully done. There seems to be a need for positive visions to complement what can become an overwhelming “problem focus.” Crime prevention could benefit from recasting some objectives into a more positive quality of life framework.

c) The requirement for integration and collaboration is a critical factor. This requires consultation and cooperation at all levels and can be an empowering exercise for the community. However, it can also bring to the surface, long-standing divisions, conflict, and diverging self-interest. To agree on a shared vision for the community is itself a significant accomplishment. It has been noted in several countries as one of the initial large hurdles, and the need for adequate time and financing of the process is an important factor. Community participation is not cheap. It is a real cost, and sometimes a real risk, for the people who participate. Their investment of time and commitment should be properly valued.
d) Historical patterns of community participation and activism are also important. In the USA for example, “democratic localism” has been an important part of the development of programs, even during the period of expansion of the central government role in social programs in the 1960’s and 70’s. Voluntary associations are a substantial and integrated part of the delivery of services.xvii

e) Spatial (renewal) interventions will likely increase in importance relative to broader based programs. We should not underestimate the possibility that these interventions can show results in politically-relevant time frames; can empower some people in communities; can serve as focus for partnerships and possibly in a backwash effect, encourage multi-level governmental and multi-sectoral collaboration. On the other hand, targeting can present problems and limitations. Focussing on certain neighbourhoods can produce a displacement effect that crime prevention professionals are well aware of, and can result in neglect of non-targeted areas. Communities which have not been diagnosed with problems of the same severity, or have simply not been diagnosed, may witness a decrease of resource availability. Public budgets tend to present choices between universal and targeted expenditures and universal programs essential to long term population well-being may be at risk.

f) Time frames are important. Showing visible results in politically-relevant time frames is a powerful factor. On the other hand, reductions in inequality, or sustained community safety and reduction of insecurity, are likely to take longer. It is not clear that spatial interventions are powerful enough to significantly offset the processes of increasing economic inequality set in motion by global economic developments. The German experience seems to suggest a need to put programs into a 10 –15 year time frame for substantive and sustainable change. The German Institute of Urban Affairs, in the 3-year review of the Socially Integrative City Program, xviii states, “The proliferation of projects and measures only contributes to a positive community atmosphere if long-term implementation of projects is guaranteed.”

g) We should note the difference in emphasis of programs called “integrated” and those called “integrative”. The first seems to imply being comprehensive in approach, bringing the partners together at the planning stage and then implementing cooperatively and simultaneously toward several mutually-re-enforcing objectives. The second seems to imply a strategy which may start from a smaller base, perhaps a strategic coalition, which will have as an objective to bring into cooperative alignment, various stakeholders… whether in planning or later stages, and which has also an objective to bring in traditionally excluded groups … in a sense making the capacity for integration more of an objective than an assumed precondition. Looking at integration as a progressive process may be of help in dealing with one of the emerging reservations about the participation of residents, which is the problem of attaining and maintaining effective participation of disadvantaged, marginalized or at risk groups. There is here an opportunity for some of the better crime prevention experiences to provide guidance, especially for example in encouraging participation of youth.

h) There are major private interests involved in urban renewal: real estate developers, construction industry, housing companies, financial institutions and various commercial investors. The potential to lever private funding is significant. However, so is the potential to lever public funding toward private commercial benefit. There is potential for corruption, large and small, spontaneous and organized. Without effective instruments to ensure transparency and accountability - of both private and public personnel - the valiant objectives and principles of community-based sustainable
development could be undermined. This could be one of the more important starting points for crime prevention.

i) This is clearly an area where every country can learn from the others, especially given population mobility. Culture and ethnicity lie behind many conflicts in modern society and within communities, and better understanding of these factors and how they affect urban conditions is crucial to long term community safety. The answers to making rapidly-expanding urban areas into safe, sustainable, liveable communities are not residing in the rich, insulated countries, but in the constant interchange of experience, ideas, success and failure, across geographic and cultural boundaries.

Our conclusion, by now no surprise, is that crime prevention should be an integral component of urban regeneration initiatives. The objectives are certainly complementary. The methodology is similar, especially in the essential role of the community. Many outcomes of urban regeneration are essential interim objectives for safer communities, and offer important mid-term indicators of success, something which crime prevention needs. Moreover, a safer community is a powerful shared objective for all residents. It can provide a clear focus for building social strength and community self-management. Collaboration is a win-win formula.
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