



**PARTNER**

Partnering, Networking and Research Services  
NPO 099-710  
+27 (0)82 659 9954  
[info@partner.org.za](mailto:info@partner.org.za)

[www.partner.org.za](http://www.partner.org.za)  
[Twitter](#)  
[Facebook](#)

**PARTNER BRIEFING PAPER NUMBER TWO 11th October 2012**

**WHAT DOES COMMUNITY SAFETY MEAN? COMMUNITIES CREATING SAFETY IN PRINCIPLE AND PRACTICE**

Dr Richard A Griggs,  
Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist for Safety Initiatives

*This is part one of a two-part presentation; see John Cartwright presentation further below*

Today we are looking at local safety and it is my task to help define what communities creating safety means in principle and then John Cartwright will discuss some practical examples of it.

***What do we mean by local safety and have we achieved this?***

Local safety does not refer to community actors managing their own safety but to a fully articulated system of communicating and responding to local safety needs. In other words, a big part of safety is about articulated systems of communication between community residents who can identify the challenges and service providers who can address them. Where communication is strong, we obtain safety; where communication is weak, we get reduced levels of local safety. Therefore it is important to understand and describe the communication systems between community members and a large range of service providers found at municipal, metropolitan, provincial and national levels.

We have not really achieved a well-integrated system of communication and response on safety issues because if we had we would not see persistently high crime rates, street protest, vigilantism, civil disobedience, and anti-government violence. This then invites some questions about the challenges to achieving this, particularly in terms of designing a good communication strategy on safety including:

- How do we define community?
- How do we define community safety?
- What are the mechanisms for communication?

- How do we document and address the community's safety vision?
- What are the mechanisms for documenting achievements?

### **How do we define 'community' in terms of community safety?**

Each community in South Africa has a unique mix of safety problems and different resources, cultures, people, and services to address the problems that have to be taken into account. It seems certain if we start with a vision of what the community hopes to achieve from place to place and use community definitions this is a better starting block than 'one local, provincial or national plan fits all.' Yet allowing communities to define themselves and network with all levels of government concerning these problems is an uncompleted task in South Africa and a challenge. This owes to:

- Strong politics around identity issues
- A long history of top-down planning;
- The bias of planners who become frustrated with the bottom up approach
- A lack of capacity and structures at the community level to fully engage in planning.

Factors like these help to explain long-standing tensions between community definitions of place and definitions of safety that sometimes erupt into protest and violence on the ground.

So, engaging the local community or at least the right mix of people at community level tends to be the biggest challenge in communication right now because definitions of community used by planners and government bodies and their structures do not always conform to how people define themselves. The administrative boundaries of our municipalities and planning areas do not fit like a glove with how people feel about their communities. For this reason the South African Government has now committed itself to the design of community safety forums but we cannot always say that the representation on these bodies fits with local definitions of place. A strategic plan on this is nearly finished now and rests with the Civilian Secretariat for Police but will this feel like a body linked to the community? The solution probably rests with an integrated system of sub-forums to these larger CSFs that find representation on that larger body but working this out is not an overnight process.

### **How do we define Community Safety?**

Another challenge is arriving at some common agreement between all tiers of administration from the local taxpayer to the president about what safety is? The safety paradigm that we choose *should* allow for communities to engage in a dialogue with service providers because definitions of safety vary. We have competing models of safety like crime and punishment, crime prevention, community safety and public health and each has its challenges but we clearly know that if the paradigm is just crime and punishment, there is not much reflection on the crime drivers; not much scope to speak with communities about safety needs and little integration of their concerns into safety planning. For example, to some communities, reactive policing is less descriptive of their safety needs than fresh water, a garden or a crèche.

I am not going to review the concepts of law enforcement, crime prevention, community safety and public health and try to solve the conundrum but one can argue that it is best to start with an embracing, positive pro-social definition of what is a safe and healthy community and move toward it rather than dwell on what one does not want (crime prevention). International literature has shown the value of allowing each community to define what would make it healthy and happy and on that basis build partnerships with many departments and groups work out a vision of safety followed by safety plans and programmes. In other words, it is better to focus on what each community wants and what it does not want rather than to impose definitions and yet the paradigm must be encompassing enough to involve all needed partners. For instance, a focus on reactive crime or preventing crime can lead to a complaints forum and limit the vision to crime issues. This might attract police, courts and prisons but not necessarily the groups the really prevent crime in the long term like health, education, businesses and social services.

### **What are the mechanisms for communication?**

If we have top down systems of communication on this, we will end up with very authoritarian definitions of safety and protest on the street. If we work with local definitions of safety, a 'one programme fits all approach' is out the window and there will have to be forums and meaningful debate. While community members have the edge when it comes to identifying and explaining their local safety needs, they lack the budgets and experts to take it from vision to implementation. They cannot come up with a policing plan and implement it and the same is true for fire fighting, recreation grounds, water and sanitation, schools, health and safety measures and all the rest. This then explains why there must be a good *two-way* communication system between communities who can identify safety problems and the municipal, provincial and national departments and stakeholders who can address them.

South African policy has basically gone the way of constructing community police forums and this is not some new idea. Rather for two decades NGOs and government have modelled this here and overseas to see what should be done and if it can focus government stakeholders on addressing local crime generators. These forums have challenges but are seemingly unavoidable such that internationally they are considered a primary indicator of a safe community. Some of the challenges with the forums include:

- The slow pace of delivering on strategies and plans
- Inconsistent representation (constantly shifting membership or attendees differ from meeting to meeting)
- Top heavy membership (not enough community input)
- People grandstanding for their own political and economic interests (which are seldom in the best interests of the entire community)
- The areas represented by these bodies tend to be administrative (lacking in social cohesion)

The solution to some of the described problems lie in numerous sub-forums to these community safety forums. The CPFs must find representation on these larger bodies so that information from the ground can feed up to decision-makers. The alternative is to have government departments better represented at community level but this is the road not taken.

*Are forums the only mechanism for communication on safety needs?* Yes and No. One can argue that there are two essential kinds of communication mechanisms but we are seen these collapse into one. The main alternative is that departments can post representatives directly in communities in ways that respond directly and immediately to community needs. Thus, we have local police departments, health care givers and social workers and there are challenges with these too but this often this amounts to low ratios of people, say social workers to the population needing services and weak programmes or simply poor service delivery owing to weak organisation, poor funding, sometimes corruption or a lack of expertise.

One of the best projects I ever evaluated included both described approaches (and this told me that we need both). The hypothesis: if a prosecutor from the NPA could be assigned to 8 of our most crime-affected communities in the country as the link to enable good two-way communication system between community and service providers about safety needs, would this reduce crime? The answer is yes—it worked but it was not funded and not sustained for that reason. These prosecutors would teach people about the law and this alone saw crime drop *and* they acted as community liaisons between safety forums and all branches of government to get things done with immediacy rather than engage in long discussions on forums. “Public Works: please clean up this overgrown field, fix these lights, etc.” Crime dropped dramatically in 8 crime hot spots around the country but the plan was never adopted. It succeeded in practice but failed to get funded—the NPA argued there were no funds to divert prosecutors away from the courts.<sup>1</sup> There were a shortage of seasoned prosecutors and the 8 ones we had ‘borrowed’ for our project were sorely missed by the NPA.

Another example of communicating needs to more capacitated departments I reviewed for the United Nations in Tanzania and this project then won a UN Habitat Award for innovation and progress in crime prevention. Interestingly Tanzania, one of the poorest countries in the world, managed to reduce crime drastically and this teaches people that solutions are not always about money. They came up with a ten cell system where every ten house every night report on safety concerns to a cell leader and then he reports to a 100 cell leader and then the system goes all the up to the president. It was a fully articulated *system of communication* about safety that runs from a circle of ten houses to a cell leader of 100 houses and then a 1000 house and then 10,000 and then a million all the way up to the President. It is good information too that includes neighbourhood watches such that the information being communicated about safety concerns that was pretty accurate.

### **How do we document and address the community’s safety vision?**

---

<sup>1</sup> DeKock, Rodney (September 2012) Personal Communication with a project driver of the Community Prosecution Pilot Project.

*How does the community document its safety vision so that those tasked with delivering safety can respond to community needs?* This is actually a huge gap. Sometimes outside experts use audits and other tools to try to define community resources and needs but the products are usually technocratic and not so much in touch with the community. It is not unusual to see community members arguing with the technocrats about how they got information on community needs—*not from us, they say.*

My favourite participative technique for communicating safety needs is community mapping of their own health and safety issues. I have designed maps and asked community representatives work together to mark on the map where it is safe and unsafe. This data can be summarised and used to inform more capacitated bodies of how to address very specific crime generators such as poor lighting, open fields and gang-infested zones. What is valuable is that the least literate to the most literate can work on this—it does not require high education levels to put an X on a map and yet, one gets back very precise information on crime generators.

I am not too excited about surveys, which many others seem to love but these can get very confusing because different South African tend read the questions differently and choose to answer the questions according to the anticipated benefits rather than in terms of being accurate. They also return very flat information like ‘Yes’ ‘No’ or ‘I don’t know’. Better techniques used globally include:

- Photographic documentation by community members of safe and unsafe areas
- Citizen ratings of community assets
- Focus groups that examine and discuss aerial photographs or satellite imagery of areas to identify both challenges and resources
- Storytelling where the evaluator examines these stories in terms of the kinds of challenges identified

Whichever of these tools are chosen, such an approach requires facilitation by experts from various groups like the Department of Community Safety or various NGOs or Municipal Safety Planning Bodies. If the process requires more than a half-day workshop to explain, don’t use it.

### **What are the mechanisms for documenting achievements?**

A good M and E system has to be professionally designed—these are scientific enterprises and they require that we monitor inputs (are we sticking to the community’s safety plan?) and evaluate the outputs (did we really increase safety?) Not everyone proceeds scientifically.

First, to shape a programme that works, yearly evaluations according to the objectives of the project are required for about 10 years to tweak a programme into something that works really well. One can even start with a lousy programme theory but if you employ a scientific system of monitoring and evaluation and still come up with a winning solution. If you just throw everything you have at a problem thinking something will work or chop and change the programme every year, you will probably fail and your efforts will be forgotten. It is very hard to impossible to locate projects in South Africa that have been properly

monitored and evaluated yearly for more than say 5 years. One of the reasons we are in a situation where people want to call in the army to deal with gang violence is that we have not over the last 20 years dealt in a systematic and scientific way with implementing programmes. Instead, people chop and change all the time—out with the old; in with the new.

Secondly, all evaluations require a baseline study meaning that proper measurements are taken to describe the situation accurately according to the objectives of the project *before* it is implemented. The M and E specialist is the FIRST one in and the LAST one out. M and E is not something you can just think about *after* the project has started but many approach me as an evaluator after the programme is half way complete or even finished.

Thirdly, there is a great ignorance and fear of evaluations. Most simply do not engage these out of fear or what it might expose and there are no evaluators who have not confronted saboteurs of the entire process. It is only in rarefied well-educated circles where you find the professional people who really understand that one cannot embark on local safety plans and expect them to achieve much of anything without an M and E plan.

Fourth, how do we provide M and E affordably at community level? The design of monitoring and evaluation system is a professional task and even amongst so called experts there are few who even know how to design indicators properly to develop appropriate research tools. First you have your objectives, then you design indicators, then you take baseline measurements, then monitor and gather evaluation data. If every community developed safety plans and worked with government to evaluate, how could this can be done affordably?

One way to save some money is to use a participatory evaluator who can engage communities in most stages of the research including the design of indicators, support monitoring and offer feedback on the early findings. This is less expensive, community empowering and produces excellent data. The participatory evaluators are also people intent on building community such that the process itself leaves the community participants more informed and more skilled (they can learn community surveying, how to conduct focus groups, mapping exercises, and how to review and discuss findings).

Another part of a solution may be in terms of the mapping safety as discussed earlier. If communities can map their safety needs and departments can work with communities to capture the plans on GIS systems, then perhaps general changes on the map can be analysed to indicate progress. However, given the number of communities involved it would be necessary to develop some kind of central system for evaluating this.

## **Conclusion to Part One**

It remains that there are five big challenges when it comes to communicating and addressing community-level safety needs. Some of these will become could become breakfast briefings. In summing up, can be

said that we must at least ask these questions if we are to develop effective systems for community-level safety:

- To what degree can we allow communities to define their own places (to create enthusiasm that can drive safety)—where is that found in terms of safety planning?
- Can community safety be defined in pro-social terms: the vision people have for their community rather defining it negatively in terms of the safety problems that they face?
- Do we have fully articulated mechanisms for communication that give communities a strong voice in their own development?
- Are there systems to document community definitions of safety (the vision) so that these can be taken into account?
- With so many communities how can we do this scientifically and measure progress affordably? Could we have a centralised M and E group with the capacity to develop and monitor affordable safety systems and programmes? Can we have someone like a government department help to provide reviews of several projects at a time to save on costs?

## **PART TWO**

### **HOW TO MOBILISE COMMUNITY KNOWLEDGE**

John Cartwright  
Department of Community Safety and UCT Department of Criminology

There are many different ways of mobilising community knowledge around community safety but three examples will be discussed:

- The Central City Improvement District
- The Model of Neighbourhood Watches
- Peace Committees

#### **1. IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS**

The Central City Improvement District, which has been going for over 10 years, actually arrived here as a model about 15 years ago. It is a way of improving on the safety of an articulated community and to add to the rates paid by those in the area for increasing the services already being rendered.

The Central City Improvement District emphasis has changed from what it was in the beginning. 'Crime and Grime' was the original thinking. The intention was to reduce the incidence of crime and connect with it increasing cleanliness. This is based on the premise that when there are dishevelled places with garbage lying around it encourages bad things to happen. A revived area improves safety and quality of life. So the improvement district brings together a whole number of partners including the municipality.

The state of living in an area also gets taken in to account for people who are not ratepayers. There are many homeless people living in the middle of town for example. We cannot ignore non rate payers and ignore those who do not fit the pattern. The Central City Improvement District engages with NGOs and Service Providers like Straatwerk and the Haven who are professionally focused on the homeless. An Improvement District cannot sweep the streets clean of people.

In the Muizenberg Improvement District, we had problems, challenges and similar responses to that of the Central City Improvement District. We have to take an overall view of a particular area and bring together the partners who are focused on action. Who can deliver the services we need and do it without impediments? This is the focus needed to achieve certain goals. In this case the community are the owners who pay the rates. This is not really a direct engagement of community and it is one way of improving safety in a particular kind of area that does improve things for everyone.

## **2. THE MODEL OF NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH**

The model for Neighbourhood Watch (NHW) is internationally very well known. Conventionally this is defined as citizens being the 'eyes and ears' of the police and it is implemented through patrolling - this is where the local knowledge comes in as to the local layout. A local NHW supports the police in dealing with crime. Where NHW is effective is when the activities are undertaken in an accountable and appropriate way. Where there is a very clear understanding of the role of the police and the role of members of the NHW, the model can work. We need to refresh and extend what a neighbourhood watch might be and build on community knowledge. The Department of Community Safety is investigating the role of community knowledge in complementing the police. Do we have two legs? We need the other leg to dance, so how do we mobilise community knowledge in its own right and dance with both legs?

In going to Community Policing Forum (CPF) meetings and looking at NHWs I constantly hear complaints that not enough people come out on patrol. Why should everyone patrol? Some people are good at this and some people are not. There can be 1000 people registered on a NHW book but only 150 regular patrollers. Most would rather not patrol. We must see what else they want to do. We need to look at what the remainder of the people registered have to offer. One thing a NHW can do is see itself as a kind of clearing house to building people who can contribute to the neighbourhoods' safety. The NHW should analyse what is not being used in terms of our community assets. The Department of Community Safety is in the process of developing training modules for use in NHW communities so that people who are not patrollers are identified and have a way to contribute. We have to know our human resources. Maybe a retired teacher enjoys reading and she can be directed to read to children on a Saturday morning in a library on the other side of the tracks. Instead of merely establishing that "this is the place where the trouble comes from" a person can be proactive and establish possibly life changing relationships in the so called

trouble causing place. The Department of Community Safety does not want to replace NHW but extend its value.

The Department of Community Safety does not have a law enforcement mandate but they do have police oversight and can enter into new areas and be a facilitator of activities. We strive to identify ways in which communities can themselves make a contribution to safety.

### **3. PEACE COMMITTEES**

The third community safety strategy I was involved with from 1997 and it is called Peace Committees. These ran until 2009. The then Minister of Justice, Dullah Omar, was involved with this. We went into Worcester and saw the community expressing its needs. We saw them dealing with unresolved small issues that the police should not have to address, such as a dispute between neighbours over a R50 loan. Local disputes can be resolved using local people and the Committees. The Peace Committees would do this effectively even though they were not a court and there was no punishment possible. They did investigate in a non-invasive way where a problem may have come from and how to resolve it with action to prevent it happening again. This investigation is positive.

Example: A man said my neighbour assaulted me and I don't want to go to the police but I live next to the assaulter. Both the man and the offender talk to the Peace Committee. Yes—he beat me up. The offender apologises and said he did beat his neighbour. But he was upset because his family had been insulting him. It goes back to a chicken messing up the vegetable garden. If this had gone to the police as an assault case, what value would the parties have gotten out of it? It was a chicken problem and not an assault problem, so a fence was built to solve the problem.

### **THE THREE EXAMPLES COMPARED**

There is a range of examples of getting the community voice in on the problems and solving them. There are Community Improvement Districts, Neighbourhood Watch groups and Peace Committees. These can deal with problems as they arise in a pragmatic way.

Each group must avoid being condescending. We must ask the community what their needs are or let them develop solutions.

The Improvement District model is a flexible adaptable way of dealing with a whole range of issues and it responds quickly.

The NHW is a kind of unequal relationship but it helps police patrol and needs to be extended into more problem solving.

The Peace Committees are on the ground community engagement in a direct way.

The missing link to Peace Committees and what caused it to stop is the lack of continuous sustaining support from government. *That is a shame because it worked but was not sustained.* Government support is needed. One can find more information on Peace Committees at <http://www.ideaswork.org/index.html>

Partnership is important in the work of the Department of Community Safety. The Department has been rethinking their role and we look at the 'whole of society'. Can we have huge standing committees of everybody? I don't know about Community Safety Forums. These seem to have been a waste of time. Partnerships have to focus on particular problems and particular solutions to those problems. We have to focus on the needs.

Lisa Chait thanked John and opened the discussion to the floor, inviting all to participate.

## OPEN DISCUSSION ON THE TWO PRESENTATIONS

### **Sam Waterhouse—Community Law Centre from University of the Western Cape**

My work is principally about engaging the unusual suspects and we want to ensure that we have *strong* communication systems. We have to be involved in our processes and our work. When communities define themselves, people can be marginalised and unheard, like children, the elderly, etc. People require different responses. When creating spaces for community engagement—we have to look at who we get to speak out and define community. Who is that? We have to make sure also those spaces don't replicate what we have already.

### **Rod Douglas from Department of Economic Development of Tourism**

PARTNER when defining communities left out people coming from another community into a community. The safety and security of our tourists need to be looked at and we have a comprehensive safety and security programme for them. Responding to an incident appropriately ensures that a tourist goes back home saying that we care. We liaise with most of the agencies here today. We have a pro-active programme of doing this and we left a flyer on the table and our safety tips and what we have been running.

John Cartwright spoke about the Department of Community Safety and the Soccer World Cup. The strategy was all about partnerships. This word is a cliché but it worked because the pressure was on all partners to work together and deliver. The police were the lead agency in this. SAPS are not known for sharing but they recognised with imagination and respect that everyone had to get on-board. The Department of Safety provided a space for this. The question therefore is: *How do we create the pressures for partnering? What creates the sense to deliver?*

### **Avrill Knot-Craig from the Quaker Peace Centre**

Avril spoke about the need for partnerships. There is a feeling that NGOs are either tree-huggers or dissident revolutionaries. NGOs are a support structure for the existing infrastructure. The idea of working with government and businesses is never more needed than it is now. Avril wants to get rid of the view that we are there to cause trouble. The idea of working with NGOs is important because we have information; we are the eyes and ears on the ground. We need to work within the infrastructure to provide the best levels of support.

### **Lynn Philipps from the Department of Local Government Community Development Worker Program**

Ms Phillipps asked—how do we define communities? We are in Mitchell's Plein and the ordinary citizen in the street needs to come to the table. We established street committees there and these have a long history and we have focused on crime and a developmental agenda. We have to develop our own street to have participation from everyone in the street. Our work and partnership with the community shows that we can register people and get them participating.

### **Greg Wagner is the spokesperson for the Minister of Safety of the Western Cape**

Individuals and organisations can work with different structures. What do you do about communities that have gatekeepers?

Dr Richard Griggs responded by saying that centralisation of power and the steeper the hierarchy, the more gatekeepers there are. There is a need to decentralise power and bring it into communities working in partnership with key departments so that a trust or bond is established between them that is as much of a cultural phenomenon as a legal one. Required yet in South Africa is a deeply democratic ethos that says we are all equal and have equal rights. Those in government must see themselves in service to the community and the community must see government as a partner.

### **Rudi Wolter - Business Against Crime**

An analysis needs to be done on Councillor Wards in communities—you have different kinds of levels of service in different communities. Different projects are handled by different wards and the level of service is always different. One does street cleaning and another something else. How do we work with these different levels?

### **Chris Giles - Violence Prevention Through Urban Upgrading**

We deal with safety volunteers and they submit incident reports. These can be very simple things and then we map these reports and this has value for us and for the police. We rely on volunteers – NGOs do not

have a common approach to this and to recognising them. Someone goes to a community post because they have a history of volunteering? Sustaining things is difficult but if we reward people for this, we can do something. Mr Giles is interested in working with any organisation that is working with volunteers, who he believes may be the key to sustaining a project once the funds are finished.

### **Naiema Talipe – Medical Research Council – Safety and Peace Promotion Research Unit**

We promote peace and safety and have done asset mapping as part of baseline study data. We got into the community by identifying key stakeholders and talking to them and they are concerned about violence and substance abuse. We also mapped the service providers and connected them together and then did action planning. All the stakeholders that worked in violence prevention got involved. We did just as Dr Richard Griggs said we should do, including making use of mapping for monitoring and evaluation and it worked.

### **Jesse Laitinen from Khulisa Social Solutions in Mitchell's Plain**

We train local people as mediators and they work with the courts and they also get referred. We work with alternative dispute resolutions. We link mediation to services and try to get government departments involved.

### **Vanessa Padayachee from NICRO**

Sometimes there are silos and fragmentation. We are not short of innovation and have a wealth of people working at local levels but lack a *comprehensive* approach at local level. We do have IDPs. We divide ourselves into sectors and innovate but don't develop together in specific areas. We need to bring a lot of force to bear on certain communities and link these to the broader developmental agenda. We linked up with victims and came up with a 4-5 year plans. We had set objectives as NICRO and how to set what the community goals are. It was not sustained in the end. *Local communities—we have to see if we can link everything into a common plan that accounts for community needs and objectives.* One more comment—we have to identify our community leaders and ask them to do dispute resolution. We need to involve Metro police etc. and see what they can contribute and make them leaders as well. We need to empower community leaders.

### **Muneeb Hendricks from the Central City Improvement District**

We have many beautiful safety and security models and some work for us. We have retail communities, nomadic communities and then residential communities—we have to deal with all of these communities in the city. We need to get a culture of law abidance going. People jaywalk for example! People do not obey the law and we do not have a culture of law abiding within us. We have different solutions for different problems.

**Reyburn Hendricks from H1 Holdings:** I propose that all available Community Safety Models be listed on a website, perhaps by the Department of Community Safety. Can we list all these models on a site or

where can these best practice models be accessed? This way organisations dealing with safety and security can access best practices and learning from other NGOs so that challenges can be dealt with effectively.

**Comment:** The Department of Health and World Health Organisation has a huge compendium on this.

### **James Williams -Community Development Worker**

Mr Williams is based in Mitchells Plain and asks: How do you get past the gatekeepers? We do community based planning with the IDP process and we could not get past the gatekeepers. To bypass them you have to involve all the role players in the community but just a few people talk and people want to speak to the leaders but there are the gatekeepers. These gatekeepers are the problem and we have to bypass them—this is how we get past them, we go directly to the community and identify every organisation in the community to get to the people.

### **Sam Waterhouse from UWC:**

In a slightly different direction on this...let's look at sustainability. Things change, sometimes there is progress when people with an investment and interest in safety come together to discuss and share ideas, such as this particular Breakfast Club. Gang violence is big again, it is cyclic and this links to sustainability. There are politics in the Western Cape which affect the work we do. The changing MECS have affected the bigger plans and funding towards our work and sustainability. The alignment of a certain strategy to an MEC is important. Where we get things right is *without* the big leadership but we need leadership involved in what works! We have data on what works.

### **Dr Richard Griggs summarised:**

The last comment sums up our conundrum—we have data on what works said Sam Waterhouse but we cannot implement in any big way because of politics and the 'changing faces' syndrome in which a newly elected leader comes in and sweeps away all the progress of the past. At the very local level, Street Committees are important. It is vital to get as local and as representative as possible, in order to get past the gatekeepers and hear the real community voice. We will talk more about this in future briefings but mapping our safety problems involving groups at the very local level like street committees or CPFs is one of the best ways forward in terms of both identifying our problems and monitoring progress, It is cheap, easy to look at and easy to monitor and evaluate. Anyone from the most illiterate to the most literate can make use of maps.

We have to talk more in future briefings about how to bring the costs of evaluations down so that it is affordable but without losing expertise. Evaluation Science requires scientists but we can include the community in this science. A large community role in collecting data can reduce costs. Another method is to review several practices at once and learn from them. Perhaps the Department of Community Safety can look at this and sponsor an evaluator or evaluation team to review say 10 good projects in the Western Cape that are having an impact on lowering crime rates.

**END**