FONDACA
active citizenship
foundation

Civic Resources for Urban Safety:

a survey on the role of active citizenship organizations

Summary Report

Rome, March 2009

GENOVA MUNICIPALITY

Safe City Department

Presentation

This document contains a summary of the main findings of a survey conducted by FONDACA on the role of active citizenship organisations in urban safety policies. The analysis was commissioned by the Municipality of Genoa (Safe City Department) in preparation for a conference on this issue, which was held on 11 March 2009.

The survey was conducted between December 2008 and February 2009. It focused on the role of organised citizens in safety policies, in particular those applied at the local level. The information was obtained through desk reviews of previous research conducted on the topic as well as policy documents and other relevant publications recording experiences at the national, European and international levels. The main objective of the study was to contribute to enriching the cultural context within which the topic of active citizen's involvement in urban safety has been debated in Italy. Furthermore, the final analysis hopes to enlarge the overall conceptual framework used to interpret situations and experiences as well as the arguments on which the respective public policies are built and promoted.

The main sources included: research papers; syllabi for university and para-university courses; specialized training materials; empirical research reports; national and local-level governmental and administrative policy documentation; policy papers by public entities and civic organisations; documents published by public, civil or mixed programmes; various resource-centre materials; operational manuals. A complete list of the sources that were consulted is attached to the present paper.

The authors would like to highlight a few cautionary notes for the reader to keep in mind. The first observation is that the survey did not focus on safety policies specifically, but rather on the involvement of those organisations active in this policy area. This choice reflects the focus of the conference and is consistent with FONDACA's expertise and background on the role of civic activism in public policy processes.

The second clarification is that the survey was based on three main operational concepts. The first one regards the concept of an *active citizenship organisation*. This term was used to identify any kind of autonomous citizen organisation involved within local safety policies, regardless of its form, rationale, main areas of action and operational strategies, provided that they act in the general interest. The second concept regards the operational definition of *safety* policy, which describes any policy aiming to prevent, reduce or repress social, environmental and intimidatory factors that contribute to threatening citizens and their right to live without fear of crime, thereby having an impact on their quality of life. This type of policy includes preventive measures to reducing crime and countering anti-social behaviour. The third operational concept is that of *community* or local community, defined as all persons living in a specific place, whose social identity, though, allows for divergent views and interests.

Thirdly, we need to clarify that, due to the limited timeframe and the vastness of the research[1] field, this analysis does not aspire to provide more than an overview, that is, it aims at identifying both priority topics and issues and phenomena that would require further investigation. These next steps should also include a systematic survey on urban safety

---

[1] It is enough to notice that two Google searches of internet web-sites based on the key words "cittadini sicurezza" and "citizen safety" (December 2008) produced almost 3,5 million and 41,5 million results respectively.

initiatives implemented autonomously by active citizenship organisations or integrated within local government programmes.

This report is divided into four parts. The first part summarizes the main context-related elements regarding the role of citizens' organisations in urban safety policies. The second part takes into account the factors that characterize the relationship between civic and administrative initiatives. The third part depicts a tentative map of "civic resources" for urban safety. Finally, the fourth section highlights some open questions and critical aspects regarding the involvement of citizens' organisations in safety policies.

Context

Safety policies as an enabling context for the development of active citizenship

A first contextual element – which should not be taken for granted, although it emerges clearly from the reviewed documents – is that safety is one of the public policy areas in which the presence of active citizenship organisations is most evidently identified and conceptualized. As such, the relationship on this topic between European public institutions and active citizenship organisations is much less ambivalent and uncertain than it tends to be on most other issues.

This important element is most probably due to the growing relevance that urban safety has acquired throughout the world in past two decades, especially thanks to:

• the transition from *professional policing* to *community policing* as part of community development, due to the limited effectiveness of traditional practices;

• the inclusion of so-called anti-social behaviour, e.g. behaviour that may disturb, cause alarm or concern, into the concept of safety;

• the importance of the cognitive dimension, which explains the partial gap between facts and citizen's sense of safety and highlights the need to include cognitive elements in the construction of a safety-risk system;

• the resulting need to "give a voice" to citizens and communities, rather than assuming to know their point of view or imposing an alternative one;

• the growing importance of social capital for community development and for the building of "safe communities".

Needless to say, all these elements involve active citizenship organisations. These organisations are indeed well established in the social fabric of local communities; they work against phenomena that are often sources of insafety, when not directly criminal in nature; they enjoy high levels of public trust that can affect the cognitive dimension of citizenship and related social representations; they have the ability to give voice to the communities, especially at-risk segments of populations (although not all of them). Finally, these organisations are both users and generators of social capital.

The Italian situation: between ideological debates and neglected experiences

Such an enabling environment is also reflected in the Italian context, where active citizenship organisations have become important partners in local safety policies. Yet there is very little (if any) awareness of these practices in the public debate. This is due not only to the above-mentioned lack of systematic data, but also – and more importantly – to the scarce attention the media system has been paying to this issue, as well as to other relevant social and institutional phenomena.

It is also important to underline that such a lack of focus is made even more problematic by alarmist tendencies (which are nevertheless common to most countries for which information is available) and, perhaps more worryingly, the extreme political and ideological polarization of the debate, which is often the consequence of confusing and unclear data. A key example of this situation is reflected in the debate that preceded and followed the adoption of the Decree Law on Safety of 23 February 2009, as well as the actual content of the provision, which legalized the so-called "citizen patrols" (or *ronde* in Italian). The decree in question reads (Article 6, paragraph 3):

> The mayors, by agreement with the prefecture, can decide to collaborate with
> unarmed citizens' associations in order to alert or signal to the state or local
> police cases that can may threaten urban safety or situations of social
> degradation.

Irrespective of specific views one may hold on the subject, it is necessary to note that this decree does not regard – as both supporters and opponents maintained – active vigilante groups, but rather citizens' organisation practicing crime watch (or "passive surveillance") approach to urban safety. The international literature clearly distinguishes between these two forms of action, describing the latter as 'neighbourhood watch' or 'crime watch'. In this case, citizens are unarmed, have no policing powers and pre-empt criminal activity only through their presence or by reporting critical situations. By contrast, public authorities recognize to the vigilante groups (or "citizens patrols") specific powers, so, allowing them for example to identify suspects and sometimes to arrest them. Thus, it is appropriate to state that the government's decree was about "passive surveillance", but it was supported or opposed as it would be a norm on citizen patrols. It is worth adding that passive surveillance experiences have been carried out for years in several Italian municipalities, often by voluntary associations composed, for example, of senior citizens, irrespective of political allegiances of local governments authorizing or supporting them. Such confusion on definitions and roles, as well as this reduction of active citizenship to crime watch (widely recognized as a low impact measure for crime reduction), reflects an uncertainty about the role of active citizenship itself. This factor, despite the above-mentioned favourable environment, is a key weakness of the Italian situation.

The style of international policy: the primacy of "common sense" and "community development"

 The way in which urban safety is dealt with is remarkably different in other countries, especially in the European context. As mentioned above, other countries of course are not exempt of criminal phenomena or anti-social behaviour, nor are they immune to the social alarm that tends to overemphasize certain facts. Yet, the difference lies in the adoption of practical and empirical approaches based on a sort of "common sense", which is supported by

relevant scientific research and guided by values of inclusion, social cohesion and guarantees of fundamental rights.

According to this approach, the criticisms by the scientific community, public administrations and civic organisations against vigilante groups and patrolling are based more on practical implications rather than principle considerations. These practical implications have to do with the risk that vigilantes may paradoxically turn themselves into threats to urban safety (i.e. thugs or hooligans) or become an obstacle to greater involvement of communities in safety policies or even inspire more fear in the citizenry rather than building a sense of safety. Similarly, while there are no principle reasons to disqualify crime watch activities, the data shows that they do not have a positive and permanent impact on crime and anti-social behaviour reduction, although they might exert a positive influence on the perceived sense of insafety. Moreover, it was on the basis of practical reasons that the American approach of "result-oriented policing", better known as "zero tolerance", was first criticized and eventually abandoned as a mainstream safety policy.

In the international arena, the reasons why the broad involvement and support of civic or community organisations is considered necessary have much less to do with abstract principles, such as the sharing of responsibility or the opportunity to reward the pursuit of civic virtues. On the contrary, the primary focus of this collaboration is the essential input of active citizenship organisations (e.g. operational capacity, relationships of trust with the people, situational awareness, expertise, etc.) to increase the chances of success of safety policy interventions. Despite the overall limitations noted above, even in Italy when long-term safety policies are set up by local administrations, the reasons for cooperation with active citizenship organizations are based upon such practical considerations.

For the same reasons, policies aimed at creating safer communities have always and everywhere consisted of integrated interventions that are only deemed effective as a whole. Thus, it is not considered sufficient to recover or restore buildings or public places without a program to counteract social exclusion, or implement a support programme for victims and witnesses of crime without education campaigns against those most at risk of becoming responsible for such crimes. Likewise, forms of neighbourhood watch should not be implemented without the guarantee that the highlighted crimes or anti-social behaviours will be quickly detected and pursued by the police.

The interaction between public administrations and civic organisations

A double-key system with variable geometry

In light of the previously-mentioned factors, it can be argued that, in the new context of community policing emerged in the last two decades at the international level, the relationship between local administrations and active citizen organisations in safety policy works as a double-key system: effective measures to decrease both perception and actual conditions of insafety require the mobilization and involvement of both actors and cannot be achieved by only one of them. In other words, it is the combined action of administrative or other governmental entities and civic or community action that achieves the best and most

sustainable results. It makes safety policy definitely different from other ones, such as environmental policy.

In this combined action there are however different ways to manage and structure the collaborative relationship. These distinctions become more evident when translating policies into actual initiatives and programmes. In this case, too, a general three-pronged typology of the relationship between public administration and citizen organisations can be identified. The first form is *dialogue*, which denotes situations in which public institutions receive input (information, claims, views, etc.) from civic organisations, which is taken into account by public administrations, and the latter provide feedback. This input can be requested directly by public institutions through, for instance, consultation procedures (which is a very common approach for safety policy). This first form includes assessments of an administration's safety policies by local civic organisations, but also the reporting of problems in proximity policing programmes.

The second form is *cooperation*, which refers to situations in which public institutions and active citizenship organisations have shared goals that can be reached through mutual support of programmes and activities or through coordination of efforts. For instance, an administration may support an initiative of a group of youth to educate other young people on gender equality and the prevention of sexual offences by providing facilities, financial resources or experts on the subject. On the other hand, a civic organisation may facilitate a community listening promoted by a public institution or place volunteers to support victims of crime within the offices of the police.

The third form of collaboration is *partnership*, whereby governments and active citizenship organisations share resources, responsibilities and risks realizing that none of the actors alone could achieve the objective that is jointly pursued. One example of partnership is the training of police officers by women's organisations on issues such as sexual violence to avoid secondary victimization. Other examples include safety audits carried out jointly, or even the inclusion of marginalized groups (e.g. ethnic minorities) in the participatory processes related to the development of community or in the participated planning programmes.

Although the three forms of dialogue, collaboration and partnership are arranged in an incrementing scale of complexity, the choice of approach is based exclusively on its suitability to the specific circumstances and needs.

The framework falls nevertheless within the "double key" approach, whereby the overall objective of promoting and supporting the development of community forms that enhance safety and minimize the physical and cognitive factors of insafety can only be achieved through a combination of "public" and civic action.

Initiatives by public administrations and organised citizens

Besides the variable geometry of this relationship, general differences between initiatives undertaken by administrations and actions promoted by active citizenship organisations also emerge from our survey. This difference can be synthesised and simplified into the following classification:

• government-led initiatives tend to have a systematic approach and are therefore implemented in sets of interlinked actions, while civic organisations' actions have a more symbolic character and a potential for emulation or duplication;

- government-led initiatives usually seek to have a general character, thereby addressing an entire spectrum of issues related to safety, while those of organised citizens tend to focus on specific situations albeit with a general application;

- government initiatives tend to stem from existing problems, while those of active citizenship organisations seem to depend mostly on available resources and opportunities.

These differences in approach can lead to forms of integration, but they can also undermine successful collaboration and create dissonances or asymmetries. Besides these possible negative outcomes are a more general phenomenon, those of different visions and agendas between the two actors, that are of general scope and rather common in the European context. Often, this situation may be caused by governments, especially when they expect organisations to play roles they are not prepared to, as is commonly the case with consultative participation. The same holds true for the inverse: civic organisations often give primary importance to activities such as information, sensitization and advice of citizens, which are usually ignored by governments. Especially in the case of safety policies, placating or avoiding these negative tendencies is of utmost importance.

A civil resources map for urban safety

A contribution to the development of communities

Irrespective of what actor is leading the initiative, active citizenship organisations do mobilize their resources in order to define, implement and evaluate safety policies, especially at the local level. What are these resources? During our survey, we identified over 100 cases, which, although do not constitute a significant sample from a scientific perspective, nevertheless provide sufficient information to draw an initial "map" of civic resources for urban safety and its practices. This is a rather useful operation in order to avoid or overcome one-dimensional or reductive understandings of these resources.

Before presenting this map, it is appropriate to make three preliminary remarks. The first remark is that the surveyed practices are very rarely implemented as standalone initiatives, particularly due to the close connection between safety and community development. Usually, these practices are integrated into more general programmes, even when they are carried out solely by active citizenship organisations.

The second remark is that, in one way or another, all analyzed practices refer to one or more of the three general roles distinguishing active citizenship organisations from other types of civil society organisations: the protection of rights, care for common goods, empowerment of citizens.

The third remark is that the resources mobilized by active citizenship organisations can be seen, due to their scope, as part of a policy to combat the phenomena that generate insafety in the cities, to prevent and minimize violence and behaviours that undermine the quality of life of the community and individuals, and especially to support community development.

A map of the practices

What are the civic resources put into the field of safety policy? On the basis of our survey's results, we can propose the following categorization.

- *Participation in the design of policies, programmes and interventions*. This type of activity can have a greater or lesser institutional relevance, ranging from official forms of consultation to advocacy and lobbying, and be focused on general plans and programmes or specific situations of special concern. Typically, they regard the urban setup and deal with the delivering of certain services to the community. These activities may take place as parts of the so-called "compacts for safety", which are often signed by civic organisations, or as components of local partnerships for safety and be implemented through coordination tables, forums, etc.

- *Advocacy for the community or for at-risk people*. This can lead to awareness campaigns or public advocacy regarding situations of exclusion and social degradation that may undermine the community's safety and can be implemented through a variety of tools.

- *Participation of communities and at-risk groups in public life*. We refer here to experiences such as the inclusion of ethnic minorities in participatory processes, as a form of empowerment for individuals and groups, but also to the promotion of associations among residents or householders to take on responsibilities for urban safety and the participation of citizens in meetings with representatives of police forces in order to foster communication and collaboration. In this category, one can also include the involvement of private enterprises in community development programmes. The experiences of participatory planning can also be included in this category.

- *Civic Information*. Forms of safety audits, carried out independently or in cooperation with the authorities, fall into this category, as does any form of community profiling or risk mappings. Also monitoring and evaluating activities to measure the effectiveness and impact of public safety are based on information from organised citizens.

- *Communitarisation of personal risk*. Typically, this kind of activities are used to counter domestic violence against women and children and may imply the design of initiatives to educate men, involve influential community representatives (such as religious leaders), train and provide advice/support to victims of violence, build shelters and protected homes for women and their children.

- *Social mediation and conflict management*. These activities, inspired by figures such as community mediators or 'street walkers', may relate to the relationship between residents and young people and students or between indigenous communities and migrants. They are designed to bring together and combine different points of view in order to prevent or resolve conflict.

- *Harm reduction*. Under this label, one may find those activities aimed at supporting the victims of crimes, both in terms of psychological support and material assistance, in order to avoid secondary victimization.

- *Preventive activities and control of the territory*. These activities include the above-mentioned cases of "neighbourhood watch", but also the less obvious and more controversial activities of patrolling. These types of activity may also relate to specific aspects such as road safety (especially involving the youth), but also community actions against violence on television and on the Internet.

- *Revitalization and management of public spaces*. This can result in "taking charge" of places such as squares or public buildings, but also the mobilization of resources to "give back" abandoned or decayed public goods for community use.

- *Proximity actions*. These activities include all those actions aimed at reaching targets that would otherwise not be able to communicate with local institutions. It is the case of programmes targeting marginalized individuals, such as prostitutes, in particular the so-called 'survival street workers', with whom a personal contact is necessary not only to educate them on sexually transmitted diseases, but also to gather evidence and eventually identify women's abusers and serial killers.

- *Information and advice*. This type of activity can range from information regarding dangerous places, no go areas and more risky times for people to walk around urban centres, to legal advice for better protection of one's rights and forms of compensation for any personal damage. These activities can be operationalised through toll-free numbers, hot lines and other public information services.

- *Public awareness and education*. This can be developed, for example, through social marketing campaigns, which advertise data and publish information to affect personal behaviours in order to make the community safer through a greater degree of attention and involvement of citizens.

- *Education and training*. These activities activity may refer to citizenship as a whole and regard, for example, the prevention of insafety and specific training on what to do in cases of emergency. At the same time, these activities may refer to specific at-risk groups, such as young pupils in relation to sexual violence. Education and training activities may also target individuals whose action or lack thereof might make a serious difference, such as police officers or the so-called 'peer leaders', who enjoy a significant reputation among at-risk subjects.

- *Creation and management of services*. These may include, for example, protected homes and shelters for women who have suffered domestic violence, communal centres for at-risk youth or meeting places for representatives of different generations. Of particular importance and value is the fact that these services are managed by peers, that is, people who have been subjected to the same risks and abuses (for example, women who experienced domestic violence or youngsters who lead services to prevent violence among young people or ethnic leaders committed to the empowerment of aboriginal communities).

In spite of its limitations, this map offers a very broad selection of activities, strategies and resources that are usually believed to constitute examples of how civic organisations can contribute to the policies of urban safety. The adoption of such a broad understanding is an indispensable requirement to make 'good use' of organised citizens in this field.

Emerging Problems

Obviously, our sources also highlight a number of considerations regarding the problems raised by the involvement of active citizens organisations in urban safety policies. Thus, it is necessary to conclude this report by identifying the main issues. They can be divided into two groups.

Impact, sustainability, results

The first problem concerns the overall impact that civic initiatives can have on community safety. As was discussed above, these actions and programmes tend to be emblematic rather than systematic, focused on specific issues and based on available resources and opportunities. Needless to say, it is extremely difficult to assess the indirect effects and structural impacts that these activities may have beyond their specific outcomes. As a matter of fact, this remark can also be made with regard to certain public administrations' policies. In the case of civic organisations, it describes a general problem, which is however more relevant in this case since, by common admission, safety in communities is the result of a variety of structural, cultural, economic and social factors.

Related to this critical problem is the more general risk that, in order to develop an all-round approach, one adopts a 'holistic' understanding of safety, thereby wasting resources and losing sight of the most urgent and commonly felt problems. If everything is safety, safety risks becoming an empty concept.

Another critical element concerns the sustainability. Empirical evidence suggests that a satisfactory degree of safety is the result of systematic, long-term and ongoing action: results can quickly vanish after interventions come to an end. The very nature of active citizenship organisations (which are characterized by a high turnover of staff) and the reliance of their actions on the availability of adequate financial resources jeopardize the sustainability of their interventions in the long run.

Relations with institutions, representativeness and the NIMBY Syndrome

Even in the case of safety policies, the relationship of civic organisations with public institutions remains problematic. As mentioned above, at least in the European context, this is a critical factor in general. This becomes however a much more serious problem within a system defined as "double key". Public authorities in Europe tend to regard the organised citizens simultaneously as a resource and as a threat, and so their relationship can be particularly difficult. On the other hand, not always active citizenship organisations succeed in relate with the government on a continuum between critique and collaboration. As a consequence of both parties' actions, this partnership often results in dynamics of subordination or a "discharge of responsibilities", as clearly shown by existing problems in the management of welfare services.

As argued above, this is due to issues regarding financial resources. As many of the sources examined for the research confirm, this problem however cannot be regarded in absolute terms. In the case of several activities that were implemented, costs were kept very low. Furthermore, active citizenship organisations have been able to collaborate on corporate social responsibility programs with the private sector. However, many of the activities require a sustained amount of significant financial resources, which cannot be taken for granted.

Furthermore, in the relationship between active citizenship organisations and public institutions, but also with the community as a whole, apparent problems of representativity exist. This issue is always present in the relationships between civic organisations in relation to their stakeholders, whether they are the community, public or private entities. In the case of safety policies, this is a serious risk that can have a major impact: for example, extreme voices are often presented as speaking on behalf of the community. Or otherwise, that the viewpoint of the offenders is defended, however legitimate this might be, though at the expense of the victims. The ultimate effect is that communities' sense of insafety actually increases, rather than the opposite.

In some way connected to the issue of representativity, there is the risk that organised citizens on urban safety policies end up acting according to what could be called NIMBY Syndrome (Not in My Backyard), applied in this case not to waste, but to marginal, vulnerable or excluded populations. This attitude can reach far beyond the perimeter of what was defined initially as "active citizenship", practicing a presumed representation of the community interpreted as a closed and homogeneous universe. Paradoxically in such a case they can become a problem rather than an asset for the promotion of urban safety.

It is understood that none of these problems are easy to solve, but nevertheless none of them will be solved without a concerted attempt of doing so.

Annexes: Reference Material

Web Sites

- Associazione Sicurezza e legalità - http://sicurezzaelegalita.it/
- Associazione Napoli Nord-Sud: http://www.informazione.it/c/91b7a78c-a492-4889-90bb-208ea60f196e/Portici-i-cittadini-firmano-per-la-sicurezza
- Centre des recherché sociologique sur le droit et les institutions pénales: http://www.cesdip.org/
- Comitato di Vasto (1): http://www.hovogliadisicurezza.org/
- Comitato di Vasto (2): http://www.associazionebarbarica.org/?p=737
- Comitato quartiere Pallotta: http://comitatopallotta.myblog.it/
- Comitato civico Caivano: http://cittadinicaivano.myblog.it/tag/Sicurezza
- Community Policing: http://www.communitypolicing.org/eleclib/index.html#A
- Community Policing Advisory Council of Ontario: http://www.communitypolicing.ca/
- Comune di Arezzo: http://www.comune.arezzo.it/retecivica/pes.nsf/web/Scrzzmrgnzttldcttdn?opendocument
- Comune di Bologna, Sportello sicurezza: http://www.comune.bologna.it/quartierenavile/sportello_sicurezza/
- Comune di Cremona, Progetto giovani e legalità: http://www.comune.cremona.it/bd_ui-viewContent-id_info_form-886.phtml; Progetto giovani in strada: http://www.comune.cremona.it/bd_ui-viewContent-id_info_form-882.phtml
- Comune di Modena, Progetto Secucities Prevention Europe: http://www.comune.modena.it/progettoeuropa/ChiSiamo_Progetti_Finanziati.php?nid=12362
- Comune di Modena, Progetto Domus: http://www.comune.modena.it/domus/progetto.php?lang=it
- Comune di Portomaggiore e Argenta: http://www.portoinrete.com/show_news.php?show=106
- Comune di Rapino: http://www.rapino.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=75&Itemid=117
- Comune di Siena: http://www.comune.siena.it/main.asp?id=0
- Consulta per la sicurezza e tavolo dei cittadini del Comune di Arezzo: http://www.comune.arezzo.it/retecivica/URP/URP.nsf/PESDocumentID/3435468145655E47C12574FE0030CD1E?opendocument&FROM=Pbblcscrzz
- Coordinamento comitati spontanei Torino: http://www.ccst.it/
- Democracy, Cities and Drug Project: http://www.fesu.org/fileadmin/efus/pdf/DCDGliwice_FR.pdf
- Estonian Neighborhood Watch: http://www.naabrivalve.ee/?mid=147
- European Forum For Urban Safety: http://www.fesu.org/
- European Institute of Democratic Participation: http://flarenetwork.org/eidp/
- Eurostat: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page?_pageid=1090,30070682,1090_33076576&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL
- Georgia State University, Department of Criminal Justice: http://www.cjgsu.net/initiatives/relevant_links.htm
- GERN, Groupe Européen de Recherche sur les Normativités: http://www.gern-cnrs.com/gern/index.php?id=2
- IARD, Ricerca sulla percezione della sicurezza in Liguria : http://www.istitutoiard.it/root/ricerca/scheda_ricerca.asp?ricerca=123
- INHES: http://www.inhes.interieur.gouv.fr/index.php?inhes=bienvenue
- Femmes et Villes International: http://www.femmesetvilles.org/english/index_en.htm
- FLARE: http://flarenetwork.org/
- Forum Italiano sulla sicurezza urbana: http://www.fisu.it/; http://www.fisu.it/wcm/fisu/sezioni/sezione_1_fisu/presentazione/brochureforum2006.pdf
- Gruppo Abele: http://www.gruppoabele.org/
- Institute for Security Studies: http://www.iss.europa.eu/
- Istituto Cattaneo: http://www.cattaneo.org/default.asp
- Istituto IARD: http://www.istitutoiard.it/intro.asp
- Joseph Rowntree Foundation: http://www.jrf.org.uk/

- Labsus:
  http://www.labsus.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=3&id=115&Itemid=30
- Libera: http://www.libera.it
- National Community Safety Network: http://www.community-safety.net/;
  http://www.fesu.org/fileadmin/efus/pdf/CommunitySafety_UK_EN.pdf
- NCJRS, National Criminal Justice Reference Centre: http://www.ncjrs.org/
- Openpolis: http://www.openpolis.it/argomento/43
- Progetto FORCE : http://www.progettoforce.it/
- Provincia di Lucca: http://www.provincia.lucca.it/sicurezzacittadini/
- Provincia di Padova: http://sicurezza.provincia.padova.it/
- Provincia di Pistoia, Osservatorio sociale: http://www.provincia.pistoia.it/pdf/26comunicati.pdf
- Safer Futures: http://www.saferfutures.org/
- Transcrime: http://www.transcrime.unitn.it/tc/1.php
- UK Home Office: http://www.respect.gov.uk/default.aspx
- Unicri: http://www.unicri.it/

Documents

- Carocci, Leonardo, D'Alessandro, Antonio, "Per una sicurezza partecipata", materiali del progetto FORCE, s.d., paper.
- Casey, Louise, "Engaging Communities in Fighting Crime", UK Cabinet Office, 2008, paper.
- Censis, Rapporto 2003: http://www.censis.it/277/280/339/3826/3827/4009/4015/content.asp
- Cisis, La sicurezza dei cittadini in cinque regioni italiane:
  http://www.cisis.it/attivita/pubblicazioni/pdf/Vol_Sicur.pdf
- City of Toronto, Community Crisis Response Program, "How to Develop a Community Crisis Response Network", s.d., paper.
- Comune di Cremona, Patto locale di sicurezza urbana del quartiere di Borgo Loreto:
  http://www.comune.cremona.it/images/comu/file_bd/patto_borgo_loreto.pdf.
- Comune di Cremona, Piano delle azioni sociali previste dal Contratto di Quartiere "Vivere a Borgo Loreto": http://www.comune.cremona.it/bd_ui-viewContent-id_info_form-806.phtml
- Comune di Meda, Guida alla sicurezza:
  http://www.comune.meda.mi.it/pubblicazioni/varie/guida_alla_sicurezza.pdf
- Comune di Modena, "The partnership-based approach in security policies: the Modena experience", DOMUS Project, 2004, paper.
- Comune di Rapino, Progetto sicurezza:
  http://www.rapino.net/doc/documentipdf/progetto%20sicurezza.pdf
- Comune di Reggio Emilia, Piano integrato della sicurezza:
  http://www.municipio.re.it/progstart/progstrat.nsf/faab632bcbdbc3bac125738300340a1d/ef5d2db5bebbc610c12571a3002f9822?opendocument
- Coordinamento comitati spontanei Torino, Sportello del cittadino:
  http://www.ccst.it/sos_torino/index.htm
- de Maillard, Jacques, "Country Survey France, Final Report", DOMUS Project, 2004, paper.
- FESU, Guidance on Local Safety Audits:
  http://www.fesu.org/fileadmin/efus/secutopics/EFUS_Safety_Audit_e_WEB.pdf
- Di Giuseppe, Giovanni, Murat, Marco, "Piazza Verdi: cosa è stato fatto e cosa resta da fare": Bologna, Piazza Verdi: http://www.bandieragialla.it/node/3715
- Femmes et Villes International, "Women's Safety Awards 2004: A Compendium of Good Practices", 2004, paper.
- Fiasco, Maurizio, "Sicurezza urbana. Valore chiave della convivenza civile, un impegno delle amministrazioni locali. Visione programmatica e modelli organizzativi", SSPAL, 17-18 giugno 2008, presentazione.
- Fiasco, Maurizio, "Politiche locali e sicurezza partecipata per lo sviluppo. I paradigmi fondamentali", materiali del progetto FORCE, s.d., paper.
- Friedmann, Robert R., "Community Policing: Some Conceptual and Practical Considerations", in *Home Affairs Review*, vol. 34 No. 6, 1996, pp. 114-123, translation from Hungarian.

- Germain, Séverine, "Report on the Grenoble (France) experience", DOMUS project, 2004, paper.
- Huges, Gordon, "Lesson-drawing on local community safety from the Luton experience", DOMUS Project, 2004, paper.
- Husain, Sohail, "Local Safety Audits: A Compendium of International Practice", Analytica Consulting, s.d., presentazione.
- International Conference on the State of Safety in World Cities, Conference Recommendations, Monterrey, 5th October 2007, paper.
- IPLAC, "Specific Theories of Social Change Underlying IPLAC's Proposed Niche", 2007, paper.
- IPLAC, Glossary 2007, paper.
- Istat, Indagine multiscopo 2002: http://www.istat.it/dati/catalogo/20040915_00/La_sicurezza_dei_cittadini.pdf
- Lawrence, Ian, "Community Involvement Case Study: Blacon, Chester", National Community Safety Network, presentazione alla conferenza del FESU, Gliwice, 6 ottobre 2006.
- Legautonomie, "Politiche per la legalità e la sicurezza urbana: la sicurezza locale partecipata", s.d., paper.
- Local Safety Audits: http://www.fesu.org/index.php?id=1594
- National Community Safety Network, "Introduction to Community Safety", 2007, paper.
- National Community Safety Network, Government Office for the South East, NACRO, "Roles & Responsibilities of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships", 2005, paper.
- Nobili, Gian Guido, Selmini, Rossella, "The urban safety policies in Italy and the experience of the Emilia-Romagna 'Città sicure' project", DOMUS project, 2004, paper.
- Pavarini, Massimo: "Il governo del bene pubblico della sicurezza a Bologna. Analisi di fattibilità", dicembre 2005, paper.
- Reisig Michael D., Parks Roger B., "Can Community Policing Help the Truly Disadvantaged?", in *Crime & Delinquency*, Vol. 50 No. 2, April 2004, pp. 139-167.
- Ristmae, Tiina, "Neighborhood Watch as an effective crime prevention method in Estonia", Neighborhood Watch Estonia, s.d., paper.
- Safer Futures, Annual Report 2006-2007.
- Shaftoe, Henry, *Crime prevention*, Palgrave MacMillan, London 2004.
- Società italiana di criminologia, Comunità civica e sicurezza dei cittadini: http://www.istitutoaffarisociali.it/flex/cm/pages/ServeBLOB.php/L/IT/IDPagina/823
- Spies Chris, "Key Elements of Cohesion Building Processes. Guyana Social Cohesion Programme", s.d., paper.
- Spotzone, Transcrime, "La svolta napoletana: da vittime che subiscono a cittadini che decidono", rapporto finale: http://transcrime.cs.unitn.it/tc/fso/conferenze/La_svolta_napoletana-da_vittime_che_subiscono_a_cittadini_che_decidono.pdf
- UK Home Office, Strengthening Communities: http://www.respect.gov.uk/article.aspx?id=9070
- UK Home Office, Not in My Neighbourhood: http://www.respect.gov.uk/news/article.aspx?id=12518&terms=safety&searchtype=2&fragment=False; report sulle attività: http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/notinmyneighbourhoodactivities.pdf
- UN-HABITAT, "Women's Safety Audits for a Safer Urban Design. Results of the pilot audit carried out in Centrum, Warsaw (25 August 2007), 2007, paper.
- Ville de Valenciennes, Local Security Strategies, Gliwice, 4-6 ottobre 2006, presentazione alla conferenza del FESU.

Other Sources

During the course of the research, information requests were also circulated to three international mailing lists of academics in the active citizenship and public policy sector:
- ISTR (International Society for Third Sector Research);
- VSSN (Voluntary Sector Studies Network);
- ARNOVA (Association for Research on Nonprofit Organisation and Voluntary Action).

The academics and experts that responded to the information request, providing us with further materials and information, are the following:
- Matthew Bowden, Trinity College of Dublin, Ireland;

- Rod Dacombe, King's College London, UK;
- Ian Jones, Cornwall Centre for Volunteers, UK;
- Jorge Laffitte, American Friends Service Committee, USA;
- Ülle Lepp, Independent Civic & Social Organisation Professional, Talllinn, Estonia;
- Amanuel Melles, United Way Toronto, Canada;
- Carl Milofsky, Bucknell University, USA;
- Henry Shaftoe, University of the West of England, UK;
- Hari Srinivas, Global Development Research Center, Kobe, Japan.

As for the Italian experiences, especially promoted by active citizenship organisations,, Mariano Bottaccio (press office of the CNCA) provided a valuable contribution by providing information and documentation.