11 Community Safety

Introduction

11.1   This chapter considers the development of partnership approaches to reducing the level of crime, reducing the fear of crime, and enhancing community safety both locally and nationally.

11.2   The Policing and Justice section of the Belfast Agreement set out what the participants to the multi-party negotiations believed were the aims of the criminal justice system. These included the need to "... be responsive to the community's concerns, and encouraging community involvement, where appropriate...". The terms of reference of the review also required us to consider "... measures to improve the responsiveness and accountability of... the criminal justice system". As a result we believed that it was right to consult on and consider the arrangements for community safety in Northern Ireland, and ways in which the criminal justice system can target its resources more effectively in preventing crime.

What is Community Safety?

11.3   No one would deny that crime constitutes a significant social and political issue, in Northern Ireland and in many other countries. Rising crime rates have fuelled public concern in most countries, and whilst Northern Ireland has enjoyed a relatively low rate of "ordinary" crime, it is nonetheless a cause for concern amongst the public here. The growing awareness of drugs, so-called "joy-riding", domestic violence and general anti-social behaviour are but a few examples of crime-related issues which the people of Northern Ireland are worried about. People are not necessarily most concerned about "big" crime issues: they often focus more on the types of crime of which they have experience and which are problems in their own area. In parallel there is a growing realisation that the formal criminal justice processes - through the detection, apprehension, prosecution, sentencing and punishment of offenders - have only a limited effect on controlling crime. This was a message that came across to us very clearly in the course of our work, from the literature reviews we commissioned, from

our study visits to other jurisdictions, and through our consultation process. That is why the approach to preventing crime has changed in recent decades in Northern Ireland and in many other countries, and why it continues to change.

11.4   Until relatively recently the term "crime prevention" was perceived as a by-product of the formal criminal justice process. For most people it meant a visit from the local police crime prevention officer to explain how they could make their home more secure. Crime prevention is much more than this. Jan van Dijk defined it as "the total of all policies, measures and techniques, outside the boundaries of the criminal justice system, aiming at the reduction of the various kinds of damage caused by acts defined as criminal by the state".[1] As the research report on the literature on community safety notes: "More recently it has become acknowledged that preventing crime requires the combination of approaches which seek to address the development of criminality among young people, reduce criminal opportunities and act upon the social conditions that sustain crime." [2]

11.5   The term "community safety" is wider again and addresses not only criminal behaviour as such but also anti-social behaviour and other factors that affect people's perceptions of safety. It is now understood as an approach which is local, in that local problems require local solutions. It is delivered through a partnership approach, drawing together a variety of organisations in the public, voluntary, community and business sectors. In the United Kingdom the Morgan Report[3] came to the view that the term "crime prevention" was often narrowly interpreted, and reinforced the view that it was solely the responsibility of the police. The report advocated the use of the term "community safety" as it was open to wider interpretation that would encourage greater community participation from all sections of the community in the fight against crime. Other countries have followed a similar path, as our research and study visits have shown, and many of those we have studied have developed mechanisms both within central government and at local level for developing and delivering community safety policy and practice.

Current Arrangements in Northern Ireland

11.6   A wide range of organisations and sectors are involved in crime prevention and community safety in Northern Ireland. Their activities in this area include situational crime prevention aimed at reducing opportunities for crimes to be committed, diverting people who are most likely to commit crimes away from offending behaviour and addressing broader policy and

---

1   van Dijk (1990) "Crime Prevention: Current State and Prospects", in Kaiser and Albrecht, (eds) *Crime and Criminal Policy in Europe,* Freiburg: Max Planck Institute, 205.

2   Crawford and Matassa, Research Report 8.

3   Morgan, *Safer Communities: The Local Delivery of Crime Prevention Through the Partnership Approach, Standing Conference on Crime Prevention* (1991), London: Home Office.

service provision issues which can impact on the level of criminal behaviour. There is already a considerable amount of activity in this field in Northern Ireland, with the RUC, Police Authority, Probation Service and the Northern Ireland Office having taken initiatives, as have a range of other statutory agencies in the field of social provision, including those responsible for housing, social services, local government and education. Voluntary and community organisations are also playing an important role in delivering services across Northern Ireland, working in partnership with public agencies, and the business sector is increasingly involved in community safety initiatives.[4]

11.7 Community safety activity is not, however, a core activity of any of the above organisations and agencies. It can therefore be difficult for agencies to find resources for community safety initiatives from their current budget structure. In addition, no agency has been given or has taken overall responsibility for setting crime prevention and community safety policy, or for funding, monitoring or evaluating community safety initiatives, either at local level or across Northern Ireland as a whole. A recent innovation, in the form of the development of the Community Safety Centre, has sought to encourage and advise those who wish to develop community safety initiatives, and to spread good practice in community safety to all those organisations and groups with an interest in making communities safer for those who work and live within them. The Centre is funded by the Northern Ireland Office, and is managed by an inter-agency board, but does not itself have a budget for funding initiatives. We were impressed by the work of the Centre and its growing track record and knowledge base, but we were also concerned that it was being asked to do a difficult job in the absence of a clearly defined and articulated community safety strategy, a point which was drawn out in a review of the Centre which is published as a research report along with this report.[5]

11.8 At present there are several mechanisms for funding community safety initiatives. Those who wish to develop a community safety project in their area can look to a variety of sources of funding, including the European Special Fund for Peace and Reconciliation or charitable sources. They must also contend - as do many other projects in the social and economic spheres - with the short-term nature of funding arrangements and the uncertainty, which such funding engenders. Short-term funding makes it difficult to mount long-term community safety initiatives, such as those aimed at preventing criminality, and to retain skilled and experienced staff.

11.9 A number of local councils have set up community safety partnerships and projects, several of which are funded from the European Special Fund for Peace and Reconciliation. In some cases these are being taken forward, under contract, by voluntary organisations. In others the projects are being delivered directly by council staff. None of the projects are at an advanced stage. CCTV schemes are being introduced in many towns across Northern Ireland funded by the Police Authority.

---

4   See Feenan, Research Report 13, section 2, for a fuller description of community safety partnership activity.

5   Crawford and Blair, Research Report 7.

11.10   The Crime Prevention Panel, led initially by the RUC, was established in 1977. The Panel comprises representatives of government departments, voluntary organisations, the Community Safety Centre, the RUC, the business sector and employers' organisations. A representative of an organisation other than the RUC chairs the panel. Its aim is to identify concerns about crime and, where possible, to co-ordinate partnership approaches to reducing crime and the fear of crime. At present the Panel's work is focused on property crime.

11.11   Despite the existence of a range of activities that are community safety related, the concept is still in its infancy in Northern Ireland. This is partly because of the understandable focus on terrorist crime by the Government, local politicians and the public over the past 30 years, and partly because of the relatively lower rate of "ordinary" crime, which Northern Ireland has experienced both before and during that period. If, as we all hope, peace is sustained in Northern Ireland, the focus will shift and "ordinary" crime will assume the importance in local political debate that it has in many other countries. We are also conscious of concerns that ordinary crime may be increasing. That is why we believe it is important to consider the structures for delivering community safety policy and initiatives, the funding mechanisms, and the arrangements for ensuring that those involved in delivering community safety services are held properly accountable to political structures and the public. These are, therefore, the issues on which we concentrate in this chapter. We commissioned a number of research projects to inform our consideration of these issues. We also examined the arrangements in other jurisdictions at first hand, in the course of our study visits. Most importantly of all, we listened to what people had to say to us in the course of our consultation process.

Research and International Comparisons

11.12   We recognise the dangers of comparing arrangements in different jurisdictions, and acknowledge that what works in one country may not work in another country with a very different institutional, social and economic context. There are no universal approaches to preventing crime. We believed, however, that we should consider the lessons learned elsewhere, both good and bad, in considering what, if any, changes we should recommend for the delivery of community safety in Northern Ireland.

11.13   We commissioned a literature review of community safety structures in a number of other jurisdictions as part of our research programme. The review is published along with this report.[6] Much of the material used in this chapter, particularly in the descriptive sections, draws directly upon that review, which considered the recent experience of community safety in France, the Netherlands, Canada, New Zealand, Scotland, the Republic of Ireland, and

---

6   Crawford and Matassa, Research Report 8.

England and Wales. It looked in particular at the structure of central and local institutions for community safety. It also considered different models of inter-organisational relationships within and between central and local arrangements, and set out a number of the key issues to be considered in the context of Northern Ireland. Another research report also considered community safety partnership models in Scotland and the Republic of Ireland.[7]

11.14   As part of our research into community safety issues we also commissioned a literature review of research on crime reduction and reducing criminality. The review, which is published along with this report, drew together a summary of the research literature.[8] The review reinforced the point that many governments were beginning to require proof of effectiveness from those programmes that claimed to reduce crime or criminality. A number of tentative lessons emerged from the review, the most important of which is that it is important to build in rigorous monitoring and evaluation of all new initiatives at the design stage, and to fund the evaluation of the initiatives properly to ensure that the evaluation is both rigorous and relevant. Only by doing so can a government determine the worth of a new initiative and whether it should be extended, subjected to further evaluation, or discontinued.

11.15   In addition we had the opportunity to study the arrangements for community safety at first hand in some of the jurisdictions considered by the literature review, most notably England and Wales, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Scotland, and the Republic of Ireland.

FRANCE

11.16   The French approach to crime prevention flowed from the Bonnemaison Committee Report (1983) that had been commissioned as a result of widespread urban disorder in the summer of 1981. It led to the creation of a three-tiered structure in 1983 involving:[9]

- a national council for the prevention of crime, which was chaired by the Prime Minister, with a total membership of over 80;

- departmental councils, which are chaired by the chief administrator for the region, with the chief judicial officer as vice-chair; and

- local crime prevention councils (CCPDs), which co-ordinate preventative action at the local level, define local aims with particular reference to victims, and monitor implementation (over 850 have been established in almost all the large and medium sized French cities).

---

7   Feenan, Research Report 13.

8   Blair, Research Report 4.

9   The administrative structure in France below national level consists of three tiers:
    • 22 regions - for which there is no crime prevention structure;
    • departments; and
    • towns or cities.
    It is these last administrative levels which have been used to co-ordinate the delivery of crime prevention.

This structure was reorganised in the late 1980s and early 1990s and the focus moved to structures concerned with urban regeneration, ensuring that concerns about social exclusion and community safety were taken account of in the policies and services of a wide range of agencies.

11.17   Contracts negotiated between central government and most local CCPDs were developed as a way of funding and integrating local initiatives. Some were focused on urban regeneration with a crime prevention element, and others were specifically directed towards crime prevention. These contracts set out commitments for a period of three years to facilitate medium and longer term planning, and have recently been based upon a local crime data analysis to identify the nature and scale of local crime problems, an assessment of the fear of crime in local populations, and an analysis of the existing responses to crime and insecurity by public authorities.

THE NETHERLANDS

11.18   The approach to crime prevention in the Netherlands was set out in the Dutch Government report *Society and Crime* in 1985. It argued that crime prevention should be the focus of action against petty crime, and that the formal criminal justice process should be used as a last resort in relation to such crime. It set out three guiding principles for preventive policies:

(i)   the strengthening of surveillance of, and control over, potential offenders, by those who are well placed to do so;

(ii)   the development of urban and environmental planning, to limit the opportunities to commit crime; and

(iii)   the reinforcement of social integration (through family, school, work and recreation).

11.19   National crime prevention policy is primarily the responsibility of a Directorate of the Ministry of Justice (the Prevention, Youth and Sanction Department) co-ordinated through an inter-ministerial committee. The Directorate has a substantial budget and is on a level with the other Directorates in the Department. It has four main responsibilities:

(i)   promoting crime prevention among municipalities and businesses;

(ii)   supporting police-based crime prevention;

(iii)   co-ordinating victim policies; and

(iv)   regulating the private security industry.

11.20   Co-operation between the government and corporate sectors has been an important feature of crime prevention. A consultative body, the National Platform on Crime Control, comprises representatives from the public and private sectors. It has a number of steering groups which

focus on particular issues, such as IT-related crime and organised crime. Wider crime prevention policy is delivered as part of the "Major Cities Policy", which was introduced in 1993 and covers four main policy areas: education; employment; health and welfare; and public safety. The policy now covers 19 major cities. It aims to strengthen the social and economic base and quality of life, and relies on a neighbourhood-based approach to social problems, delivered through a partnership between central and municipal government, criminal justice and social agencies, businesses, neighbourhood groups and individuals. The Government set aside £100 million over the period 1995-1999 and £40 million per year thereafter to combat juvenile crime, and an additional £8 million to tackle drug-related crime. Prime responsibility for designing and delivering initiatives occurs at the municipal, district and neighbourhood level, in partnership with other agencies, including police and prosecutors. Each of the municipalities has crime prevention co-ordinators and local crime prevention committees.

11.21   The Netherlands have also developed a pragmatic, evidence-based approach to developing policy and to the initiation, planning and implementation of projects. This places considerable emphasis on the role of evaluation and research, which is a requirement of any crime prevention funding. Around 10% of funding is devoted to evaluation.

NEW ZEALAND

11.22   New Zealand provides an interesting model, because of the similar size of its population (3.7 million), its mix of different communities, and because of the relationship between, and respective powers of, central and local government, which are similar in many respects to those in Northern Ireland. New Zealand's interest in crime prevention and community safety policy began in the mid-1980s. The Roper Report[10] recognised that the responsibility for crime prevention did not lie solely with the police, but with the community as a whole. The Government proceeded to develop a model based on the French system, setting up four pilot Safer Community Councils in 1990, overseen by a Prime Ministerial Safer Communities Council, and managed by the Crime Prevention Administration Unit.

11.23   In 1992 the Government created an inter-departmental working party, the Crime Prevention Action Group, to develop a coherent crime prevention strategy. It developed a strategy for crime prevention that co-ordinated policy, research and service delivery from government agencies, local government and the wider community within one strategic crime prevention framework. In 1993 the Crime Prevention Unit was established within the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet to advise the Government on crime prevention, develop a crime prevention plan based on a knowledge of "what works", and ensure co-operation between concerned groups. Seven key areas were given to the Unit by Ministers:

(i)   Supporting "at risk" families.

---

10   *Report of the Ministerial Committee of Inquiry into Violence* (1987).

      (ii)   Reducing family violence.

      (iii)   Targeting youth "at risk" of offending.

      (iv)   Minimising formal involvement of casual offenders within the criminal justice system through diversion schemes.

      (v)   Developing an approach for the management of programmes that address the misuse and abuse of both alcohol and drugs.

      (vi)   Addressing the incidence of "white collar crime".

      (vii)   Addressing the concerns of victims and potential victims.

11.24   The Unit supports the development of Safer Community Councils (SCCs), which are usually formed under the sponsorship of a local authority, or the Maori equivalent of a local authority, the *iwi*. (It is worth noting that local authorities in New Zealand have very limited powers and responsibilities, and are closer to local authorities in Northern Ireland than those in many other jurisdictions.) The SCCs are responsible for preparing a community safety profile of their area, and for developing crime prevention strategies based on that profile. Sixty-one SCCs had been formed, representing around two-thirds of local authorities. Local authorities were given a small amount of funding to support the establishment and maintenance of the SCC, and a small amount of seed-corn money to fund small-scale local crime prevention projects. SCCs engage in both situational and social crime prevention, working closely with the police and business community.

ENGLAND AND WALES

11.25   Crime prevention and community safety policy and practice in Northern Ireland has tended to follow developments in England and Wales, at least until recent years. There has been some divergence in practice more recently because of the very different institutions of government, particularly at the local level, which exist in the two jurisdictions.

11.26   In England and Wales the approach to crime prevention and community safety has been heavily influenced by two circulars and a major report. The first document, an interdepartmental circular in 1984, recognised that:

> "A primary objective of the police has always been the prevention of crime. However, since some of the factors affecting crime lie outside the control or direct influence of the police, crime prevention cannot be left to them alone. Every individual citizen and all those agencies whose policies and practices can influence the extent of crime should make their contribution. Preventing crime is a task for the whole community."

11.27   The 1980s and early 1990s saw the development of a number of central government initiatives to promote crime prevention, most notably the Safer Cities Programme launched in 1988. The second document, a follow-up circular in 1990,[11] reinforced the concept of a partnership approach to combating crime, and was accompanied by a good practice booklet which provided advice on what constituted good practice in designing and implementing crime prevention policy.

11.28   The Morgan Report[12] in 1991 provided the philosophy and structure which underpin community safety policy in England and Wales today. The report elaborated on the term "community safety" and advocated specific institutional structures and arrangements, including a three-tiered structure of responsibility. It also recommended additional funding from central government to support the proposed new duty on local authorities. Its principal recommendations included:

- giving local authorities statutory authority, working with the police, to develop and stimulate community safety and crime prevention;

- appointing a co-ordinator with administrative support to the local authority structure;

- the nomination by chief constables for each local authority area of the "most senior local operational police officer" in order to promote coterminous boundaries;

- paying particular attention to young people and crime in local partnerships;

- making best use of the voluntary sector;

- involving business as a partner instead of regarding it solely as a source of funds;

- consideration by the Government of how a strong focus at the centre could be provided;

- the need for a clear statement of crime prevention training needs and an action plan to address those needs; and

- the provision by central government of a community safety impact statement for all new legislation and policy initiatives.

11.29   The Morgan Report's principal recommendations were taken forward, albeit with some important changes, by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. The Act:

- places a new statutory duty on local authorities and the police, requiring them *together* to co-ordinate and promote local community safety partnerships (the guidance on which requires the police and local authority to produce a joint crime audit, consult and involve a wide range of other agencies, including the voluntary and community sectors, and produce and publish a "community safety strategy");

---

11   *Crime Prevention - The Success of the Partnership Approach,* 11/90.

12   Morgan, *Safer Communities: The Local Delivery of Crime Prevention Through the Partnership Approach, Standing Conference on Crime Prevention* (1991), London: Home Office.

- requires local authorities, in exercising their various functions, to consider the crime and disorder implications and the need to do all that they can do to prevent crime and disorder in their area;

- requires local authorities to establish one or more multi-disciplinary "youth offending teams" to bring together " the experience and skills of relevant local agencies to address the causes of a young person's offending and so reduce the risk of re-offending", and to encourage children and young persons not to commit offences; and

- creates a number of new orders, including the anti-social behaviour order, the curfew order, the child safety order, and the parenting order.

11.30   In addition, as a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review, a "Crime Reduction Programme" was announced by the Government in July 1998, together with the publication of a research review of national and international evidence of "what works" to reduce crime.[13] Under the programme £250 million is to be invested in crime reduction over a three-year period from April 1999, overseen by an inter-departmental committee, and with up to 10% of the budget devoted to the evaluation of initiatives.

11.31   Both the Crime Reduction Programme and the new arrangements under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 are in their infancy, and it is too early as yet to make a judgement as to their effect. The arrangements for implementing the latter are still being developed, and there is evidence of local authorities adopting a variety of structures to meet the requirements of the Act. No new resources have been made available to enable local authorities or the police to fulfil their new responsibilities under the Act.

SCOTLAND

11.32   The police in Scotland have played, and continue to play, a central role in crime prevention. Recent government initiatives have, as in other countries, sought to develop an awareness that crime cannot be tackled by the police alone, and that responsibility for tackling crime needs to be shared amongst the statutory, voluntary and community sectors.

---

13   Goldblatt and Lewis, *Reducing Offending: An Assessment of Research Evidence on Ways of Dealing with Offending Behaviour* (1998), Home Office Research Study 187, London: Home Office

11.33   In 1992 the Scottish Office launched a new strategy document[14] which led to the creation of the Scottish Crime Prevention Council to carry the strategy forward. Following a review of the Council in March 1999, Ministers agreed to wind up the Council and replace it with a less formal body with an extended membership to reflect the growing prominence of community safety and community planning. A new body, the Scottish Community Safety Forum, will shortly be formed. Its remit will be to advise the First Minister of the Scottish Executive on crime prevention and community safety policy; create wider partnerships in community safety and crime prevention; stimulate innovative approaches to crime reduction and community safety. It will also promote the joint Scottish Executive, Association of Chief Police Officers in Scotland (ACPOS) and the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (CoSLA) Strategy, which is designed to improve community safety in Scotland through partnership between public, private and voluntary bodies.

11.34   The Community Safety Strategy *Safer Communities Through Partnership*[15] promotes the idea that local authorities and the police should lead local partnerships involving public, private and voluntary bodies to tackle community safety issues at local level. Out of 32 local authorities in Scotland, 29 have community safety partnerships. Guidance in the form of *Safer Communities in Scotland*[16] has been issued to the police, local authorities and other community safety partners and will be enhanced with training for community safety practitioners. The Scottish Executive Crime Prevention Unit and CoSLA will review the partnerships' action planning process to ensure initiatives are being monitored and evaluated to improve the delivery of "safer communities". The Scottish Executive Crime Prevention Unit has a budget of £3m to fund community safety projects. Half will go to projects identified by partnerships as addressing wider community safety issues and the other half will fund CCTV projects.

THE REPUBLIC OF IRELAND

11.35   Crime prevention policy in Ireland is developed by the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform in conjunction with the Garda Síochána. Crime prevention was, and still is, one of the core functions of the Garda. Since 1992 and the publication of the report *Urban Crime and Disorder,*[17] there has been a growing consensus, in line with international trends, that crime prevention is delivered most effectively through inter-agency co-ordination at a local level. This, together with the Strategic Management Initiative (SMI),[18] led to a shift in

---

14   *Preventing Crime Together in Scotland: A Strategy for the 90s* (1992), The Scottish Office, Edinburgh: HMSO.

15   *Safer Communities Through Partnerships: A strategy for Action,* (1999), The Scottish Office, Edinburgh: HMSO.

16   *Safer Communities in Scotland,* (1999), Scottish Executive, Edinburgh.

17   Report of the Interdepartmental Working Group (1992) *Urban Crime and Disorder,* Dublin: Stationery Office.

18   The SMI was launched in 1994 with the purpose of improving the service of government departments to the public. The first stage of the initiative was a requirement that departments produce a strategy statement.

government policy. The Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform published its developing crime prevention policy as part of its strategy document *Community Security – Challenge and Change*.[19] The report emphasised the need for the Department to adapt its management structures in line with international views on how to plan and implement policy on crime.

11.36   The discussion paper *Tackling Crime* followed in 1997.[20] This highlighted the need "to secure community involvement and support for anti-crime measures, so that effective partnerships are forged between the general public and the relevant statutory and voluntary agencies in the fight against crime." The debate stimulated by the 1997 discussion paper led to the formation of the National Crime Forum, which reported in 1998.[21] The report recommended a more coherent and co-ordinated strategy at central government level aimed at reducing poverty and social exclusion. It recommended the creation of a National Crime Council (which was established in July 1999 and which comprises 16 representatives from the judiciary, the Garda Síochána, the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform, and a range of statutory, voluntary and community organisations and individuals with an interest in crime and the effects of crime). At local level, the report commended the use of partnership models, citing the 13 local drugs task forces as good examples, and recommended the creation of local crime councils, organised at local government level, to complement the National Council. Both tiers would involve representatives of the relevant statutory agencies, together with a range of voluntary and community groups.

SOUTH AFRICA

11.37   Although not covered by the literature review, we had the opportunity to hear of the arrangements for crime prevention in South Africa in the course of our study visit. The concept of crime prevention was relatively new, but had become an issue of central importance to the government as a direct result of escalating crime levels post-apartheid, and a crisis of confidence in the effectiveness of the formal criminal justice process and the agencies of the criminal justice system. Crime was seen as the single most important issue facing the Government. It was seen to constrain development, undermine the process of reconciliation and undermine public confidence in the Government. It also threatened the building of a human rights culture and compromised the process of transformation to democracy. As a result the Government had initiated the development of a National Crime Prevention Strategy in 1995, driven by an inter-departmental committee consisting of the Ministers for Safety and Security, Justice, Correctional Services and Defence.

---

19   *Community Security - Challenge and Change* (1996), Department of Justice, Dublin: Stationery Office.

20   *Tackling Crime - Discussion Paper* (1997), Department of Justice Dublin: Stationery Office.

21   *Report of the National Crime Forum* (1998), Institute of Public Administration, Dublin: IPA.

11.38   The strategy consisted of four elements, which set the framework for the development of crime prevention programmes at all levels of government (national, regional and local). The four elements were:

(i)   reform of the criminal justice system, to reduce delay and improve efficiency and effectiveness;

(ii)   environmental design of communities to make it harder for criminals to operate, and to strengthen social networks and cohesiveness;

(iii) changing public values and attitudes to crime, by educating the public as to the costs of crime and the role they can play in preventing crime; and

(iv)   measures to combat transnational crime.

11.39   We were briefed on the scale and nature of reforms to the criminal justice system, and on the way in which the three tiers of government were bound into the process. Of particular interest was the development of "Community Safety Forums", which had originated in 1994 as a means of building relations between the new South African Police Service and the community and developing the legitimacy of that service. These were in the process of being transformed into local authority-led institutions, and their remit was being broadened to include community safety and crime prevention at the local level.

Views Expressed during the Consultation Process

11.40   Crime prevention and community safety issues generated a good deal of comment during the consultation process, both in the formal written and oral submissions to the Review, and in the consultative seminars. There was a good deal of agreement across all shades of the political and social spectrum as to how effort on crime prevention and community safety might best be co-ordinated and delivered, and what arrangements were necessary to ensure that the most effective use was made of available funds in reducing crime.

11.41   It was widely recognised that it was not for the police or the formal criminal justice process alone to deal with crime and criminality, and that many of the underlying causes of crime could only be addressed by well co-ordinated social, economic and criminal justice policies. No one dissented from this view. A small minority believed, however, that it was the function of government to deliver community safety, through the co-ordination of policies at the macro level, and that the Government should not seek to foist its responsibilities upon the community. The majority view was that the statutory, voluntary and community sectors, and individuals all had a role in developing and delivering community safety. One viewpoint put forward strongly at a seminar in Omagh was that "the widest involvement possible of the community is desirable in developing policy and services in this area". This was echoed in

Belfast, where the comment was made that "deprivation cannot be tackled by throwing money around. There needs to be empowerment of communities to help them help themselves." However, money, or more explicitly the lack of long-term funding, was identified as a particular problem: communities did not have the resources to devote to community safety activity, and if the Government was serious about empowering communities then it needed to provide the necessary resources. Some also suggested that the balance of government spending was wrong, and that resources should be shifted away from the prosecution and punishment of offences to the prevention of crime.

11.42 Others were mindful of the pervasive paramilitary presence in some communities, and the danger of paramilitary elements being involved in delivering community safety initiatives. They did not dissent from the view that community involvement was important, particularly in respect of dealing with minor crimes, but they counselled that those representing communities in such activity must be truly representative, to avoid influence from paramilitary or organised crime creeping in. One group envisaged "...community co-operation by way of existing state agencies or recognised private sector bodies e.g. Chambers of Commerce, local churches, local government or police liaison committees, etc, in order to protect against possible abuse". Another group noted that there might be limitations to community involvement where issues of specific sensitivity were being dealt with, such as the issue of how sex offenders are dealt with in the community on release from prison.

11.43 The concept of a partnership approach to dealing with community safety and crime prevention received considerable support. Many respondents favoured an inclusive approach in which partnerships were developed amongst the statutory, voluntary and community sectors to address local problems identified in local areas. Some recommended that the structures and institutions which develop and implement a community safety strategy should themselves embody the principles of partnership, in that all sectors of society should be involved in the development of policy at the strategic and local level, as well as in the delivery of services and programmes in the community.

11.44 As to who should be involved in such partnerships, a number of those who commented suggested that, within the statutory sector, the police, probation, education and housing authorities, health and social services, and local councils all had a role to play. There was a wide range of potential partners suggested in the voluntary sector, including Extern, the Northern Ireland Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders, Victim Support, Women's Aid, Mediation Network and the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, to name but a few. There was also a wide range of community organisations and individuals that could contribute, depending on the nature of the local problems to be addressed. These might include the churches, young people's organisations, local politicians, women's groups, and parent-youth support groups.

11.45 A minority of those who commented recognised that there would be difficulties in involving statutory sector partners, and in particular the police, in some areas where they were

mistrusted by the community. This view was expressed by a number of groups and individuals, from both the Nationalist and Loyalist traditions. However, they all acknowledged that under a new political dispensation, when the agencies of the state were under the control of and accountable to local political structures, and in a situation where the police service had been reformed, the difficulties of involving such partners would lessen considerably.

11.46   Most individuals and organisations agreed that effective co-operation and information sharing between statutory agencies was vital, and that mechanisms were necessary within central government to ensure that departments and agencies worked co-operatively to achieve agreed objectives. This was of particular importance in the area of community safety, where the causes of crime and criminality were seen as a complex mix of social and economic deprivation and the breakdown of local communities, demanding complex, multi-faceted, well co-ordinated responses. As a precursor to this, however, it was argued that central government should develop and articulate a clear and overarching strategy for community safety, which set out the roles and responsibilities of the agencies and groups involved. One group suggested that the Community Safety Centre should establish a strategic overview and planning system for the field of crime prevention. Others suggested that responsibility for community safety issues should be brought together under a single governing body, department, or Minister, to ensure co-ordination of policy development and service delivery. One group suggested that there should be a department devoted to youth justice with responsibility for crime prevention. Another counselled against a "corrective or punitive" agency leading the development of community safety strategy. Many also commented that it was difficult for some statutory agencies to participate without a statutory duty to prevent crime in their remit.

11.47   At local level, many pointed out that there was no single body or structure which took responsibility for community safety. However, there was no consensus on what, if any, body should be responsible for leading or facilitating community safety efforts at the local level. Indeed many argued that that it would be counterproductive to have one (or even two) lead bodies for community safety as in England and Wales, because different local areas had different problems, which would require different bodies to come together to create solutions. Some argued, however, that local authorities should take the lead in encouraging the development of community safety initiatives in their areas, since councillors were elected representatives of the community they served. Others suggested that the social partnership model, which had been used successfully to bring together political, business and community interests in disbursing European funding, should be used in each council area. Some suggested that community police liaison committees would serve as a useful forum for discussing community safety issues. Yet others suggested that no fixed model should be adopted, and that arrangements should develop organically and in response to local needs, and that no one agency or organisation should have a predetermined leadership role.

11.48   Many saw funding for community safety initiatives as an important issue. Some believed that funding for community safety should be ring-fenced and not siphoned off into other areas of an agency's work. Others recommended that clear funding mechanisms should be developed to facilitate those coming forward with proposals. All too often it was difficult to secure a funding package to enable projects to proceed, irrespective of the merits of the proposal, and even where funding was secured, it was short-term. Linking funding to monitoring and evaluation was recommended, but those delivering projects would need to have access to specialist advice in relation to monitoring and evaluation techniques.

11.49   A number of issues were identified as being essential targets of any community safety strategy, although it was recognised that not all would be priorities in any given area. These included:

- drug prevention work, where an effective, properly resourced anti-drugs strategy was called for;

- alcohol and substance abuse;

- domestic violence, which was regarded by many as endemic in Northern Ireland;

- youth crime and anti-social behaviour, which was seen as a growing feature of many parts of Northern Ireland;

- fostering community cohesion;

- the availability of mediation services to local communities to assist in resolving neighbourhood disputes; and

- educational work with young people, covering crime issues and civic responsibilities.

Evaluation and Recommendations

11.50   The literature reviews, our visits to other jurisdictions and the consultation process have given us much food for thought. The research report reviewing the literature on community safety initiatives in other jurisdictions in particular has set out a number of issues to be considered in developing arrangements for community safety policymaking and service delivery to suit the needs of Northern Ireland.[22] These take account of the nature of the crime and disorder problems in Northern Ireland, the social and cultural context, and the political and institutional landscape. From looking at what happens elsewhere and bearing in mind local needs, we believe that key priorities for community safety in Northern Ireland should include:

---

22   Crawford and Matassa, Research Report 8.

- a local partnership approach involving all relevant agencies and bodies in the statutory, voluntary, community and private sectors;

- local strategies based on local crime profiles and people's worries and concerns about crime;

- a Northern Ireland-wide community safety strategy to provide drive and leadership;

- allocating responsibility for community safety to a central high-profile part of government;

- empowering and encouraging statutory agencies to participate in community safety activity through the provision of statutory remits;

- community safety featuring in inter-agency and inter-departmental funding and policy initiatives, such as those concerned with urban regeneration (Making Belfast Work is an example of this working in practice);

- the funding of national and local level projects, based on good practice guidelines;

- the centrality of evaluation and research into "what works";

- the monitoring and evaluation of projects to learn lessons; and

- the creation of a database of best practice so that information can be shared.

A COMMUNITY SAFETY STRATEGY FOR NORTHERN IRELAND

11.51   We considered first what the aims of a community safety strategy should be in Northern Ireland. Our consultation process has demonstrated a strong desire for developing community safety through an inclusive partnership approach, in which communities, elected representatives, statutory agencies, and the voluntary and private sectors work together co-operatively to tackle crime. **We recommend that the aim of a community safety strategy in Northern Ireland should be to create the conditions which promote an inclusive partnership-based approach in developing community safety initiatives between relevant agencies, voluntary groups, the private sector and local communities, with a view to reducing crime, the fear of crime and enhancing community safety.** No fully articulated community safety strategy exists in Northern Ireland at present, and **we recommend the development of a Northern Ireland community safety strategy based upon extensive consultation with relevant agencies, political structures, and the voluntary, private and community sectors.**

11.52   We considered whether there were any specific issues of concern in Northern Ireland generally upon which a community safety strategy for Northern Ireland should focus. A number of such issues were raised with us in the course of the consultation process. Others

we have observed in the media and in our discussions with key players within the criminal justice system. **We recommend that in developing a community safety strategy for Northern Ireland specific consideration be given to:**

- **offences against women, particularly domestic violence;**

- **child abuse;**

- **interventions in relation to youth offending;**

- **the needs of ethnic minority communities;**

- **drug, substance and alcohol abuse;**

- **street violence, low-level neighbourhood disorder and anti-social behaviour;**

- **car crime; and**

- **reducing criminality (i.e. addressing the factors which lie behind criminal behaviour).**

This should not seek to duplicate or take over the work of partnerships already in place, such as the Domestic Violence Forum and the anti-drugs co-ordinating machinery, but should rather place them in the context of an overarching strategy.

COMMUNITY SAFETY STRUCTURES

11.53   In developing our thinking on community safety structures, we took full account of the approaches adopted in other jurisdictions such as France, New Zealand, the Netherlands and England and Wales. However we were also mindful of specific Northern Ireland considerations. For example we have a small jurisdiction, which allows for short lines of communication but militates against over complex multi-layered structures; and we did not want to make recommendations that would result in an environment overcrowded with overlapping consultative and executive bodies. Nor did we wish to interfere with crime prevention work currently undertaken by the police or the community-based approach of the Probation Service. We also took account of Northern Ireland's vibrant community sector, which was apparent to us during our consultations.

11.54   The recommendations of the Independent Commission on Policing also had to be taken into account. We welcome the Commission's recognition of the need for co-ordination between policing and other agencies and non-governmental organisations for public safety purposes. We considered whether to recommend that the proposed Policing Board might take on lead responsibility for co-ordinating community safety activity and the development of a community safety strategy. We decided against such an approach. The lessons from other jurisdictions and comments made during the consultation process militate against the police or a police focused body (or any other single agency) being in the lead on community safety

matters; partnership is the key. Moreover, we believe that in order to ensure that community safety receives proper attention throughout the system, responsibility for its promotion and co-ordination needs to be located centrally within government. However partnership with and involvement of the police and policing bodies will be of critical importance.

11.55   At the local level we considered which agencies and groups should be involved in local community safety partnerships, recognising that their precise composition should be tailored to local needs. We concluded that local partnerships might include representatives from some or all of the following groups:

- statutory agencies, such as police, probation, social services, education and health;

- voluntary agencies and groups;

- local government;

- community groups; and

- the private sector.

11.56   We considered whether the leadership of local partnership structures should be given to any particular organisation, whether leadership should be shared amongst one or more organisations, or whether one organisation should adopt a sponsorship or responsible authority role. We looked at the option of placing lead responsibility for creating and maintaining community safety partnerships in the hands of local authorities, as had been suggested by some in the consultation process. We noted, however, (as did one of the research reports[23]) that their functions related only slightly to the achievement of community safety objectives and that they had no statutory authority to spend money on community safety activities as such. On the positive side they had a local focus, which no other organisation could match, and their members were local people, directly accountable to the local electorate.

11.57   For purposes of delivering, promoting and encouraging community safety at the local level, we strongly endorse the philosophy of partnership between local service providers, the community and the police, as envisaged in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and as practised in many jurisdictions which we have looked at. In particular we want to enable the energy that exists at community level to contribute. We note that the Independent Commission on Policing came to similar conclusions and made proposals "for a different style of policing, with the police working... in partnership with the community to solve public safety problems together". The challenge is how to translate this into viable local structures, bearing in mind our concern not to see a proliferation of consultative bodies or complicated inter-agency relationships.

---

23   Feenan, Research Report 13.

11.58   Our initial thinking on how best to deliver community safety at the local level was that local authorities in Northern Ireland should be encouraged to lead community safety activity in their council area, funding local projects and using whatever partnership and consultative model they saw fit. They would be eligible to receive seed-corn funding from the centre to provide for the employment of development workers or to put towards the funding of local initiatives. This would allow local authorities the flexibility to develop approaches which they judged best met the needs of their local communities. Individual community safety initiatives might, depending on the problem being tackled, be led by statutory or voluntary agencies, or community bodies. **We recommend that there should be no presumption that any particular body should always take the lead in individual community safety projects.**

11.59   The Independent Policing Commission's proposals for District Policing Partnership Boards, and the role the Commission envisaged for such Boards in relation to community safety activity, required us to consider how what we had in mind would mesh, if at all, with their recommendations. In particular we considered whether one local body could fulfil both our community safety remit and the role envisaged by the Policing Commission in relation to policing.

11.60   We also took account of the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland's statement to the House of Commons on 19 January 2000 in respect of the Government's decisions in relation to the report of the Independent Commission on Policing in Northern Ireland, in which he said:

> "Patten proposed the creation of district policing partnership boards to provide an element of local accountability. He envisaged that they should have a primarily consultative role, with an ability to monitor police delivery against an agreed local plan, and I endorse that. He also proposed an additional community safety role, with powers to purchase services on top of normal policing. The latter activity is currently a subject being considered by the criminal justice review. Until decisions are taken on the review, which will be published shortly, I do not intend to extend their function in that way. It will be better, in any case, to concentrate on building up relationships at the local level, in what I propose to call district policing partnerships. I also intend to consider further the arrangements proposed for Belfast, where I am not satisfied that it would be right to have four separate partnerships."[24]

11.61   We believe that there are good reasons for combining the functions of community safety and policing within one local body. To do so would avoid putting too great a burden on local councils (and we were aware of the plethora of existing bodies to which local authorities are expected to contribute) and would enable a single body to consider the community safety and policing needs of local communities. Policing is an important aspect of community safety, but

---

24   Hansard, 19 January 2000, Col 846.

not the only aspect, and community safety can in turn contribute to effective policing. We wish to recommend a broader role for these bodies, which would focus on community safety. **Rather than District Policing Partnerships we recommend that:**

- **Community Safety and Policing Partnerships (CSPPs), chaired by local authority elected members, should be established.**

- **The role and remit of the CSPP should be set out in statute, supplemented by good practice guidelines.**

- **The membership of the CSPP should be as recommended by the Policing Commission for District Policing Partnership Boards, with a majority of elected members, and with independent members selected to represent business and trade union interests and to provide expertise in matters relating to community safety. We suggest that consideration be given to inviting councils to seek nominations through bodies such as Chambers of Commerce, Business in the Community, the Northern Ireland Committee of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions and the Northern Ireland Council for Voluntary Action. The District Partnership Boards, currently in place to administer European funding, provide a useful model.**

- **The CSPP should prepare a local community safety strategy based on local crime profiles, people's worries about crime locally, and the availability of local services.**

- **When carrying out this wider community safety role, the CSPP should consult widely in the community and work in partnership with community, statutory, and voluntary agencies; on the statutory side, the police should be involved along with others such as the Probation Service, the Public Prosecution Service, social services, education, health and the Northern Ireland Housing Executive.**

- **It should be open to the CSPP to invite other relevant agencies to the monthly public meetings envisaged in recommendation 36 of the Policing Commission Report.**

- **The CSPP should submit an annual report of its activities in relation to community safety to the district council or councils to which it relates, and then to the Policing Board and the central Community Safety Unit (which is referred to below) for their information.**

11.62   We endorse the spirit of paragraph 6.29 of the Independent Policing Commission's report. The functions of the CSPPs should be advisory, explanatory and consultative. But they should also be proactive in developing a local community safety strategy and in developing links with the statutory and voluntary agencies with a role to play in delivering community safety. They should foster and develop partnerships within the district, working closely with the central Community Safety Unit, to deliver the services necessary to achieve the aims of the local community safety strategy.

11.63   We envisage a central community safety body concerned with the development of a community safety strategy for Northern Ireland, with the co-ordination and promotion of the concept of community safety throughout the government, voluntary and private sectors, and with encouraging initiatives by providing financial and other resources.

11.64   **We recommend that there should be a central Community Safety Unit responsible for:**

- **developing a community safety strategy for Northern Ireland;**

- **providing a focus for the promotion and co-ordination of community safety throughout government, the voluntary and the private sectors;**

- **developing effective and innovative public consultation mechanisms in developing community safety policy, including the development of mechanisms to engage the Civic Forum;**

- **encouraging initiatives, by funding and evaluating pilot projects, at the local level, and by making crime mapping information available to local partnership bodies;**

- **setting the monitoring and funding requirements for centrally-funded projects;**

- **spreading good practice and mainstreaming successful demonstration projects;**

- **advising Ministers on community safety policy; and**

- **publishing an annual report setting out progress against strategic objectives, funding activity and the contributions of departments and agencies towards community safety objectives.**

11.65   An important role of the central unit will be to ensure that good practice guidelines are made available to those involved in community safety initiatives at the local level. **We recommend that the Community Safety Unit should develop guidance packs, covering such issues as:**

- **advice for developing local schemes;**

- **training manuals;**

- **publicity and "how to consult" guides;**

- **crime audit guides and assistance;**

- **help and guidance in relation to monitoring and evaluation; and**

- **advice on preparing bids for funding.**

11.66   In pursuing its remit we would expect the central unit to develop links with its counterparts in Scotland, England and Wales and the Republic of Ireland and with European and international crime prevention institutions to keep up to date with best practice elsewhere. While much of its focus will be on the development of partnerships to address community

safety issues that concern local communities, it should also include in its remit such matters as workplace and corporate security. As in other fields, the unit would not necessarily lead on such matters but, through links with the police and Health and Safety Executive for example, would be in a position to demonstrate that they were being fully addressed. A central community safety unit would also, if necessary, take an interest in the development of policy on the private security industry. In respect of organised crime, we would see it as contributing to the work of wider inter-agency machinery of the type we recommend at Chapter 15.

11.67 The organisation, staffing and location within government of the central unit will be of pivotal importance in developing and delivering a community safety strategy, as we noted from our research and study visits. We believe that there is much to commend the arrangements within central government in France and, in particular, New Zealand. We believe that central government should take a strong lead on community safety issues and spell out that community safety is a central priority in Northern Ireland. The creation of a properly funded and staffed central unit would do much to underline the importance that the Government attaches to community safety in the minds of the public in Northern Ireland.

11.68 Staffing will be an important issue. **We recommend that a central Community Safety Unit be staffed by a team of people who bring a range of knowledge and experience to bear, including knowledge of community safety, wider government social and economic policy, finance, research and evaluation, and training issues. There would be merit in some staff working in the team on a secondment basis, from the police and probation for example, and at least one research officer should be included. It should be headed by someone of sufficient stature to command respect and confidence within and beyond government in Northern Ireland. In addition, given the acknowledged expertise developed within the Community Safety Centre, we recommend that it and its staff be integrated into the team.**

11.69 In considering where the unit should be located within government, we were mindful that responsibility for economic and social matters would be devolved to a Northern Ireland Assembly in advance of criminal justice. One option would be to devolve responsibility for the Community Safety Unit, along with the economic and social portfolios, in recognition of the role to be played by departments and agencies outside the criminal justice system. However, on balance, given the importance of co-ordination with the criminal justice agencies and possible accountability difficulties in relation to reserved matters, **we recommend that, until such time as responsibility for criminal justice issues is devolved to the Northern Ireland Assembly, the Community Safety Unit should be located within the Northern Ireland Office.**

11.70 Once criminal justice issues are devolved the issue arises of whether the Unit should remain within a Northern Ireland department responsible for justice matters. In a number of jurisdictions community safety at the national level is a major responsibility in a high profile part of the machinery of government. We were particularly attracted to the New Zealand

model where a Crime Prevention Unit operates within the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, thus helping secure the commitment of all departments. **On devolution, we recommend that the Community Safety Unit be located within the Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister. If that proves impracticable then it should be located within a justice department; but steps should be taken through central machinery to ensure that community safety is addressed on a co-ordinated, inter-departmental basis. Committing departments and agencies to contributing to an annual report on community safety would be one way of encouraging such an approach.**

11.71   The partnership model might operate at the central government level. There would be merit in the Community Safety Unit having access to an advisory body that brings together representatives from local partnership bodies together with representatives of the relevant departments and statutory agencies. The role of the body would be to act as a sounding board in relation to the Community Safety Unit's work, as an independent source of advice and expertise to the Unit, and, together with the Unit, to develop funding criteria. **We recommend the creation of a non-statutory and advisory Community Safety Council, which should comprise representatives from local partnership bodies together with representatives of the relevant departments and statutory agencies, and should be supported by the Community Safety Unit.**

11.72   **We also recommend that relevant agencies should have a clear statutory responsibility for helping to prevent crime and reduce the fear of crime and to contribute to community safety. Relevant agencies might include the Probation Service, social services, education and health authorities, and the Public Prosecution Service.**

FUNDING OF COMMUNITY SAFETY ACTIVITY

11.73   We considered whether the Community Safety Unit should have a programme budget to resource and evaluate Northern Ireland-wide demonstration projects and particularly promising local projects, and to spread good practice through the development of a readily accessible central database of project activity. We do not think that the current position, where funding is often short-term and comes from diverse sources, is sufficiently robust to support a coherent community safety strategy. **Based on what we have seen elsewhere, we recommend that the Community Safety Unit should have a budget to fund demonstration projects, to fund projects which are of a scale or geographic extent beyond the capabilities of local partnership arrangements, for the production and dissemination of good practice guides, and to provide seed-corn funding for the administration and implementation of local partnership projects and arrangements. We further recommend that the arrangements for funding new initiatives should include a requirement that a percentage of the funds allocated be devoted to evaluation of the project.**

11.74   The detailed consultation we suggest should include consideration of the number and kinds of projects that should be resourced. We do not make a detailed recommendation as to the size of the budget, but note that £250 million has been allocated to a three year crime reduction programme in England and Wales, which would equate to £7.5 million in Northern Ireland, or a budget of around £2.5 million per annum. Any funding provided by the Unit should be in addition to, not instead of, the funds which statutory agencies already devote to community safety and crime prevention, although it is important that their expenditure is consistent with the overall strategy.

11.75   On funding, recommendation 32 of the Policing Commission - district councils to have the power to contribute an amount initially up to the equivalent of a rate of 3p in the pound towards the improved policing of the district - gave us food for thought. From the examples given by the Commission of projects which might be funded in this way (security cameras, youth club schemes) it is clear to us that community safety activity was what they had in mind. **We make the following recommendations:**

- **That district councils be given the power to contribute an amount initially up to the equivalent of a rate of 3p in the pound, for the purpose of funding community safety initiatives.**

- **The legislation containing the power to raise such funds and authorising expenditure on community safety matters should on its face, or through regulations, contain clear guidelines about the raising of such funds and the use to which they might be put. For example, expenditure should be based on a clearly established analysis of local crime as defined in the local community safety strategy.**

- **CSPPs should be encouraged to seek funds from other sources, including the private sector.**

- **CSPPs should be able to seek a limited amount of funding from the central Community Safety Unit. Such funding might be provided on a matching basis, thus providing the CSPPs with an incentive to seek alternative sources of funds, whether from district council funds, the private sector or elsewhere.**

11.76   Finally, we wish to make several general comments in relation to the funding conditions which the central Community Safety Unit and CSPPs might apply to both Northern Ireland-wide and local projects. **We recommend that the Community Safety Unit should draw up funding guidelines as a matter of priority.** Any or all of the following funding conditions might be applied:

- that there is evidence based on an analysis of local crime of problems to be addressed, in accordance with the local community safety strategy;

- that pilot projects should be rigorously evaluated (on a basis agreed by the Community Safety Unit) and that an element of funding should be set aside for evaluation;

- that all projects should include monitoring by reference to guidelines prepared by the Community Safety Unit;

- that there should be transparency, with the identity of those involved in the project, and the purpose of the project, being made public;

- that community involvement in designing and implementing the project should be an expectation; and

- that there should be clear accountability mechanisms, including financial accountability to local or national structures, and the publication of research findings, evaluation reports, monitoring reports, and annual reports.