



urban safety  
reference group



2018 | 19



# The State of Urban Safety in South Africa **REPORT**



“We will create sustainable, well-resourced implementation and coordination mechanisms that include actors from all of society”

– WHITE PAPER ON SAFETY AND SECURITY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN







2018 | 19

The State of Urban  
Safety in South Africa  
**REPORT**

## Acknowledgements

This report was made possible by the commitment and direction of the SA Cities Urban Safety Reference Group. The project is also supported through the financial contribution and guidance of the GIZ-Inclusive Violence and Crime Prevention Programme (VCP) on behalf of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Report compiled by: Siphelele Ngobese (SACN), Esther Wegner (GIZ), Terence Smith (GIZ), Geci Karuri-Sebina (SACN)

Authors: Guy Lamb (SAVI, UCT), Matthew Skade (CoC, UCT), Anine Kriegler (CoC, UCT)

Research support provided by the Safety and Violence Initiative (SAVI) and the Centre of Criminology (CoC) at the University of Cape Town (UCT)

Additional contributions from the SACN member cities

Content Editor: Write to the Point

Design: Ink Design

Unless otherwise indicated, photo credits are © South African Cities Network and GIZ-VCP South Africa

### Suggested citation:

SACN. 2019. *State of Urban Safety in South African Cities Report 2018/19*.

A report of the Urban Safety Reference Group. South African Cities Network: Johannesburg.

Available online at [www.sacities.net](http://www.sacities.net) and [www.saferspaces.org.za](http://www.saferspaces.org.za).

ISBN: 978-0-6399215-2-5



© 2019 by South African Cities Network. The State of Urban Safety in South African Cities Report is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>.

### Published by

South African Cities Network (SACN)

*Urban Safety Reference Group*

158 Civic Boulevard

Braamfontein, 2017

Johannesburg

### With the support of

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

*Inclusive Violence and Crime Prevention Programme*

333 Grosvenor Street

Hatfield, 002



This report was made possible by the commitment and direction of the SA Cities Urban Safety Reference Group; made up of the member cities of the SACN, together with National partner institutions. The project is also supported through the financial contribution and guidance of the GIZ-Inclusive Violence and Crime Prevention Programme (VCP) on behalf of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development.

# Contents

|                  |     |
|------------------|-----|
| Acknowledgements | ii  |
| Figures          | iv  |
| Tables           | v   |
| Acronyms         | vi  |
| Foreword         | vii |

## **01 Introduction** **1**

|                                        |   |
|----------------------------------------|---|
| International Developments in 2018     | 2 |
| South Africa's Urban Policy and Safety | 3 |
| Overview of the Report                 | 5 |

## **The State of Crime and Safety in SA Cities** **6**

|                               |    |
|-------------------------------|----|
| Interpreting Crime Statistics | 7  |
| National Crimes               | 10 |
| Latest City Trends            | 12 |
| Crime and Violence Indicators | 17 |
| Rapid Diagnostic              | 21 |

## **03 Learning and Sharing** **25**

|                                        |    |
|----------------------------------------|----|
| USRG Meetings                          | 26 |
| Knowledge Exchange                     | 28 |
| Knowledge Sharing                      | 32 |
| Knowledge Dissemination and Networking | 34 |

## **04 City Practices** **38**

|                                            |    |
|--------------------------------------------|----|
| Strategy Development                       | 39 |
| Knowledge Application                      | 43 |
| Partnership Policing                       | 48 |
| Peer-to-Peer Learning                      | 50 |
| Alignment with other spheres of government | 52 |

## **05 Recommendations** **55**

## **ANNEXURE A:** **Individual City Crime Profiles** **57**

|                      |    |
|----------------------|----|
| City of Johannesburg | 58 |
| City of Cape Town    | 60 |
| eThekweni            | 62 |
| Ekurhuleni           | 64 |
| City of Tshwane      | 66 |
| Nelson Mandela Bay   | 68 |
| Mangaung             | 70 |
| Buffalo City         | 72 |
| Msunduzi             | 74 |

## **ANNEXURE B:** **USRG Members** **76**

## **Annexure C:** **USRG Safety Briefs** **78**

|                                                                                                    |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Urban Safety Brief No. 1/2018:<br>By-laws as a tool for regulating urban safety                    | 79 |
| Urban Safety Brief No. 2/2018:<br>Better together: Partnership policing for effective urban safety | 84 |

## **References** **88**



## Figures

|                   |                                                                                                             |    |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>FIGURE 1:</b>  | Absolute number of murders compared to murder rates per 100 000 (2017/18).....                              | 9  |
| <b>FIGURE 2:</b>  | South Africa's murder rate per 100 000 (1994/95–2017/18) .....                                              | 11 |
| <b>FIGURE 3:</b>  | Recorded murder rates per 100 000 by city (2005/06–2017/18) .....                                           | 12 |
| <b>FIGURE 4:</b>  | Assault with the intent to inflict GBH (2005/06–2017/18) .....                                              | 13 |
| <b>FIGURE 5:</b>  | Robbery at non-residential premises per 100 000 (2005/06–2017/18) .....                                     | 13 |
| <b>FIGURE 6:</b>  | Burglary at residential premises per 100 000 (2005/06–2017/18).....                                         | 14 |
| <b>FIGURE 7:</b>  | Robbery at residential premises per 100 000 (2005/06–2017/18).....                                          | 15 |
| <b>FIGURE 8:</b>  | Vehicle and motorcycle theft per 100 000 (2005/06–2017/18).....                                             | 15 |
| <b>FIGURE 9:</b>  | Carjacking per 100 000 (2005/06–2017/18).....                                                               | 16 |
| <b>FIGURE 10:</b> | Sexual offences per 100 000 (2005/06–2017/18) .....                                                         | 16 |
| <b>FIGURE 11:</b> | Total crime detected through police action per 100 000 (2005/06–2017/18) .....                              | 17 |
| <b>FIGURE 12:</b> | The 21 indicators of crime and safety.....                                                                  | 18 |
| <b>FIGURE 13:</b> | How the JCSS contributes to the CoJ 10 point plan .....                                                     | 40 |
| <b>FIGURE 14:</b> | Installed CCTVs .....                                                                                       | 42 |
| <b>FIGURE 15:</b> | Aerial view of the End Street North Park (top);<br>Park design including community inputs (bottom) .....    | 44 |
| <b>FIGURE 16:</b> | Mapping of safety hotspots at the park (top);<br>community activation programmes in the park (bottom) ..... | 44 |
| <b>FIGURE 17:</b> | Maps drawn by the youth participating in the workshop .....                                                 | 45 |
| <b>FIGURE 18:</b> | Congella Park Aerial View .....                                                                             | 46 |
| <b>FIGURE 19:</b> | Urban Park Social Model for the Congella Park Project.....                                                  | 47 |
| <b>FIGURE 20:</b> | Pretoria West, Ward 3.....                                                                                  | 48 |
| <b>FIGURE 21:</b> | The Caleb Motshabi Project Sites.....                                                                       | 50 |

|                   |                                                                                   |    |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>FIGURE 22:</b> | Artist renditions of some activities and services earmarked for the project ..... | 51 |
| <b>FIGURE 23:</b> | Examples of Community Safety Kiosks from the Western Cape .....                   | 51 |
| <b>FIGURE 24:</b> | Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in Johannesburg .....         | 59 |
| <b>FIGURE 25:</b> | Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in Cape Town .....            | 61 |
| <b>FIGURE 26:</b> | Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in eThekweni .....            | 63 |
| <b>FIGURE 27:</b> | Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in Ekurhuleni.....            | 65 |
| <b>FIGURE 28:</b> | Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in Tshwane.....               | 67 |
| <b>FIGURE 29:</b> | Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in Nelson Mandela Bay .....   | 69 |
| <b>FIGURE 30:</b> | Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in Mangaung.....              | 71 |
| <b>FIGURE 31:</b> | Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in Buffalo City .....         | 73 |
| <b>FIGURE 32:</b> | Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in Msunduzi .....             | 75 |

## Tables

|                 |                                                                             |    |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>TABLE 1:</b> | Crimes for which official figures are released for public use by SAPS ..... | 7  |
| <b>TABLE 2:</b> | Comparison of cities across the 21 indicators .....                         | 21 |
| <b>TABLE 3:</b> | Subjective indicators of crime.....                                         | 24 |
| <b>TABLE 4:</b> | CCTV strategic summary.....                                                 | 42 |
| <b>TABLE 5:</b> | Crime statistics in Westbury.....                                           | 44 |
| <b>TABLE 6:</b> | Challenges and recommendations for tackling cable theft .....               | 49 |



# Acronyms

|              |                                                                          |                 |                                                        |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>AFUS</b>  | African Forum for Urban Safety                                           | <b>JDA</b>      | Johannesburg Development Agency                        |
| <b>AU</b>    | African Union                                                            | <b>NDP</b>      | National Development Plan                              |
| <b>CBD</b>   | Central Business District                                                | <b>NFMCCC</b>   | Non-Ferrous Metal Crime Combating Committee            |
| <b>CCTV</b>  | Closed-Circuit Television Cameras                                        | <b>NMB</b>      | Nelson Mandela Bay                                     |
| <b>COC</b>   | Centre of Criminology (UCT)                                              | <b>NMBM</b>     | Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality           |
| <b>COJ</b>   | City of Johannesburg                                                     | <b>NPC</b>      | National Planning Commission                           |
| <b>CPF</b>   | Community Policing Forum                                                 | <b>NPO</b>      | Non-Profit Organisation                                |
| <b>CPTED</b> | Crime Prevention through Environmental Design                            | <b>NUA</b>      | New Urban Agenda                                       |
| <b>CSF</b>   | Community Safety Forums                                                  | <b>NUP</b>      | National Urban Policy                                  |
| <b>CSPS</b>  | Civilian Secretariat for Police Service                                  | <b>OECD</b>     | Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| <b>CSVR</b>  | Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation                      | <b>SACN</b>     | South African Cities Network                           |
| <b>CWP</b>   | Community Work Programme                                                 | <b>SAFGO</b>    | Institute for Safety Governance and Criminology        |
| <b>DCOG</b>  | Department of Cooperative Governance                                     | <b>SALGA</b>    | South African Local Government Association             |
| <b>DHS</b>   | Department of Human Settlements                                          | <b>SAPS</b>     | South African Police Service                           |
| <b>DOCS</b>  | Department of Community Safety                                           | <b>SAVI</b>     | Safety and Violence Initiative (UCT)                   |
| <b>DSL</b>   | Department of Safety and Liaison                                         | <b>SCODA</b>    | SA Cities Open Data Almanac                            |
| <b>EFUS</b>  | European Forum for Urban Security                                        | <b>SDG</b>      | Sustainable Development Goal                           |
| <b>EPWP</b>  | Expanded Public Works Programme                                          | <b>STATS SA</b> | Statistics South Africa                                |
| <b>GBH</b>   | Grievous Bodily Harm                                                     | <b>TMPD</b>     | Tshwane Metro Police Department                        |
| <b>GDS</b>   | Growth and Development Strategy                                          | <b>UBF</b>      | Umbilo Business Forum                                  |
| <b>GIZ</b>   | Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit                  | <b>UCT</b>      | University of Cape Town                                |
| <b>HDI</b>   | Human Development Index                                                  | <b>UN</b>       | United Nations                                         |
| <b>IDP</b>   | Integrated Development Plan                                              | <b>USRG</b>     | Urban Safety Reference Group                           |
| <b>IUDF</b>  | Integrated Urban Development Framework                                   | <b>VCP</b>      | Violence and Crime Prevention                          |
| <b>JCPZ</b>  | Johannesburg City Parks and Zoo                                          | <b>VPUU</b>     | Violence Prevention through Urban Upgrading            |
| <b>JCSP</b>  | Johannesburg City Safety Programme (within the Public Safety Department) | <b>WUF</b>      | World Urban Forum                                      |
| <b>JCSS</b>  | Joburg City Safety Strategy                                              |                 |                                                        |

# Foreword

The Urban Safety Reference Group (USRG) is convened by the South African Cities Network (SACN), with the support of the GIZ-Inclusive Violence and Crime Prevention (VCP) Programme, on behalf of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. It was formed in 2014 and is a platform for structured collaborative learning, exchange and advocacy on issues of urban safety among city practitioners and national government stakeholders. As the only institutionalised forum in South Africa for enabling evidence and practice-based learning on the subject of urban safety and violence prevention, the USRG's aim is to inform urban policy, planning and management, and to support the application of integrated approaches for violence and crime prevention at municipal level. Exchange, joint learning and future application are central to USRG's activities.

This third edition of the *State of Urban Safety in South Africa Report* continues the tradition of the 2016 and 2017 reports in providing a longitudinal study of city-level crime trends in South Africa's major cities. It gives an overview of the USRG knowledge sharing and learning activities, and showcases current city practices related to urban safety. The report's overarching aim is to contribute to improved efforts to prevent and respond to crime and violence, and to create safer communities in the country's urban centres.

Despite the current tough economic climate in the country, cities remain the largest contributors to gross value added and are synonymous with economic opportunity. Home to the majority (63%) of the country's population (a figure that continues to grow), cities are where crime and violence are most concentrated. Within cities, the drivers of crime and violence are the social, economic, spatial and cultural risk factors that result from the extreme poverty and inequality in South Africa's cities. This reality, juxtaposed with a highly constrained fiscal situation and the need to stretch existing, limited resources, forms the basis of the USRG's call for more spatially-targeted and evidence-based approaches to preventing crime and violence in our cities and urban areas. The USRG understands that all sectors and all spheres of government have a role to play in addressing violence and crime, as part of a "whole-of-society" approach espoused in the White Paper on Safety and Security.

The 2017 report profiled global processes, in particular the New Urban Agenda (NUA) and Agenda 2030, which position cities as central actors in pursuing development priorities. The report drew attention to South Africa's policies that call for local authorities to play a pivotal role in development, such as Chapter 12 of the South African National Development Plan (NDP) on building safer communities and the Integrated Urban Development Framework (IUDF) that defines urban safety as a cross-cutting issue. The USRG welcomes efforts to give substance to global goals such as Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 11 ("Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable") and to embed these in the local context.

This year's report calls for the alignment of global and national development goals with the strategic priorities of cities. It makes clear that there is a need to jointly explore support mechanisms that assist municipalities to assume their central role in development and to increase their performance in building safer communities.



In the context of cities being at the centre of development efforts, it is important to note that crime and violence prevention continues to be considered by many as an unfunded mandate, with cities having to stretch their internal budgets to fund safety activities. A key advocacy objective of the USRG is to clarify the role of cities in crime prevention and safety promotion and ensure sufficient resources. In this regard, the USRG continues to explore actively and incrementally, the substance of a city's role, seeking to support the existing work of local authorities in bringing about safer cities.

This edition of the report continues to build an evidence base (aggregated to city level) that may inform policy and practice, and to strengthen the case for integrated approaches to city urban safety functions. The statistics presented in this edition highlight the fact that cities are locations where violence and criminal activities are disproportionately prevalent. While the picture is not entirely grim, given improvements made by cities in terms of various crime types, the numbers still indicate a need for a strong focus on cities and towns, and identified “crime hotspots” within them.

A notable development since the 2017 edition is that USRG's reporting on urban safety is gathering interest and a growing profile, and is being seen as a possible model to replicate or adapt for other African cities. In the last two years, the USRG was invited to present on South Africa's urban safety reporting experience at various international platforms, including the Africa Forum for Urban Safety (AFUS) Learning Exchange in November 2017 and the Africities 8 Summit in November 2018 (see Chapter 3).

In addition to presenting and analysing data for the member cities of the SACN, the report discusses developments within the safety and security policy sector, innovative city-level practices and inspirational models for possible adaptation and replication. Since this is the third edition, the report also reviews performance and responses within the USRG and within broader policy and practices.


Among the recommendations in the 2017 report was the need for the USRG to link its recommendations to its knowledge generation/application workstreams for the coming year. Despite many challenges, linking recommendations with knowledge generation has reinforced the relevance and usefulness of the USRG and its programme of work to both its members and its dissemination platforms. In this reporting cycle a review of the USRG was carried out to establish the value of the platform and its learning mechanisms. The review resulted in practical recommendations for reconfiguring and improving learning and exchange, in order to provide maximum value to member institutions, so that the USRG may continue to have a sustainable impact.

As members and partners look ahead to refine our focus and approaches, we trust that readers continue to find these reports insightful and helpful.



---

**Sithole Mbanga**  
CEO, SACN



---

**Terence Smith**  
Programme Manager, GIZ-VCP



# Introduction

In recent years, the governments of the world have ratified a set of agendas intended to drive policy and actions towards improving livelihoods for their populations. These include the 2030 Agenda with its 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), African Union Agenda 2063 (AU 2063), and the New Urban Agenda (NUA), adopted in October 2016 at the United Nations conference. The NUA sets out a common vision and standards for future urban development and is aligned with the SDGs. The centrality of cities to sustainable development has been solidified through efforts to localise these global agendas.

A precondition for developing sustainable and inclusive cities is to work continuously towards community safety and violence prevention. This is embedded in the NUA and the SDGs, particularly SDG 11 (“Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable”).

Urban safety is often considered synonymous with crime prevention strategies and policing, but it is about more than preventing crime and violence – it is “a complementary concept to crime prevention, as it starts from the observation that inadequate urban development and local governance and social and territorial exclusion patterns encourage crime and violence” (UN-Habitat, 2015: 2). This means that sustainable urban safety requires additional strategies that target an extensive range of socio-economic and political risk factors. These factors include inadequate and inequitable urban development; weak, ineffective and unjust city governance and service delivery; and the marginalisation of certain population groups.



## International Developments in 2018

The 2017 report provided an overview of the global and regional evolution of urban safety policy development. Over the past year, the focus internationally has been on aligning and streamlining the implementation processes of the NUA and SDGs. The South African government has also started to localise these goals, aligning them through a South African Localisation Framework and analysing how cities contribute to the international agenda. The localisation process is being driven by the national Department of Cooperative Governance (DCOG) and Department of Human Settlements (DHS) in collaboration with the South Africa Cities Network (SACN).

### World Urban Forum

In February 2018, the Ninth World Urban Forum (WUF9) took place in Kuala Lumpur. Under the theme of “Cities 2030, Cities for All: Implementing the New Urban Agenda”, the WUF9 looked at how to use the NUA as a tool and accelerator for achieving the SDGs. The conference brought together government representatives, experts and civil society organisations to discuss urban sustainable development and included a series of dedicated sessions and events on urban safety.

The Kuala Lumpur Declaration on Cities 2030 contains several actionable recommendations aimed at encouraging the implementation of the NUA, including the following that are specifically related to the objectives and activities of the USRG:

7. Foster a culture of creativity and innovation to be embedded in the way cities and human settlements operate.
8. Develop monitoring and data collection mechanisms, including community-generated data, to enhance availability of information and disaggregated and comparable data at city, functional urban areas, and community levels. This would promote informed and evidence-based decision making and policy formulation, assessing progress and impact at all levels.
9. Create an enabling environment and develop capacities for the scaling up of good practices, including municipal finance, sustainable private and public investments in urban development and job creation, and generating value while advancing the public good.

### High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development

In July 2018, the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development took place in New York. The Forum is the main UN platform for reviewing progress in implementing the 2030 Agenda and SDGs. The theme for 2018 was “Transformation towards sustainable and resilient societies” and includes sustainable human settlements as covered by SDG 11, which was among the SDGs discussed in depth. At the Forum, 46 governments submitted Voluntary National Review reports on their implementation of the objectives of the SDGs. South Africa intends to present its Voluntary National Review report in 2019.

Despite considerable progress in terms of incorporating the SDGs into national development plans and strategies (UN, 2018a), the UN Secretary-General reported that growing inequality, social exclusion and segregation are challenges facing most cities, and that “urban areas are increasingly epicentres of crises, insecurity and violence” (UN, 2018b: 3). He also highlighted the lack of financial and human resources, as an obstacle to local governments’ ability “to plan, manage and execute the transformative policies and actions in the Agenda” (UN, 2018b: 4).

## The Global State of National Urban Policy

In 2018, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and UN-Habitat published *The Global State of National Urban Policy*, which contributes to the monitoring and implementing of the NUA and SDGs by assessing the development and status of national urban policies (NUPs) and governance structures in 150 countries. NUPs are “central to achieving the paradigm shift needed for the implementation of the New Urban Agenda” (UN-Habitat and OECD, 2018: 61). Of the 150 countries, 76 have developed distinct NUPs, while 74 have partial NUPs. Furthermore, 92 countries are actively implementing their NUPs, and 19 governments are in a position to undertake monitoring and evaluation of their NUPs.

The report identified six “essential factors to a successful NUP” (ibid: 8): clear goals and objectives, a spatial integration perspective, suitable institutional arrangements and policy instruments, the commitment of resources and stakeholder engagement. The report notes that South Africa’s national urban policy – the Integrated Urban Development Framework (IUDF) – is significantly more detailed than that of most other African countries and is on a par with that of Rwanda and Kenya.

## South Africa’s Urban Policy and Safety

The push for localisation coincided with a growing call for national governments to recognise and prioritise urban safety, by giving adequate support to local governments to create safer, more liveable cities. As demonstrated, national urban policies are instrumental in enabling governments to coordinate and articulate global agendas and their own path to sustainable urban development.

### Integrated Urban Development Framework

In South Africa, DCOG is responsible for driving the roll-out of the country’s urban policy, the IUDF (DCOG, 2016), which was adopted by Cabinet in 2016.

The vision of the IUDF is “Liveable, safe, resource-efficient cities and towns that are socially integrated, economically inclusive and globally competitive, where residents actively participate in urban life” (ibid: 38). The nine policy levers are:

- Integrated spatial planning.
- Integrated transport and mobility.
- Integrated and sustainable human settlements.
- Integrated urban infrastructure.
- Efficient land governance and management.
- Inclusive economic development.
- Empowered active communities.
- Effective urban governance.
- Sustainable finances



Urban safety is one of three cross-cutting issues that feature across all policy levers. The IUDF recommends the following interventions in order for urban safety to be enhanced in South Africa:

- The development of integrative local safety plans.
- The improvement of the urban built environment.
- A focus on prevention initiatives.
- The incorporation of social components into prevention initiatives.
- The incorporation of community/public participation in prevention initiatives.

## White Paper on Safety and Security

In 2016, Cabinet also adopted the revised White Paper on Safety and Security, which is aligned to Chapter 12 of the National Development Plan (NDP) and has the following vision (CSPS, 2016: 6).

By 2030, South Africa will be a society in which all people:

- Live in safe environments;
- Play a role in creating and maintaining the safe environment;
- Feel and are safe from crime and violence and conditions that contribute to it;
- Have equal access and recourse to high quality services when affected by crime and violence

The White Paper on Safety and Security provides policy direction to achieve the vision of building safer communities and recognises that safety extends far beyond the purview of the police. It calls for the integration of safety, crime and violence prevention principles into “urban and rural planning and design that, promotes safety and facilitates feeling safe” (ibid: 18). Like the IUDF, the white paper promotes a whole-of-society approach as crucial for successful implementation.



## Safety in South African cities

In his inaugural State of the Nation Address in 2018, President Cyril Ramaphosa committed to building cities and towns where families are safe, productive and content. At the National Summit on Violence and Crime Prevention, the Minister of Police, Bheki Cele, framed safety as well as violence and crime prevention as contingent on the promotion of human dignity in addition to policing and effective integrated service delivery. Deputy-Minister Andries Nel, from DCOG, underscored crime as disproportionately concentrated in cities and highlighted a number of cross-correlating risk factors needing urgent attention. Among them were: mitigating the downside of urbanisation, where few currently reap the urban dividend; fractured family structures; environmental design conducive to criminality; and underdeveloped capacity within systems and institutions for deep or meaningful community participation.

## Overview of the Report

The nine cities covered in this report are economic centres that are growing twice as fast as other cities and towns, are home to about 40% of the country's population and produce over 80% of the country's gross value added (DCOG, 2016: 17). However, South Africa's large cities are also burdened with higher rates of violence and crime than other urban centres. This has direct implications for their ability to attract investment and grow, and to meet local government's developmental mandate. Contributing to the violence and crime rates is the visible and tangible spatial segregation common to South Africa's urban spaces. Furthermore, when citizens feel unsafe, their freedom of movement and their opportunities for social, economic and cultural development tend to be increasingly restricted. This in turn restricts development for both individuals and the city, as, for instance, people are often scared to walk, cycle or use public transport, which results in continued high vehicular traffic, with affluent people persisting in using individual modes of motorised transport. This results in unsustainable, ineffective public transport systems. Such a dynamic prohibits the development of socially inclusive, resilient and climate-friendly cities, which not only affects health issues and economic development, but also continues to divide city populations and perpetuate marginalisation. These are the challenges that cities need to address.

Although cities are increasingly seen as central actors, budget allocations remain misaligned and limited. Nevertheless, national government has recognised that urban safety comprises multiple dimensions, which is a welcome development. The 2017 report highlighted that this issue needs to be on the radar of those who craft policy and allocate budgets.

As in previous reports, the 2018 report shows that urban and metropolitan regions continue to be disproportionately affected by crime and violence. With the exception of the three Gauteng metros, murder rates remain significantly above the national average, but, in a welcome change, crimes such as assault with intent to cause grievous bodily harm (GBH) and residential burglaries have declined. Nevertheless, in spite of these declines, average rates of all types of crime remain high compared to national rates.

After providing an update on the state of crime in the nine cities (Chapter 2), the report shares the USRG's activities over the past year, including learning and knowledge sharing events (Chapter 3). Chapter 4 showcases some of the city practices with the aim of encouraging urban safety practitioners to create their own multi-disciplinary and multi-stakeholder partnerships to address safety and violence prevention. Chapter 5 proposes practical recommendations aligned to all areas in the USRG's programme of work.





## The State of Crime and Safety in SA Cities

After considering the national state of certain crime categories, this chapter presents and analyses the state of crime and violence in nine of South Africa's major cities: Johannesburg, Cape Town, eThekweni, Ekurhuleni, Tshwane, Nelson Mandela Bay, Mangaung, Buffalo City and Msunduzi. Taken from national crime statistics released by the South African Police Service (SAPS), the data is then aggregated to city level to give a more accurate representation of how crime is distributed, and the types of interventions needed. With data spanning 13 years – from 2005/06 to 2017/18 – it provides a longitudinal picture of selected types of crime within nine of South Africa's largest cities.





## Interpreting Crime Statistics

SAPS collects and regularly disseminates statistics on crimes recorded at the 1153 police stations within the borders of South Africa. The crimes include those reported by victims, witnesses or third parties, as well as those detected by the police. The administrative data collection process begins with an incident of possible or alleged criminality being assessed for its unlawfulness and proper classification. The incident is then recorded in a case docket, which is entered into the SAPS' Crime Administration System/ Investigation Case Docket Management System. Crime types are grouped into various broader categories, listed in Table 1. These are the types and categories of crimes for which official figures are currently released for public use. It is not an exhaustive list of all crimes recorded by the police.

**TABLE 1:** Crimes for which official figures are released for public use by SAPS

|                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <br><b>COMMUNITY-REPORTED<br/>SERIOUS CRIMES</b>                     | <b>CONTACT CRIMES</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|                                                                                                                                                       |  Murder, attempted murder, assault with intent to inflict GBH, common assault, sexual offences<br>(rape, sexual assault, attempted sexual offences, contact sexual offences) |  Common robbery, robbery with aggravating circumstances<br>(including truck hijacking, bank robbery, cash-in-transit robbery, SAPS-designated priority crimes of carjacking, robbery at residential and at non-residential premises) |
|                                                                                                                                                       |  Contact-related crimes<br>(arson, malicious damage to property)                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|                                                                                                                                                       | <b>PROPERTY-RELATED CRIMES</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|                                                                                                                                                       |  Burglary at residential and non-residential premises                                                                                                                      |  Theft of motor vehicles and motorcycles                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|                                                                                                                                                       |  Stock theft                                                                                                                                                               |  Theft out of motor vehicles                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|                                                                                                                                                       | <b>OTHER SERIOUS CRIMES</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|                                                                                                                                                       |  All theft not mentioned elsewhere                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|                                                                                                                                                       |  Commercial crime                                                                                                                                                          |  Shoplifting                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <br><b>CRIMES DEPENDENT<br/>ON POLICE ACTION<br/>FOR DETECTION</b> |  Illegal possession of firearms and ammunition                                                                                                                             |  Drug-related crimes                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|                                                                                                                                                       |  Driving under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs                                                                                                                       |  Sexual offences detected as a result of police action                                                                                                                                                                             |



It is important to note that official police figures are not a perfect or objective measure of all crimes occurring in a given space and time. They emanate from a process that is designed to assist law enforcement to execute and evaluate its duties, not to undertake statistical research on crime prevalence. Therefore, official crime statistics should always be qualified as “recorded crime statistics”, or “crime statistics as known and acknowledged by the police”.



Furthermore, the behaviours of victims, witnesses, third parties and officers are all shaped by various factors, including:

- Their understanding of which incidents are appropriate matters for official attention, versus more appropriate for interpersonal, family or community resolution.
- Their interpretation of the various parties’ legal rights and responsibilities.
- Their perceived motivations to initiate an official legal process following what may already have been a traumatic incident.
- Their practical capacity to access police services and produce an accurate written record of the event.

For example, relatively wealthy and educated individuals and communities are likely to successfully report and follow the legal process that would see their crime incidents reflected in official police statistics. This is because they have an expectation of personal safety, insurance policies on their goods, and a relationship of accountability with the police. For those without such characteristics, crime incidents are far less likely to make it to official attention.

The impact of these factors can vary considerably by crime type. For example, surveys suggest that about 80% of motor vehicle thefts in South Africa are reported to the police, which is related to the fact that vehicles are covered by insurance. In contrast, only about 51% of residential burglaries are reported to the police because many victims are convinced that police would not or could not do anything to help them (Stats SA, 2018: 24, 51). Such differences can produce a highly distorted impression of crime prevalence. Therefore, crime statistics should always be interpreted in the context of independent survey data on crime experiences and reporting, chiefly that provided by Statistics SA (Stats SA) in its annual national Victims of Crime Survey.

An additional difficulty in interpreting crime statistics is that, as mentioned earlier, crime is not evenly distributed within any country, city, neighbourhood or even household. Therefore, it is important to analyse the levels and drivers of crime at the smallest geographical scale possible, which is very difficult to do in South Africa. As discussed at length in previous reports, despite hosting a disproportionate share of many major crime types, South African cities do not have access to the crime statistics that would allow them to properly quantify and respond to their unique crime situations. SAPS does not provide city-specific crime data and generating the necessary city-level crime statistics requires certain technical work, as described in the following section.



## Methodology

The same methodology as in previous reports was used for compiling the crime statistics. It consists of four steps:





Figure 2 illustrates the importance of taking into account the population when comparing crime rates. For example, in 2017/18, Mangaung recorded 310 murders, whereas the City of Tshwane recorded 568 murders. This might lead to the conclusion that residents in Tshwane face a higher risk of murder than those in Mangaung. However, as Tshwane's population is about four times greater than that of Mangaung, the average resident of Mangaung is more than twice as likely to be murdered than the average resident of Tshwane.

**FIGURE 1:** Absolute number of murders compared to murder rates per 100 000 (2017/18)





## Non-violent property crimes



burglary at residential premises **↓9%**



burglary at non-residential premises **↓7%**



theft of motor vehicle and motorcycle **↓6%**



theft out of/from motor vehicle **↓8%**



## Violent property crimes

Since 2011/12 violent property crimes have increased:



robbery with aggravating circumstances **↑25%**



robbery at residential premises **↑21%**



robbery at non-residential premises **↑15%**



carjacking (but has not reclaimed the heights of the late 1990s) **↑58%**

## National Crimes

### Property crimes

Despite a decrease in certain violent property crimes between 2016/17 and 2017/18, (residential robbery ↓1%, non-residential robbery ↓4%, and carjacking ↓3%), the long-term trend shows an increase, whereas non-violent property crimes have decreased. Residential burglary and theft of motor vehicles and motorcycles are at their lowest rates in over 20 years, having declined by at least 30% since 1994.

Contributing factors or conditions that may influence or facilitate the increase in property crimes involving direct and violent contact between perpetrator(s) and victim(s) may include:

- **Changes in standards and technologies of security** (e.g. burglar bars, cameras, immobilisers) that could make it more difficult and riskier for criminals to gain access to houses, businesses and vehicles. In several other countries, this increased difficulty of theft may lead would-be perpetrators to use violent measures to gain access. However, further research is needed to establish whether this displacement effect from non-violent to violent property crimes is relevant to South Africa.
- **Failures of policing**, with crime intelligence operations that are failing to dismantle organised criminal networks and police forces being poorly equipped to catch perpetrators. There also appears to be a growing backlog of cases that are incomplete and thus cannot result in conviction. This could weaken the deterrent effect of police, as perpetrators realise that they are unlikely to be apprehended. Law enforcement oversight needs to work on and analyse these backlogs.

### Interpersonal violent crimes


Over the long term, national trends in recorded interpersonal violent crimes have shown major improvement, but patterns have been mixed over the last few years. Since 1994, the rates of murder, attempted murder, assault with intent to cause GBH, and common assault have all declined by roughly 50%. However, South Africa still has one of the highest rates of murder in the world – murder is considered a generally robust comparative measure over different legal and institutional jurisdictions. Moreover, since 2011/12 the murder rate has increased, with 2016/17–2017/18 seeing the largest per capita annual increase since 1994. This is cause for serious concern. The national murder rate has now risen to 36 per 100 000, which equates to almost 56 murders a day.



SIPHELELE NGOBESE AND  
KENEILWE MANGANYA



**FIGURE 2:** South Africa's murder rate per 100 000 (1994/95–2017/18)



Likely contributors to these patterns are socio-economic shocks, instability in police and political leadership, and an influx of firearms into high-risk areas. However, it is important to zero in on why crime levels rise in particular areas. Global and local evidence shows that crime is not evenly distributed within any country, city, neighbourhood, or even household. This is why, as pointed out in previous urban safety reports, the most effective use of crime prevention resources is when the focus is on narrowly geographically targeted areas and identified groups at high risk of becoming perpetrators. As the core objective is to solve the problems underlying the rising crime, the influencing factors need to be analysed and understood, and measures need to reach out to all parties, to build partnerships and resilience within affected communities. The hotspots research described in the 2017 report (SACN, 2017) was a first step to encourage precisely this kind of highly localised problem-solving thinking, which seeks to draw together existing city, community and private sector resources and expertise to prevent crime and target the determinants of urban insecurity.

Research findings in both South Africa and other countries has consistently shown that murder and attempted murder are usually the outcome of disagreements or conflicts between young men, usually in the context of the consumption of alcohol. The availability of firearms significantly increases the risk of fatalities in such contexts. Therefore, city authorities should prioritise the regulation of alcohol outlets (such as taverns and shebeens) and work with the owners of such establishments to implement measures that reduce the risk of such interpersonal conflict. Furthermore, cities should prioritise the policing of firearms and regularly advocate for the SAPS to make the seizure of illegal firearms a priority.

### Addressing inequality is a matter of life and violent death


Since at least the 1970s, South Africa's murder levels have not been below 30 per 100 000, which is considered very high by global standards – only a handful of countries record murder rates at this level. Comparative international research shows that a very strong predictor of a country's level of crime and violence is its level of inequality. As measured by its Gini coefficient, South Africa is one of the most unequal countries, if not the most unequal country, in the world. Addressing inequality must no longer be considered an abstract and long-term ideal. It is a matter of life and violent death.



## Latest City Trends

This section looks at the main crime types over the last 13 years and compares the cities to national and average metro trends. It is not an exhaustive account of the crime trends in the relevant cities but points to some important features and trends observed in the crime statistics.

**FIGURE 3:** Recorded murder rates per 100 000 by city (2005/06–2017/18)




Over the last 13 years, the murder rate in the three Gauteng metros (Johannesburg, Ekurhuleni and especially Tshwane) has remained below the national average. Yet despite this, the average murder rate for the nine cities has remained well above the national average, reflecting the disproportionate urban burden for this crime. Although eThekweni and Buffalo City have seen the greatest decrease in murder

rates since 2005/06 (down by 23% and 28% respectively), the two cities still remain above the national average (since 2015/16, eThekweni's rate has crept up, whereas Buffalo City's rate continues to fall). Cape Town continues to buck the trend, with a murder rate that has steadily risen since 2009/10, increasing by almost 70% between 2009/10 and 2017/18, despite plateauing over three years (2014/15–2016/17). The increase in the murder rate in Cape Town is presumably driven by gang violence, which has been exacerbated by the supply of thousands of illegal firearms to criminal gangs in Cape Town. SAPS investigations and court proceedings have implicated corrupt police officials as one source of the illegal firearms. There is also evidence to suggest that similar illegal firearm transfers into Nelson Mandela Bay have significantly contributed to the city's elevated murder rate in recent years.






**FIGURE 4:** Assault with the intent to inflict GBH (2005/06–2017/18)




Reflecting the national trend, the recorded rates of assault with intent to inflict GBH have declined steadily over the past 13 years. Nelson Mandela Bay has seen the greatest decline in assault rates (down by 56%), followed by Tshwane (–52%) and Johannesburg (–46%). Mangaung and Buffalo City have also seen a decline (by 44% and 38% respectively). Nevertheless, these two cities are the only ones with assault rates that remained well above the national rate in 2017/18.

**FIGURE 5:** Robbery at non-residential premises per 100 000 (2005/06–2017/18)



From 2010/11 until 2015/16, Msunduzi had the lowest rate for robbery of all the cities, but over the past three years, its rate has increased by 65%. In 2017/18 Msunduzi surpassed the national rate for the first time since 2008/09. eThekweni reflects a similar pattern to Msunduzi, having kept below the national rate from 2009/10 until 2016/17. In 2017/18, Buffalo City and Nelson Mandela Bay had the highest levels of robbery at non-residential premises – Nelson Mandela Bay has had persistently high levels since 2011/12, whereas Buffalo City has seen this type of crime steadily climb over the past 13 years. Between 2016/17 and 2017/18, the Gauteng metros all experienced a decrease in robbery at non-residential premises, from between 4% (Ekurhuleni) and 16% (Johannesburg), while in Mangaung incidents dropped by more than 30%. Indeed, Mangaung has seen a 55% decrease in this type of crime since 2012/13. It seems that cities generally have not shown a steady progress in tackling this crime.

**FIGURE 6:** Burglary at residential premises per 100 000 (2005/06–2017/18)




The picture for burglary at residential premises (non-violent, property crime) is very different from that of robbery at residential premises (violent, contact crime). It suggests there has been a displacement effect from non-violent to violent property crimes.

Overall, residential burglaries have been steadily declining in all cities except for Msunduzi, which saw an increase between 2013/14 and 2015/16 and Buffalo City, which had a slight increase between 2015/16 and 2016/17. Since 2012/13, residential burglary rates have dropped by about a third in Nelson Mandela Bay (33%) and Cape Town (28%), whereas residential robbery rates have increased by 60% in both cities. Since 2011/12, Johannesburg was below the national rate for residential burglary but had the highest rate for residential robberies of all nine cities until 2016/17.

In 2016/17, Nelson Mandela Bay overtook Johannesburg to become the leader in residential robberies, with a rate that increased by over 50% in three years. Since 2012/13, Cape Town has seen its rate steadily climb (with a slight dip in 2016/17) to reach third place in 2017/18. In 2005/06, four cities – Nelson Mandela Bay, Cape Town, Buffalo City and Mangaung – had rates below the national average, but only Buffalo City remained below the national average throughout the 13 years.




**FIGURE 7:** Robbery at residential premises per 100 000 (2005/06–2017/18)




The theft of vehicles and motorcycles is a crime with a strong urban bias, as illustrated by the fact that most cities have stayed above the national rate over the past 13 years. Three cities are below the national rate: Buffalo City (since 2006/07), Mangaung (since 2011/12) and Msunduzi (since 2013/14). All nine cities have seen a decline in this type of crime since 2005/06. Despite a significant decline (of 56% and 60% respectively), Tshwane and Johannesburg remain the cities with the highest rates of this crime, followed by eThekweni, Ekurhuleni and Cape Town. The majority of cities have vehicle and motorcycle theft rates that are well above the national level, suggesting that this type of crime is clearly an urban problem and more prevalent in the larger cities.

**FIGURE 8:** Vehicle and motorcycle theft per 100 000 (2005/06–2017/18)




**FIGURE 9: Carjacking per 100 000 (2005/06–2017/18)**



Over the past 13 years, three cities – Johannesburg, eThekweni and Ekurhuleni – were the top three cities for carjacking, while three cities – Cape Town, Nelson Mandela Bay and Tshwane – show a similar pattern: after some years of decline, carjackings began increasing from 2011/12, but have slightly decreased since 2016/17. This crime is less prevalent among the smaller cities, with Msunduzi, Buffalo City and Mangaung remaining below the national rate (except between 2011/12 and 2012/13 for Mangaung). It is unclear as to why there have been substantial increases in carjackings in most cities, but this may relate to the introduction of more sophisticated vehicle security measures, which has made the theft of parked vehicles more difficult (as possibly shown in the reduction in vehicle and motorcycle thefts in Figure 8), and hence vehicle theft syndicates have increasingly resorted to carjacking.


**FIGURE 10: Sexual offences per 100 000 (2005/06–2017/18)**





The reporting of sexual offences is problematic – many people do not report offences because of a lack of trust in the police, or due to concerns about negative repercussions for themselves and their families. In addition, the definition of several sexual offences has changed over time. Since 2011/12, SAPS reports sexual crimes detected as a result of police action as a separate category (see Figure 10). From about 2011/12, metro average and national rates converged. Most cities have seen a steady decline in this type of crime, with the most dramatic decrease being in Nelson Mandela Bay, which shows a decrease of 60% in reported sexual offences since 2008/09. The three Gauteng metros – Tshwane, Ekurhuleni and Johannesburg – had the lowest rates in 2017/18. Together with assault with intent to inflict GBH, it is the only type of crime where the national and metro averages are at a similar level – in the other cases, the metro average is above the national average.

**FIGURE 11:** Total crime detected through police action per 100 000 (2005/06–2017/18)




For the past 13 years, Cape Town has had the highest rate of crime detected through police actions, with the largest contributions coming from drug-related crimes. This is unsurprising given the high levels of substance abuse and the substantial illegal drug trade within the city, as well as the police’s prioritisation of arrests for drug-related crimes in Cape Town. After increasing steeply, by 130% between 2005/06 and 2012/13, there was a levelling off until 2015/16, when rates began climbing again. eThekweni has seen a steady rise (of 140% since 2006/07) in crimes detected through police actions, primarily due to increases in drug-related crimes and sexual offences. Since 2014/15, four cities have had rates below the national rate: Ekurhuleni, Tshwane, Mangaung and Buffalo City.

## Crime and Violence Indicators

In the 2017 report, the 21 indicators described in the 2016 report were used to compare the cities, with the aim of standardising the measurement and assessment of the state of safety across South African cities. This would assist city governments in identifying the key determinants and mitigating factors of crime and violence, thereby enabling them to develop appropriate crime prevention policies and strategies. The factors that contribute to crime and safety are shown in Figure 12, which takes the form of an “onion” comprising three interlinked layers: crime and violence indicators, social/structural risk factor indicators, and strategy types. After a description of the 21 indicators, a diagnostic is provided comparing the nine cities, with the aim of identifying relevant areas on which cities should focus their preventive actions.



**FIGURE 12:** The 21 indicators of crime and safety



\* The measure of strengthening the security by increasing the required effort to commit crimes to or at an object.  
[http://securipedia.eu/mediawiki/index.php/Measure:\\_Target\\_hardening](http://securipedia.eu/mediawiki/index.php/Measure:_Target_hardening)



**INDICATOR 1** The murder rate is considered a good indicator and even proxy for general levels of violence, as it is readily measured and relatively well-reported. It can be supplemented by data from mortuary reports should there be accuracy concerns. The rate is per 100 000 people in the residential population.

**INDICATOR 2** This is the rate of assault with intent to inflict GBH. Victim surveys suggest that only about half of the assaults in South Africa are ever reported to the police (Stats SA, 2015: 62) and no city-level data is available on the proportion of crimes reported, so this indicator should be interpreted with some caution. The rate is per 100 000 people in the residential population.

**INDICATOR 3** Not all robberies are reported to the police, and so this indicator should also be interpreted with care. The rate is per 100 000 people in the residential population.

**INDICATOR 4** Property-related crime includes burglaries and thefts of, for example, motor vehicles or stock. Again, reporting of this crime varies considerably, depending on whether or not the household is insured. The rate is per 100 000 people in the residential population.

**INDICATOR 5** Sexual offences are particularly poorly reflected in official police statistics. Data remains limited, although there has been some improvement, through differentiating the types of sexual offences. To make sense of the officially recorded rates of sexual offences, large-scale specialised surveys are needed (Vetten, 2014). Patterns and trends in recorded rates of sexual offences should therefore be interpreted with extreme care.

**INDICATOR 6** Comprehensive data for this indicator is not yet available at national or city level. The nature of public or collective violence is also context sensitive, and so further research is necessary at city level.

**INDICATOR 7** Police-detected crimes may include the illegal possession of firearms and ammunition, drug-related crime and driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs. Here, the indicator covers driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs per 100 000 people in the residential population. Police activity rates are related to police capacity and motivation, and (unlike the other objective indicators of crime), lower numbers signal that police are failing to get out on the streets and prioritise these crimes. Nevertheless, this indicator is not a perfect measure of police activity levels, as it does not reflect, for example, the quality of investigations and station-level performance. This indicator overlaps somewhat with Indicator 21 (access to alcohol, drugs and firearms), which also reflects the extent to which people are driving under the influence.

**INDICATOR 8** Residents' experience of crime/violence, as measured by the proportion of those sampled in the 2016 Community Survey who reported having been a victim of any crime in the past 12 months.

**INDICATOR 9** The proportion of respondents in each municipality who said that they would feel either "a bit unsafe" or "very unsafe" walking alone in their neighbourhood during the day or at night. The data is from the 2016 Community Survey.

**INDICATOR 10** Residents' perception of or satisfaction with law enforcement, as measured by the proportion of those sampled in Stats SA's National Victims of Crime Survey who answered "yes" to the question of whether they were satisfied with the police services in their area. From 2015/16, Stats SA opted to provide its Victims of Crime survey data at the district level, which was an important improvement in terms of city-level data on subjective experiences of crime and safety. This improvement can be attributed to the persistent USRG advocacy on this matter to Stats SA. However, it is not possible to determine from the data whether respondents were referring to SAPS, the Metro Police, or both.



**INDICATOR 11** This is the projected annual population growth rate based on census data contained in The SA Cities Open Data Almanac (SCODA), expressed as a percentage of the base population, and is an average for the period 2010–2015.

**INDICATOR 12** This is the average number of people per square kilometre living in the city, as recorded in the 2011 Census.

**INDICATOR 13** Social incoherence/family disruption is a composite of four variables from Census 2011: (i) the percentage of households in the municipality who had moved to their current address within the last five years; (ii) the percentage of households who rent, rather than own or are paying off, their property; (iii) the percentage of respondents who do not know whether their father is alive; and (iv) the percentage of women-headed households.

**INDICATOR 14** Poverty is measured by the city Human Development Index (HDI), which is a composite of life expectancy, literacy and gross value added per capita (data from 2013).

**INDICATOR 15** Income inequality is measured by the city's Gini coefficient (as contained in SCODA). It is reflected as a value between 0 and 1, where 0 is perfectly equal and 1 is perfectly unequal.

**INDICATOR 16** This is the city's youth unemployment rate from Census 2011.

**INDICATOR 17** Deprivation of services is measured by the average percentage of city residents without piped water inside their dwelling, a flush toilet in their house or yard, or access to electricity, from the 2016 Community Survey.

**INDICATOR 18** Informal housing is measured by the proportion of city residents who are not living in formal dwellings, from the 2016 Community Survey.

**INDICATOR 19** Infrastructure includes adequate lighting and accessible roads. However, no comparable city-level data is currently available.

**INDICATOR 20** School conditions and violence is a good indication of the level of urban violence. However, no comparable city-level data on this indicator is currently available.

**INDICATOR 21** As there is no comparable city-level data available to measure access to alcohol, drugs and firearms, a rough proxy is proposed in the form of SAPS category "police-detected crimes", i.e. drug-related crimes, driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, and illegal possession of firearms and ammunition. (Note: SAPS now also includes sexual offences detected as a result of police action in the category, but these offences are not included in the calculation of the indicator.) The Urban Safety Indicators Expert Workshop in Cape Town on 24 July 2018 has recommended that this indicator be split into its three components in future reports.



## Rapid Diagnostic

Table 2 shows the 21 indicators for the nine cities, grouped into objective, subjective and social/structural indicators. It should be noted that indicators 1 to 7 have been updated with new data from SAPS (2017/18), indicators 8 and 9 remain unchanged, indicator 10 has been populated for the first time as described above, indicators 11 to 19 have not been updated because no new data is available, and indicator 21 is as per the description above.

Colour coding is used to show how each city compares to the other cities. The colour comparisons are not an assessment of the significance of the indicator in driving crime in each city. Therefore, just because a city has a good showing compared to the other cities does not mean that the indicator is at an acceptable level. For instance, all cities have high Gini coefficients (Indicator 15: income inequality), and so the fact that a city is doing relatively well compared to the other cities for indicator 15 does not mean that the measure is at an acceptable level. Instead this diagnostic is aimed at providing some guidance on the specific challenges that each city should focus on.

### LEGEND

City is doing relatively well compared to the other cities

City is doing about average compared to the other cities

City is doing relatively poorly compared to the other cities

**TABLE 2:** Comparison of cities across the 21 indicators (2017/18)

| THE OBJECTIVE INDICATORS OF CRIME  |     |      |     |     |      |      |      |      |     |
|------------------------------------|-----|------|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|
| INDICATOR                          | JHB | CPT  | ETH | EKU | TSH  | NMB  | MAN  | BCM  | MSU |
| 1. Murder rate                     | 31  | 69   | 46  | 32  | 17   | 54   | 39   | 43   | 40  |
| 2. Assault rate                    | 295 | 268  | 235 | 243 | 207  | 295  | 402  | 507  | 242 |
| 3. Robbery rate                    | 435 | 484  | 320 | 296 | 310  | 440  | 232  | 325  | 253 |
| 4. Property-related crime rate     | 941 | 1475 | 961 | 856 | 1074 | 1036 | 1072 | 1244 | 985 |
| 5. Sexual offences rate            | 69  | 98   | 74  | 66  | 58   | 105  | 130  | 131  | 80  |
| 6. Public/collective violence rate |     |      |     |     |      |      |      |      |     |
| 7. Police activity                 | 320 | 208  | 293 | 211 | 112  | 172  | 86   | 188  | 78  |

| THE SUBJECTIVE INDICATORS OF CRIME               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| INDICATOR                                        | JHB | CPT | ETH | EKU | TSH | NMB | MAN | BCM | MSU |
| 8. Experience of crime/violence                  | 10% | 11% | 6%  | 8%  | 9%  | 8%  | 6%  | 8%  | 8%  |
| 9. Feelings of safety/fear of crime              | 24% | 28% | 23% | 22% | 19% | 26% | 21% | 27% | 23% |
| 10. Perception/satisfaction with law enforcement | 58% | 49% | 56% | 66% | 50% | 59% | 62% | 44% | 61% |



| SOCIAL/STRUCTURAL RISK FACTOR INDICATORS     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|----------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| INDICATOR                                    | JHB   | CPT   | ETH   | EKU   | TSH   | NMB   | MAN   | BCM   | MSU   |
| 11. Rapid population growth                  | 3.2%  | 2.6%  | 1.1%  | 2.5%  | 3.1%  | 1.4%  | 1.5%  | 0.7%  | 1.1%  |
| 12. Population density                       | 2696  | 1530  | 1502  | 1609  | 464   | 588   | 119   | 298   | 976   |
| 13. Social incoherence/<br>family disruption | 26%   | 22%   | 21%   | 23%   | 24%   | 19%   | 19%   | 21%   | 21%   |
| 14. Poverty                                  | 0.72  | 0.73  | 0.63  | 0.70  | 0.72  | 0.67  | 0.65  | 0.65  | 0.62  |
| 15. Income inequality                        | 0.652 | 0.613 | 0.628 | 0.651 | 0.631 | 0.625 | 0.622 | 0.642 | 0.636 |
| 16. (Youth) unemployment                     | 32%   | 32%   | 39%   | 37%   | 33%   | 47%   | 37%   | 45%   | 43%   |
| 17. Deprivation of services                  | 18%   | 12%   | 17%   | 21%   | 16%   | 9%    | 23%   | 27%   | 21%   |
| 18. Informal housing                         | 18%   | 18%   | 13%   | 19%   | 17%   | 7%    | 12%   | 25%   | 8%    |
| 19. Infrastructure                           |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 20. School conditions and violence           |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 21. Access to alcohol, drugs, firearms       | 274   | 688   | 350   | 207   | 191   | 239   | 174   | 149   | 290   |

Despite ranking first among the cities for most urbanisation factors – rapid population growth, population density and social incoherence – **JOHANNESBURG** performs relatively well for the objective indicators of crime. This may be in part because it ranks number one for police activity. Relative to the other cities, robbery is Johannesburg's key crime problem, followed by assault. Although Johannesburg has the highest Gini coefficient, the level of youth unemployment is the same as Cape Town and lower than all the other cities.

**CAPE TOWN** performs well compared to the other cities in terms of poverty, income inequality and youth unemployment, but has the highest rates of murder, robbery and property-related crimes. Therefore, understandably, Cape Town residents reported experiencing more crime/violence and feeling more unsafe compared to residents in other cities – they are also the least satisfied with law enforcement after Buffalo City. The 2017 report suggested that what might be driving the crime in Cape Town is the disproportionate access to alcohol, drugs and firearms, which is more than double that of other cities. The intention to divide this indicator into its three separate components (drug-related crime, driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, and illegal possession of firearms and ammunition) will hopefully provide a better understanding of the likely primary catalysts for the high levels of insecurity and violent crime in this city.

Compared to the other cities, **ETHEKWINI** has some of the lowest rates of violent crime, such as assault, but the murder rate is still a challenge. eThekweni is ranked second (after Msunduzi) for its HDI (indicator 14 – poverty) and second (after Cape Town) for access to alcohol, drugs and firearms. Yet city residents (with those of Mangaung) have the lowest experience of crime/violence compared to the other cities. The main safety challenges facing the city are related to human development and access to alcohol, drugs and firearms.



**EKURHULENI** is doing relatively well compared to the other cities: it has the lowest rate of property-related crime and the highest percentage (66%) of residents who are satisfied with law enforcement. The challenges lie in urbanisation factors, such as rapid population growth (which is at a similar level to Cape Town), as well as income inequality and informal housing. Among the nine cities, Ekurhuleni is ranked second (after Johannesburg) for income inequality and second (after Buffalo City) for informal housing.

**TSHWANE** has the lowest rates of murder, assault and sexual offences of all the nine cities, but has fairly high levels of property-related crime (coming third after Cape Town and Buffalo City). Compared to the other cities, residents of Tshwane feel the safest, but are not correspondingly satisfied with law enforcement – only 50% are satisfied, which is a similar level to Cape Town (49%). Tshwane's population is growing at a similar rate to that of Johannesburg, but its population density remains far lower because the municipality's land area is four times that of Johannesburg.

**NELSON MANDELA BAY** (NMB) has the second highest murder rate and robbery rate, after Cape Town – both cities have high levels of gang-related crimes. Unlike Tshwane, its residents have high levels of fear of crime (similar to levels in Cape Town and Buffalo City) but are fairly satisfied with law enforcement. The city has the highest level of youth unemployment but the lowest level of informal housing and of social incoherence.

**MANGAUNG** is ranked second for sexual offences, after Buffalo City. The city is also ranked second for police activity (after Tshwane), which may explain why residents have the lowest experience of crime/violence and are the second most satisfied with law enforcement (after Ekurhuleni). Mangaung has the third lowest HDI (same as Buffalo City) and second highest level of deprivation of services.

**BUFFALO CITY** ranks highest among the cities for assault and sexual offenses. Its residents have the lowest satisfaction with law enforcement – it is the only city apart from Cape Town to fall below 50% for this indicator. It comes second, after Cape Town, for property-related crimes. Yet its population growth is the lowest of the cities and its population density is the second lowest after Mangaung. Of the nine cities, Buffalo City has the highest percentage of informal housing and households deprived of services, and the second highest rate of youth unemployment. Its challenges are therefore related to human development.

**MSUNDUZI** has the lowest HDI of the cities and the third highest level of youth unemployment. However, its informal housing is on a par with NMB. It has the second lowest robbery rate (after Mangaung) and is ranked fourth among the cities for property-related crimes and fifth for assault. Like Buffalo City, Msunduzi's main challenges are related to development, especially poverty, youth unemployment and deprivation of services. Although Msunduzi has the lowest level of police activity, the majority (61%) of its residents are satisfied with law enforcement.

More detailed analysis of each city's position in terms of the 21 indicators is provided in Annexure A.



For the first time, data is available for indicator 10 and is from roughly the same time as the data for indicator 9. There is a fairly strong correlation between the two indicators: for the most part, cities with high levels of fear of crime (indicator 9) also have low levels of satisfaction with policing in their area (indicator 10).

**TABLE 3:** Subjective indicators of crime

| THE SUBJECTIVE INDICATORS OF CRIME               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| INDICATOR                                        | JHB | CPT | ETH | EKU | TSH | NMB | MAN | BCM | MSU |
| 8. Experience of crime/violence                  | 10% | 11% | 6%  | 8%  | 9%  | 8%  | 6%  | 8%  | 8%  |
| 9. Feelings of safety/fear of crime              | 24% | 28% | 23% | 22% | 19% | 26% | 21% | 27% | 23% |
| 10. Perception/satisfaction with law enforcement | 58% | 49% | 56% | 66% | 50% | 59% | 62% | 44% | 61% |

In all cities, the fear of crime was far greater than the experience of crime/violence, ranging from between two times higher (Tshwane) and almost four times higher (eThekweni). Yet satisfaction with law enforcement is much lower in Tshwane than in eThekweni.

Experience of crime/violence may be similar in Johannesburg and Cape Town, but satisfaction with law enforcement is nearly 10% higher in Johannesburg. Buffalo City and Ekurhuleni have similar levels of experience of violence/crime, but the level of satisfaction with law enforcement is completely different: Ekurhuleni has the highest level of satisfaction whereas Buffalo City has the lowest level of satisfaction among the cities. This may be related to the types of crime most prevalent in the cities. For example, of the nine cities, Ekurhuleni has the lowest number of property-related crime, whereas Buffalo City has the second highest number of this type of crime.





03

## Learning and Sharing

Over the years, since the USRG came into existence in 2014, member cities have built a broader understanding of urban safety. This has been achieved through peer-to-peer learning, knowledge sharing, dissemination and networking. The regular USRG meetings continue to be the core space for discussing city practices, emerging issues and common challenges, while members also get the opportunity to build their capacities at various learning and knowledge-exchange events, and to attend conferences and seminars.





## USRG Meetings

In previous years, the USRG met quarterly and, at each meeting, would undertake site visits to innovative projects within the host city. From this year, the USRG decided to hold plenary meetings biannually and to establish “working groups” that would meet in between the main meetings. This decision resulted from discussions about increasing the value and impact of the USRG platform for its members and partners. The discussions identified the need for practical knowledge application that encourages collaboration, and jointly generates and applies innovative good practices in urban safety. This knowledge application takes the form of working groups, which are smaller, decentralised committees that each identify a specific issue, share challenges, select an appropriate case study, and formulate a policy brief on the issue. Over the past year, the working groups have had varied levels of success because of resource and other challenges, and so the USRG is in the process of reviewing how best to structure the knowledge generation and application components, with the aim of ensuring more focused learning in the future.

### USRG plenary meetings

In 2017/18, the USRG held two plenary meetings: one in August 2017 and one in April 2018.

The **August 2017 meeting** was held in Johannesburg and coincided with the launch of the *2017 State of Urban Safety Report*, which formed the basis for discussions at the meeting. The meeting also reflected on the broader challenges and experiences of cities in institutionalising safety within their municipalities. A key issue that arose was the need to engage political seniors around the holistic approaches being tested by cities because officials can only make as much progress as politicians allow. Across member cities, practitioners have experienced a push-back to holistic approaches, which is linked to the difficulty of streamlining safety in the mid- and long-term strategies of cities. The meeting also discussed the need for better communication, both between departments and spheres of government, and with the media, in particular regarding how to get the media to include stories about good practices in safety and violence prevention, not just negative stories. The suggestion was made for the USRG to work on a communication/advocacy strategy. The meeting closed with a visit to the End Street North Park project, which is a collaboration between the Johannesburg City Safety Programme, Johannesburg City Parks and Zoo (JCPZ), the Johannesburg Development Agency (JDA) and other partners (see Chapter 4).



The **April 2018 meeting** took place in Mangaung and consisted of a plenary and a break-away session, so that working groups could meet and consolidate their activities. One focus of discussions was the ongoing challenges for member cities, which include protest actions that often turn violent, illegal dumping, vandalism, cable theft, land invasions and substance abuse. Another concern for member cities is knowledge management and institutional memory retention. It was proposed that this is another area in which SACN could assist, possibly by establishing a knowledge repository that sits outside of cities and would not be affected by administrative changes. During the plenary, the main themes discussed were:

- **Partnerships**, whether in community-oriented policing or the implementation of projects. Mangaung's planned adaptation of aspects of the Violence Prevention through Urban Upgrading (VPUU) model in their Caleb Motshabi community (see Chapter 4) prompted a discussion around the different types of collaboration among city departments and government spheres, community engagement and forms of participation that are required to sustain such a project.
- **Promotion of safety** across administrations. Nelson Mandela Bay reported that the awareness of safety as a cross-cutting function was growing within the city administration, despite a difficult environment. For instance, the Safety and Security Department is included in the City's Built Environment Performance Plan Committee and is able to ask questions that have not been asked before when discussing mega-priority projects. The City of Joburg shared a lesson for raising awareness, which is that Safety Units should actively comment on and be aware of all policy processes within their administrations.
- **Safety-related bylaws**. Members shared their challenges with safety-related bylaws. What emerged from the discussion was the lack of a common definition for safety-related bylaws and the different perceptions of the right and the mandate of cities to establish, implement and enforce such bylaws. Several city officials also doubted the general effectiveness of safety-related bylaws, stating that there is no visible impact.

## Working groups

Within the knowledge application stream, three groups were established. Between February and November 2018, each group met physically at least once and interacted via email. Research and policy documents relevant to their respective themes were archived in an online portal created by the Institute for Safety Governance and Criminology (SafGo) for continued use and reference. The three groups looked at:

|                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|  <p><b>Public open spaces<br/>and safety promotion</b><br/>(eThekweni, Johannesburg,<br/>Tshwane)</p> |  <p><b>Using bylaws to<br/>improve city safety</b><br/>(Mangaung, Johannesburg,<br/>Msunduzi)</p> |  <p><b>Partnership policing<br/>for city safety</b><br/>(Johannesburg, Civilian<br/>Secretariat of Police Service,<br/>Nelson Mandela Bay)</p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Policy briefs were developed for safety bylaws and partnership policing – see Annexure C.

Another topic – city safety strategies/municipal safety planning – did not materialise as a specific working group, but member cities have started a process with GIZ and the South African Local Government Association (SALGA) to explore this further (see “Capacity-building for municipal safety planning” on page 31).





## USRG review meeting

After more than four years of existence, the USRG asked an external service provider to undertake a review of the reference group by canvassing opinions from members at local and national level, as well as the convening partners SACN and GIZ-VCP Programme. The result was an internal review report that highlighted the value offered by the USRG to members, as well as the challenges, gaps and missed opportunities. A core objective of the review was to formulate practical recommendations for the future of the USRG. These are reflected in some of this report's recommendations, in particular ways in which USRG learning activities could be structured for maximum value (see Chapter 5).

A workshop was held over two days (5–6 September 2018) in Centurion, Tshwane, with the purpose of discussing the outcomes of the report and jointly establishing the USRG's future vision. The workshop was very well attended: several cities participated, sending two representatives, and the national level, the Civilian Secretariat for Police Service (CSPS), DCOG, DHS, SALGA and the National Treasury's Neighbourhood Development Partnership programme were all present. The good attendance provided an excellent basis for discussion, particularly about the value of the reference group working on a topic as complex as urban safety. Members reconfirmed their interest in the USRG and the value of this "peer-to-peer" learning and knowledge platform, for sharing not only good practices and successes but also obstacles and frustrations. Nevertheless, members felt that advocacy could be improved and that the USRG needs to become better known among relevant officials in the municipalities and among politicians in all spheres of government. It was further agreed that research on data per city needs to continue, as this research provides crucial evidence to inform action. Finally, members showed an interest in contributing to policies and strategies that relate to safety topics. Although several open questions still exist, such as whether or not to broaden membership, since some stakeholders are still missing, the overall outcomes of the workshop clearly demonstrated the commitment of members.

## Knowledge Exchange

The USRG's core objective is to contribute incrementally to a city-level knowledge base on the prevention of violence and crime, as well as safety in urban and peri-urban areas. Indeed, one of the most valuable aspects of the USRG is the peer-to-peer learning that takes place. The USRG provides a platform where members can discuss their successes and frustrations, and together improve their knowledge and practice of safety governance.



## Urban Safety Governance Executive Course



Between 20 and 24 November 2017, the USRG hosted an executive course, supported by GIZ-VCP Programme and SACN at the River Club, Cape Town. A total of 24 participants attended, and 18 speakers made presentations and acted as training facilitators. The course was designed and presented by SafGo which is a partnership between the Centre of Criminology, the Safety and Violence Initiative, and the Graduate School of Development Policy and Practice at the University of Cape Town, in collaboration with the Geneva-based Global Initiative against Transnational Organised Crime. The course was specifically designed for city and local government officials, senior managers, practitioners and civil society representatives who contribute to building safer and more resilient cities. It paid special attention to the impact of crime and violence (the huge range of tangible and intangible costs) on national and local governments (especially cities), on taxpayers, victims and their families, offenders and their families, businesses etc., especially in African cities.

Both public and non-governmental institutions in Africa are working to make their cities safer, but this work is not always underpinned by methodological analyses of relevant data and trends for the main urban areas. Crime-reduction interventions are inadequately linked to each other and to relevant national frameworks. Safety actors at city level require support to better understand the dynamics of crime and violence in cities and to develop comprehensive crime prevention strategies. Therefore, the course provided participants with both conceptual and practical insights into promoting urban safety in a more holistic and sustainable manner, aligned to national development priorities in South Africa, as set out in the White Paper on Safety and Security, the NDP and the IUDF, and formal multilateral commitments, such as the SDGs and NUA. Participants acquired key capacities needed to work on evidence-informed city safety plans and implementation strategies, as well as urban safety governance networks. Course participants were urged to connect across relevant departments to institutionalise, manage and share knowledge on urban safety governance.

### THE FIVE-DAY PROGRAMME COVERED THE FOLLOWING 5 THEMES:

#### DAY 1

**Safety Governance:**  
Concepts, Context  
and Policy

#### DAY 2

**Urban Safety:**  
Plans, Stakeholders  
and Resources

#### DAY 3

**Urban Safety in  
Practice:**  
Case Studies

#### DAY 4

**Strategies for  
Change**

#### DAY 5

**Leading Change in  
Your City**



The course was well-received by participants who found it practical and useful. In their feedback, participants suggested that the course be longer in future, to allow more time for peer-to-peer learning, reflection, discussion, interaction and processing of the information shared. Nevertheless, what the course did achieve was to give participants a glimpse of a safety governance approach that is a building block of the NDP (NPC, 2012: 356).

It is necessary to move from a narrow law-enforcement approach to crime and safety to a focus on identifying and resolving the root causes of crime. To achieve this, a wider range of state and non-state capacities will need to be mobilised at all levels, which requires shifting to an integrated approach with active citizen involvement and co-responsibility.

## Dinner conversation on urban safety

On 20 November 2017, the USRG hosted a dinner conversation on urban safety that provided an opportunity for participants to interact in a relaxed atmosphere with principals from relevant national departments and convening partner institutions, including Deputy-Minister Jeremy Cronin (Department of Public Works), Deputy-Minister Zota-Fredericks (DHS) and Mr Volker Oel (Head of Cooperation of the German Embassy in South Africa).



Mr Irvin Kinnes, former Chief Director for Policy and Research at the CSPA and currently a researcher at the UCT Centre of Criminology framed the evening with a talk entitled “Governing the Periphery”. Cape Town continues to struggle with a spatial and economic form that benefits only the few, while communities living on the periphery are socially and economically marginalised. He spoke about the importance of “governance hubs”, of which many exist in a city, and how a governance hub that is not working creates opportunities for the emergence of another non-state (i.e. gang) governance hub that exists in parallel with the state governance hub. Gang governance can move from the periphery into the mainstream of a city, especially when transnational organised crime networks connect with city gangs. This is already happening in Cape Town. In conclusion, Kinnes touched on several advocacy points of the USRG, such as the need to shift to an integrated model of safety governance that includes social interventions in addition to policing. This shift is especially important because gangs are already governing certain spaces (and indeed some communities) in the City, and police operations have no real effect on gang operations but only entrench gang solidarity and enhance gang governance.



After Kinnes' talk, the principals from national departments and partner organisations circulated from table to table, joining in the discussions. Each table discussed various urban safety topics, prompted by statements that included: safety cannot be achieved until structural poverty is addressed, organised crime is the most serious type of crime affecting the economic development prospects of cities, youth unemployment crisis lies at the heart of cities' safety challenges, and the privatisation of public space is becoming a greater threat to safety in cities.

## Capacity-building for municipal safety planning

Several USRG members had indicated their interest in working jointly on safety planning and the elaboration of city-wide safety strategies. As a parallel process was happening in the two provinces (Gauteng and Eastern Cape), it was proposed to have a closer look at potential connections and possible synergies.

The GIZ-VCP Programme is piloting a project in two provinces (Gauteng and the Eastern Cape) that aims to build more strategic and effective safety planning at local level. The project is a partnership between GIZ-VCP, the provincial departments of safety, and SALGA at national and provincial levels. A capacity-development process was designed based on a capacity assessment and a capacity-development strategy. In 2018, officials from the provincial Department of Community Safety (DOCS) and the Department of Safety and Liaison (DSL), together with officials from selected district and local municipalities were trained to support municipalities in developing their own participatory safety plans based on community safety audits, and also in the establishment of Community Safety Forums (CSFs) that would inform and coordinate the implementation of these plans. The training made use of materials recently developed by GIZ-VCP and partners, such as the Guidebook for Provincial and Municipal Officials on Participatory Safety Planning and the Facilitator's Guide on Facilitating Community Participation in Safety Planning in Municipalities.<sup>1</sup>

In August 2018, an initial assessment workshop took place in Tshwane attended by the Tshwane Metro Police Department (TMPD), the MMC for Community Safety, SALGA, DOCS, SACN, and GIZ-VCP. The aim of the meeting was to introduce the different stakeholders to one another, and to get a better idea of both existing interest and demand from the City of Tshwane for safety development programmes. In addition, the meeting explored possible support that partners from SALGA, DOCS and GIZ-VCP might provide to Tshwane – and how to align such a process with the USRG work on city safety strategies. It was agreed to have another, more technical meeting to look at existing approaches for safety planning in the city and to introduce the Guidebook for Provincial and Municipal Officials on Participatory Safety Planning.

In October 2018, a similar process took place in the Eastern Cape. A workshop in East London brought together USRG members (Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality and Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality) and officials from the Eastern Cape Department of Safety and Liaison, SALGA Eastern Cape, SACN and GIZ-VCP. The aim was to inform participants about the outcomes of ongoing work by the provincial government in partnership with SALGA and GIZ-VCP, as well as the activities and results achieved by the USRG. In addition, the meeting sought to align the work to main policies such as the White Paper on Safety and Security, the IUDF and the Provincial Safety Strategy. What emerged from a fruitful meeting was a better understanding of the various policies and their interaction in the realm of integrated safety planning, and that different stakeholders have some partly divergent roles and responsibilities.

---

<sup>1</sup> Guides available on the SaferSpaces website [www.saferpaces.org.za](http://www.saferpaces.org.za)



## Knowledge Sharing

In addition to peer-to-peer learning, USRG members have highlighted the value of knowledge sharing that takes place both online and in person.

### SaferSpaces

SaferSpaces is an online knowledge-sharing and networking portal for practitioners from government, civil society and the research community in South Africa engaged with community safety, violence and crime prevention. The portal focuses on preventative approaches that will provide long-term, sustainable solutions to violence and crime. In mid-2014, GIZ-VCP launched SaferSpaces, which was later handed over to the CSPS with support and guidance provided from a cross-sectoral advisory group. UCT provides the technical support.

SaferSpaces offers all its information freely to anyone visiting the website but specifically caters for practitioners, policy-makers and researchers in the field of violence prevention and community safety in South Africa. SaferSpaces offers them an online network where they may share their knowledge and connect with each other once they register as site members.

SaferSpaces aims to become:

- South Africa's key knowledge sharing hub, for finding and publishing knowledge resources, events, good practices and thematic information on a wide spectrum of topics related to community safety, and violence and crime prevention;
- a central online networking space where practitioners from government, civil society and academia working towards community safety and violence and crime prevention in South Africa may showcase their work, share their knowledge resources, announce events, connect with and learn from each other; and
- an effective support to the community safety and violence and crime prevention agenda of South Africa, thereby supporting safety-related processes and developments.

### Park (re)development and social activation

Inclusive, safe and accessible public open green spaces and parks are an incredibly valuable asset for cities. Such spaces can provide the urban population with a range of social and environmental benefits, and economic opportunities, increasing quality of life in specific neighbourhoods and in the overall urban area. However, planning, developing and managing public open spaces and parks is an increasingly complex task, especially in many South African cities facing substantial urbanisation. Many urban areas – in particular townships and densely populated inner-city areas – lack public open green spaces, while existing spaces are often in a state of decay, hardly used for recreation and relaxation purposes, and are perceived as unsafe.

In the inner city, neglected parks and open spaces are frequently home to informal activities, such as gambling or waste burning, or are used as illegal parking lots or just as a place to sleep. While some of these activities do not necessarily infringe the law, they do conflict with the interests of other societal groups that want to use parks for recreation, relaxation or sports.



eThekweni Municipality and the City of Johannesburg have both experimented with new approaches for integrated park re-development, with the aim of creating more inclusive, safe and attractive public open green spaces. Johannesburg focuses on community participation and joint park activation mechanisms (End Street North Park), while eThekweni emphasises social challenges in parks, especially homeless people, acknowledging them as a valuable part of society and integrating them into park maintenance (Congella Park). In 2018, following discussions at the USRG, two inter-city engagements were arranged at which officials had the opportunity to discuss experiences, good practices and ongoing challenges. The departments involved were JCPZ, Johannesburg City Safety Programme (JCSP) located in the Public Safety Department, eThekweni Parks, Leisure & Cemeteries Department and the eThekweni Safer Cities Unit.

## Johannesburg

The first workshop included a site visit to End Street North Park in Johannesburg's inner city. The workshop focused on two case studies (End Street North Park and Congella Park). After the workshop, all participants agreed on the importance of sharing more information, not just on the respective cases but beyond, including looking at existing park management structures in the city and their respective departmental structures. The idea of a joint advocacy strategy was also mentioned.

## eThekweni

The second workshop took place at Burman Bush, one of the City's nature reserves and included a site visit to Congella Park. A larger group of officials attended this workshop at which further good practices were presented, including data capturing and managing, horticultural aspects of urban parks as well as park activation for a safer public space. More similarities and common challenges were identified, and the interaction started to go beyond the initial knowledge exchange on the two specific cases, to the elaboration of action plans or roadmaps. Nevertheless, questions of participation, activation and good management for accessible, safe and inclusive parks and green spaces remained the centre of the discussion. As a structural aspect, both cities highlighted the need for more cooperation and collaboration between different departments in order for integrated approaches to be successful.

The value for participants of the two knowledge exchange events was two-fold:

- Participants learned about and from other city practices.
- Through the various group discussions, participants were able to reflect on and look at ways of improving their current practices.



## Knowledge Dissemination and Networking

The USRG participated in national and continental forums and, for the first time, in an international exchange with similar platforms from the northern hemisphere. This marked an expansion for the USRG, which has traditionally focused on South–South learning and networking.

### Trilateral International Exchange on Violence and Crime Prevention

On 12 September 2018, in the lead-up to the National Summit on Crime and Violence Prevention, the SACN, in partnership with GIZ-VCP, hosted a trilateral international exchange between the USRG and its German and Canadian equivalents. The international counterparts were represented by Dr Felix Munger from the Canadian Municipal Network on Crime Prevention and Mr Erich Marks, Director at the State of Lower Saxony Crime Prevention Council and convener of the German Forum on Urban Security. The exchange was attended by the cities of Johannesburg and Nelson Mandela Bay and proved to be fruitful, with participants sharing lessons and experiences. While the two international counterparts recognised the significantly higher rates of violence and victimisation in South Africa, nevertheless some overlaps were found, in terms of experiences and approach. Continued learning and exchange among all counterparts, through online platforms (webinars), was proposed and will be explored. All present were particularly interested in further exchanges around substance abuse and mental health. The international guests stressed the importance of understanding the “why” of what’s happening (e.g. socio-economic determinants such as poverty and inequality) when crafting responses.

### National Summit on Crime and Violence Prevention

On 13 and 14 September 2018, the CSPS and the Ministry of Police, supported by GIZ-VCP, hosted the first National Summit on Crime and Violence Prevention under the theme “Building safer communities through an integrated developmental approach to violence and crime prevention”. The summit took place just after the release of the 2017/2018 crime statistics (on 11 September 2018), which showed some alarming figures, especially the disappointing increase in murder cases, up by 6.9% from the previous year.

More than 400 delegates attended the event. These included members of Parliament, representatives of national, provincial and local government, traditional leaders, and various civil society organisations, the USRG secretariat and safety officials from the member cities Ekurhuleni, City of Tshwane, City of Johannesburg, Nelson Mandela Bay Metro and eThekweni Metropolitan Municipality. International speakers from Canada, Germany and Namibia were also present.

The national summit played an important role in starting the journey to implement and institutionalise a “whole-of-society” approach to safety and crime prevention. This approach is laid out in the 2016 White Paper on Safety and Security, which provides substance and policy direction to the vision of the building safer communities contained in the NDP (NPC, 2012). The white paper highlights the need for an integrated approach to violence prevention and cooperation and collaboration at all levels, as a key aspect of building safer communities.



In his keynote address, the Minister of Police, Bheki Cele, acknowledged that policing is but one contributing component and that social drivers and the recognition of human dignity are keys to crime and violence reduction. He stressed that the ways in which people are socialised contributes to the high level of crime in a society and urged delegates to do “less finger pointing and more working together”. He strongly advocated for the transparent use of resources, stating that “corruption kills the progress of communities” and that corruption at the municipal level is one of the main obstacles for fighting crime properly.

In his speech, Deputy-Minister Andries Nel, from DCOG, underlined the critical role of local governments in promoting safety. He linked the white paper to the global 2030 Agenda and SDG 11, Chapter 12 of the South African NDP and the subsequent IUDF, all of which champion the message of integrated approaches to community safety. Some of the main points raised included:

- Crime is disproportionately concentrated in the country’s largest cities.
- Divisions related to access to state resources have resulted in a breakdown in governance.
- South Africa suffers from fractured family structures.
- There is a need to balance top-down planning systems that have the potential to create chaos, despite the state’s good intentions.
- It is important to deepen participation, which may be costly and time-consuming, but the long-term benefits outweigh initial costs.
- There is also a strong need for more intergovernmental cooperation and collaboration.

The Minister of Social Development, Susan Shabangu, affirmed that South Africa has done well at the policy level, specifically referring to the Integrated Social Crime Prevention Strategy and linkages to the white paper. Similarly, the international speakers from Canada, Germany and Namibia, applauded the advanced status of policy development in the areas of safety, crime and violence prevention. The challenge is implementation. The summit was an effort to bring together stakeholders from different spheres to start raising awareness of the white paper and the need to work jointly on implementation. Mr Erich Marks from the Crime Prevention Council of Lower Saxony in Germany reminded participants that investing in prevention reduces government expenditure on supporting victims, investigating crimes and dealing with detained accused perpetrators etc. in the longer term. Crime prevention thus has economic advantages.

On Day 2 of the summit, participants gave inputs during break-away sessions on the core themes of the white paper, responding to questions on: what was working/not working; how gaps could be addressed; and the roles and responsibilities of national, provincial and local government. Participants considered:

- Early intervention to prevent crime and violence
- Safety through environmental design
- Victim support
- Safety plans to inform their approaches to crime prevention
- An effective criminal justice system
- Effective and integrated service delivery for safety and violence prevention

USRG members made valuable inputs during these participatory break-away sessions, giving feedback on challenges and obstacles that cities experience at the very local level. A common topic was the functionality of CSFs, which is a structure contained in the white paper, and in particular the practicality of implementing CSFs without duplicating Community Policing Forums (CPFs).



## Africa Forum on Urban Safety (AFUS)

The 2nd Annual AFUS Learning Exchange took place in eThekweni from 1–3 November 2017, bringing together political principals and practitioners from African cities, under the theme “Creating Safer Cities for All: Implementing the New Urban Agenda”.

For eThekweni, the host city, the envisaged outcomes included:

- To learn from other cities, and from regional and global organisations, and to consolidate, strengthen, review and mainstream urban safety and crime prevention into service delivery policy, strategy and practice.
- To strengthen inter-departmental coordination in support of the implementation of municipality-wide safety strategies and plans.
- To strengthen the active involvement of other spheres of government, civil and non-government organisations, academia and business in the review, implementation, and monitoring of urban safety strategies and plans.

For the wider AFUS community the conference presented an opportunity for cities and local governments:

- To collectively explore ways in which to review, strengthen and consolidate urban safety policies, strategies and plans within the context of Agenda 2030 (especially SDG 11) and the New Urban Agenda.
- To share and profile promising urban safety practices.
- To support the development of urban safety monitoring capabilities through the profiling of existing and emerging tools for data collection, storing and sharing.

The USRG’s contribution was to share its knowledge and research activities, as a collective effort of South Africa’s largest metros and as a model for integrating safety in national urban policies that other African cities could adapt and replicate. One of the presentations focused on research – data collection and analysis, and the development of indicators for measuring safety – within the context of crime in South Africa. The USRG also showcased the Crime Hotspots Research as a potential tool to support the development of more effective, targeted urban safety interventions at local level.

## European Forum for Urban Security (EFUS)<sup>2</sup>

Margo Weimers, an urban safety official from the City of Johannesburg, was invited to participate and share her experiences at the EFUS Conference that took place in Barcelona on 15–17 November 2017. GIZ-VCP supported with logistics, visa and travel costs related to her participation. The conference had a special focus on “Security, Democracy and Cities: co-producing urban security policies”, and included a panel discussion on “The Design and Management of Public Places”. The panel included representatives from local authorities, academia, practitioners and civil society from Italy, Colombia, different regions in Spain and South Africa. The discussion centred on how to take safety aspects and crime prevention into account when designing public spaces, and how to ensure ownership so that citizens themselves contribute to making the spaces inclusive and safe. Panellists shared their diverse experiences, including methods of mobilising resources, structural challenges for cooperation within local governments, the use of technology as a tool and the potential of partnerships with the private sector and research institutions.

---

2 EFUS is a network of nearly 250 local and regional authorities from 16 European countries that was founded in 1987 under the auspices of the Council of Europe. It is a European network of local and regional authorities dedicated to urban security. Its objectives include promoting a balanced vision of urban security, combining prevention, sanctions and social cohesion and helping local and regional authorities conceive, implement and evaluate their local security policies.



The outcomes of the panel discussion were:

- Safety and security are an essential aspect when designing public open spaces.
- Current practices do not take safety aspects adequately into account.
- Training needs to be offered, so that existing knowledge may be shared among all stakeholders.
- Local governments need to develop a more strategic approach on how to ensure safe, accessible and inclusive public open spaces.
- A special focus is needed in order to involve vulnerable groups in participatory processes.
- A multi-stakeholder diagnosis should be developed at local level in order to be able to work on tailor-made solutions.
- Local urban management systems with a broad stakeholder involvement should be systematised and widely shared.

The pilot project on participatory upgrading and co-management of End Street North Park in the inner-city in Johannesburg (see Chapter 4) was recognised as a good practice for safety in public open spaces involving community members.

## Africities 8

Between 20 and 24 November 2018, the United Cities and Local Governments Africa hosted the 8th Africities Summit in Marrakech, Morocco. This triennial meeting of Africa's local governments aims to address questions, share practices and identify strategies that may edge cities forward in meeting their commitments to global and regional frameworks such as the SDGs, NUA and African Union 2063 (AU 2063). The Summit was attended by ministers in charge of local government, housing, urban development and the public service; local authorities and local elected officials; officials in local and national administrations; civil society organisations, associations and trade unions; the private sector; traditional leaders; researchers, academics and international cooperation agencies.

The thematic focus of Africities 8 was “The role of local and subnational governments in the transition to sustainable cities and territories”, and the topic of urban safety featured prominently as part of exploring how local governments can contribute to the integration, peace and unity of Africa, in accordance with the AU 2063 objectives. The USRG made two inputs in sessions hosted by eThekweni Municipality. The first session unpacked the role of knowledge and reporting in meeting global and regional commitments, and in particular SDG localisation. The theme of the second session was City Safety Labs, where eThekweni convened a multi-stakeholder panel to share research and data collection activities as possible models for replication or adaptation in other African urban contexts. The USRG presented its objectives, advocacy techniques and research approaches, as an example of what South African cities are doing as a learning network for safety practitioners.





## City Practices

An important aspect of the USRG's work is the sharing of experiences, innovative practices and lessons learnt among its members. Some of the projects implemented by individual cities and in partnership with other stakeholders are highlighted in this chapter. The projects illustrate the importance of multi-disciplinary, multi-stakeholder partnerships, including local communities, of peer learning and of integrated or all-of-society approaches in addressing violence prevention measures and urban safety challenges.



## Strategy Development

One of the objectives of the USRG is to advocate for policy reform that empowers local government to contribute more effectively to safety and security issues facing communities. The development of safety strategies is an important first step for any municipality, in order to have an informed and coherent approach to crime prevention and violence reduction. Two case studies – from Johannesburg and Nelson Mandela Bay – are examples of how city practices may inform strategies and policy.

### The Joburg City Safety Strategy

Johannesburg is a unique city, a centre of innovation and a thriving hub for arts and culture. It is an economic powerhouse for both the wider region and the nation, attracting people from across South Africa and beyond who are seeking better prospects and opportunities. Johannesburg experiences high levels of urbanisation and growth, which brings with it urban safety challenges that threaten the City's vision for investment and economic growth for all.

Public safety is one of the ten strategic priorities of the city administration elected during the August 2016 local government elections. This priority provides a continuing mandate to implement the JCSS, which was described in the previous State of Urban Safety Report (2017).

Since the 2017 report, the JCSS has been revised extensively, with inputs from various City departments and safety experts, and a booklet has been developed to explain the JCSS in a user-friendly way, with the objectives of:

- enabling a common understanding of the strategy's outcomes across city departments, entities and stakeholders;
- reaching a wider audience; and
- allowing for the lobbying of internal and external role players.

As part of the lobbying process, city stakeholders were asked to define a "safe city", and there was consensus on the need to intersect the different elements of safety in order to achieve the goal of being "a caring, safe and secure city". The JCSS contributes to the City's long-term growth and development strategy (GDS 2040), which includes public safety as an objective (Figure 13).



**CITY:** Johannesburg



**PROJECT DEPARTMENT:**  
Public Safety



**PARTNERS:**  
City departments and entities



**END USERS:**  
Citizens of Johannesburg



**PROJECT AIM:**  
*To revise and update the Joburg City Safety Strategy, taking into account the views and experiences of multiple stakeholders involved in urban safety and crime prevention.*




**STATUS:** Ongoing



**PROGRESS:**  
The Joburg City Safety Strategy (JCSS) was revised and updated with the involvement of and input from multiple city stakeholders, including city departments and safety experts.

**FIGURE 13:** How the JCSS contributes to the CoJ 10 point plan



Source: CoJ (2017)

## Regulating public and private CCTV



The Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality (NMBM) has a mandate “to promote a safe and healthy environment” within its financial and administrative capacity (Section 152, Chapter 7 of the 1996 Constitution). The installation of privately owned closed-circuit television cameras (CCTV, also known as video surveillance) on property belonging to NMBM is part of the municipality’s broader approach to establish a safe and secure sustainable environment, to achieve its developmental objectives and to enhance public safety. CCTV will assist in improving the ability to prevent, respond to, and recover from criminal and other threats to the municipality and its citizens.

There had been an increase in the number of privately owned CCTV installed on municipal land and infrastructure. The concern was that some of these installations may damage, obstruct and clutter municipal structures and or duplicate other cameras monitoring the area. However, there was no effective way to ascertain the ownership of these cameras installed on municipal land, which affects investigation processes by SAPS. In addition, the City did not have an official policy, control mechanisms or application processes in place, which meant that recognised organisations, registered bodies or private individuals could not register their CCTV system with the City.

Therefore, the City developed the NMBM CCTV City Policy, to guide stakeholders in ensuring safe and secure information-gathering, rapid response and protection of infrastructure and people. The policy establishes a uniform and comprehensive set of standards and assessment criteria to assist in the control, development and installation of CCTV infrastructure on municipal property and structures. The policy is meant to be reviewed annually.



**CITY:** Nelson Mandela Bay



**PROJECT DEPARTMENT:**

Safety and Security



**PARTNERS:**

City departments, security companies, local businesses, SAPS and communities



**END USERS:**

Residents and business owners



**PROJECT AIM:**

*To regulate and promote the use of CCTV for crime prevention and safety in public and private property in Nelson Mandela Bay.*



**STATUS:** ongoing (2018–2023)



**PROGRESS:**

The policy is in place, to ensure that CCTV systems are registered. To date more than 260 cameras have been installed and registered.

**TABLE 4:** CCTV strategic summary

| <br>MISSION                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | <br>VISION                                                                                                                                                                                     | <br>DEFINITION                                                                                                                                      |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>To inspire public confidence by developing a safe and secure environment for the benefit of those employed, visiting or using a specific area or facilities, ensuring that all CCTV cameras and systems linked to a CCTV control room are operated in a manner that will secure their consistent effectiveness and preserve the civil liberty of law-abiding citizens.</p> | <p>To provide a high quality, professional and effective CCTV service, utilising international quality equipment, systems, technical expertise and procedures to ensure a world class system is installed and maintained in all areas where such installations are located.</p> | <p>A CCTV system is an integrated solution to macro-area security and facilities management. It delivers real-time data with which it is possible to analyse patterns, predict behaviour and offer pre-emptive deployment options.</p> |

*Source: NMBM CCTV Cameras Policy*

The City has embarked on testing the CCTV technological initiative, with the aim of reducing crime and promoting safety. Council approved the new policy. To ensure inclusivity and that citizens comply with the approach, the NMBM has requested that all CCTV cameras installed on NMBM property and on private property be registered by 31 December 2018 with the NMBM Safety and Security Directorate. By October 2018 more than 260 cameras had been installed and registered. The policy has been approved by the NMBM Council.

**FIGURE 14:** Installed CCTVs



*Source: Photos supplied by NMB Municipality*



## Knowledge Application

The City of Johannesburg and eThekweni have both used participatory safety audits, as a way of involving the community in order to understand (and thereby address more effectively) safety and security issues within a neighbourhood. Although their case studies differ, both cities offer lessons in effective community involvement to tackle safety challenges facing cities.

### Participatory Safety Audits

Two case studies highlight the value of multi-disciplinary partnerships involving local communities and other local government departments. They illustrate how effective urban safety strategies require a significant shift in how government and civil society address issues. The safety audits in End Street North Park and Westbury helped to create a common understanding of safety and security issues experienced within the different precincts and provided baseline data that may be used for future studies.

#### CASE STUDY 1:

##### End Street North Park in Doornfontein

Parks and other public open spaces in the city suffer from unacceptably high levels of crime and insecurity, as a result of the historic legacy of socio-spatial segregation, a lack of integrated urban planning and appropriate governance models, together with inadequate management and maintenance. Surrounding communities often have little or no sense of ownership of parks and open spaces.

The JCSP (within the Department of Public Safety), the JDA and the JCPZ partnered to address the issue of safety in parks and open spaces. The JCSP approach was implemented using Crime Prevention through Environment Design (CPTED) and a safety audit. CPTED uses principles that address opportunities for crime before they occur, based on the understanding that the design and management of the urban environment has a direct impact on crime, the fear of crime and quality of life. CPTED is also an important component of safety audits. An inner-city park – End Street North Park in Doornfontein – was selected as representative of the multiple challenges facing parks and open spaces. The first step was to conduct a safety audit in the park precinct.

The safety audit provided the impetus for finding a collective solution. Local government and communities became key implementation partners in dealing with safety concerns and enabling better park management. Mapping exercises were conducted and generated valuable data that the city could use to develop adequate responses to safety issues. In addition to mapping exercises and interviews, as part of the safety audit, community members were able to feed their ideas into the park design using the Minecraft computer game at a facilitated workshop.



**CITY:** Johannesburg



**PROJECT DEPARTMENT:**  
Public Safety



**PARTNERS:**  
City departments and entities



**END USERS:**  
Citizens of Johannesburg



**PROJECT AIM:**  
*To improve safety collectively, with the involvement of all city stakeholders, in order to achieve caring, safe and secure communities, as envisaged in the City's long-term plans.*



**STATUS:** Ongoing



**PROGRESS:**  
Through collaboration and the involvement of community and other critical stakeholders, a common understanding of the safety and security issues within a precinct was reached and baseline data obtained that may be used for future assessments and for structural and operational interventions required to resolve safety issues.



**FIGURE 15:** Aerial view of the End Street North Park (top); Park design including community inputs (bottom)



Source: Google Maps (top); JDA, City of Joburg (bottom)

**FIGURE 16:** Mapping of safety hotspots at the park (top); community activation programmes in the park (bottom)



Source: JPCZ, City of Joburg (2016)

The End Street North Park project involved communities in local government processes, resulting in more meaningful engagement, the inclusion of more voices, new relationships and many more activities in the park.

## CASE STUDY 2

### Youth Crime Mapping Exercise in Westbury

Westbury is a suburb located in the western part of the City of Johannesburg that experienced an alarming increase in crime incidents between 2016 and 2017 (Table 5).

**TABLE 5:** Crime statistics in Westbury

| CRIME CATEGORY                              | 2016 | 2017 | CHANGE   |
|---------------------------------------------|------|------|----------|
| Murder                                      | 27   | 36   | ↑ 25.0%  |
| Attempted murder                            | 35   | 55   | ↑ 36.6%  |
| Illegal possession of firearms & ammunition | 34   | 53   | ↑ 36.0%  |
| Carjacking                                  | 49   | 100  | ↑ 60.0%  |
| Rape                                        | 0    | 41   | ↑ 100.0% |
| Community-reported serious crimes           | 0    | 4923 | ↑ 100.0% |

Source: SAPS, SA Crime Statistics, Station Statistics for Sophiatown, 2017.

The JCSP office undertook a safety audit with a non-governmental organisation in the area working with youth and used the youth to conduct a mapping exercise to identify crime hotspots. The maps (Figure 17) identified specific sites linked to serious crime issues in Westbury. The exercise revealed that crime is prevalent in high-density settlements and in the northern and eastern part of the suburbs. Street crime is a major challenge, while areas that society regards as safe areas (such as churches) have become crime hotspots, and unused sporting fields in and around the area have become danger zones.

**FIGURE 17:** Maps drawn by the youth participating in the workshop



Although drawn by different groups, the maps show similarities (the red in both identifies danger zones): crime is prevalent in high-density settlements, and a crime hotspot is located next to Dowling Street. The workshop participants identified the following challenges and proposed solutions for making the area safe.

|  <b>CHALLENGES IDENTIFIED</b>                                                                                             |  <b>SOLUTIONS PROPOSED</b>                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|  <p>Community members do not want to report the drug lords because family members who are breadwinners are involved.</p> |  <p>Some parents should try different parenting models.</p>                                                         |
|  <p>Lack of role models; criminality is idealised and seen as “cool”.</p>                                               |  <p>“Successful” community members should start giving back to the community to uplift others.</p>                 |
|  <p>Community members turn a blind eye to crime when it does not affect them.</p>                                       |  <p>There must be more social activities to keep young people away from the streets.</p>                           |
|  <p>The community has lost trust in the police.</p>                                                                     |  <p>People in the community must show interest in each other – <i>start caring more, motivate one another.</i></p> |
|  <p>Some police members are allegedly involved in crime in the area.</p>                                                |  <p>Young people should stop praising bad things on social media.</p>                                              |
|  <p>Community members fear reporting crime because they fear for their lives if they do so.</p>                         |  <p>The community must stand together and fight crime.</p>                                                         |

## Rehabilitation of Congella Park by integrating homeless people



**CITY:** eThekweni



**PROJECT DEPARTMENT:**

Department of Parks and Recreation, Safer Cities Unit and the Umbilo Business Forum (UBF)



**PARTNERS:**

CBD business community, provincial (KwaZulu-Natal) Department of Public Works



**END USERS:**

Homeless people in parks and open spaces



**PROJECT AIM:**

*To find a solution to integrate homeless people as part of the Congella Park rehabilitation project.*



**STATUS:**

2016–2019  
(implementation phase)



**PROGRESS:**

While the project has been developed by various city departments working together, potential barriers to implementation are the entrenchment of silo governance across government spheres. To get support and the necessary political will, the City will have to call on partners to enable and lobby for support for this project.

Congella Park in Durban (eThekweni) is a 3.6-hectare park in the Congella industrial area located to the southwest of Durban's City centre, close to the harbour and to a large train handling centre that serves local industry. It is situated between the industrial area and the neighbouring residential area to the west. In recent years, homeless people have overtaken the park, and with rising crime in the area, other park users have stopped using the park. The park is a very uninviting physical space and faces challenges of littering, illegal dumping, vandalism and homeless occupation.

Congella Park offered an opportunity to test a new model of park management that addresses key social development challenges such as homelessness, and forms part of the new thinking in the management of public space in urban centres. At the start of the project in 2015, formal and informal surveys were conducted with  $\pm 100$  homeless people who had been living in the park for years. The survey asked participants their reasons for living in the park, their health status, job opportunities, and whether they saw an end to their homelessness. The surveys provide a baseline against which the progress of the project could be measured.


**FIGURE 18:** Congella Park Aerial View



(Source: Google Maps)

A new Urban Park Social Model for the Congella Park Project has emerged.

**FIGURE 19:** Urban Park Social Model for the Congella Park Project



The model comprises three phrases. Phases 1 and 2 (education/awareness and implementation) are complete, and the project is currently in Phase 3.

- The food garden has been established, with food harvested regularly since 2017. There is an ongoing evaluation regarding the outcome of the vegetables of the food garden.
- The toilets have been completed.
- The recycling station is nearing completion, and its input and output will be monitored to establish the income generated.
- A selected number of interested local homeless people have received training in maintaining and securing the park and are working in close collaboration with municipal staff.
- Congella Park is moving towards becoming more accessible and inviting to the public.

The project's ultimate goal is to empower and socially uplift all those who are willing to contribute to the betterment of the area as a whole. In addition to the homeless individuals, stakeholders include municipal departments (Parks and Recreation, Durban Solid Waste, Metro Police Security Management Unit and Safer Cities Unit), the private sector (the UBF), civil society (Kenneth Gardens Youth and Dennis Hurley Centre) and SAPS.

The Congella Park Project offers an opportunity to develop a set of guidelines that could be replicated in other urban park environments, especially where the welfare of homeless people and local community safety and security is concerned. The model, which places homeless individuals as the park's caretakers, guardians and operators, could be implemented in other parks and public spaces within the Durban area. With the 2016 survey as the baseline, ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the project is planned. This will include a follow-up survey with the homeless in Congella Park and other nearby parks and public open spaces, to establish their reasons for living in the park, their health status, job opportunities, feedback from the family, and whether they see an end to their homelessness.

## Partnership Policing

The Tshwane case study is an example of partnership policing that involves multiple city departments to combat an ongoing problem in the municipality – cable theft.

**CITY:** Tshwane

**PROJECT DEPARTMENT:**  
Tshwane Metro Police Department (TMPD)

**PARTNERS:**  
Ward councillor, neighbourhood watch, City departments

**END USERS:**  
City residents

**PROJECT AIM:**  
*To prevent theft of cables and raise awareness for residents.*

**STATUS:** Ongoing  
(in implementation phase)

**PROGRESS:**  
An operational Cable Theft Enforcement Unit has been established and additional patrol vehicles have been procured, to increase patrols at hotspots. Although cable theft persists, the Unit does make regular arrests and works closely with communities, often through neighbourhood watches.

### Combatting cable theft through community policing

Cable theft is a major concern for the City of Tshwane and has various socio-economic repercussions for residents and businesses. To address this concern, the Tshwane Metro Police Department (TMPD) started working within one of the hotspots in Pretoria West, Ward 3, to combat the scourge of cable theft with the assistance of the ward councillor. The main objectives for the partnership policing was to improve responses to cable theft and raise awareness of the problem in the community. In addition, it aims to:

- Highlight the extent of cable theft and its impact on service delivery and the economy.
- Establish best practices for preventing cable and copper theft.
- Encourage intergovernmental cooperation.
- Solve problems together.
- Initiate a multidisciplinary strategy.

**FIGURE 20:** Pretoria West, Ward 3



To mitigate the theft of cables within the City, The TMPD's Anti-Cable Theft Unit posts static guards and patrols regularly at hotspots and substations, carries out inspections at scrapyards (to ensure accreditation and compliance), responds to cable theft complaints, and apprehends suspects involved in cable theft.

In addition to the TMPD, stakeholders involved in the project include the City's Utility Services

Department and the Office of the Chief Operations Officer, as well as the South African Police Service and the Non-Ferrous Metal Crime Combating Committee (NFMCCC). The project is funded from the TMPD's operating budget, while the Office of the Chief Operating Officer provided funding for procuring additional patrol vehicles during 2017/18.



Prior to implementing the pilot community policing approach, cable theft occurred approximately twice a week. The relevant stakeholders and role-players were harnessed, and the community patrol groups availed themselves for visible patrolling and support. Direct channels of communication were established to ensure any suspicious activities were immediately dealt with. Furthermore, the municipality assisted the community by clearing bushes at certain problematic areas to enable better visibility when patrolling.

The Community Policing Project in Ward 3 has demonstrated that efforts towards combatting cable theft at key hotspots within certain areas can be achieved through partnership policing. This initiative resulted in a significant reduction of cable theft. Ongoing efforts are required to nurture the relationship with community patrollers to ensure the continued success of the project.

The TMPD participates in the provincial NFMCCC to highlight the impact of cable theft and propose solutions and engages periodically with its counterparts in Johannesburg and Ekurhuleni. Table 6 illustrates some of the challenges and recommendations for tackling cable theft that emerged during the project implementation.

**TABLE 6:** Challenges and recommendations for tackling cable theft

| CHALLENGES                                                                                                     | RECOMMENDATIONS                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Organised crime syndicates</b>                                                                              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Cable theft to be considered a priority crime</li> <li>■ Involvement of the Hawks to combat organised crime classified as levels 3-5</li> <li>■ Involvement of the State Security Agency</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>Information, technology, resources and personnel</b>                                                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Information systems and analysis (dedicated hotline)</li> <li>■ Profiling/gathering of intelligence/informers</li> <li>■ Specialised equipment, e.g. night vision equipment and thermal cameras, radios and drones</li> <li>■ Specialised tactical force and detectives.</li> <li>■ Specialised dedicated prosecutors (internal and criminal) and a mobile court</li> <li>■ Send all members for training in forensic investigation, crowd management, tactical survival, and identifying ferrous and non-ferrous metals.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Legislative mandate (Second Hand Goods Act)</b>                                                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Municipal police departments to be granted powers in terms of the Second-Hand Goods Act by the National Minister</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| <b>Low prosecution rates</b>                                                                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ SAPS to register non-ferrous metal theft under the Criminal Matters Amendment Act to ensure harsher sentences</li> <li>■ Experts to attend court proceedings</li> <li>■ Minister of Police to allocate powers to Metro Police in terms of the Second-Hand Goods Act.</li> <li>■ Metro Police to have authority to inspect new scrapyards</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>Lack of concerted proactive interventions</b>                                                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ National education and awareness campaign through various media (television, radio, etc.)</li> <li>■ National toll-free number for cable theft reporting</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>Lack of skills and capacity of law enforcement agencies</b>                                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Training by SAPS in the Second Hand Goods Act and the Criminal Matters Amendment Act</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| <b>Lack of skills regarding cable identification</b>                                                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Training by owners of assets</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| <b>Second hand goods business licences issued by SAPS without considering compliance with municipal bylaws</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Ensure premises are appropriately zoned by the municipality before issuing such licences</li> <li>■ Confirm with Home Affairs the status of foreign nationals when applications are received.</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |



## Peer-to-Peer Learning

Two cities – Mangaung and Msunduzi – are currently exploring the adaptation of best practices from other cities. Both projects are still at conceptual stage but are examples of the value of learning exchanges and peer-to-peer learning.

### The Caleb Motshabi Project

In June 2017, Mangaung officials attended an exchange workshop on violence prevention, organised by National Treasury in collaboration with the German Development Cooperation and held in Cape Town. The exchange included a site visit to Harare and Monwabisi Park in Khayelitsha, where the Violence Prevention through Urban Upgrading (VPUU) project is being implemented. The VPUU model targets core issues of increasing personal safety through urban upgrading in-situ, which means without relocating people outside of the area. One core aspect – besides small infrastructure projects and interventions in the design of the physical environment – is to actively start building social cohesion in the community. Cost effective urban design measures combined with voluntary community participation makes it appropriate for Mangaung where crime is exacerbated by social issues, such as broken communities and fractured family structures.

Mangaung is in the early stages of implementing a project that uses a community-development approach in the Caleb Motshabi informal settlement, which is on the outskirts of Bloemfontein (Mangaung), next to the N6. The two proposed sites for the project are approximately 2.5 hectares and home to about 6000 households (Figure 21). The area has no roads, clinics or any facilities, and is notorious for illegal connections of electricity cables, and the stealing of water and other service delivery infrastructure, as well as opportunist crimes, such as mugging and theft at night.

**FIGURE 21:** The Caleb Motshabi Project Sites



*Source: Google Maps*

The aim of the project is to provide a one-stop, integrated socio-economic service centre that brings services closer to the people, to ensure an active, healthy, literate, safe and vibrant community. The project is part of a wider strategy aimed at reducing crime and promoting safety through education and community engagement. Driven by two city departments – the Department of Public Safety and the Department of Community Development – the project will be rolled out in partnership with other city departments, including Parks, Engineering (design), Fleet Management, and Library and Information Services. For the project to be successful, the various city departments will have to work together and overcome the potential barriers to implementation, which include the silos style of working so characteristic of government. In addition, political support is needed, which will require approaching and including other stakeholders from civil society, national government and the private sector, to assist and support the planned project. Project implementation is dependent on internal staff and resources, but external partners have been identified.

Resources are being sought from provincial and national government. R100-million has been earmarked for the project, focusing on the youth (youth unemployment is a factor that drives crime and violence in the area), early childhood development, arts and culture, public spaces, school-based projects, technical infrastructure/service delivery/urban upgrading, awareness raising for community/resident and improvement of reactive responses to crime and safety.

**FIGURE 22:** Artist renditions of some activities and services earmarked for the project



Source: Photos supplied by Mangaung Municipality

## Safety Kiosk Security Project

To curb crime and violence in the City, in February 2018, Msunduzi initiated an Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP) Safety Kiosk Project. The project's aim is to promote a safer environment through protecting and preserving the sustainability of the central business district (CBD) and municipal properties. The project is part of the ongoing mainstreaming of urban safety and seeks to enable the CBD business community, informal traders, residents, visitors and everyone within the vicinity to live and work in an economic and socially vibrant, safe environment.

Msunduzi's EPWP Safety Kiosk Project is based on the Western Cape Safety Kiosk initiative. The kiosks provide a link between communities and SAPS, and can be moved to crime hotspot areas, thereby increasing police visibility and assisting members of the public. People can report a crime, gang activity or suspicious behaviour in the area, and compliment good police behaviour. Kiosks are also a place where people can make affidavits and get documents certified and find a place of safety if a victim of crime.

**FIGURE 23:** Examples of Community Safety Kiosks from the Western Cape



Source: Cape Town CCID



### Why municipalities do not sufficiently consider community safety functions:

#### A LACK OF POLITICAL WILL

community safety has to compete with basic service provision as a priority.

#### THE CROSS-CUTTING FUNCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

many politicians and officials regard community safety as a policing function.

#### INSUFFICIENT RESOURCES

even if the municipality accepts the functional responsibility of community safety, the shortage of capacitated staff and other resources in effect strangles the function.

Key city partners are the Departments of Risk Management (Public Safety), the Parks Unit (custodians of EPWP programme), the Office of the Mayor and the City Manager. The Office of the Mayor has put aside approximately R2-million in funding to acquire and equip the kiosks and is consulting with businesses to get their support and funding for further kiosks. The project employs 20 EPWP Community Safety Volunteers who have received peace officer training and been equipped with uniforms and vehicles, all under the auspices of the EPWP. They have been used for joint clean-up operations in collaboration with other municipal units, targeting the removal of illegal posters on street poles, robots and city property, the removal of wall graffiti, and acting as safety ambassadors for tourists in the City.

## Alignment with other spheres of government

Other government spheres are exploring possible models using the EPWP to boost local community safety and violence prevention in cities and towns.

Despite their mandate, many municipalities regard community safety and violence prevention as outside their constitutional and functional mandate, or only partially carry out integrated, locally tailored community safety solutions. While municipal bylaws (e.g. littering, noise pollution) are accepted as a municipal function, they are enforced with little consideration for the violence and crime prevention aspects. In addition, planning for community safety is rarely included in integrated development plans (IDPs), and the use of environmental design and management to create safer urban spaces is ignored. Lastly, integrated cooperation with other spheres of government and community safety agencies is lacking. Although municipalities do assist SAPS in joint operations (e.g. roadblocks), what is needed is long-term, integrated cooperation.

Although shortfalls in funding and the competition for resources seem to be almost impossible challenges, one option is to use EPWP for community safety. The EPWP focuses on four sectors: infrastructure, environment and culture, social and non-state. The non-state sector has two components: The Community Work Programme (CWP) and non-profit organisations (NPOs).

The GIZ-VCP is partnering with the CSPS, the provincial Departments of Community Safety in the Eastern Cape and Gauteng, and SALGA to develop a model for strengthening the capacity of community safety practitioners within local municipalities. The goal is to improve the support that municipalities receive from provincial governments, to enable them to achieve their mandates for community safety and violence prevention, as laid out in the 2016 White Paper on Safety and Security, the IUDF, the Municipal Systems Act, the NDP, and indeed the Constitution. The VCP and the Department of Public Works jointly commissioned a study of EPWP and CWP projects and the development of a guide to support municipalities.



What emerged from the study was enlightening but hard to pin down in terms of policy insights and practical lessons. Certainly, municipalities and metros are already using the EPWP to address community safety and violence prevention objectives. They are using the EPWP to implement safety volunteer projects, which are programmes that contribute to strengthening parenting, schooling environments, peer groups and neighbourhood-level social structures. For example:

- In the Northern Cape, the EPWP Safety Volunteers is a community volunteer project that works with various stakeholders to implement crime fighting programmes in the province. In this case social crime prevention is the main focus, with projects covering programmes to stop violence against women, children and youth, combat substance abuse and mobilise the community against crime. The project also addresses road safety and transport operations.
- Since 2014, the eThekweni Safety Volunteers programme has seen 2000 young unemployed people used to monitor and patrol streets, pension pay points, businesses and schools. The programme covers all wards and there are roughly 11–13 volunteers assigned per ward, depending on the size of the ward. The programme seems to be effective in heightening crime awareness and highlighting issues such as drug abuse. It also links up certain role-players in the process, for example, the Community Policing Forum (CPF) and the municipality's own crime and violence prevention capability.
- Other safety volunteer projects are more focused on safety in a particular sector, such as schooling. For example, the Mangaung Metropolitan Municipality Community Safety and Scholar Patrol project is aimed at preventing violence and crime by making the community stronger and more resilient, protecting those most vulnerable and supporting measures that combat or help to reduce crime and violence. The operational sites are schools and cemeteries. By training community members and improving partnerships with non-governmental and other civil society organisations, the municipality's violence prevention strategy draws in resources and effort from local civil society.
- An initiative under the EPWP Social Sector, the Ntabankulu Community Safety Programme in the Eastern Cape, employed 40 young people in tasks geared to safeguarding neighbourhoods. The project is a partnership between the Ntabankulu Local Municipality (Community Services Department/Traffic Section) and the National Youth Development Agency. It is designed to address youth unemployment, while also rendering security and safety services to schools, communities, offices and public buildings, in the town and surrounding areas of Ntabankulu.

These community projects tend to focus on responses to violence and crime in areas regarded as “hotspots” of gang activity and other social crime. However, such projects are almost never conceptualised, recognised and documented in the context of their contribution to long-term violence and crime prevention.

Projects funded through the EPWP non-state sector programme do not seem to significantly focus on community safety. However, the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (CSVR) did find that the CWP is being used to provide advice and information at local police stations. CWP participants help victims and other community members to access resources for coping with domestic violence, violence against women, child abuse and gang-related violence. Again, this approach is a response to violence and crime rather than preventive in nature. A preventative approach would involve organising marches, rallies and public education events to raise awareness about different forms of violence, how they affect the community and how they can be addressed. The CSVR did find some examples of awareness-raising projects through the CWP that also link with advice office services; for example, there are in partnership between CWP and local CPFs in Orange Farm and Alexandra (City of Johannesburg), and Manenberg (City of Cape Town).

As noted, most of the above projects are a *response* to threats to community safety and violence rather than part of *prevention* strategies, which would be more important, given the systemic nature of the violence and crime problem in South Africa. However, the integration of all community safety efforts under the EPWP could give a real boost to violence and crime prevention in municipalities. It would mean incorporating preventative and responsive projects, assistance to the police, and environmental design and urban planning into a locally tailored process that integrates into safety strategies and IDPs, led by local government. Untapped potential may lie in the non-state sector. For example, through the wage subsidy for NPOs under the NPO Programme, a municipality could enter into a partnership with a supported NPO, thereby harnessing the “hands and the feet” required to have a more effective crime and violence prevention programme.

Under the current policy, EPWP projects are designed with temporary employment as the main priority and public benefit as a secondary consideration. This approach may need to be adapted in order to be applied to community safety, especially in the municipal sphere. Municipalities should be developing their own unique responses to crime and violence, based on local circumstances. This means tapping into EPWP resources and directing these strategically towards unique local violence and crime problems. Such an exercise must take cognisance of the fact that some municipal needs are key to developing safer communities and that solutions may depend on success factors other than the volume of work created.





05



## Recommendations

South African cities are dealing with serious socio-economic, political and environmental challenges, which contribute to the risk factors for violence and crime. These factors include high levels of income and gender inequality, unemployment, inadequate basic and social services, a breakdown of social cohesion, and alcohol and drug abuse.

The recommendations of the two previous reports in 2016 and 2017 called for integrated approaches to address the various social, economic, spatial and political drivers of violence and crime in urban areas. Over the past few years, important progress has been made at national level in establishing a policy framework for coherent, coordinated action, through the IUDF and the White Paper on Safety and Security, with its implementation framework. However, the success of these national policies depends heavily on effective implementation at local level. This has also been recognised in several global agendas (e.g. Agenda 2030, the New Urban Agenda), which advocate safe, inclusive and resilient cities as a requirement for peaceful development worldwide. While national governments have started to align policies with the global agendas, many cities are already contributing to achieving global agenda objectives and targets. These efforts need to be coordinated and made more visible in order to champion the importance of cities in development and, specifically, to create safer and more peaceful societies.



While South African cities continue to struggle with insufficient financial and human resources, addressing the institutional challenges is long overdue. These challenges include the need for far more communication, coordination and cooperation among the different spheres of government and among city line departments.

In 2017, The State of Urban Safety in South Africa Report presented the following recommendations:

- i. Ensure that city planning and delivery are “crime wise”.
- ii. Develop a multi-stakeholder approach.
- iii. Push for aligned boundaries.
- iv. Link research and policy-making.
- v. Allocate resources and build capacity.
- vi. Align the USRG programme to these recommendations.

The recommendations of this report are in line with the previous report’s recommendations. In addition, the recommendations encourage cities to campaign more actively for resource and capacity support, and for improved strategic alignment of existing and funded programmes or interventions with violence and crime prevention objectives. The following specific recommendations are proposed:

- i. Develop evidence-based municipal community safety strategies based on systematic data collection through safety audits and other methods. The approach should be incremental, starting with identified priority “hotspot” settlements or neighbourhoods, and then scaling up to eventually cover the entire city. Such strategies should formulate clear objectives, define clear roles and responsibilities, and be aligned to the objectives of existing development strategies for the city or the province.
- ii. Integrate gender strongly into the data collection and analysis that informs the development, implementation and monitoring of municipal community safety plans. The manifestations and drivers of gender-based violence, and the gendered nature of violence in general, must be considered. Data collection needs to be disaggregated by gender wherever possible.
- iii. Seek and form alliances with interested stakeholders in the city who might come from civil society, other government sectors, non-governmental organisations or the private sector. As described in this report, creating alliances with other interested stakeholders can help when advocating safety interventions or facilitate access to resources. One example is the multi-stakeholder, multi-dimensional approach used in the End Street North Park case study in the inner-city of Johannesburg.
- iv. Devise and implement systems to effectively monitor and evaluate the implementation of violence and crime prevention programmes. Interventions need to be systematically documented. A knowledge management system, which captures the processes, approaches and results, ensures institutional learning and should inform future city planning and budgeting on a regular basis.
- v. Increase advocacy with other government sectors and spheres for integrated approaches to urban safety based on the existing frameworks (White Paper on Safety and Security, IUDF). A starting point could be a joint communication strategy among USRG members for better awareness-raising, especially with departments or committees working on IDPs, strategic planning and urban management.
- vi. Consider creative ways to spend available resources in an integrated manner. Make use of public programmes such as the EPWP, with the aim of creating synergies in job creation and safety promotion/violence prevention. While some initial investment would be required, to train participants in programmes and activities relevant to violence prevention and community safety promotion, the mid- and long-term benefits should outweigh the initial expense.

These recommendations point to the approaches that cities should be engaging in or testing, and the requisite partnerships and knowledge they should be drawing from to improve the impact of their safety promotion and violence prevention strategies.



# ANNEXURE A:

## Individual City Crime Profiles

In this Annexure, each city's data is briefly described, with the goal of highlighting the key crime concerns and drivers that should form part of that city's crime and safety planning. For an explanation of the methodology and indicators, please refer to Chapter 2 of this report.

Colour coding is used to show how each city compares to the other cities for the different crimes. It is important to note that the colour coding for the indicators is **relative** to the other eight cities, ranging from green (city is doing relatively well compared to the other cities) to red (city is doing relatively poorly compared to the other cities). The colour comparisons are not an assessment of the significance of the indicator in driving crime in each city. Therefore, just because a city has a good showing compared to the other cities does not mean that the indicator is at an acceptable level. It simply means that other cities record higher levels of the indicator, and that the indicator is less likely to be a standout factor driving the city's crime challenges.

As explained in Chapter 2, indicators 1 to 5 and 7 have been updated with new data from SAPS, indicators 8 and 9 remain unchanged from the 2017 report, indicator 10 has been populated for the first time, indicators 11 to 19 have not been updated since the 2017 report because no new data is available, and indicator 21 has been updated.

A graph covering the period from 2005/6 to 2017/18 is provided for each city, showing the trend in selected crime types in recorded rates per 100 000: murder, assault with intent to inflict GBH, robbery with aggravating circumstances, sexual offences, property-related crime, and driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs. Populations are adjusted for each year. Two different scales of vertical axis have been used, so that recorded rates of murder and sexual offences, which are fewer than those of the other selected crimes, can be depicted on the same graph.

It should be noted that the differences in recorded crime rates (both between cities and within a city over time) are a product of real differences in crime prevalence, as well as differences in crime reporting and recording behaviour on the part of victims and the police. For example, declining recorded levels of sexual offences may indicate that these crimes are becoming less prevalent, but may also suggest that victims are becoming less inclined to report them to the police and/or the police are becoming less inclined to record these crimes when reported. The significance of these factors may be indicated by low and declining levels of resident satisfaction with law enforcement.



| CATEGORY                         |                             | INDICATOR                                          | JHB   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Objective indicators             |                             | 1 Murder rate                                      | 31    |
|                                  |                             | 2 Assault rate                                     | 295   |
|                                  |                             | 3 Robbery rate                                     | 435   |
|                                  |                             | 4 Property-related crime rate                      | 941   |
|                                  |                             | 5 Sexual offences rate                             | 69    |
|                                  |                             | 6 Public/collective violence rate                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 7 Police activity                                  | 320   |
| Subjective indicators            |                             | 8 Experience of crime/violence                     | 10%   |
|                                  |                             | 9 Feelings of safety/fear of crime                 | 24%   |
|                                  |                             | 10 Perception of/satisfaction with law enforcement | 58%   |
| The social/structural indicators | Urbanisation                | 11 Rapid population growth                         | 3.2%  |
|                                  |                             | 12 Population density                              | 2696  |
|                                  |                             | 13 Social incoherence/family disruption            | 26%   |
|                                  | Marginalisation             | 14 Poverty                                         | 0.72  |
|                                  |                             | 15 Income inequality                               | 0.652 |
|                                  |                             | 16 (Youth) unemployment                            | 32%   |
|                                  |                             | 17 Deprivation of services                         | 18%   |
|                                  | Social/physical environment | 18 Informal housing                                | 18%   |
|                                  |                             | 19 Infrastructure                                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 20 School conditions and violence                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 21 Access to alcohol, drugs, firearms              | 274   |

City is doing relatively well compared to the other cities

City is doing about average compared to the other cities

City is doing relatively poorly compared to the other cities


The City of Johannesburg's relative rankings for the 21 indicators have changed only slightly from the previous report. Compared to the other cities, the city's crime rates are low to moderate, except for assault and especially robbery. It has the second-lowest recorded rate of murder, after the City of Tshwane, and levels of non-violent property-related crime have declined significantly, so that the city ranks second best after Ekurhuleni. Of all the cities, the City of Johannesburg has the highest level of police activity targeting people driving while under the influence of alcohol or drugs.



The subjective indicators show that residents experience relatively high levels of crime and have moderately high levels of fear of crime. Indicator 10 – how residents perceive/are satisfied with law enforcement – places the city among the middle of the pack, ranked fifth of the nine cities.

Urbanisation factors are the key drivers of Johannesburg's crime and safety challenges – of all the cities, it ranks first for rapid population growth, population density and social incoherence (indicators 11, 12 and 13), and first for income inequality. However, it should be noted that all cities have high levels of inequality, and the gap between them is narrow. These indicators suggest that the city's safety planning would do well to focus on the challenges related to urbanisation and inequality.

**FIGURE 24:** Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in Johannesburg



All the cities have seen long-term declines in recorded rates of assault with intent to inflict GBH and of sexual offences. The City of Johannesburg is no exception: since 2005/06, recorded rates of assault with intent to inflict GBH have decreased by over 40%, while sexual offences have decreased by 60% since 2008/09. It is unclear whether the relatively low rates of sexual offences signify a lower prevalence of these crimes, or a lower inclination to report such crimes to the police. Recorded rates of non-violent property-related crimes have also been declining fairly steadily, down 34% over the last 10 years and 13% in the last year. Although the city's murder rate in 2017/18 was the lowest after Tshwane, it increased by 5% compared to the previous year, the second-largest increase among the cities (after Cape Town). After declining, aggravated robbery rates have increased by 26% over the last five years, although last year did see a decrease of 6%. Recorded rates of driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs have fluctuated but show a strong upward trend, increasing by 10% in the last year, which suggests that police have significantly raised the priority of roadblock activities.



| CATEGORY                         |                             | INDICATOR                                          | CPT   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Objective indicators             |                             | 1 Murder rate                                      | 69    |
|                                  |                             | 2 Assault rate                                     | 268   |
|                                  |                             | 3 Robbery rate                                     | 484   |
|                                  |                             | 4 Property-related crime rate                      | 1475  |
|                                  |                             | 5 Sexual offences rate                             | 98    |
|                                  |                             | 6 Public/collective violence rate                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 7 Police activity                                  | 208   |
| Subjective indicators            |                             | 8 Experience of crime/violence                     | 11%   |
|                                  |                             | 9 Feelings of safety/fear of crime                 | 28%   |
|                                  |                             | 10 Perception of/satisfaction with law enforcement | 49%   |
| The social/structural indicators | Urbanisation                | 11 Rapid population growth                         | 2.6%  |
|                                  |                             | 12 Population density                              | 1530  |
|                                  |                             | 13 Social incoherence/family disruption            | 22%   |
|                                  | Marginalisation             | 14 Poverty                                         | 0.73  |
|                                  |                             | 15 Income inequality                               | 0.613 |
|                                  |                             | 16 (Youth) unemployment                            | 32%   |
|                                  |                             | 17 Deprivation of services                         | 12%   |
|                                  | Social/physical environment | 18 Informal housing                                | 18%   |
|                                  |                             | 19 Infrastructure                                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 20 School conditions and violence                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 21 Access to alcohol, drugs, firearms              | 688   |

City is doing relatively well compared to the other cities

City is doing about average compared to the other cities

City is doing relatively poorly compared to the other cities


The City of Cape Town has very high rates of almost all crime types. It has the highest recorded rates of the nine cities for murder, robbery, and non-violent property-related crimes, and this year moved from being ranked fourth to ranked third for sexual offences. The relatively high levels of police activity (as measured by recorded rates of driving while under the influence) may be a positive indicator of proactive policing efforts.



The high crime levels are reflected in the subjective indicators, which show that residents experience the highest levels of crime and fear of crime of all the cities. Indicator 10 shows very low levels of satisfaction with law enforcement, with only Buffalo City recording lower levels.

Yet the city's social/structural risk factors for crime suggest a low likelihood that marginalisation factors are the key relative drivers. Although urbanisation factors are likely to play a significant role, as the city has relatively high levels of rapid population growth, population density and social incoherence, the causal outlier for Cape Town appears to be access to alcohol, drugs and firearms. In this area, the city is a clear leader, recording a rate almost twice that of the next most-affected city (eThekweni). This suggests that city crime reduction efforts should focus on the prevalence of alcohol, drugs and firearms.

**FIGURE 25:** Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in Cape Town



A cause for concern is the city's murder rate, which has increased by 60% since 2009/10 and by 13% in the last year alone, which is more than twice the increase in any of the other eight cities. However, like the other cities, the City of Cape Town has seen long-term declines in recorded rates of sexual offences, which has decreased by almost 40% since 2008/09, and assault with intent to inflict GBH, which declined by 26% over the last 10 years and 7% in the last year. The recorded rates of non-violent property-related crimes have also declined, by 33% over the last 10 years and 9% in the last year. Similar to Johannesburg, the city's previously rising rates of aggravated robbery may be showing signs of stabilisation, with no significant change for the past two years. The recorded rate of driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs is in a downward trajectory, decreasing by 28% over the past five years and 9% in the last year. This probably indicates that police have lowered the priority of their roadblock operations.



| CATEGORY                         |                             | INDICATOR                                          | ETH   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Objective indicators             |                             | 1 Murder rate                                      | 46    |
|                                  |                             | 2 Assault rate                                     | 235   |
|                                  |                             | 3 Robbery rate                                     | 320   |
|                                  |                             | 4 Property-related crime rate                      | 961   |
|                                  |                             | 5 Sexual offences rate                             | 74    |
|                                  |                             | 6 Public/collective violence rate                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 7 Police activity                                  | 293   |
| Subjective indicators            |                             | 8 Experience of crime/violence                     | 6%    |
|                                  |                             | 9 Feelings of safety/fear of crime                 | 23%   |
|                                  |                             | 10 Perception of/satisfaction with law enforcement | 56%   |
| The social/structural indicators | Urbanisation                | 11 Rapid population growth                         | 1.1%  |
|                                  |                             | 12 Population density                              | 1502  |
|                                  |                             | 13 Social incoherence/family disruption            | 21%   |
|                                  | Marginalisation             | 14 Poverty                                         | 0.63  |
|                                  |                             | 15 Income inequality                               | 0.628 |
|                                  |                             | 16 (Youth) unemployment                            | 39%   |
|                                  |                             | 17 Deprivation of services                         | 17%   |
|                                  | Social/physical environment | 18 Informal housing                                | 13%   |
|                                  |                             | 19 Infrastructure                                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 20 School conditions and violence                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 21 Access to alcohol, drugs, firearms              | 350   |

City is doing relatively well compared to the other cities

City is doing about average compared to the other cities

City is doing relatively poorly compared to the other cities


Compared to the other cities, eThekweni has the second-lowest rates of assault and third lowest rates of non-violent property-related crime. It is ranked fifth for robbery (down from fourth in 2015/16) and has middling to relatively low rates of sexual offences. Murder seems to be the city's key relative crime challenge, as it has overtaken Buffalo City to rank third highest of the nine cities. At the same time, the police seem to have stepped up their levels of activity, as since 2015/16, eThekweni has climbed four places to rank second for recorded rates of driving while under the influence of alcohol or drugs.



Non-violent property crimes tend to be far more numerous than violent crimes. Generally, eThekweni's crime profile is relatively dominated by violent crime, which is less frequent and more fear-inducing than non-violent property-related crimes. This may help explain why eThekweni's residents enjoy relatively low rates of crime victimisation (ranking a joint most favourable position, together with Mangaung), yet middling levels of fear of crime (indicators 8 and 9). Indicator 10 shows middling to low levels of satisfaction with policing efforts – the city is ranked sixth.

eThekweni's social/structural indicators show a broader mix of causal drivers, including aspects of urbanisation, marginalisation, and the social/physical environment. It ranks second last in terms of both poverty levels (as measured by the HDI) and access to alcohol, drugs and firearms. Therefore, the city's safety planning may do well to focus on these particular challenges.

**FIGURE 26:** Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in eThekweni



Like the other cities, eThekweni has shown long-term declines in its recorded rates of sexual offences (down 32% over the last five years) and assault with intent to inflict GBH (down 30% over the last 10 years). Non-violent property-related crimes declined (down 23% over the last five years and 5% in the last year), while aggravated robbery rates are showing signs of improvement; having increased by 2% over the last five years, they decreased by 3% in the last year. Of concern is the rising murder rate, which was down 21% over the last 10 years, but increased by 21% over the last five years and 3% in the last year – in 2017/18, eThekweni had the third-highest murder rate after Cape Town and Nelson Mandela Bay. A positive sign is the major increase in recorded rates of driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs (up 46% in the last year alone), suggesting that roadblock operations form a significantly higher police priority.



| CATEGORY                         |                             | INDICATOR                                          | EKU   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Objective indicators             |                             | 1 Murder rate                                      | 32    |
|                                  |                             | 2 Assault rate                                     | 243   |
|                                  |                             | 3 Robbery rate                                     | 296   |
|                                  |                             | 4 Property-related crime rate                      | 856   |
|                                  |                             | 5 Sexual offences rate                             | 66    |
|                                  |                             | 6 Public/collective violence rate                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 7 Police activity                                  | 211   |
| Subjective indicators            |                             | 8 Experience of crime/violence                     | 8%    |
|                                  |                             | 9 Feelings of safety/fear of crime                 | 22%   |
|                                  |                             | 10 Perception of/satisfaction with law enforcement | 66%   |
| The social/structural indicators | Urbanisation                | 11 Rapid population growth                         | 2.5%  |
|                                  |                             | 12 Population density                              | 1609  |
|                                  |                             | 13 Social incoherence/family disruption            | 23%   |
|                                  | Marginalisation             | 14 Poverty                                         | 0.70  |
|                                  |                             | 15 Income inequality                               | 0.651 |
|                                  |                             | 16 (Youth) unemployment                            | 37%   |
|                                  |                             | 17 Deprivation of services                         | 21%   |
|                                  | Social/physical environment | 18 Informal housing                                | 19%   |
|                                  |                             | 19 Infrastructure                                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 20 School conditions and violence                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 21 Access to alcohol, drugs, firearms              | 207   |

City is doing relatively well compared to the other cities

City is doing about average compared to the other cities

City is doing relatively poorly compared to the other cities


Ekurhuleni continues to show relatively low recorded rates of most crime types. Of the nine cities, it has the lowest rates of non-violent property-related crimes, second-lowest rates of sexual offences (although as always it should be noted that this may be a poor reflection of the real extent of sexual offences), and third-lowest rates of both murder and robbery. Its recorded robbery rate is low for a city of its size (only Mangaung, Buffalo City and Msunduzi recorded lower rates in the last year). Its indicator of police activity (as measured by recorded rates of driving while under the influence) has seen some improvement, as it now ranks third to Johannesburg and eThekweni.



As for the subjective experience of crime, Ekurhuleni's residents enjoy middling to relatively low rates of both crime victimisation and fear of crime, in both of which it ranks third. Two-thirds of residents in Ekurhuleni are satisfied with law enforcement, which is the highest perception/satisfaction level of all the cities.

Ekurhuleni's social/structural indicators point to moderate challenges with a wide range of urbanisation factors (especially population density and social incoherence) and marginalisation factors, especially income inequality, in which it ranks second only to Johannesburg, although it should be noted that in this indicator the range of difference between the nine cities is small.

**FIGURE 27:** Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in Ekurhuleni



Like all the cities, Ekurhuleni saw long-term decreases in recorded rates of assault with intent to inflict GBH (down 24% over the last 10 years and 4% in the last year). Its recorded decline in sexual offences appears to be slowing, as despite decreasing by 21% over the last five years, last year saw no significant change. Its recorded rates of non-violent property-related crime have also declined (down 17% over the last five years and 12% in the last year). After increasing from 2013/14, the recorded rates of aggravated robbery are showing signs of recovery, declining by about 10% in the past two years. As in Johannesburg, the city's murder rate has been increasing since 2012/13 and increased by 2% in the last year. A growing policing priority appears to be roadblock activities, as reflected in the major increase in recorded rates of driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs (up 165% over the last 10 years, 84% over the last five years, and 20% in the last year).



| CATEGORY                         |                             | INDICATOR                                          | TSH   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Objective indicators             |                             | 1 Murder rate                                      | 17    |
|                                  |                             | 2 Assault rate                                     | 207   |
|                                  |                             | 3 Robbery rate                                     | 310   |
|                                  |                             | 4 Property-related crime rate                      | 1074  |
|                                  |                             | 5 Sexual offences rate                             | 58    |
|                                  |                             | 6 Public/collective violence rate                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 7 Police activity                                  | 112   |
| Subjective indicators            |                             | 8 Experience of crime/violence                     | 9%    |
|                                  |                             | 9 Feelings of safety/fear of crime                 | 19%   |
|                                  |                             | 10 Perception of/satisfaction with law enforcement | 50%   |
| The social/structural indicators | Urbanisation                | 11 Rapid population growth                         | 3.1%  |
|                                  |                             | 12 Population density                              | 464   |
|                                  |                             | 13 Social incoherence/family disruption            | 24%   |
|                                  | Marginalisation             | 14 Poverty                                         | 0.72  |
|                                  |                             | 15 Income inequality                               | 0.631 |
|                                  |                             | 16 (Youth) unemployment                            | 33%   |
|                                  |                             | 17 Deprivation of services                         | 16%   |
|                                  | Social/physical environment | 18 Informal housing                                | 17%   |
|                                  |                             | 19 Infrastructure                                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 20 School conditions and violence                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 21 Access to alcohol, drugs, firearms              | 191   |

City is doing relatively well compared to the other cities

City is doing about average compared to the other cities

City is doing relatively poorly compared to the other cities


The City of Tshwane enjoys relatively low recorded rates of interpersonal violent crimes, with the lowest rates of murder, assault and sexual offences of all nine cities – its murder rate is almost half that in neighbouring Johannesburg and Ekurhuleni. However, non-violent property-related crimes are slightly higher than neighbouring Johannesburg and Ekurhuleni, while robbery rates are far lower than in Johannesburg and slightly higher than in Ekurhuleni. Its indicator of police activity (as measured by recorded rates of driving while under the influence of alcohol or drugs) suggests little police proactivity in this regard.



Non-violent property crimes tend to be far more numerous than violent crimes (particularly robbery) yet generate less fear. This may explain why Tshwane's residents have the lowest levels of fear of crime among the nine cities but report relatively high rates of crime victimisation (ranking third-to-last). Interestingly, residents show relatively low levels of satisfaction with law enforcement – much lower, for example, than those seen in Ekurhuleni.

Tshwane's social/structural indicators point to some urbanisation challenges in terms of rapid population growth and social incoherence (for both of which it ranks second-to-last), although its population density remains relatively low. There is a need for more research, to profile crime hotspots and explore on a more granular level the drivers behind these trends.

**FIGURE 28:** Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in Tshwane



The City of Tshwane has shown long-term declines from an already low base, but has shown increases over the last year in recorded rates of sexual offences (down 26% over the last five years but up 2% in the last year) and assault with intent to inflict GBH (down 24% over the last five years but up 1% in the last year). Like many cities, aggravated robbery rates appear to be stabilising, showing a 28% increase over the last five years but a 7% decrease in the last year. Tshwane's murder rate is the lowest among the cities, decreasing by 12% in the last year. It also has a fairly constant decline in recorded non-violent property crimes since 2005/06, with a 12% decrease in the last year. The general upward trend in the recorded rate of driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, which was increased by 26% in the last year, suggests that roadblock activities are a growing policing priority.



| CATEGORY                         |                             | INDICATOR                                          | NMB   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Objective indicators             |                             | 1 Murder rate                                      | 54    |
|                                  |                             | 2 Assault rate                                     | 295   |
|                                  |                             | 3 Robbery rate                                     | 440   |
|                                  |                             | 4 Property-related crime rate                      | 1036  |
|                                  |                             | 5 Sexual offences rate                             | 105   |
|                                  |                             | 6 Public/collective violence rate                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 7 Police activity                                  | 172   |
| Subjective indicators            |                             | 8 Experience of crime/violence                     | 8%    |
|                                  |                             | 9 Feelings of safety/fear of crime                 | 26%   |
|                                  |                             | 10 Perception of/satisfaction with law enforcement | 59%   |
| The social/structural indicators | Urbanisation                | 11 Rapid population growth                         | 1.4%  |
|                                  |                             | 12 Population density                              | 588   |
|                                  |                             | 13 Social incoherence/family disruption            | 19%   |
|                                  | Marginalisation             | 14 Poverty                                         | 0.67  |
|                                  |                             | 15 Income inequality                               | 0.625 |
|                                  |                             | 16 (Youth) unemployment                            | 47%   |
|                                  |                             | 17 Deprivation of services                         | 9%    |
|                                  | Social/physical environment | 18 Informal housing                                | 7%    |
|                                  |                             | 19 Infrastructure                                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 20 School conditions and violence                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 21 Access to alcohol, drugs, firearms              | 239   |

City is doing relatively well compared to the other cities

City is doing about average compared to the other cities


City is doing relatively poorly compared to the other cities

Although it records middling to low levels of non-violent property-related crimes, Nelson Mandela Bay has the second-highest murder rate, the third-highest robbery rate and the third-highest sexual offences rate of all nine cities. This suggests that its middling recorded rates of assault may be due to low levels of reporting of these crimes. Its indicator of police activity (as measured by recorded rates of driving while under the influence of alcohol or drugs) suggests middling to low levels of police proactivity in this regard.



Non-violent property crimes tend to be far more numerous than violent crimes (particularly robbery) yet seem to generate less fear. Nelson Mandela Bay's crime profile is relatively dominated by violent crimes, which are less frequent but more fear-inducing. Residents report relatively low rates of crime victimisation (ranking third-to-best), and yet relatively high levels of fear of crime (ranking third-to-last among the cities). This could be the result of residents self-restricting their movements, such as avoiding walking outside in the dark, to avoid becoming a target of violent crime. Residents are fairly satisfied with law enforcement relative to the other cities. The city's key outlier in terms of social/structural indicators is youth unemployment, in which it ranks worst among the cities.

**FIGURE 29:** Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in Nelson Mandela Bay



As in all the other cities, Nelson Mandela Bay saw long-term decreases in its recorded rates of assault with intent to inflict GBH (down 54% over the last 10 years and 5% in the last year) and sexual offences, but this last may be reversing, as it decreased by 35% over the last five years but in the last year increased by 2%. The recorded rate of non-violent property-related crimes has been steadily decreasing, with a 9% decline in the last year. Like many cities, aggravated robbery rates have improved in the past year (down 6%), although over 10 years they have increased by 25%. Recorded murder rates increased by 24% between 2015/16 and 2016/17 but stayed at the same level for the last two years. Roadblock activities seem to have taken an increasingly low policing priority, as shown in the decreasing medium-term trend in the recorded rate of driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs (down 19% over the last five years and down 1% in the last year).



| CATEGORY                         |                             | INDICATOR                                          | MAN   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Objective indicators             |                             | 1 Murder rate                                      | 39    |
|                                  |                             | 2 Assault rate                                     | 402   |
|                                  |                             | 3 Robbery rate                                     | 232   |
|                                  |                             | 4 Property-related crime rate                      | 1072  |
|                                  |                             | 5 Sexual offences rate                             | 130   |
|                                  |                             | 6 Public/collective violence rate                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 7 Police activity                                  | 86    |
| Subjective indicators            |                             | 8 Experience of crime/violence                     | 6%    |
|                                  |                             | 9 Feelings of safety/fear of crime                 | 21%   |
|                                  |                             | 10 Perception of/satisfaction with law enforcement | 62%   |
| The social/structural indicators | Urbanisation                | 11 Rapid population growth                         | 1.5%  |
|                                  |                             | 12 Population density                              | 119   |
|                                  |                             | 13 Social incoherence/family disruption            | 19%   |
|                                  | Marginalisation             | 14 Poverty                                         | 0.65  |
|                                  |                             | 15 Income inequality                               | 0.622 |
|                                  |                             | 16 (Youth) unemployment                            | 37%   |
|                                  |                             | 17 Deprivation of services                         | 23%   |
|                                  | Social/physical environment | 18 Informal housing                                | 12%   |
|                                  |                             | 19 Infrastructure                                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 20 School conditions and violence                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 21 Access to alcohol, drugs, firearms              | 174   |

City is doing relatively well compared to the other cities

City is doing about average compared to the other cities

City is doing relatively poorly compared to the other cities


Mangaung's relative crime profile is strongly dominated by violent interpersonal crimes. It ranks second only to Buffalo City in recorded rates of both assault and sexual offences. However, it records the lowest rate of robbery among the nine cities. Police activity, as measured by recorded rates of driving while under the influence, is low, suggesting little police proactivity.



Mangaung's residents report the second-to-lowest levels of both crime victimisation and fear of crime. This may be explained by relatively low rates of robbery, which is a strong driver of fear of crime. Residents show relatively high levels of satisfaction with law enforcement, which is second only to Ekurhuleni.

The city's social/structural indicators suggest that urbanisation factors are unlikely to be key relative drivers of crime in Mangaung, whereas marginalisation factors dominate. It has a middling to poor position in poverty (as measured by the HDI) and ranks second-to-last in terms of access to services (as measured by electricity and water in the house, and a flush toilet in the house or yard). Provision of these important household services should be considered a key component of crime reduction planning.

**FIGURE 30:** Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in Mangaung



Like all the cities, Mangaung has shown long-term decreases in its recorded rates of assault with intent to inflict GBH (down 43% over the last 10 years and 7% in the last year). Its recent reversal of the downward trend in recorded sexual offences is the largest among the cities: having decreased steadily since 2012/13, the last year saw an increase of 6%. Its trend in non-violent property-related crime has been less steady than most cities but generally downward (down 32% over the last five years and 5% in the last year). Unlike most of the cities, its murder rate has not changed significantly over the last 10 years, although it did increase slightly over the past year. Also, unlike most of the cities, aggravated robbery rates have fluctuated mostly downward, decreasing by 27% over the last five years and 8% in the last year. The recorded rate of driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs shows signs of slowing, having increased by 110% over the last 10 years, but decreasing by 4% in the last year, suggesting that roadblock activities are a lower policing priority.



| CATEGORY                         |                             | INDICATOR                                          | NMB   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Objective indicators             |                             | 1 Murder rate                                      | 43    |
|                                  |                             | 2 Assault rate                                     | 507   |
|                                  |                             | 3 Robbery rate                                     | 325   |
|                                  |                             | 4 Property-related crime rate                      | 1244  |
|                                  |                             | 5 Sexual offences rate                             | 131   |
|                                  |                             | 6 Public/collective violence rate                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 7 Police activity                                  | 188   |
| Subjective indicators            |                             | 8 Experience of crime/violence                     | 8%    |
|                                  |                             | 9 Feelings of safety/fear of crime                 | 27%   |
|                                  |                             | 10 Perception of/satisfaction with law enforcement | 44%   |
| The social/structural indicators | Urbanisation                | 11 Rapid population growth                         | 0.7%  |
|                                  |                             | 12 Population density                              | 298   |
|                                  |                             | 13 Social incoherence/family disruption            | 21%   |
|                                  | Marginalisation             | 14 Poverty                                         | 0.65  |
|                                  |                             | 15 Income inequality                               | 0.642 |
|                                  |                             | 16 (Youth) unemployment                            | 45%   |
|                                  |                             | 17 Deprivation of services                         | 27%   |
|                                  | Social/physical environment | 18 Informal housing                                | 25%   |
|                                  |                             | 19 Infrastructure                                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 20 School conditions and violence                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 21 Access to alcohol, drugs, firearms              | 149   |

City is doing relatively well compared to the other cities

City is doing about average compared to the other cities

City is doing relatively poorly compared to the other cities

Buffalo City has high levels of violent interpersonal crimes, ranking worst among the cities in recorded rates of both assault and sexual offences, as well as a close fourth in its rate of murder. It also records fairly high levels of robbery, which are about 40% higher than in Mangaung, but still lower than in Nelson Mandela Bay and in the two largest cities and ranks second (behind Cape Town) for non-violent property-related crime.

Buffalo City's residents report a middling position in terms of rates of crime victimisation, but high levels of fear of crime – second only to Cape Town. Residents show the lowest levels of satisfaction with law




enforcement among all the cities, five percentage points lower than in Cape Town and 18 percentage points lower than in Mangaung.

Buffalo City's social/structural indicators point overwhelmingly to marginalisation factors. It ranks worst among the cities in terms of deprivation of services, second-to-last in youth unemployment, and third-to-last in both poverty (as measured by the HDI) and income inequality (although in this last indicator the range of difference between the nine cities is small). It also ranks worst among the cities in terms of levels of informal housing. Its crime reduction planning should aim to ameliorate these conditions.

Its indicator of access to alcohol, drugs and firearms (as measured by the average of its recorded rates of drug-related crime, driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, and illegal possession of firearms and ammunition) is the lowest among the cities. This may indicate that Buffalo City is faring relatively well in terms of these possible drivers of crime and violence but may equally suggest that police are placing a very low priority on the roadblock operations that might detect these crimes.

**FIGURE 31:** Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in Buffalo City



Compared to the other cities, Buffalo City has shown the longest and most sustained decrease in its murder rate: down 40% over the last 10 years and 9% in the last year. However, aggravated robbery has increased, by 38% over the last 10 years and 4% in the last year – it is one of only two cities where aggravated robbery increased in the last year. As in all the cities, recorded rates of assault with intent to inflict GBH have declined, by 37% over the last 10 years and 2% in the last year. Recorded sexual offences have also decreased, by 24% over the last five years and 6% in the last year. Its recorded rate of non-violent property crimes has generally declined, but more unsteadily and slowly than most other cities (down 6% over the last 10 years and 2% in the last year). Its recorded rates of driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs have been trending downward for almost a decade (down 13% over the last 10 years, 42% over the last five, and 10% in the last year), suggesting that police have increasingly deprioritised roadblock activities.



| CATEGORY                         |                             | INDICATOR                                          | NMB   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Objective indicators             |                             | 1 Murder rate                                      | 40    |
|                                  |                             | 2 Assault rate                                     | 242   |
|                                  |                             | 3 Robbery rate                                     | 253   |
|                                  |                             | 4 Property-related crime rate                      | 985   |
|                                  |                             | 5 Sexual offences rate                             | 80    |
|                                  |                             | 6 Public/collective violence rate                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 7 Police activity                                  | 78    |
| Subjective indicators            |                             | 8 Experience of crime/violence                     | 8%    |
|                                  |                             | 9 Feelings of safety/fear of crime                 | 23%   |
|                                  |                             | 10 Perception of/satisfaction with law enforcement | 61%   |
| The social/structural indicators | Urbanisation                | 11 Rapid population growth                         | 1.1%  |
|                                  |                             | 12 Population density                              | 976   |
|                                  |                             | 13 Social incoherence/family disruption            | 21%   |
|                                  | Marginalisation             | 14 Poverty                                         | 0.62  |
|                                  |                             | 15 Income inequality                               | 0.636 |
|                                  |                             | 16 (Youth) unemployment                            | 43%   |
|                                  |                             | 17 Deprivation of services                         | 21%   |
|                                  | Social/physical environment | 18 Informal housing                                | 8%    |
|                                  |                             | 19 Infrastructure                                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 20 School conditions and violence                  |       |
|                                  |                             | 21 Access to alcohol, drugs, firearms              | 290   |

City is doing relatively well compared to the other cities

City is doing about average compared to the other cities

City is doing relatively poorly compared to the other cities


Msunduzi displays middling to low recorded rates of most crime types. It has the second-to-lowest rates of robbery and fairly low rates of non-violent property-related crimes. Although at middling levels compared to the other cities, it would do well (like the other smaller cities) to focus on addressing its patterns of the interpersonal violence crimes of murder and sexual offences. Its position in the rankings for murder, assault and property-related crimes have all deteriorated slightly since 2015/16. It ranks last among the cities in terms of its indicator of police activity (as measured by recorded rates of driving while under the influence), suggesting that police are placing a very low priority on the roadblock operations that might detect these crimes.



Msunduzi residents report middling rates of both crime victimisation (ranking fourth) and fear of crime (ranking sixth), but they show relatively high levels of satisfaction.

As in Buffalo City, Msunduzi's social/structural indicators point very clearly to challenges with marginalisation. It ranks worst among the cities in terms of poverty (as measured by the HDI), and third-to-last in terms of both youth unemployment and deprivation of services. Its crime prevention strategies would do well to focus on ameliorating these particular challenges.

**FIGURE 32:** Long-term trend in selected crime rates per 100 000 in Msunduzi



As the smallest of the cities and the only non-metro, Msunduzi has shown some unique crime trends. Unlike the other cities, the long-term trend for non-violent property-related crimes is upwards, with an 18% increase since 2008/09, although the past three years have seen a decrease. Its long-term trend in assault with intent to inflict GHB has been only slightly and unsteadily downwards (up 4% over the last 10 years, down 12% over the last five, and down 7% in the last year). Its recorded rates of sexual offences have declined with little sign of slowing (down 35% over the last five years and 5% in the last year). Its trend in aggravated robbery has been unsteady but slightly upwards, increasing by 22% over the last 10 years and by 10% in the last year – the largest increase among the cities. The city's murder rate trend resembles that of most of the other cities, showing a long-term decline (down 20% over the last 10 years), slight medium-term increase (up 2% over the last five years), and recent decline (down 5% in the last year). Its recorded rates of driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs have declined over the long term (down 75% over the last 10 years) but increased more recently (up 28% over the last five years and up 4% in the last year), perhaps suggesting that police have slowly begun reprioritising roadblock activities.





# ANNEXURE B: USRG Members

| MEMBER CITIES      | TITLE | NAME           | SURNAME        | DESIGNATION                                                     |
|--------------------|-------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Buffalo City       | Dr    | Ntobeko        | Stemele        | Commander: Law Enforcement                                      |
| City of Ekurhuleni | Mr    | Goodman        | Mzolo          | Deputy Chief of Police: Ekurhuleni Metro Police Dept.           |
|                    | Mr    | Julius Doctor  | Mkhwanazi      | Snr. Superintendent: Ekurhuleni Metro Police Dept.              |
| City of Joburg     | Ms    | Nazira         | Cachalia       | Deputy Director: Joburg City Safety Programme                   |
|                    | Mr    | Makgafela      | Thaba          | Project Specialist: Joburg City Safety Programme                |
| City of Tshwane    | Ms    | Charmaine      | Sutil          | Functional Head: TMPD                                           |
|                    | Ms    | Aline          | Birkenstock    | Director, Staff Office: TMPD                                    |
| eThekweni          | Mr    | Bongumusa      | Zondo          | Acting Head: Safer Cities Unit                                  |
| Mangaung           | Mr    | Mzingisi       | Nkungwana      | Head of Department: Social Services                             |
|                    | Ms    | Mpumie         | Damane-Mnyanda | Manager: Library Services                                       |
|                    | Ms    | Ratanang       | Menong         | Community Development Officer                                   |
| Msunduzi           | Mr    | Justice Kwenza | Khumalo        | Snr Manager: Public Safety Enforcement & Disaster Management    |
|                    | Mr    | Chandrallal    | Parbhoo        | Superintendent: Public Safety Enforcement & Disaster Management |
| Nelson Mandela Bay | Mr    | Shane          | Brown          | Acting Executive Director: Safety & Security                    |
|                    | Ms    | Thandile       | Matshikwe      | Coordinator: CSF                                                |



| PARTNER ORGANISATIONS                                       | TITLE | NAME      | SURNAME       | DESIGNATION                                           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-----------|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>GIZ-VCP</b>                                              | Mr    | Terence   | Smith         | Programme Manager                                     |
|                                                             | Ms    | Esther    | Wegner        | Technical Advisor                                     |
| <b>SA Cities Network</b>                                    | Dr    | Geci      | Karuri-Sebina | Associate                                             |
|                                                             | Ms    | Siphelele | Ngobese       | Researcher                                            |
| <b>Civilian Secretariat for Police Service</b>              | Dr    | Manthiba  | Phalane       | Director: Social Crime Prevention                     |
|                                                             | Ms    | Itumeleng | Moagi         | Deputy Director: Policy Analysis                      |
|                                                             | Ms    | Prashne   | Pillay        | Assistant Director                                    |
|                                                             | Ms    | Mimi      | Mlangeni      | Assistant Director                                    |
| <b>SALGA</b>                                                | Mr    | Dumisani  | Mahole        | Manager: Strategic Support                            |
| <b>National Treasury</b>                                    | Mr    | Ndimphiwe | Jamile        | Projects Manager: Neighbourhood Development Programme |
| <b>National Department of Human Settlements</b>             | Ms    | Hailey    | McKuur        | Chief Director: Macro Policy                          |
| <b>National Department of Social Development</b>            | Mr    | Steven    | Maselesele    | Director                                              |
| <b>UCT: Institute for Safety Governance and Criminology</b> | Dr    | Guy       | Lamb          | Director: Safety & Violence Initiative                |
|                                                             | Mr    | Matthew   | Skade         | Researcher                                            |
|                                                             | Ms    | Anine     | Kriegler      | Researcher                                            |



## ANNEXURE C: USRG Safety Briefs





# URBAN SAFETY BRIEF No. 1/2018

This Urban Safety Brief looks at ways in which cities can use by-laws as a tool for regulating urban safety.

The SA Cities Urban Safety Reference Group's Briefs Series is designed to distil the state of current knowledge on urban safety-related topics for a policy and planning audience. It is presented quarterly to the City Budget Forum and other key stakeholders.



## By-laws as a tool for urban safety regulation in South African cities



### BACKGROUND

By-laws are perhaps the most powerful regulatory instrument available for municipal administrations striving to create inclusive, accessible and safe cities for their residents and visitors. The authority to pass by-laws lies exclusively with the Council. By-laws bind both the municipality (political and administrative structures) and the community (including residents, rate-payers, non-governmental organisations, the private sector and labour organisations). By-laws offer a means of controlling human and corporate behaviour because they are directly enforceable and compliance to by-laws is mandatory. Therefore, they have the potential to effect positive change in the safety profile of a city over time.

This policy brief explains how by-laws can be used to legislate on the powers of authorised municipal officials in matters such as environmental health, disaster management, public space, public amenities and informal trading, and that safety by-laws can control and regulate certain activities and conduct. After considering by-laws as governance instruments, the process of making by-laws and principles for effective by-laws are explained. The policy brief then explains that various roleplayers and stakeholders must be involved and argues for the expansion of municipal courts. It concludes with some guidelines for safety by-laws.



### DISCUSSION

#### 01 By-laws as governance instruments

By-laws bring order and certainty to the urban environment. By-laws provide certainty both to city residents (who know what behaviour and actions are permitted or not permitted) and to the municipality (enforcement officials know what powers they have to enforce order in their jurisdiction). The effectiveness of by-laws lies in their ability to be tailor-made to local circumstances. Cities can pass by-laws to deal with their specific circumstances, provided the by-laws do not conflict with national legislation and relate only to local government functions. The potential to create innovative by-laws is limitless, so long as by-laws are complemented by other mechanisms, such as planning and financial instruments (e.g. tax incentives and subsidies).

By-laws can also be enforced on the spot, with (for example) municipal officials issuing fines for a breach of the by-law. Such visual enforcement can have a knock-on effect in the community, which stimulates further compliance. The enforcement of by-laws can lead to a significant reduction in crime (one aspect of community safety), not only at city level but also nationally.

By-laws written with the Criminal Procedure Act (No. 51 of 1997) and the National Prosecuting Authority Act (No. 32 of 1998 – Section 22) in mind are powerful crime-fighting tools for municipal officials. When combined with effective training of municipal personnel in criminal enforcement, these tools can lead to successful prosecutions in criminal court, which serve as an effective deterrent. By-laws can also contain administrative enforcement provisions, such as contravention notices and directives.

Each municipality decides on the number of and design of its by-laws. Therefore, given the lack of a national or provincial by-law “template”, municipalities cover urban safety differently in their by-laws. A survey of some South African cities revealed that the aspects to urban safety typically covered in by-laws include: beaches, community safety, disaster management, environmental health services, events, fireworks, informal trading, problem properties, public amenities, public parks and streets, roads and traffic safety, storm water management, streets, public places, nuisances

(including noise), behaviour and substance abuse. This list is not exhaustive, and the by-laws have varying aims, from promoting a safe and health environment, to establishing support structures (e.g. a committee), promoting constitutional rights (e.g. Section 24 environmental right) and prohibiting certain activities and conduct (e.g. in the event of a disaster). Typically, the by-laws contain:

- Provisions on the powers of authorised officials.
- Measures to manage, control and regulate access and behaviour.
- Measures to prevent, minimise and prohibit nuisances and certain activities/conduct.

By-laws can effect positive change in a city over time, as residents are instructed what *to do*, rather than what *not to do*. A municipality wanting to improve community safety could use by-laws to instruct and incentivise measures that reduce crime. For instance, a business that installs security lighting in the streets and pavements surrounding its building could receive a rates rebate.


## 02 The by-law-making process

The proper drafting of a by-law requires legal and other skills and resources, which may be out of reach for many municipalities. Therefore, policy-makers should embrace the potential of *standard draft by-laws*, as provided for in Section 14 of the Local Government:

Municipal Systems Act (No. 32 of 2000). The Act states that local government may request an MEC or Minister to make standard draft by-laws and prescribes a process to be followed when promulgating by-laws. The by-law process is summarised in Figure 1 and Figure 2.

**FIGURE 1:** The by-law-making process



**FIGURE 2:** From pre-drafting to post-promulgation

### 03 Principles to guide the by-law making process:

| KEEP IT SIMPLE                                                                                | BE CONCISE                                                                                | BE CONSISTENT                                           | KEEP TO A CLEAR STRUCTURE                              | FOLLOW PRESCRIBED PROCESS                                                                                              |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Use language that as many as possible can understand (avoid legal jargon/technical language). | Avoid repetition and check each statement addresses the purpose and intent of the by-law. | Standardise and use consistently any terms/definitions. | Ensure that each paragraph addresses a separate issue. | Give reasonable notice to Council members, publish in the provincial Gazette and make readily available to the public. |

### 04 Requirements for making by-laws work

A by-law must be initiated, developed, implemented, complied with and enforced in order to deliver on its objectives. It must also be understood by all relevant stakeholders. As the illustration on page 4 shows, the success of safety by-laws require a cooperative governance approach. Certain requirements are:



An organisational structure that meets the challenges of the jurisdiction and complies with the national framework and constitutional imperatives.



Access to services and information by the community (e.g. Emergency Incident Management Centres for reporting incidents and complaints), education and awareness-raising, and activation/coordination of relevant services and departments.



Effective follow-through, i.e. investigation and prosecution where necessary.



Exploration of the opportunities presented by new information and communication technologies.




Feedback on (and further development and maintenance) of local legislation and/or policy and corresponding information portals.



Inclusion of cooperative and democratic governance structures such as Community Policing Forums (CPFs), or other Public/Private Partnerships.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT – BY-LAW DEVELOPMENT AND ENFORCEMENT



## 05 The role of municipal courts

The law does not require a municipal area to have a municipal court, and few municipalities have such specialised lower courts. Instead, traffic offences and by-law contraventions are dealt with by Magistrates' Courts. Well-functioning municipal courts could make by-law compliance and enforcement more effective, as they would be able to prioritise and dedicate time and resources to by-law contraventions. The challenge is that the concept of a "municipal court" is not yet clearly defined. If a national municipal courts' statute were in place, the departments of justice and correctional services, and of cooperative government and traditional affairs could join forces with municipalities to identify suitable buildings, provide infrastructure and support, and (later) offer judicial training on the substance, scope and reach of by-laws that fall within the jurisdiction of such courts.

## CONCLUSIONS

By-laws relating to environmental health, disaster management, public spaces and amenities, informal trading etc. could be used to legislate the powers of officials and institute measures to control/regulate access and behaviour in public places, at events and under specific circumstances. Safety by-laws could also provide for measures that prevent and prohibit certain activities and nuisances, as well as for municipal licensing systems.

New or additional safety by-laws should be aligned with other by-laws and applicable provincial and national policies and legislation. The drafting, implementation and enforcement of by-laws require specialised skills and acumen. Political will, as well as intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder support and collaboration are key for municipalities revising their safety by-laws, as part of the broader aim to make South African's cities inclusive, accessible and safe.

**This brief was compiled by the SA Cities Urban Safety Reference Group with support from the UCT Centre of Criminology in collaboration with the South African Research Chair: Cities, Law and Environmental Sustainability (CLES), North-West University.**

The Urban Safety Reference Group is a platform for peer-to-peer learning and knowledge sharing among practitioners from the SACN member cities as well as other key government role-players on urban safety and violence prevention. It is convened by the South African Cities Network (SACN) with the support of the GIZ-Inclusive Violence and Crime Prevention (VCP) Programme.

### CONTACT:

 [urbansafety@sacities.net](mailto:urbansafety@sacities.net)

 +27 11 407 6264

 [www.sacities.net](http://www.sacities.net)

 [www.saferspaces.org.za](http://www.saferspaces.org.za)



Implemented by  
**giz** Deutsche Gesellschaft  
für Internationale  
Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH



# URBAN SAFETY BRIEF No. 2/2018

## Better together: Partnership policing for effective urban safety

This Urban Safety Brief considers the imperative of partnership policing for ensuring safer cities in South Africa. It looks at how partnership policing can be used to address the complex crime and safety challenges faced by cities.

The SA Cities Urban Safety Reference Group's Briefs Series is designed to distil the state of current knowledge on urban safety-related topics for a policy and planning audience. It is presented quarterly to the City Budget Forum and other key stakeholders.



### BACKGROUND

Cities face a range of complex crime and safety challenges but have scarce resources to address such challenges. One solution is partnership policing, which is policing in cooperation with a range of stakeholders, such as other government departments, the private sector, non-governmental organisations and community groups. Derived from the premise that the police need to work with and draw upon the capabilities and competence of communities, partnership policing is an approach that seeks to make the police and community members “co-producers of public safety”<sup>1</sup>

In an ideal model of partnership policing, the relevant policing bodies and community representatives are equals in making crime-prevention decisions. This requires a high level of trust between communities and the police, and for the police to be viewed as providing a public service that is legitimate and receptive to the needs of the community.

Since the mid-1990s, partnership policing has occurred in various manifestations in South Africa, but more systematic cooperation is needed. The National Development Plan (2012) states that “Effective coordinated partnerships with civil society and the private sector are key components of a sustainable strategy for citizen safety”, while the White Paper emphasises the importance of the police placing “communities at the centre of its approach to policing”<sup>2</sup>

Partnership policing has almost exclusively been driven by the South African Police Service (SAPS), which has adopted a relatively restrictive interpretation of this form of policing. Furthermore, most cities have not pursued partnership policing in a systematic and strategic fashion and so have not harnessed the crime prevention capacity and capabilities of the non-governmental and private sectors. As a result, initiatives between metro police and community and business tend to be ad hoc and short-term.

The brief explores the state of partnership policing in South Africa, through the different types of partnership that exist. It suggests that cities should not depend on SAPS’ limited approach to collaborating with metro police, but should embrace effective partnership policing. The brief concludes with some short-term and longer term recommendations for cities.



urban safety  
reference group

- 
1. Skolnick, JH and Baylay DH. 1988. Community Policing: issues and practices around the world. Washington DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Communication and Research Utilization.
  2. NPC (National Planning Commission). 2012. National Development Plan. Pretoria: NPC, p. 386. CSP (The Civilian Secretariat for Police). 2016. White Paper on Policing. Pretoria: CSP, p. 20.



## DISCUSSION

### 01 SAPS and partnership policing

Since the 1990s, the South African government has embraced community-oriented and partnership policing. A key motivation for such approaches was to instil democratic policing values throughout SAPS and generate legitimacy and grassroots accountability for the police.<sup>3</sup> The SAPS Act (No. 68 of 1995) requires police to establish Community Policing Forums (CPFs) in all police stations. Since 1995, SAPS has interpreted partnership policing narrowly, as the mobilising of local communities to be auxiliary resources that support the National Crime Combatting Strategy.

In recent years, SAPS has prioritised school safety and CPF capacity-building. The involvement of cities is limited, as SAPS tends to work directly with CPFs and affected schools via the Department of Basic Education. However, SAPS does envisage the involvement of metro police in school safety committees and searches at schools.

Some of the achievements to date include:

- The development of guidelines for crime prevention through partnerships.
- Capacity-building for policy officials to engage in partnership policing
- The establishment of “community structures” to facilitate crime prevention discussions with communities.
- A “Partnership Protocol on Crime and Violence in Schools” signed by the Ministers of Police and Basic Education (2011)
- A Schools-based Crime Prevention Programme supported by Medium-Term Strategic Frameworks (2015–2019), which is aimed at:
  - strengthening safe school committees,
  - linking schools to local police station,
  - mobilising communities to take ownership of schools,
  - raising awareness among learners about the impact of violence,
  - encouraging a crime/safety reporting system at schools,
  - implementing schools-based crime prevention programmes and specialised operations for hotspot schools (visible policing and patrols), and
  - closing illegal shebeens and liquor outlets within 500m of schools.

### 02 Partnership policing SAPS and MPS

Legislation requires the MPS to actively cooperate with SAPS. The White Paper (2016) emphasises the need for effective coordination between the SAPS and MPS as a means of “maximising the utilisation of law enforcement resources for effective and efficient policing”<sup>4</sup>. Interactions take place at national, provincial, cluster and station levels. The National Forum of Metro Police Chiefs meet quarterly with SAPS to discuss cooperation, policing standards and procedures, and suitable practices.

In some instances, the MPS actively contribute to improving school safety. For example, in Cape Town, the MPS deploy specially trained school resource offices (SROs) to unsafe schools in Cape Town. SROs conduct search and seizure operations, monitor and report truancy, and generally contribute to reducing crime and violence, including apprehending offenders on school grounds.<sup>5</sup>

### 03 Partnering with NWS

Neighbourhood watch structures (NWS) are geographically specific, not-for-profit community safety entities made up of volunteers from the area. NWS may take the form of neighbourhood watch associations, street committees, street watches and flat watches. Both the SAPS and MPS collaborate with NWS to prevent crime and improve community safety.



In Buffalo City, NWS and MPS patrol jointly busy areas along the coastline (“bush walks”).



In Cape Town, accredited NWS receive some resources (e.g. reflective vests, radios), and members undergo a basic training course. NWS patrol at schools and escort groups of learners to their homes (“walking bus”) in high crime areas.<sup>6</sup>

3. ANC (African National Congress). 1993. Policing the Transition: transforming the Police. Johannesburg: ANC. Pelser E. 1999. The challenges of community policing in South Africa. Institute for Security Studies Papers.

4. *Op cit.*, p. 31

5. Safety and Violence Initiative. 2017. School Safety in the Western Cape: strengths, limitation and recommendations. Briefing Note for the Western Cape Government.

## 04 Partnering with private security

As of 31 March 2017, there were 498 435 active private security personnel and 8995 service providers in South Africa.<sup>7</sup> The private security industry frequently works closely and coordinates their activities with SAPS, MPS and NWS. They often support SAPS and MPS through providing intelligence, manning of road blocks and responding to emergencies.

The concentration of private security, particularly in CIDs, mean that SAPS and MPS can reallocate some of their policing resources from these areas to high-crime areas.<sup>8</sup>

- In Nelson Mandela Bay, one of the major security companies recently funded the establishment of a Neighbourhood Watch Support Desk, to improve communication and sharing of information.

- Throughout South Africa, private security companies provide equipment and sponsorship to credible NWS, although such sponsorship is ultimately self-serving, as more effective NWS means that private security companies can potentially reduce the number of patrollers in an area.
- City improvement districts (CID) are typically created to improve public spaces through additional cleansing and security services, and are not-for-profit funded through levies paid by property owners within a geographic area. They contract private security companies to provide policing and patrolling services. In Johannesburg, 30 improvement districts (referred to now as voluntary management initiatives) spend over R61-million on public safety maintenance and cleaning annually.<sup>9</sup>



## CONCLUSION

The SAPS' narrow interpretation of partnership policing and limited approach to collaborating with the MPS have substantial implications for cities in South Africa. Most city authorities do not have the mechanisms, systems and processes, financial resources and personnel – and arguably the political will – to leverage the activities of NWS and resources and expertise of the private security industry.

Cities have the opportunity to ensure more equitable policing in their cities through embracing partnership policing. The recommendations that follow include both short-term “easy wins”, based on existing

successful initiatives, and longer term solutions involving technology and private-public partnerships.



## RECOMMENDATIONS

### Accredit and support NWS

Cities could use NWS accreditation to more effectively coordinate their activities with and provide support to NWS. Such a strategy would enable city authorities to develop a database of credible community safety entities; establish effective communication mechanisms; provide training and equipment where it is most needed; hold NWS to account for their actions; and even promote non-violent norms and standards in this sector.

### Provide and coordinate support for CPFs with SAPS

Functional CPFs are an integral component of effective partnership policing, but many CPFs in high crime areas are not entirely effective. City authorities should enter into agreements with the SAPS to support the CPF capacity-building programme, by providing training, funding and equipment.

### Deploy neighbourhood safety officers and teams

The UK, New Zealand and Australia have used neighbourhood safety officers (NSOs) and neighbourhood safety teams (NSTs) or neighbourhood policing teams to varying degrees of success. NSTs are currently being piloted in Delft (Cape Town). An NSO is typically a specially trained MPS official who is deployed to identify and solve safety problems with the local community and local government stakeholders. NSTs draw members from relevant city entities, community organisations, such as CPFs and NWS, to provide a more comprehensive problem-solving approach to safety and security problems.

Small numbers of NSOs, which can be selected from existing metro police, or specifically recruited, can result in improved police-community relations with a relatively short period of time.

6. DCS (Department of Community Safety). 2018. Walking Bus Project. Western Cape DCS.

7. PSIRA (Private Security Industry Regulatory Authority). 2017. Annual Report 2016/17. Centurion: PSIRA.

8. Berg J. 2015. Polycentric Security Governance: legitimacy, accountability and the public interest. PhD Thesis, UCT.

9. Johannesburg CID. 2016. Johannesburg CID Forum.

### ■ Employ school resource officers (SROs)

The financing, recruitment and deployment of SROs may add considerable value in terms of improving school safety. They can also be the principal intermediaries in terms of facilitating interactions between schools and the SAPS. As with NSOs, SROs can be selected from existing metro police, or specifically recruited, and the deployment of small numbers of SROs to schools in high crime areas (with the support of the Metro Police and SAPS) can lead to significant improvements in school safety.

### ■ Use CCTV technology and resource management (systems and software).

CCTV can be found in most South African cities, especially Johannesburg, eThekweni, Cape Town and Nelson Mandela Bay. Linking and integrating the myriad of CCTV cameras under a common authority can contribute to more effective crime prevention. It enables improved monitoring of crime hotspots and (potentially) the tracking of offenders, and CCTV footage can be used as evidence in court proceedings. Cities could provide subsidies or create an entity overseen by the city authority, ensuring that laws relating to privacy are adhered to systematically.

Electronic policing and emergency response management and communication systems allow for real-time crime mapping and analysis, and efficiently facilitates communication across relevant city departments and community entities, such as NWS. This technology has led to improved policing responses and better use of crime prevention resources in the USA, while improvements in safety resulted from implementing similar systems in Kanpur (India), Nairobi (Kenya), Singapore and London (UK).<sup>10</sup> The City of Cape Town recently introduced such a system called Emergency Policing and Incident Command (EPIC), but it is too early to assess its effectiveness.

### ■ Promote public-private and people partnerships

International evidence shows that public-private partnerships can contribute to substantial improvements in urban safety. In South Africa, various cities have experimented with this approach: the Cape Town Partnership had positive safety outcomes in Cape Town,<sup>11</sup> while in Nelson Mandela Bay a major motor manufacturing company donated bicycles for the City's newly appointed beach officials and tourism ambassadors who provide increased visible policing and by-law enforcement along beachfront areas.

Such partnerships can be even more effective in promoting public safety if they draw on the expertise, resources and knowledge of individual residents who have knowledge, experience and skills that can effectively contribute to crime prevention and safety promotion, either generally or in relation to specific areas.<sup>12</sup>

**This brief was compiled by the SA Cities Urban Safety Reference Group with support from the UCT Centre of Criminology.**

The Urban Safety Reference Group is a platform for peer-to-peer learning and knowledge sharing among practitioners from the SACN member cities as well as other key government role-players on urban safety and violence prevention. It is convened by the South African Cities Network (SACN) with the support of the GIZ-Inclusive Violence and Crime Prevention (VCP) Programme.

#### CONTACT:

✉ [urbansafety@sacities.net](mailto:urbansafety@sacities.net)

☎ +27 11 407 6264

🌐 [www.sacities.net](http://www.sacities.net)

🌐 [www.saferspaces.org.za](http://www.saferspaces.org.za)



Implemented by  
**giz** Deutsche Gesellschaft  
für Internationale  
Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

10. Coldre JR, Huntton A and Medaris M. 2013. Introducing smart policing: foundations, principles and practice. *Police Quarterly*, 16(3): 275–286. IHS Markit. The benefits of safe cities. [https://cdn.ihs.com/www/Technology/Security/IHS\\_Markit-Benefits\\_of\\_Safe\\_Cities\\_WhitePaper.pdf](https://cdn.ihs.com/www/Technology/Security/IHS_Markit-Benefits_of_Safe_Cities_WhitePaper.pdf)

11. Berg. *op cit*.

12. Marana P, Labaka L and Sarriegi JM. 2017. A framework for public-private-people partnerships in the city resilience-building process. *Safety Science*.



# References

- CoJ (City of Joburg). 2017. Johannesburg City Safety Strategy Booklet. Johannesburg: CoJ.
- CSPS (Civilian Secretariat for Police Service). 2016. White Paper on Safety and Security. Pretoria: CSPS.  
Available online: <https://www.saferspaces.org.za/uploads/files/2016-WPSS-incl-Annexures.pdf>
- DCOG (Department of Cooperative Governance). 2016a. Integrated Urban Development Framework. Pretoria: DCOG.
- NPC (National Planning Commission). 2012. National Development Plan 2030: Our future – make it work. Pretoria: NPC.
- OECD and UN-Habitat.(2018), Global State of National Urban Policy, OECD Publishing, Paris/UN-HABITAT, Nairobi. Available online: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264290747-en>.
- Stats SA (Statistics South Africa). 2018. Victims of Crime Survey 2017/2018, pp. 24, 51. Pretoria: Stats SA.
- UN (United Nations). 2018a. United Nations High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development, President's Summary of the 2018 High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development, 18 July 2018. Available online: [https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/205432018\\_HLPPF\\_Presidents\\_summary\\_FINAL.pdf](https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/205432018_HLPPF_Presidents_summary_FINAL.pdf)
- UN. 2018b. United Nations General Assembly (Economic and Social Council). Progress on the implementation of the New Urban Agenda: Report of the Secretary-General, A/73/83–E/2018/62, 7 May 2018.
- UN-Habitat. 2015. Conference on Housing and Sustainable Development. Habitat 3 Issue Paper on Safer Cities, 31 May 2015. Available online: [http://habitat3.org/wp-content/uploads/Habitat-III-Issue-Paper-3\\_Safer-Cities-2.0.pdf](http://habitat3.org/wp-content/uploads/Habitat-III-Issue-Paper-3_Safer-Cities-2.0.pdf)
- Vetten L. 2014. Domestic violence in South Africa. Policy Brief. Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies.
- World Bank. 2015. Inclusive Cities Approach Paper. Available online: <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/402451468169453117/World-Inclusive-cities-approach-paper>





# About the State of Urban Safety in South Africa Report

## About the Urban Safety Reference Group

Although local practitioners and many government officials in South Africa face similar challenges in addressing urban safety, there have been few opportunities for a structured exchange on urban safety issues among cities, and with relevant national government stakeholders.

The Urban Safety Reference Group (USRG) was established in early 2014 as a way to close this gap. As the first institutionalised forum in South Africa for enabling practice-based learning on urban safety and violence prevention issues, the USRG's aim is to inform urban policy, planning and management. It is a valuable and important platform for peer-to-peer learning and knowledge sharing among practitioners from the South African Cities Network (SACN) member cities and other key government role-players.

The USRG is premised on the unique position of local government to play a leading role in driving integrated approaches to preventing violence and crime that extend beyond traditional policing and law enforcement approaches or the reliance on private security firms. The USRG also confirms the strategic importance of municipalities in localising global and national policy processes aimed at safe, inclusive, resilient and sustainable cities, such as the New Urban Agenda (NUA) and the Integrated Urban Development Framework (IUDF)

The USRG also provides a basis for cities to collectively raise the profile of the topic of urban safety nationally, and advocates for political, legislative, institutional or fiscal reforms to empower cities and local governments to make a more pro-active contribution to violence and crime prevention.

The USRG is convened by the SACN with the support of the Inclusive Violence and Crime Prevention (VCP) Programme. The VCP Programme is a joint development cooperation programme between South Africa and Germany implemented by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ).

## USRG Annual Reporting

As part of its overall work programme, the USRG produces an annual report that offers an analytical update on the state of crime, violence and safety in South Africa's nine largest cities. By presenting crime data at a city-level, the reports reveal crucial research results, given that crime statistics do not usually provide information at this level and changes over time. Having data aggregated to city level enables cities to tailor violence and crime prevention strategies and target interventions where they are needed. The reports promote a common frame of reference for understanding and responding to urban safety challenges, as well as institutionalising this field of practice at the municipal level. The USRG also applies a set of urban safety indicators that provide the basis for comparative analysis, assessment and planning.




# The State of Urban Safety in South Africa 2018/19 Report

The 2018/19 Report provides an update on the state of crime and violence in South Africa's nine largest cities. It is envisioned as a credible resource for all decision-makers and practitioners involved in the different aspects of making cities safer, including political leaders, officials across city sector departments and different spheres of government, civil society and the business sector.


Like previous reports, the 2018/19 Report encompasses aggregated crime data; global and national policy developments pertaining to urban safety; individual city reports on lessons, strategies and interventions to prevent crime and violence; and examples of good practices for making cities safer. It continues to call for political championship of the urban safety agenda and resource support to enable cities to better act on their safety promotion function, which remains an unfunded mandate.

## Previous Reports



South African murder rates are roughly five times higher than the global average, making the country among the most unsafe in the world. High levels of crime and violence are a significant developmental challenge for South Africa's major cities. With an urbanisation rate of over 60%, the majority of South Africans live in cities and towns. It is in these areas that vulnerability to crime and violence is most acutely felt. Inter-related factors driving the rates of crime include inequality, social exclusion, (youth) unemployment, substance and alcohol abuse, family disruption, a built environment that enables criminality and poorly planned and managed urbanisation. The socio-spatial segregation legacy of apartheid adds to these problems. While there are many ongoing efforts

by both public and non-governmental institutions aimed at making cities safer, what has been missing are integrated approaches that recognise that safer cities require more than just policing. Similarly there has been a lack of systematic analysis of crime trends at city level, to empower, enable and support city governments and other government and civil society actors, to formulate the appropriate prevention and response strategies.




Cities worldwide generate about 80% of the gross national product of their respective countries. They are also central to the achievement of national, regional and global sustainable development goals. They are places of opportunity and as a result are challenged with violence and crime possibly arising from high inequality. There is a comprehensive policy field on building safer communities, but gaps remain in the implementation of those policies. Understanding crime trends is key to crafting the right responses and effective policy implementation. Safety promotion strategies and interventions must be evidence-based to have sustainable impact. Quality city-level data can be the difference, allowing for better targeting and use of existing resources, particularly in the current budget climate. City-level

data captures the true distribution of crime challenges, thereby enabling city authorities to place-specific dynamics and drivers. For example, people may live side-by-side but be exposed to entirely different worlds of crime risk due to their gender, age, disability or employment status. Data could enable actors to respond to the social, economic and spatial drivers of crime and violence.

## Key Contents of the 2018/19 Report

Taken from the USRG's research, advocacy, peer learning and capacity building activities, this year's report updates on

- Global and national policy developments, particularly the emerging frameworks for alignment, localisation and implementation of sustainable urban development.
- The sustained trend of cities disproportionately challenged with crime and violence. The continued call is for budget allocations to reflect the central role that cities are expected to play in accordance with global and national policies.
- The state of crime and safety in the nine major cities.
- All-of-society approaches to making cities and towns safer, with practical examples of how the requisite partnerships can be established and sustained.
- Testing of innovative practices for improved community participation and co-creation in the conceptualisation, design, activation and management of open public spaces.
- The USRG's growing profile, as a possible model for replication and adaptation in other African urban contexts, both in terms of peer-to-peer learning and knowledge generation (research and reporting).




While South African murder rates are among the highest in the world, the country's largest cities carry a disproportionate burden for this crime type. Because murder is considered a good indicator for general levels of violence, closer attention to place-specific drivers could influence violence reduction in cities and nationally.

|                                                                |                                                                  | NATIONAL CRIMES | CITY CRIMES |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| <b>Non-violent property crimes (Decreased between 2016/17)</b> | Burglary at residential premises                                 | ↓9%             | ↓9%         |
|                                                                | Burglary at non-residential premises                             | ↓7%             | ↓6%         |
|                                                                | Theft of motor vehicle and motorcycle                            | ↓6%             | ↓8%         |
|                                                                | Theft out of/from motor vehicle                                  | ↓8%             | ↓7%         |
| <b>Violent property crimes (Increased between 2016/17)</b>     | Robbery with aggravating circumstances                           | ↑25%            | ↑18%        |
|                                                                | Robbery at residential premises                                  | ↑21%            | ↑24%        |
|                                                                | Robbery at non-residential premises                              | ↑15%            | ↑13%        |
|                                                                | Carjacking (but has not reclaimed the heights of the late 1990s) | ↑58%            | ↑43%        |

The USRG needs to have a closer research focus to establish reliably correlations between certain crime trends, e.g. the shift from non-violent to violent property crimes; the possible link between alcohol/substance use and GBH/sexual offenses/GBV etc., in order to formulate the necessary strategies and policy recommendations.

## Crime and Violence Indicators



\* The measure of strengthening the security by increasing the required effort to commit crimes to or at an object.  
[http://securipedia.eu/mediawiki/index.php/Measure:\\_Target\\_hardening](http://securipedia.eu/mediawiki/index.php/Measure:_Target_hardening)

- The risk factors that impact crime and safety are structural and social. Knowing the multifaceted drivers, together with frequent identification, measurement and assessment of the key determinants, enables actors to develop the appropriate crime prevention policies and strategies.
- High crime and fear often go hand in hand with low trust in police and dissatisfaction with policing. This has implications for how actors in an integrated framework should align their actions, exploring long-term and preventive responses in support of revised law enforcement-based approaches.
- Perceptions of crime are often contrary to the objective evidence and carry more weight. It is important to engage continuously and partner with communities as empowered actors in safety promotion.


## Key Recommendations

This year's recommendations encourage cities to campaign more actively for resource and capacity support in the field of violence and crime prevention interventions, for a strong integration of a gender lens when collecting relevant data and a focus on effective knowledge management systems.


- Develop evidence-based municipal community safety strategies that are incremental, starting with identified crime “hotspots”, and then scaling up to cover the entire city.
- Integrate gender strongly into the data collection and analysis that informs the development, implementation and monitoring of municipal community safety plans.
- Form alliances with interested stakeholders in the city who can support advocacy for safety interventions or facilitate access to resources.
- Monitor and evaluate the implementation of violence and crime prevention programmes using knowledge management systems that capture processes, approaches and results (including institutional learnings and how they inform future city planning and budgeting)
- Increase advocacy with other government sectors and spheres for integrated approaches to urban safety based on the existing policy frameworks.
- Consider creative ways to spend available resources; making use of public programmes such as the EPWP to leverage synergies between job creation and safety promotion/violence prevention.

## Insights from City Practices


### Develop safety strategies



#### Current CoJ Objectives



### Develop integrated, inclusive models



### Include local communities in multi-stakeholder partnerships



### Adapt good practices from other cities







## urban safety reference group



### Urban Safety Reference Group

The State of Urban Safety in South Africa Report is a flagship publication of the South African Cities Urban Safety Reference Group (USRG). The USRG constitutes the first institutionalised forum in South Africa that enables practice-based learning on the theme of urban safety and violence prevention to inform urban policy, planning and management. It has proven to be a valuable platform for peer-to-peer learning and knowledge sharing amongst practitioners from the SACN member cities as well as other key government role-players on urban safety and violence prevention.

The USRG was established in early 2014. It is convened by the South African Cities Network (SACN) with the support of the Inclusive Violence and Crime Prevention (VCP) Programme.

The VCP Programme is a joint South African-German intervention steered by the South African Department of Cooperative Governance and various other departments, and implemented by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) on behalf of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ).



For more information on urban safety and other related issues, please visit:



@safer\_spaces



@saferespaces.sa



SaferSpaces



www.sacities.net  
www.saferespaces.org.za

For further information on the USRG or the State of Urban Safety in South Africa Report 2017, please contact:

**South African Cities Network**



urbansafety@sacities.net



+27 (0)11 407 6471

