Introduction

In 2007, the $15 million Safer Suburbs Plan was established as an election commitment of the Australian Government, and is administered by the AGD. This plan aims to address crime and anti-social behaviour by funding important community safety measures such as CCTV systems and street lighting. A number of State/Territory and local governments along with community organisations were asked to develop 24 projects, of which 22 were related to public space CCTV implementation or upgrades.

In October 2008, the AIC was engaged by AGD to conduct a review of projects given funding for CCTV implementation via the Safer Suburbs grants program. The purpose of this review was to:

- identify a set of good practice principles relating to the design, implementation, operation, maintenance and evaluation of a CCTV system;
- assess whether the CCTV schemes in each of the selected case study sites have adhered to good practice;
- determine the mechanisms through which the installation of CCTV is expected to bring about a reduction in crime;
- identify those factors that contribute to the overall effectiveness of a CCTV system as a crime prevention initiative;
- determine the extent to which the context in which CCTV is applied impacts upon project delivery and identify circumstances in which CCTV is most effective; and
- identify those factors that influence an organisation’s capacity to design, implement, maintain and review a CCTV project, and possible strategies to increase this capacity.

During the life of the review project the following key outputs were produced to answer these questions:

1. **Good practice resource for CCTV implementation**
   A good practice resource manual was developed on CCTV as a crime prevention measure addressing the three broad themes of planning, implementation and evaluation.

2. **Progress report**
   A progress report aimed to address emerging issues relating to the implementation of the case study projects, and provide feedback from funding recipients, which assisted in the further development of the good practice guidelines.

3. **Final report**
   This final report documents the key findings from the examination of a sample of funded projects and recommendations for future directions, including an assessment as to the utility of the resource manual for application to other CCTV schemes.
The experiences of case studies implementing CCTV via Safer Suburbs grants recipients

The following methodologies were employed to deliver the key outputs as described above. These included:

- conducting consultations (face to face, by telephone and electronically) with funding recipients and key stakeholders involved in the design and delivery of the CCTV systems in each of the selected case study locations;
- reviewing the online discussion forum, including issues identified by funding recipients in relation to their projects;
- reviewing relevant project documentation pertaining to the design, implementation and operation of each scheme; and
- reviewing any progress reports, and where available, final evaluation reports.

Six sites were selected from the 24 recipients of the Safer Suburbs grants program. Of the 24 grants awarded, two projects did not have a CCTV component. However, one of those sites received two grants, and only one grant contained CCTV elements. The sites were questioned on how their projects had been designed, implemented and evaluated in accordance with good practice principles, what factors influenced delivery of the CCTV system, and how they had been progressing.

Case study site selection was based on accessibility, costs and variation on the types of CCTV projects implemented. This cross-section allowed us to review projects that were:

- at the consultation stage;
- run by a newly amalgamated council;
- conducted by a Chamber of Commerce;
- already at the implementation stage; and
- examples from three Australian jurisdictions.

Originally six sites were selected. Upon hearing about the review, another site invited the AIC to interview them on their experiences as well, for they perceived that they had a lot to share on the issue. The site was not on the original case study site list but was a recipient of a Safer Suburbs grant. Their primary experience with CCTV implementation came from a preceding National Community and Crime Prevention Programme grant (another grants programme administered by AGD); however it was considered that the additional information would be valuable, and the time and financial cost involved in interviewing another site could be done within the review’s scope. Therefore, there were seven consultation sites in total. Geographically of the seven sites, one was located in Queensland, three in and three in . Table 1 provides a short summary on the case study sites selected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Current responsibility</th>
<th>Primary objectives</th>
<th>Proposed cameras/locations</th>
<th>Stage of implementation</th>
<th>Funding amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S47E(d)</td>
<td>Conduct a feasibility study for community safety needs, including CCTV and lighting</td>
<td>6 fixed cameras, 1 with mobile capacity</td>
<td>Feasibility study presently with council</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S47E(d)</td>
<td>Increase community safety perceptions; reduce crime</td>
<td>24 fixed cameras for main CBD streets (State government grant), near train station, suburban commercial area, local youth centre and nearby park, 4 mobile units attached to Ranger vehicles</td>
<td>Camera locations being approved by Council</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S47E(d)</td>
<td>Increase perceptions of safety at a park, reduce graffiti &amp; vandalism around leisure precinct, overall decrease antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>Fixed cameras at the park, and leisure precinct (around skate park) Portable Trailer camera</td>
<td>Some cameras in the park and library centre had been installed, as well as leisure precinct. An upgraded data storage unit had been installed at the park. Specifications were being finalised for the portable trailer.</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S47E(d)</td>
<td>Reduce antisocial behaviour around skate park and library; increase community safety in car park and nearby areas</td>
<td>2 sites- 1) CPOD/Community Centre 2) Civic Precinct- (skate park, library, car park)</td>
<td>1st site cameras have been installed. 2nd stage in approval with council</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To extend existing system 20 CCTV cameras to be installed along cameras installed and system is up and running | $680,000 |
Variability across the case study sites in terms of the different stages of development of their projects, and the different circumstances each faced when implementing their projects allowed the researchers to assess the needs of different locations and types of projects.

Inviting the sites to become case studies

In February 2009 all sites were sent a formal letter inviting them to participate in this review. An invitation to the GovDex discussion forum was also sent to all the Safer Suburbs grant recipients, with the exception of one council. At the time of the GovDex Forum site launch, the grant for this council had not been formally agreed by the Minister. As this grant application had no CCTV component, it was decided that there was no need to include the council as a review site.

The following sections attempt to answer the key research questions proposed for this review. The first section Closed circuit television and crime prevention looks into the effectiveness of CCTV as a crime prevention measure, what does and does not work in CCTV, and how its effectiveness can be evaluated. The section Factors that influence CCTV implementation reviews the factors that influence the implementation of CCTV, primarily based on the consultations with the case study sites and the Considerations manual. The final two sections summarise the findings from the review, and offer suggestions on what is needed to support CCTV implementation for grants recipients.
Closed circuit television and crime prevention

What is known about what does and does not work with CCTV

Two research questions were addressed through a literature review. These were:

- to determine the mechanisms through which the installation of CCTV is expected to bring about a reduction in crime; and
- to identify those factors that contribute to the overall effectiveness of a CCTV system as a crime prevention initiative.

Reliance was placed on a literature review to answer these questions because the sites included in this review had not yet progressed to the evaluation stage. As such, the consultations would not have been able to answer these questions. The following is a summary of how CCTV is currently used in crime prevention both in Australia and internationally. Its effectiveness is explored, including what is needed to effectively evaluate the impact of CCTV on crime.

There has been tremendous growth in the use of CCTV to prevent crime in public space, in particular among local governments, with the rate in which systems have been installed accelerating in recent years (IRIS 2005). Systems are commonly used in public space in urban centres and on public housing estates, in retail malls, individual shops and banks (particularly around Automatic Teller Machines), on public transport (including stations, trains, buses and taxis); and in car parks. A survey of local councils found that of those that had a CCTV system in operation, one third had a system operating in an open air shopping mall or plaza, around one half had systems operating in city centres other than malls, and almost half had cameras on council property (IRIS 2005). While open street CCTV systems were initially located primarily in central business districts of major metropolitan centres, there has been a growing trend towards their installation in smaller regional and rural centres and in suburban locations (Wilson & Sutton 2003). Local government has driven this trend primarily as a measure to combat antisocial and alcohol related behaviour (Wilson & Sutton 2003).

Given the local nature of their application, CCTV systems vary considerably across locations in terms of administration, operational practice and technology (Wilson & Sutton 2003). CCTV systems may involve cameras that are static (fixed) or have the capacity to pan, tilt and zoom either independently according to a fixed pattern or via the control of operators (Gill & Spriggs 2005). CCTV can be fixed, able to be redeployed, or mobile; can transmit digital or analogue images either via cable or wireless links; and the subsequent images can be recorded in different ways with different levels of quality and the type and speed of monitoring that is available (Gill & Spriggs 2005). These technical specifications are an important consideration in any assessment of the effectiveness of a CCTV system as a crime prevention measure (Gill & Spriggs 2005).

CCTV systems also vary in terms of control room operations. Monitoring and control room operations are arguably the most crucial element of a CCTV system, particularly where the aim of a scheme is to improve the response of police or private security to incidents as they occur (Wilson & Sutton 2003). The monitoring of CCTV can be classified into three broad categories:

- active monitoring - whereby a person sits and monitors camera footage in real time;
- passive monitoring - monitors are in view and are casually monitored by operators who react when an incident is observed in progress; and
• no monitoring – where recording devices record images that can be accessed and replayed if a crime is reported (Wilson & Sutton 2003, Ratcliffe 2006)

A web-based questionnaire of all Australian councils (with the exception of the ACT local government) was conducted in 2005. This survey determined that of those local governments that had installed CCTV, almost one third were not monitored in any capacity and were instead used purely as a recording device (IRIS 2005).

CCTV is often installed as part of a suite of crime prevention interventions implemented in a particular location. This has obvious implications in terms of determining the relative influence of CCTV as distinct from other crime prevention measures. Similarly, many CCTV projects involve the upgrade of an existing system, either by way of installing newer equipment or increasing the size and scope of a system, as opposed to the introduction of CCTV into an area for the first time.

How effective is CCTV as a crime prevention measure?

Previous evaluations into the effectiveness of CCTV as a crime prevention measure have produced mixed findings. This has lead to some conjecture as to the actual impact of CCTV schemes, the context in which it is most effective, and the relative contribution of the various features of systems. The following is a brief overview of the key findings from the literature.

Early evaluations into the effectiveness of CCTV, many of which showed promising results in terms of a reduction of crime, suffered a number of significant methodological issues, which made the reliability of these evaluations highly questionable (Armitage et al. 1999, Ratcliffe 2006). Problems included lack of control areas, independence of researchers, and simplistic approaches to temporal crime patterns. There have been several studies conducted in the last few years that have more successfully evaluated the effectiveness of CCTV. Welsh and Farrington (2006) undertook a systematic review and meta-analysis of evaluations of the effectiveness of CCTV as a crime prevention measure in both the UK and America. Twenty-two CCTV reviews met the stringent criteria for inclusion in the study. Based on their analysis of the available data Welsh and Farrington demonstrated that:

• Overall CCTV had a significant desirable effect on crime rates, although the reduction was relatively small (4%), suggesting that CCTV reduces crime but only by a small degree.

• Eleven studies found a positive effect (decrease in offences), five found an undesirable effect (increase in crime), five found no effect and in one case the evidence was unclear.

• The effectiveness of the CCTV system appeared dependent upon the context in which it had been applied, with significant reductions observed in car parks (around 40%) but mixed findings for schemes in city centres, public housing and public transportation systems.

• Success of CCTV schemes in car parks was limited to a reduction in vehicle crimes. These schemes also coincided with other interventions, such as improved lighting and signage alerting to the presence of CCTV, suggesting that if CCTV is to be an effective crime prevention tool, then it must be carefully planned and integrated with other measures.

• CCTV had no effect on violent crime, suggesting that thought needs to be given to the nature of the crime problem for which CCTV is being considered as an intervention measure.

In 2005, Gill and Spriggs undertook an evaluation of the impact of 13 CCTV projects which were funded by the Home Office in the UK, and were implemented in various contexts. The evaluation considered the use of police recorded crime statistics to measure changes in the levels of crime in
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both the intervention and comparable control areas before and after the installation of CCTV systems. In addition, the evaluation also considered:

- changes in crime patterns in surrounding areas to measure displacement and diffusion of benefit effects;
- findings from public attitude surveys to assess changes in public perceptions of CCTV and fear of crime in both intervention and control areas before and after the installation of CCTV;
- changes in both crime and fear of crime for a post-intervention period of two years following implementation;
- other crime reduction initiatives operating within the intervention and control areas;
- technical specifications and design of the CCTV systems, and the process of implementing and installing the CCTV systems;
- control rooms operations, including working relationships with external agencies such as police; and
- the economic impact of each CCTV system.

As with past studies, the evaluation experienced problems relating to the availability of crime data, implementation delays and failures, and a lack of suitable control areas. Despite these problems, there were a number of significant findings in relation to the impact of CCTV on crime rates:

- consistent with previous evaluations, there were mixed results in town centres and residential systems, but encouraging results in other categories, particularly car parks;
- impulsive crimes, such as alcohol-related violence, were less likely to be reduced than premeditated crime (e.g., stealing motor vehicles);
- although not significant, camera coverage was positively related to effect size, as was camera density, although in this study only where a saturation effect of the implementation of CCTV had not occurred;
- there was evidence that CCTV was more effective in sites with limited control and access points, such as entrances and exits; and
- spatial displacement occurred in a small number of cases.

Public attitude surveys were carried out before and after the implementation of CCTV systems in 12 different areas. These surveys also revealed a number of interesting findings (Gill & Spriggs 2005):

- the public had a high level of awareness of CCTV cameras, which increased with the number of cameras installed;
- there was an increase in feelings of safety following the installation of CCTV in all areas surveyed and worry about being a victim of crime declined in a number of sites, but this appeared to be more closely correlated with changes in actual crime levels rather than the presence of cameras;
- the presence of CCTV did not appear to influence the propensity of residents to visit or avoid those areas monitored by CCTV, and
- there was a high level of public support for CCTV as a crime prevention measure before it was installed. As people became more aware of the actual impact of CCTV being only marginally effective in preventing crime, their support declined and their expectations became more realistic.

Gill and Spriggs (2005) also examined characteristics that contributed to the overall effectiveness of the schemes evaluated. They found that many projects lacked clear objectives and were unrealistic with respect to what CCTV could achieve, which typified a lack of understanding of the underlying mechanisms associated with CCTV. In addition, the evaluators also observed that the way in which a camera was mounted and the type of camera being used influenced whether a system was used for live monitoring, for retrospective evidence, as a deterrent for potential offenders or for reassuring the public. This demonstrates the importance of clearly specifying the objectives of a system prior to deciding upon the particulars of a system.
The study also concluded that schemes were more successful if they were carefully managed, and the importance of actively engaging police in the planning, implementation and monitoring aspects of CCTV systems. Police intelligence, as well as input from camera operators, was particularly useful in planning where to install the cameras to ensure optimal coverage, rather than simply installing as many cameras as possible. Involving police in any decision to implement CCTV systems in local areas was also crucial to ensuring that the relevant protocols and procedures were established. This would enable the people monitoring CCTV systems to alert the police to incidents enabling a rapid response to observed incidents. Similarly, it was important to establish processes to provide police with footage from CCTV systems after an incident had taken place to be used as evidence to detect offenders and secure prosecutions.

A similar finding from Australian research has highlighted the importance of communication between police and control room operators, particularly where a CCTV system is being actively monitored (Wilson & Sutton 2003). Wilson & Sutton (2003) go on to emphasise the importance of clear procedures being developed and outlined as part of a broader memorandum of understanding between police and the relevant local government, which clearly articulates the commitments of each party.

Formal evaluations of CCTV use in Australia have thus far been scarce (Brew 2005). The most comprehensive study conducted in Australia on the effectiveness of CCTV as a crime prevention measure was undertaken by Wells et al. (2006). Using recorded crime data, they focused on the use and effectiveness of CCTV as a crime prevention tool in Gold Coast public spaces and on the Queensland Rail City Train network. The research indicated that:

- CCTV had an effect when detecting violent offending, which resulted in significant increases in the extent of total offences being recorded against the person;
- CCTV had no significant effect on the total number of property offences or the total number of offences occurring in the locations in which it had been installed; and
- surveys of business traders, residents and rail commuters found strong support for the presence of CCTV. However, questions were raised regarding the effectiveness of the increased surveillance in terms of whether the cameras were being actively monitored and the capacity of the system to improve police response times to incidents as they occurred.

Ultimately, Wells et al. (2006) concluded that the effectiveness of CCTV as a crime prevention tool was questionable. The research suggested that CCTV was effective at detecting violent crime and/or may result in increased reporting as opposed to preventing any type of crime. However, like many other evaluations of CCTV, this research had a number of methodological shortcomings including the lack of control areas, an inability to acquire street level data, and the reliance on police recorded statistics as the principle measure of crime.

There is no evidence that CCTV prevents violent or impulsive offending. CCTV is potentially a useful source of evidence. It has other uses not measured by changes in crime, such as increased reporting and conviction rates of incidents due to increased detection. It is most effective when used in conjunction with other initiatives, such as increased lighting or community patrols. There also continues to be strong public support for CCTV. However, careful consideration must be given to how CCTV is applied and in what circumstances.

**Evaluating the effectiveness of CCTV**

Having undertaken a systematic review and meta-analysis of the available research, Welsh and Farrington (2006) concluded that increased attention to methodological rigour in the design of CCTV
evaluations was required in order to develop and further understand the impact of CCTV as a crime prevention measure.

Methodological issues with evaluating the effectiveness of CCTV

Some of the methodological issues encountered in past research into the impact of CCTV include:

- an overreliance on recorded crime statistics, which is problematic when mechanisms to reduce crime operate alongside those that increase the reporting and/or recording of crime;
- limited use of victim survey data;
- the lack of suitable control areas;
- the lack of important information regarding implementation, including the technical specifications of the system that had been installed, whether the system was being actively monitored, and to what extent and by whom;
- short follow up periods between implementation to evaluation, which may mean that CCTV schemes were not given long enough to produce a clear impact on crime rates; and
- inadequate attempts to measure the effect of displacement of crime and/or diffusion of benefits

A number of specific strategies have been employed by researchers to overcome the methodological limitations of earlier studies into the impact of CCTV. To improve the internal validity of evaluation studies, researchers have utilised the Scientific Methods Scale (Sherman et al. 2002) as a guide in developing research designs. Table 2 provides an overview of the specific criteria for each point on the five point scale, and an example outlining the application of these criteria to an evaluation of CCTV.

### Table 2: Scientific Methods Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>CCTV example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Correlation between a prevention program and measure of crime at one point in time</td>
<td>Areas with CCTV have lower crime rates than areas without CCTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Measures of crime before and after the program, with no comparable control condition</td>
<td>Crime decreased after CCTV was installed in an area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Measures of crime before and after the program in experimental and comparable control condition</td>
<td>Crime decreased after CCTV was installed in an experimental area, but there was no decrease in crime in a comparable control area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Measures of crime before and after the program in multiple experimental and control units, controlling for other variables that influence crime</td>
<td>Victimization of premises under CCTV surveillance decreased compared to victimisation of control premises, after controlling for features of premises that influenced their victimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Random assignment of program and control conditions to units</td>
<td>Victimization of premises randomly assigned to have CCTV surveillance decreased compared to victimisation of control premises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sherman et al. 2002

A research design that achieves level three on the Scientific Methods Scale is considered the minimum design for drawing conclusions regarding the effectiveness of a crime prevention intervention. Both Welsh and Farrington (2002) and Gill and Spaggs (2005) based their respective research designs on the criteria associated with this level.

In addition, Gill and Spaggs (2005) combined a quasi-experimental research design and a Realist Evaluation framework (Pawson & Tilley 1997) to evaluate the effectiveness of CCTV schemes. Rather than focusing entirely on whether an intervention is effective, realist evaluation seeks to determine how an intervention causes a particular effect. The primary advantage of this approach is that it can be used to identify the specific context in which CCTV is effective (Pawson & Tilley 1997; Wilson & Sutton 2003). Pawson and Tilley (1997) specified three key areas of investigation:

- the context in which the system is expected to operate – i.e. the features of the conditions in which the intervention (in this case CCTV) is introduced that are relevant to the operation of the intervention.
• the mechanism through which the system might achieve an impact – i.e. what is it about the intervention that brings about change; and
• the outcome/s of introducing the measure – i.e. the intended and unintended consequences of programs resulting from the activation of different mechanisms in different contexts.

How CCTV can contribute to the reduction of crime

A number of underlying mechanisms exist through which CCTV is understood to contribute to a reduction in crime:

• perpetrators can be detected by CCTV, and subsequently removed;
• CCTV can deter potential offenders who perceive an increased risk of apprehension;
• the introduction of CCTV may encourage more people to frequent the places under surveillance, which can increase the presence of natural surveillance and deter potential offenders;
• CCTV can direct police and/or security personnel to a potentially dangerous situation, which may avert the situation escalating to more serious behaviours or crime;
• CCTV may symbolise efforts to take crime more seriously, and perception of those efforts may energise law abiding citizens and deter others;
• CCTV may be perceived by potential offenders as reducing the amount of time available to commit crime, preventing those crimes that require extended time and effort;
• the presence of CCTV may act as a prompt to remind people to take other security measures such as locking their car;
• the presence of CCTV may also act as a prompt to remind people to take other security measures for fear of being shamed by being shown on CCTV, and
• cautious people migrate to the areas with CCTV coverage, and their caution and security mindedness reduce the risk (Armitage et al. 1999).

Other mechanisms however may have potentially less desirable consequences.

• the presence of CCTV may encourage more people to frequent the places under surveillance creating more opportunities and targets for crime;
• potential offenders may be deterred from offending in the area targeted by CCTV and may instead move their offending behaviour to alternative targets, and
• users of space monitored by CCTV may become less vigilant as a result of feeling more secure and take fewer security precautions, thereby increasing the opportunities for crime (Welsh & Farrington 2002; Gill & Spriggs 2005)

Adopting a realist approach to evaluating the impact of CCTV requires considering the extent to which each of these mechanisms operates in certain contexts, and whether the resulting outcome/s is likely to be generated (Pawson & Tilley 1997).

This report does not attempt to evaluate the Safer Suburbs sites. As the sites have not yet completed rolling out their systems, an evaluation is not realistic. However, it does review how the projects are travelling in the first stages of their project. The following sections primarily deal with the experience of Safer Suburbs sites in implementing CCTV, and particularly the factors that have influenced project delivery.
Key points:

• The overall effectiveness of CCTV systems is not clear
• CCTV cameras may lead to an increase in detection of crime, but not necessarily lead to a reduction in crime occurring
• High quality research design is essential for conducting valid evaluations of CCTV systems
Factors that influence Safer Suburb CCTV implementation

The following section outlines the main findings from the eight interviews conducted for review. These consultations sought to address the following research questions:

- determine the extent to which the context in which CCTV is applied impacts upon project delivery; and
- identify factors that influence an organisation’s capacity to design, implement, maintain and review a CCTV project.

There is currently a lack of literature on the practical considerations around selecting, installing, operating and monitoring of CCTV systems. Table 3 contains a summary of current research on the main influences on the effectiveness of CCTV, factors that are also included in the Considerations manual developed for this project. The stakeholder consultations aimed to complement the previous research findings by expanding on these issues, and offering additional considerations that ultimately affect a site’s CCTV delivery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Factors to consider when measuring the effectiveness of CCTV system as a crime prevention measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A well as changes in the levels of crime in the intervention and comparable control areas before and after the installation of CCTV systems, researchers suggest considering:
| • changes in crime patterns in surrounding areas, to measure displacement and diffusion of benefit effects |
| • changes in perceptions among both business traders and general public of CCTV and fear of crime/feelings of safety in both intervention and control areas before and after the installation of CCTV |
| • details regarding other crime reduction initiatives operating within the intervention and control areas |
| • technical specifications and key features of the design of the CCTV systems, such as the number of cameras and coverage area |
| • the process of implementing and installing the CCTV systems, including any issues that are encountered over the course of the project |
| • activities aimed at increasing general awareness of the presence of CCTV, such as signage and media releases |
| • control room operations, including a log of monitoring schedules, details regarding incidents identified by the cameras, calls to police and/or security patrols in relation to incidents that have been identified, and requests from police for access to footage for evidentiary purposes |
| • relationships with key external agencies such as police, including any protocols and procedural guidelines or memorandum of understanding that are developed |
| • the costs attributed to the installation, maintenance and monitoring of the CCTV system (Gill & Spriggs 2006, Welch & Farrington 2006 & 2008, Wilson & Sutton 2003) |
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Stakeholder consultations

Stakeholder consultations with seven sites and one police representative commenced in May 2009 and were finalised in September 2009. This study interviewed the key project contact, and/or any other representative whom the project officer(s) invited to the meeting. There were nine consultations in total as two sites had follow up consultations. However this was not possible for the other four sites, as available resources precluded travel to these locations.

The key project contact details were supplied by AGD, and most contacts were local council workers. The exception was one representative, whom another site representative recommended to contact as well. An invitation was made by further Safer Suburbs site to visit and obtain information on their experiences with CCTV implementation. This site was not part of the original six case study sites selected, but as the AIC was conducting a site visit within a 2 ½ hour drive from the additional site it was decided that it would be an advantage to obtain the additional information to inform the resource considerations. is also a recipient of a Safer Suburbs grant, however their primary experiences in CCTV implementation was for the CCTV project funded by the AGD National Community and Crime Prevention Programme. Information from the site interviews, the Considerations manual and the CCTV experts interviewed, were used to inform the considerations around CCTV implementation processes, but were not used to inform the research questions that specifically deal with Safer Suburbs CCTV implementation.

A site representative also provided contact details for their police liaison for their CCTV project. As such, this report includes consultations from seven Safer Suburb sites and from a Police Local Area Command. Although more time was needed to conduct these additional site visits, the insights provided by the extra consultations were invaluable and enhanced the quality of information included in both this review and the considerations resource manual.

In conjunction with finding out the experiences and needs of case study sites when implementing CCTV, the consultations were also used to trial the draft CCTV considerations resource manual. Unfortunately, none of the sites had reviewed the manual at the time of their consultation. Despite this, the insights from the case study sites on their experiences in CCTV implementation determined the structure and content of the final resource manual and this review. All case study sites approached consented to being a site. The case study consultations involved gathering additional information on CCTV implementation, through semi-structured interview questions, that were based on gaps identified in the literature and the good practice resource.

Consultations were conducted as an informal discussion, with the content of the discussion being steered around the key stages of project implementation. An interview schedule was used by the researchers to guide the discussion (Appendix 3). As it was recognised that the processes involved with implementation are not linear, the questions were not asked in a structured format. Sites were encouraged to talk about their experiences in an open discussion, with the schedule being used to provide prompting questions. Consultations were conducted on site at each case study location, and were typically between one and three hours duration. Most sites were at the end of their feasibility studies or have just started to roll out the proposed CCTV system. Therefore, information obtained for this review is dominated by the consultation and decision making processes at the start of the project rather than the effectiveness of the projects in the longer term.

Structure of the findings
The findings from the consultations are presented within five key themes. These themes are structured around the 5 I's, a theoretical framework, which has been developed to improve knowledge transfer and project documentation for crime prevention projects (see Ekblom 2007). The themes are:

- the purpose of the CCTV system;
- deciding what to do and how to do it;
- the reality of implementation;
- managing stakeholders and community expectations; and
- measuring effectiveness.

Each theme includes sub-themes on the experiences and issues of sites in the application of the Safer Suburbs grants. In structuring the presentation of the findings it is recognised that the processes undertaken in implementing CCTV, whether for the Safer Suburbs grant or another funding scheme, are not linear. Factors such as local context, available resources, existing infrastructure, existing stakeholder relationships, staffing, and time constraints can influence when and how each step in the implementation process is conducted. Additionally, the themes provided are not mutually exclusive categories, because many of the actions and processes of the sites are interconnected and do not sit comfortably under one theme alone. Therefore, different issues highlighted may be addressed with the same action or process, so this action may be mentioned various times within the report. Information provided in the consultations was also used to support and refine the Considerations manual (see Clancy 2009).

Not every site’s experiences are highlighted for each theme discussed in this review. Where possible, most of the sites’ experiences have been discussed, but in some cases experiences from one or two sites have been used as illustrations to avoid the report becoming too cumbersome. CCTV implementation is a multifaceted process with many different actors and departments that have different responsibilities. As such, not one person could talk authoritatively on each theme raised. CCTV implementation is a long process, and the level of detail and importance of an issue to each site varied. Therefore on some occasions some sites did not- or could not- expand on issues and topics raised in the consultation. Most detail came from sites when the issues discussed were considered the most pertinent or problematic to their CCTV implementation. These issues were different for each site. For obvious reasons, sites further along in the Safer Suburbs process and with previous CCTV experience had more to say, and this is often reflected in the findings.

The findings of this review are based on the opinions of the people interviewed for this review. Throughout the report, comments are anonymous and are referred to as 1 through to 6. This report also does not assume that the findings are representative of the organisation that the interviewees represented. They represent the opinion of the interviewees only, and therefore it must not be assumed that the comments are representative of the organisations as a whole.

**CCTV experiences unrelated to the Safer Suburbs review**

Almost all case study sites had varying degrees of exposure to CCTV implementation in their local area prior to undertaking the Safer Suburbs initiative. In some cases this included being the recipient of National Community Crime Prevention Programme Security related infrastructure funding. State grants programs, or already having the CCTV infrastructure in their communities via other mechanisms. Most sites talked extensively about their previous experiences in CCTV, and often this topic was more prominent than the current Safer Suburbs project. It was often difficult to separate the experiences. This was an unsurprising finding as the Safer Suburbs projects were, for the most part, either in the feasibility stage or in the initial implementation stages. Although they did not constitute part of the Safer Suburbs grant, observations and experiences from these other projects were
The purpose of the CCTV system

Having a clear purpose/objective for the CCTV system was universally emphasised as the cornerstone for effective CCTV implementation. As the sites pointed out, the types of cameras to use, where to place them, how (and when) they are monitored, and what the images will be used for, are all inextricably linked to what the system is trying to achieve. Sites recognised that not defining the CCTV camera’s objectives before the system is installed enhances the risk of installing the wrong cameras and choosing the wrong locations. In some sites (eg S47E(d)), clear aims were used as tools to educate and justify camera placement to stakeholders and the community. Despite this, each had varying experiences in developing their objectives. The Considerations manual (Clancy 2009) identified the SMART approach, as a useful tool to utilise when developing objectives for crime prevention. This ensures objectives are:

- **Specific**
- **Measurable**
- **Achievable**
- **Realistic**
- **Time-bound** (see Clancy 2009 for further clarification).

Each case study site had to outline to the AGD the purpose of the CCTV implementation or upgrade in their initial Safer Suburbs application. However, the objectives documented in the applications did not always align with the current ones. These changes reflected a practical reality associated with implementing the initiative. Alterations were made in some cases due to:

- the outcomes of the feasibility studies (eg S47E(d)),
- community consultations (eg S47E(d)),
- recognising local needs;
- reflecting more realistic outcomes than were initially proposed; or
- reviewing the overall costs of their project and altering their expectations accordingly.

Most of the councils were implementing CCTV systems to target three broad concerns:

- antisocial behaviour;
- property damage, including graffiti and vandalism; and
- community perceptions of safety.

These issues were consistently raised within the consultations for this review. They were commonly determined via community surveys, reference groups, and consultations with the residents, local businesses and key stakeholders such as the police. A more detailed exploration of how this was conducted is in the Managing stakeholders and community expectations section.

Within most sites the decision on where and how the cameras would be placed was often not made by the project implementers (ie council staff), but rested with others, primarily locally elected representatives. Regardless of what objectives had been outlined in the initial application or in consultancy reports, the implementers were unable to have full control over how the Safer Suburbs funding would be applied locally. In one site at the time the AIC conducted the interview, the consultancy report was being presented to the Council, as the strategy outlined was subject to their approval. When questioned about how they would try to convince the councillors to approve the report in its current form, the representatives indicated they relied on a strong evidence base and good methodology, particularly regarding the areas they proposed to use CPTED strategies instead of CCTV. In S47E(d) the strong political support for the project was considered an asset.
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