

UNAFEI NEWSLETTER

UNITED NATIONS ASIA AND FAR EAST
INSTITUTE FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRIME
AND THE TREATMENT OF OFFENDERS

No. 114
June 2004

Established
1961

IN THIS ISSUE

	<i>Page</i>
LETTER FROM THE DIRECTOR	1
THE 127TH INTERNATIONAL TRAINING COURSE	3
IMPLEMENTING EFFECTIVE MEASURES FOR THE TREATMENT OF OFFENDERS AFTER FIFTY YEARS OF UNITED NATIONS STANDARD SETTING IN CRIME PREVENTION AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE	
Course Rationale	3
Course Summary	8
Lecture Topics	9
Individual Presentation Topics	11
Group Workshop Sessions	14
Observation Visits	17
Group Study Tour	18
Special Events	19
Reference Materials Distributed	21
Experts and Participants List	26
NINTH SPECIAL SEMINAR FOR SENIOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE OFFICIALS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA	30
THIRD SEMINAR ON THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM FOR TAJIKISTAN	32
INFORMATION ABOUT FORTHCOMING PROGRAMMES	34
The 1 st Training Course on Strengthening the Anti-Corruption Capacity in Thailand	34
The 128 th International Training Course	34
ADMINISTRATIVE NEWS	40
Faculty Changes	40
Overseas Trips by Staff	41
FACULTY & STAFF OF UNAFEI	42

UNAFEI IS AN AFFILIATED REGIONAL INSTITUTE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

LETTER FROM THE DIRECTOR

It is my privilege to inform readers of the successful completion of the 127th International Training Course on “Implementing Effective Measures for the Treatment of Offenders after Fifty Years of United Nations Standard Setting in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice” which took place from 17 May to 24 June 2004. In this Course we welcomed 12 Japanese and 15 overseas participants and 2 observers: 10 from Asia, 2 from Africa and 5 from the Pacific. They included police, public prosecutors, judges, a probation officer, correctional officers, and other high-ranking public officials. We were also delighted to welcome our first participant from Palau. As this newsletter demonstrates, the Course was extremely productive. It consisted of individual presentations, group workshop sessions, visits to relevant criminal justice agencies, and presentations by visiting experts, faculty members and ad hoc lecturers.

Since the adoption of the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners in 1955 the United Nations has continuously promoted measures to improve the treatment of offenders, including the promotion of alternatives to imprisonment. Many countries have adopted these measures and incorporated them into their legislation, however despite this fact, prison is still often the punishment of choice and this has been reflected in a greatly increasing prison population in many parts of the world. As a consequence of this prisons have become more overcrowded and less able to provide the conditions or treatment that is necessary in order to rehabilitate prisoners. In light of the above UNAFEI, as a United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme Network Institute, decided to undertake this Course in order to come up with solutions that would enable Member States to implement U.N. Standards and Norms more effectively.

During the Course the participants diligently and comprehensively examined the current situation of the treatment of offenders with reference to U.N. Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice with special reference to the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (SMR) and the U.N. Standard Minimum Rules for Non-Custodial Measures (Tokyo Rules). This was accomplished primarily through a comparative analysis of the current situation and the problems encountered in implementing the above U.N. Standards.

Discussions during the Course highlighted the promotion of alternative measures to imprisonment; administration of penal institutions; and the promotion of effective treatment programmes for offenders. After studying the above subjects and engaging in in-depth discussions the participants were able to put forth effective and practical solutions that could be applied in their respective countries.

I would like to offer my sincere congratulations to all the participants upon their successful completion of the Course, made possible by their strenuous efforts. My heartfelt gratitude goes to the visiting experts and ad hoc lecturers who contributed a great deal to the Course’s success. Furthermore, I appreciate the indispensable assistance and cooperation extended to UNAFEI by various agencies and institutions, which helped diversify the programme.

A warm tribute must be paid to the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) for its immeasurable support throughout the Course. At the same time, I must express great appreciation

to the Asia Crime Prevention Foundation (ACPF) and its branch organizations for their substantial contributions. Lastly, I owe my gratitude to all the individuals whose unselfish efforts behind the scenes contributed significantly to the successful realization of this Course.

Upon returning to their home countries, I genuinely believe that, like their predecessors, the strong determination and dedication of the participants will enable them to work towards the improvement of their respective nation's criminal justice systems, and to the benefit of the international society as a whole.

Finally, I would like to reiterate my best regards to the participants of the 127th International Training Course. I hope that the experience they gained during the Course proves valuable in their daily work, and that the bonds fostered among the participants, visiting experts, and UNAFEI staff will continue to grow for many years to come.

June 2004

Kunihiko Sakai
Director, UNAFEI

THE 127TH INTERNATIONAL TRAINING COURSE

“IMPLEMENTING EFFECTIVE MEASURES FOR THE TREATMENT OF OFFENDERS AFTER FIFTY YEARS OF UNITED NATIONS STANDARD SETTING IN CRIME PREVENTION AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE”

Course Rational

The United Nations adopted the “Standard Minimum Rules for Treatment of Prisoners” at the First Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (hereinafter referred to as “Congress”) in 1955, and has adopted so far more than fifty resolutions, declarations, guidelines and codes of conduct concerning crime prevention and criminal justice.¹ In addition to the topic of the treatment of offenders, they now cover very wide and diverse subjects, such as: juvenile justice; the code of conduct of law enforcement officials; independence of the judiciary; prevention of crimes, such as corruption and urban crime; protection of victims; restorative justice; and so on.

Such resolutions, declarations, guidelines and codes of conduct (hereinafter referred to as “United Nations standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice”) aim at materializing the contents of “the Universal Declaration of Human Rights”² in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice. They do not bind Member States as treaties or conventions do to the signatory states;³ however, the United Nations and Member States have been endeavouring to promote their use and application for many years.

At the first General Assembly of the United Nations of the new century, Member States declared as follows:

We recognize that the United Nations standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice contribute to efforts to deal with crime effectively. [...] We shall endeavour, as appropriate, to use and apply the United Nations standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice in national law and practice. We undertake to review relevant legislation and administrative procedures, as appropriate, with a view to providing the necessary education and training to the officials concerned and ensuring the necessary strengthening of institutions entrusted with the administration of criminal justice.⁴

¹ Most of these resolutions, declarations, guidelines, and so on, are included in the following compendium. “Compendium of United Nations Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice.” United Nations, NY. 1992. It can be obtained at the following Internet site. <http://www.uncjin.org/Standards/Compendium/compendium.html>.

² “Universal Declaration of Human Rights.” General Assembly Resolution 217A (III). 10 December 1948.

³ Aust, Anthony. “Modern Treaty Law and Practice.” Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK. 2000: p.44.

⁴ “Vienna Declaration on Crime and Justice: Meeting the Challenges of the Twenty-first Century.” General Assembly Resolution A/55/593. 17 January 2001: Para. 22.

Also, the United Nations Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice supported the application of the United Nations standards and norms “as an important means by which Governments could upgrade criminal justice administration, across sectors, improving professional performance, while safeguarding basic elements of human rights in an integrated manner”.⁵

Therefore, the Member States are required to evaluate their practices and to build a fair and effective criminal justice system based on United Nations standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice. Many countries endeavour to incorporate United Nations standards and norms in their domestic laws and make use of them in their practice.⁶ It is not an exaggeration to state that the United Nations standards and norms greatly contribute to the improvement of criminal justice systems and their practices, and they now have an undeniably large impact on each state’s administration of criminal justice.

In regard to the treatment of offenders, “The United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Treatment of Prisoners (hereinafter referred to as “the SMR””,⁷ which was adopted 50 years ago, has great importance among the United Nations standards and norms that have relevance in the field.

The SMR stipulates minimum standards in regard to every aspect of the treatment of all kinds of prisoners and the administration of institutions, such as: provision of adequate accommodation; provision of adequate clothing and medical care; prohibition of cruel punishment; prisoner’s right to lodge complaints to the head of the institution; communication with the family; confirmation of the fundamental principle that the treatment of prisoners should aim at their reintegration into society; individualization of treatment and classification, and so on. Many countries promulgate their laws based upon the SMR, and the use and application of the SMR has contributed to the improvement of institutional treatment of offenders.

The importance of the SMR can also be found in the fact that various United Nations standards and norms that are subsequently adopted repeatedly mention that the spirit of the SMR should be reflected.⁸ Moreover, although the United Nations had maintained the position that the implementation of the SMR should be left to each country’s efforts, it adopted the “Procedure for the effective implementation of the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners”⁹ in 1984 and set out practical procedures (dissemination of the SMR; reflection of it in the domestic laws; technical assistance; strengthening of the reporting procedure of the implementation of the SMR in each state; remedies and review and elaboration of the Rules) in order for the basic principles of the SMR to be incorporated into administration of penal confinement institutions. Additionally, in 1990 the General Assembly adopted the “Basic Principles for the Treatment of

⁵ United Nations. Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. “Use and application of United Nations standards and norms.” E/CN.15/2002/3. 26 February 2002: p.4.

⁶ http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/crime_cicp_standards.html

⁷ “World Social Situation.” ECOSOC Resolution 663 (XXIV). (Annex: Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners.) 31 July 1957.

⁸ Examples include “United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-custodial Measures (The Tokyo Rules)”, 4.1; “United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Administration of Juvenile Justice (The Beijing Rules)”, 27; and “United Nations Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty”, preamble.

⁹ “Procedure for the effective implementation of the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Offenders.” ECOSOC Resolution 1984/47. 25 May 1984.

Prisoners”¹⁰ and clarified the basic principles of the treatment of prisoners, such as all prisoners should “be treated with respect due to their inherent dignity and value as human beings”, “believing that full implementation of the SMR would be facilitated by the articulation of basic principles underlying them”.¹¹ It also strengthened the contents of the SMR.

When we turn our attention to the actual situation of the treatment of offenders, there are circumstances that impede effective use and application of the United Nations standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice, including the SMR, in many countries in the world. The notable increase in the population of various penal confinement institutions is one example. A recent study indicated that 8.75 million people are incarcerated in prisons and the prison population is increasing in many countries.¹²

The capacity of accommodation in prisons cannot catch up with the increased number of prisoners; therefore, overcrowding has become a major issue in many countries. In fact, a report of the Secretary-General stated that “[u]ntil the problem of overcrowding was resolved, efforts to improve other aspects of prison reform were unlikely to have any meaningful impact”.¹³ The issues caused by overcrowding have thus become serious.

Even in the situation of overcrowding, however, the responsibilities of a penal institution, as a public organization, are not diminished. These include the responsibility to provide prisoners with a humane environment and treatment programmes that assist their reintegration into society, adequate mechanisms to safeguard their legal rights because prisons are closed institutions and inaccessible. For the general public, the responsibilities of a penal institution include securing confinement of the prisoners and maintaining transparency and accountability as regards the administration of the institution. As the SMR and other United Nations standards and norms that support it include many clauses for such issues, they are still very significant and relevant to the current prison situations.

In view of improving the treatment of offenders, it is not efficient to confine all offenders to penal institutions in order to punish them, regardless of the type of offenders or the types of crime. It is very difficult to provide offenders with effective treatment if the prisons are overcrowded. To incarcerate offenders for minor infractions stigmatizes them unnecessarily, and thus prevents them from reintegrating into society. In such a situation, the introduction of alternatives to incarceration is more appropriate and effective.

By reducing the number of prisoners, the burden of prisons will be mitigated and the proper correctional treatment can be given to those who remain incarcerated. Non-custodial measures are more conducive to social integration of offenders and facilitate their rehabilitation by allowing them continuous contact with the community. They have advantage of: reducing offender stigmatization; avoiding escalation in deviant behaviour when new offenders are mixed with hardened criminals; and if the offender remains in employment, allowing him/her to continue contributing towards his/her family in particular, and society in general.

¹⁰ “Basic principles for the treatment of prisoners.” General Assembly Resolution 45/111. 14 December 1990.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Walmsley, Roy. “Findings 188: World Prison Population List (Fourth Edition).” Home Office, UK. 2003.

¹³ United Nations. Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. “Use and application of United Nations standards and norms.” E/CN.15/2002/3. 26 February 2002: p.12.

In consideration of the above, in 1990 the General Assembly, based upon the recommendations of the Eighth Congress, adopted “United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-Custodial Measures (hereinafter referred to as “the Tokyo Rules”).¹⁴ The Tokyo Rules indicate guidelines and standards concerning various non-custodial measures. They aim at alleviating problems arising from overcrowding in prisons and at streamlining the administration of criminal justice by promoting less use of confinement, through enhancing the use of alternative measures that can be exercised in society. In this sense, the Tokyo Rules complement the SMR.

However, the current world situation in which many countries face a prison population increase and overcrowding, implies that enhancement of non-custodial measures indicated in the Tokyo Rules have not been fully implemented in such countries.

Giving due consideration to the above rationale, UNAFEI, as one of the regional institutes of the United Nations for Prevention of Crime and for the Treatment of Offenders, intends to study the current situation of the treatment of adult offenders both in institutions and in the society and will explore their improvement for this training course. This will be accomplished mainly referring to the SMR and the Tokyo Rules among numerous United Nations standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice.

Thus, the participants are required to: review the history of the respective countries where the United Nations standards and norms concerning treatment of offenders, *inter alia* the SMR and the Tokyo Rules, have been incorporated in practice or in legislation; confirm the extent that the current system and situation of the practice conform to the United Nations standards and norms; and study the reasons, both the social as well as legal backgrounds if the practice deviates from the United Nations standards and norms. Moreover, the training course will explore measures for effective use and application of United Nations standards and norms by sharing and discussing lessons and successful examples that are provided by the participants.

The focus of discussion in this training course will be as follows:

- (1) The current situation and problems of the treatment of offenders in the respective countries
- (2) Problems and countermeasures concerning the use and application of United Nations standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice (mainly the SMR and the Tokyo Rules)
 - (a) Incorporation of United Nations standards and norms in domestic laws and regulations
 - (b) Organizations for the treatment of offenders (inspection, transparency, accountability, etc.)
 - (c) Personnel in charge of treatment of offenders (recruitment, training, guidance and supervision, etc.)

¹⁴ “United Nations Standards and Minimum Rules for Non-Custodial Measures (Tokyo Rules).” General Assembly Resolution 45/110. 14 December 1990.

(d) System for the treatment of offenders

- Systems that guarantee offenders' rights, including grievance mechanisms
- Maintenance of discipline and order
- Provision of effective treatment programmes

(e) Understanding and participation of the public

(3) Promotion of international cooperation for development of United Nations standards and norms

(a) An effective system of reporting to the United Nations

(b) Technical cooperation.

Course Summary

Lectures

In total, seven lectures were presented by visiting experts, two by ad hoc lecturers and seven by the professors of UNAFEI. Four distinguished criminal justice practitioners and scholars from abroad served as UNAFEI visiting experts. They lectured on issues relating to the main theme, and contributed significantly to the Course by encouraging discussions after their own lectures, participating in the discussions of other programmes, and conversing with the participants on informal occasions. Additionally, distinguished senior officials of the Government of Japan delivered ad hoc lectures. The lecturers and lecture topics are listed on pages 9 and 10.

Individual Presentations

During the first two weeks, each Japanese and overseas participant delivered a fifty minute individual presentation, which introduced the actual situation, problems and future prospects of his/her country. These papers were compiled onto a CD Rom and distributed to all the participants. The titles of these individual presentation papers are listed on pages 11 through 13.

Group Workshop Sessions

Group Workshop Sessions further examined the subtopics of the main theme. In order to conduct each session effectively, the UNAFEI faculty selected individuals to serve as ‘group members’ for the sub-topics, based on their response to a questionnaire previously distributed. Selected participants served as chairpersons, co-chairpersons, rapporteurs or co-rapporteurs, and faculty members served as advisers. Each group’s primary responsibility was to explore and develop their designated topics in the Group Workshop Sessions. The participants and UNAFEI faculty seriously studied the topics and exchanged their views based on information obtained through personal experience, the Individual Presentations, lectures and so forth. After the Group Workshop Sessions, reports were drafted based on the discussions in the conference room. These reports were subsequently presented in the plenary meetings and report-back session, where they were endorsed as the reports of the Course. Very brief summaries of the Group Workshop reports are provided on pages 14 through 16.

Visits and Special Events

Visits to various agencies and institutions in Japan helped the participants obtain a more practical understanding of the Japanese criminal justice system. In addition to the Course's academic agenda, many activities were arranged to provide a greater understanding of Japanese society and culture, with the assistance of various organizations and individuals, including the Asia Crime Prevention Foundation (ACPF). For more detailed descriptions, please refer to pages 17 through 20.

Lecture Topics

Visiting Experts' Lectures

- 1) Prof. Nils CHRISTIE
 - Some Basic Dilemmas of the Use of Imprisonment on the Global Scale
 - Mediation: One of the Alternative Measures to Resolve Conflict
- 2) Ms Cristina ROJAS RODRIGUEZ
 - Applicability of United Nations Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice in the Latin American and Caribbean Region
- 3) Mr Michael SPURR
 - Her Majesty's Prison Service of England and Wales- Part 1
 - Her Majesty's Prison Service of England and Wales- Part 2
- 4) Ms Chomil KAMAL
 - Probation Services in Singapore- Part 1
 - Probation Services in Singapore- Part 2

Professors Lectures

- 1) Mr Hiroyuki SHINKAI, *Professor*, UNAFEI
 - The United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners
- 2) Ms Tamaki YOKOCHI, *Professor*, UNAFEI
 - The Tokyo Rules: The United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-Custodial Measures
- 3) Ms Megumi URYU, *Professor*, UNAFEI
 - Investigation and Prosecution in Japan
- 4) Mr Ichiro SAKATA, *Professor*, UNAFEI
 - The Criminal Justice System in Japan: The Courts

- 5) Mr Hiroyuki SHINKAI, *Professor*, UNAFEI
 - Institutional Corrections in Japan
- 6) Mr Kei SOMEDA, *Professor*, UNAFEI
 - Community-Based Treatment of Offenders in Japan

Ad Hoc Lectures

- 1) Mr Satoshi TOMIYAMA
*Special Assistant to the Director of the General Affairs Division Correction Bureau,
Ministry of Justice*
 - Japanese Penal Reform
- 2) Prof. Nisuke ANDO
Professor, Doshisha University
 - Human Rights Committee and the Protection of Detainees

Individual Presentation Topics

Overseas Participants

- 1) Mr Hany Mohamad Nasseh GABR (Egypt)
 - Crime Prevention and Treatment of Offenders
- 2) Mr Orisi Vuki KATONIBAU (Fiji)
 - Crime Prevention (Treatment of Offenders)
- 3) Mr Maju AMBARITA (Indonesia)
 - Development of Legal Treatment of Offenders in Indonesia, Related with the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Offenders, as in the First U.N. Congress 1955
- 4) Mr ABDUL AZIZ Bin Mohamad (Malaysia)
 - Treatment of Offenders-The Malaysian Style
- 5) Mr Rungit SINGH a/l Jaswant Singh (Malaysia)
 - Non-Custodial Sentencing Options in Malaysia
- 6) Mr Julio Ometei RINGANG (Palau)
 - Division of Correction Operation Manual, Republic of Palau
- 7) Mr Mark Mengepe MEWERIMBE (Papua New Guinea)
 - Crime Prevention (Treatment of Offenders)
- 8) Mr Hernan Gallo GRANDE (Philippines)
 - The General Situation of Crime and the Criminal Justice System in the Philippines
- 9) Mr Saidamir Badriddinovich SAIDOV (Tajikistan)
 - Current Situation of Crime and Corrections in Tajikistan
- 10) Mr Pongtorn JANOUDOM (Thailand)
 - Recent Legal Innovation for Non-Custodial Treatment in the Thai Criminal Justice System
- 11) Mr Somphop RUJJANAVET (Thailand)
 - Crime Prevention (Treatment of Offenders)
- 12) Mr Patelisio Leniti PALE (Tonga)
 - Community- Based Treatment System of Offenders in Tonga
- 13) Mr Hamish GARAE (Vanuatu)
 - Crime Prevention- Treatment of Offenders in Vanuatu

- 14) Mr Jonah MUZAMBI (Zimbabwe)
 - Implementing Effective Measures for the Treatment of Offenders
- 15) Ms Mildred Bernadette Baquilod ALVOR (Philippines)
 - The Philippine Corrections System: Current Situation and Issues
- 16) Mr Eric Wai-fung LAW (Hong-Kong)
 - Contemporary Issues in Corrections
- 17) Ms Soo-Hee KIM (Korea)
 - United Nations Standards and the Situation of Korean Corrections-Reality and Effective Countermeasures for Them

Japanese Participants

- 18) Mr Osamu AOKI
 - Treatment Programmes of Juvenile Prison in Japan and SMR
- 19) Mr Toshihiro FUKUGAKI
 - The Tokyo Rules and the Current Parole Practice in Japan
- 20) Mr Keiichi ICHINOSE
 - Police Detention Administration in Japan
- 21) Ms Hatsue MATSUBAYASHI
 - Tokyo Rules and Effective Utilization of Volunteer Probation Officers in Japan- Recruitment, Appointment and Training
- 22) Ms Mikako MATSUSHITA
 - Dealing with Juvenile Cases with Educative Activities
- 23) Mr Koichi NAKAMURA
 - Implementing Effective Measures for the Treatment of Offenders from the Viewpoint of Non-Custodial Measures at the Pre-Sentencing Stage
- 24) Mr Yuichiro OKUNO
 - A Japanese Public Prosecutor's Experiments to Implement the Tokyo Rules
- 25) Ms Noriko SHIBATA
 - Japanese Public Prosecutor's Role in the Criminal Justice System Focusing on Non-Custodial Measures
- 26) Mr Yasuaki SUGAWARA
 - Detainee Treatment- Immigration Bureau of Japan

- 27) Mr Akira TAKANO
 - Non-Custodial Measures for the Treatment of Offenders at the Sentencing Stage in Japan

- 28) Ms Sachiko TOKUDA
 - Challenges Facing Juvenile Training Schools for Girls in Japan

- 29) Mr Masahiro TOMOI
 - The Japanese Police System

Group Workshop Sessions

Group 1**PROMOTION OF ALTERNATIVES TO IMPRISONMENT**

Chairperson	Mr Rungit Singh	(Malaysia)
Co-Chairperson	Mr Koichi Nakamura	(Japan)
Rapporteur	Mr Masahiro Tomoi	(Japan)
Co-Rapporteur	Mr Pongtorn Janoudom	(Thailand)
Co-Rapporteur	Ms Noriko Shibata	(Japan)
Members	Mr Maju Ambarita	(Indonesia)
	Mr Julio Ometei Ringang	(Palau)
	Mr Mark Mengepe Mewerimbe	(PNG)
	Mr Toshihiro Fukugaki	(Japan)
Visiting Expert Advisers	Ms Chomil Kamal	(Singapore)
	Deputy Director Tomoko Akane	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Kei Someda	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Ichiro Sakata	(UNAFEI)

Report Summary

Group 1 approached the task of looking at alternatives to imprisonment in the light of the Tokyo Rules which advocates a holistic approach to non-custodial alternatives.

The Group began by examining the measures currently available in the participant countries at the pre-trial, sentencing and post-sentencing stage. They referred to the participant's individual presentation papers for the most current practice.

Group 1 then considered the problems and solutions to the introduction of each type of non-custodial alternative. It was recommended that a great deal of progress could be made if the current alternatives were utilized more extensively. Group 1 asserted that, for a start, it would be easier to fine tune existing practices than to try to introduce completely new legislation.

The Group then discussed future prospects and the introduction of new measures that could be implemented in the long run.

In their conclusion Group 3 made the following recommendations: all criminal justice systems should incorporate a clear mission statement that advocates the extensive use of non-custodial measures; the public should be educated to understand the benefits of non-custodial measures and policy makers and politicians should be the agents for this change; an effective treatment framework should be established; countries need to be committed to change; and research needs to be carried out on a continual basis in order to ensure that the most effective measures are in place.

The Group concluded by stating that all countries should use the Tokyo Rules as a benchmark for the promotion of alternatives and that an easy strategy for change would be to infuse small incremental changes in the social and justice systems to eventually blend in non-custodial alternatives.

Group 2**ADMINISTRATION OF PENAL INSTITUTIONS**

Chairperson	Mr Bin Mohamad Abdul Aziz	(Malaysia)
Co-Chairperson	Mr Keiichi Ichinose	(Japan)
Co-Chairperson	Ms Soo-Hee Kim	(Korea)
Rapporteur	Ms Mildred Bernadette Baquilod Alvor	(Philippines)
Co-Rapporteur	Mr Somphop Rujjanavet	(Thailand)
Co-Rapporteur	Mr Yasuaki Sugawara	(Japan)
Members	Mr Hany Mohamad Nasseh Gabr	(Egypt)
	Mr Hamish Garae	(Vanuatu)
	Mr Osamu Aoki	(Japan)
	Ms Hatsue Matsubayashi	(Japan)
Visiting Experts	Ms Cristina Rojas Rodriguez	(Costa Rica)
	Mr Michael Spurr	(U.K.)
Advisers	Prof. Keisuke Senta	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Megumi Uryu	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Hiroyuki Shinkai	(UNAFEI)

Report Summary

Group 2 noted that the U.N. Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (SMR) sets out good principles and practices for the treatment of prisoners and management of institutions, but most countries still have some difficulties implementing the basic rules of the SMR.

The Group began by discussing the current situation of the prison administration of each participating country in order to analyze the issues and problems they face and find ways to overcome their difficulties in applying the SMR. They looked at the following aspects: accommodation, separation of inmates, provision of medical services, information to prisoners, contact with the outside world, discipline and punishment, grievance mechanisms, prison incidents, inspection and community participation.

After in-depth discussions, Group 2 made the following recommendations: 1) transferring inmates between prisons can alleviate the most overcrowded facilities, as can the use of alternatives to imprisonment; 2) provision of more recreational facilities can reduce inmate stress levels; 3) separation of inmates is desirable; 4) medical care should be improved; 5) use of audio-visual equipment is useful to educate prisoners on their rights and rules, etc.; 6) e-mail and a video visit system should be in place; 7) disciplinary proceedings should incorporate basic features of natural justice; 8) mediation should be used to settle prison conflicts; 9) more effective prison and inmate management is necessary to reduce prison incidents; 10) independent bodies to inspect prisons should be established; 11) active participation of the community in certain prison affairs must be encouraged to ensure transparency and accountability; 12) outsourcing of certain functions of prison administration to the private sector may be considered under certain conditions in order to effectively utilize available resources.

Group 2 concluded by stating that prison management must use forward planning to anticipate and avoid problems. In order to fully realize the objectives of the penal system it is necessary that the attitudes of those within the system and outside it change in order that prison reform can go forward.

Group 3**PROMOTION OF EFFECTIVE TREATMENT PROGRAMMES FOR OFFENDERS**

Chairperson	Mr Orisi Vuki Katonibau	(Fiji)
Co-Chairperson	Mr Yuichiro Okuno	(Japan)
Rapporteur	Mr Jonah Muzambi	(Zimbabwe)
Co-Rapporteur	Mr Hernan Gallo Grande	(Philippines)
Co-Rapporteur	Mr Akira Takano	(Japan)
Members	Mr Saidamir Badriddinouich Saidov	(Tajikistan)
	Mr Patelisio Leniti Pale	(Tonga)
	Mr Wai-fung Law	(Hong Kong)
	Ms Mikako Matsushita	(Japan)
	Ms Sachiko Tokuda	(Japan)
Advisers	Prof. Takafumi Sato	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Tamaki Yokochi	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Masato Uchida	(UNAFEI)

Report Summary

Group 3 began by acknowledging that traditionally the purpose of prisons was to merely contain prisoners until they had served their sentences. However this approach has been considered a failure because prisoners very often re-offend since their criminal behaviour problems have not been addressed. Most participating countries recognized this problem and placed more of an emphasis on rehabilitation. The Group identified and offered possible solutions to the problems in the participating countries that hinder the effective implementation of treatment and rehabilitation.

The Group noted that participating countries had laws and policies similar to Art.65 of the SMR which advocates that the treatment of persons sentenced to imprisonment should have as its purpose, to establish in them the will to lead law abiding lives. However, a lack of resources hindered the treatment programmes that were in place.

Group 3 recognized that offenders had unique characteristics and it was necessary to identify the particular treatment needs of each offender by using a classification system. In addition to such a system the Group considered that for a treatment programme to be holistic it must at least include the following: privileges; work; education; social relations; and aftercare.

Group 3 then made the following recommendations: 1) archaic facilities need to be improved; 2) additional therapeutic programmes must be provided; 3) the existing classification system should be reviewed; 4) a more practical progressive stage system needs to be introduced; 5) earnings should be equal to the value of the prisoners work; 6) more availability of work that is of value in the outside world; 7) prison legislation should have provision for education; 8) integrated rehabilitation programmes and education are needed; 9) prisoners should be allowed more and longer visits; 10) coordination between prisons and probation services re: aftercare programmes; and 11) mechanisms should be put in place to evaluate the success of rehabilitation programmes.

Observation Visits

<u><i>Date</i></u>	<u><i>Agency/Institution</i></u>	<u><i>Main Persons Concerned</i></u>
May 21	Fuchu Prison	• Mr Masayoshi Tashiro (Special Assistant to Warden)
May 26	Tokyo District Public Prosecutors Office	• Mr Teruhisa Yamashita (Deputy Chief Prosecutor)
May 26	Ministry of Justice	• Mr Yukio Jitsukawa (Vice Minister of Justice)
June 17	Tokyo District Court	• Mr Osamu Ikeda (Deputy Chief Judge of the Tokyo District Court, Criminal Division)
June 22	Fuchu Dai-ichi Junior High School	• Mr Akio Asanuma (Principal)
June 22	Supreme Court	• Mr Tatsuo Kainaka (Justice)
June 23	Tachikawa Disaster Preparedness Centre	• Mr Michitaka Ishikawa (Director)

Group Study Tour

<u><i>Date</i></u>	<u><i>Location</i></u>	<u><i>Agency/Institution</i></u>	<u><i>Main Persons Concerned</i></u>
June 3-4	Hiroshima and Kyoto	• Hiroshima Prison	• Mr Masaaki Kinoshita Deputy Warden (Treatment)
		• Halfway House (Meishin)	• Mr Takayuki Matsumura
		• Talk on Kyoto Probation Office	• Mr Tadao Hashimoto Director (Aftercare Section)
		• Okazaki Park Police Box	• Mr Yoshio Yamashita Assistant Police Inspector

Special Events

May 17 *Welcome Party*

May to June *Japanese Conversation Classes*

The overseas participants attended three Japanese conversation classes and learned practical Japanese expressions. The Sensei (teacher) was Kumiko Yanagesawa.

May 21 *Ping-Pong Tournament*

The participants enjoyed a ping-pong tournament at UNAFEI in which the staff and faculty members of UNAFEI also participated. This was followed by a friendship party and prize giving.

May 22 *Tour to Tokyo Metropolitan Area*

The participants had the opportunity to go on a small tour of Tokyo which included the “Electric Town” in Akihabara and the Edo Tokyo Museum.

May 26 *Courtesy Visit to the Ministry of Justice and Reception by the Vice-Minister of Justice*

After visiting the Ministry of Justice, a reception was held by the Vice-Minister of Justice, Mr Keiichi Tadaki at the Lawyers Club, Tokyo.

May 28 *UNAFEI Olympics*

The UNAFEI Olympic Games were held on the grounds of the Training Institute for Correctional Personnel. The participants competed in such events as racket relay, tug of war and the true or false quiz. Afterwards, there was a friendship party at UNAFEI.

May 29 *Bus Tour to Nasu Highlands Hosted by ACPF, Kisei-kai Branch*

The participants visited the Nasu Musical Box Museum where they enjoyed a performance and explanation of musical boxes. They then visited the Mount Jeans Ski Resort and went up Mt. Jeans by cable car. Later on they enjoyed a visit to the Nasu Zoo Park where they watched a Falcon show. Following this Kisei-kai Branch ACPF hosted a very enjoyable party for the participants at the Nasu Zoo Park.

May 30 *UNAFEI Barbecue Party*

The participants and UNAFEI staff enjoyed a Sunday afternoon barbecue party on the lawn at UNAFEI.

June 3-4 *Hiroshima-Kyoto Study Tour*

Hiroshima : On their first day of the study tour the participants visited the Peace Memorial Museum and Peace Memorial Park in Hiroshima.

Kyoto : On their second day they took a short tour of the Kyoto Station building. On their third day they went on a tour of Kyoto which included Nijo Castle, Kinkaku Temple and the Kyoto Imperial Palace.

June 5 *The Way of Tea*

“Chan-no-yu” or “Sado”, a formal Japanese tea ceremony hosted by Soroptimist International Tokyo, Fuchu was held for the participants in Kyodo-no-Mori Park.

June 8 *Bowling Tournament*

The participants enjoyed bowling at the Fuchu bowling centre. Afterwards there was a small friendship party and prize giving held at UNAFEI.

June 10 *Meeting with Volunteer Probation Officers and Friendship Party*

A discussion session was arranged to exchange views between the Volunteer Probation Officers (VPOs) and the participants. It was organized by UNAFEI and the Rehabilitation Bureau of the Ministry of Justice. It was followed by dinner and a friendship party at UNAFEI.

June 12 and 13 *Home Visits*

ACPF Fuchu Branch organized dinners for the participants and visiting experts in the homes of members from the Fuchu International Exchange Salon, Tokyo Fuchu Rotary Club and Soroptimist International of Tokyo, Fuchu. The hosts were Mr Yoshiyuki Sakano, Ms Chitose Sashida, Mr Yasuhiro Momota, Mr Yasuhiko Mori, Ms Kazuko Seki and Ms Reiko Morioka.

June 15 *ACPF Fuchu Party*

The ACPF Fuchu branch hosted an enjoyable party for the participants and their host families at UNAFEI.

June 17 *ACPF Minoru-Kai Party*

The ACPF Minoru-Kai hosted a party at the Sunshine Sixty building in central Tokyo.

June 21 *Koto Concert*

The Participants enjoyed a Koto concert performed by ‘The Ensemble 21st Century’ held at UNAFEI.

June 23 *Suntory Brewery Visit*

The participants visited the Suntory Brewery where they were given a guided tour. Afterwards the Fuchu Rotary Club hosted a very enjoyable party.

June 24 *Farewell Party*

Reference Materials Distributed

I. UN Standards and Norms

- (1) United Nations (1948) Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
- (2) United Nations (1955) Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners. (1st UN Congress).
- (3) United Nations (1984) Procedures for the effective implementation of the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners. (1984/47).
- (4) United Nations (1988) Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment. (A/RES/43/173).
- (5) United Nations (1990) Basic Principles for the Treatment of Prisoners. (A/RES/45/111).
- (6) United Nations (1990) United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-Custodial Measures (The Tokyo Rules). (A/RES/45/110).
- (7) United Nations (1975) Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. (A/RES/3452XXX).
- (8) United Nations (1979) Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials. (A/RES/34/169).
- (9) United Nations (1990) Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials.
- (10) United Nations (1985) Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary. (A/RES/40/32 and 40/146).
- (11) United Nations (1985) Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power. (A/RES/40/34).
- (12) United Nations (1990) Basic Principles of the Role of Lawyers. (8th UN Congress).
- (13) United Nations (1990) Guidelines on the Role of Prosecutors. (8th UN Congress).
- (14) United Nations (2000) Vienna Declaration on Crime and Justice. (10th UN Congress).

II. UN Conventions

- (1) United Nations (1966) International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. (A/RES/2200A XXI).
- (2) United Nations (1966) Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. (A/RES/2200A XXI).
- (3) United Nations (1989) Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty. (A/RES/44/128).
- (4) United Nations (1984) Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. (A/RES/39/46).
- (5) United Nations (2003) Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. (A/RES/57/199).

III. Prison Population

- (1) Blumstein, A. (2002) "Prisons: A Policy Challenge." In J.Q. Wilson and J. Pattersilia (Eds.). *Crime: Public Policies for Crime Control* (pp. 451-508) Oakland: ICS Press.
- (2) Lappi-Seppala, T (2002) "Reducing the Prison population in Finland."
- (3) Lappi-Seppala, T (2002) "Penal Policy and Incarceration Rates in Finland." *Corrections Today*, vol. 64, No.1, February 2002.
- (4) Pease, K. (1994) "Cross-National Imprisonment Rates: Limitations of Method and Possible Conclusions." *The British Journal of Criminology* Vol.34 1994.
- (5) Tkachuk, B. and Walmsley, R. (2001) "World Prison Population: Facts, Trends and Solutions." Helsinki: HEUNI.
- (6) Walmsley, R. (1999) "World Prison Population List." Research Findings No. 88. UK: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- (7) Walmsley, R. (2000) "World Prison Population List (Second edition)." Research Findings No. 116. UK: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- (8) Walmsley, R. (2002) "World Prison Population List (Third edition)." Research Findings No. 166. UK: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- (9) Walmsley, R. (2003) "World Prison Population List (Fourth edition)." Research Findings No. 188 UK: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- (10) Walmsley, R. (2004) "World Prison Population List (Fifth edition)." Research Findings No. 234 UK: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.

IV. Prison Management

- (1) Ashworth, A. et al. (2001) "England/ Wales." In M Tonry (ed). *Penal Reform in Overcrowded Times* (pp. 238-260) New York: Oxford University Press.
- (2) Carlson, P.M. (1999a) "The Organization of the Institution." In P.M. Carlson and J.S. Garrett (Eds.) *Prison and Jail Administration* (pp. 25-31) Gaithersburg: An Aspen Publication.
- (3) Carlson, P.M. (1999b) "Management Accountability." In P.M. Carlson and J.S. Garrett (Eds.) *Prison and Jail Administration* (pp. 41-46) Gaithersburg: An Aspen Publication.
- (4) Cooksey, M.B. (1999) "Custody and Security." In P.M. Carlson and J.S. Garrett (Eds.) *Prison and Jail Administration* (pp. 75-81) Gaithersburg: An Aspen Publication.
- (5) Cripe, C.A. (1999) "Inmate Disciplinary Procedures." In P.M. Carlson and J.S. Garrett (Eds.) *Prison and Jail Administration* (pp. 208-218) Gaithersburg: An Aspen Publication.
- (6) Cripe, C.A. (2003) "Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments: Due Process- Inmate Discipline." In C. A. Cripe. *Legal Aspects of Corrections Management*. (pp. 163-193) Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.
- (7) Garrett, J. S. (1999) "Compliance with the Constitution." In P.M. Carlson and J.S. Garrett (Eds.) *Prison and Jail Administration* (pp. 321-326) Gaithersburg: An Aspen Publication.
- (8) Pryor, S. (2001) "The Responsible Prisoner: An exploration of the extent to which imprisonment removes responsibility unnecessarily and an invitation to change."

V. Treatment Programmes in Prison

- (1) Austin, J. (1999) "Rehabilitation: Reality or Myth?" In P.M. Carlson and J.S. Garrett (Eds.) *Prison and Jail Administration* (pp. 287-292) Gaithersburg: An Aspen Publication.
- (2) Cullen, F.T. (2002) "Rehabilitation and Treatment Programs." In J.Q. Wilson and J. Patersilia (Eds.). *Crime: Public Policies for Crime Control* (pp. 252-289) Oakland: ICS Press.
- (3) Cullen, F. and Gendreau, P. (2001) "From Nothing Works to What Works: Changing Professional Ideology in the 21st Century." *The Prison Journal* Vol.81 No.3.
- (4) French, S. and Gendreau, P. (2003) "Safe and Humane Corrections through Effective Treatment."
- (5) Gendreau P. (1996) "The Principles of Effective Intervention with Offenders." In A. Hartland (ed). *Choosing Correctional Options That Work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- (6) Gendreau P., et al. (2002) "The Common-Sense Revolution and Correctional Policy." In *Offender Rehabilitation and Treatment Effective Programs and Policies to Reduce Re-Offending*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- (7) Liebling, A. and Arnold, H. (2002) "Measuring the Quality of Prison Life." *Research Findings No. 174 UK: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate*.
- (8) Mackenzie, D.L. (2002) "Reducing the criminal activities of known offenders and delinquents." In L.W. Sherman, D.P. Farrington, B.C. Welsh and D.L. Mackenzie (Eds.) *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention* (pp. 330-404). New York: Routledge.
- (9) Mackenzie, D. L. (2001) "Corrections and Sentencing in the 21st Century: Evidence Based Corrections and Sentencing." *The Prison Journal*. Vol.81 No.3.
- (10) Martinson, R. (1974) "What Works? -Questions and Answers about Prison Reform." *The Public Interest*, 10 (pp. 22-54) In R. Matthews (ed.) *Imprisonment* Dartmouth: Ashgate.

VI. Inspection, Monitoring, Accountability

- (1) Council of Europe (2002) *The CPT in brief*.
- (2) Council of Europe (2003) *The CPT Standards: "Substantive Sections of the CPT's General Reports."*
- (3) Department of Justice "Strategic Objective & Annual Goal." 6.1: *Detention FY 2002 Performance and Accountability Report*.
- (4) Emmrys, C. *The Role of Citizens' Advisory Committees in Canada*.
- (5) HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (1998) *Annual Report 1997-1998: of HM Chief Inspector of Prisons*.
- (6) HM Inspectorates of Prisons and Probation (2001) *Through the Prison Gate*.
- (7) H.M.P. Ashwell (2002) *BOV annual report: 1 July 2001 to 30 June 2002*.
- (8) Home Office (2004) "Independent Monitoring Boards for Prisons and Immigration Removal Centres." [<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/justice/prisons/imb/index.html>].
- (9) Home Office (2004) "What does being a board member involve?" [<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/justice/prisons/imb/involve.html>].
- (10) Independent Monitoring Board for HMP Canterbury (2003) "Annual Report for July 2002/3."

- (11) Morgan, R. and Evans, M. (1994) "Inspecting Prisons: The View from Strasbourg." *The British Journal of Criminology* Vol.34 1994.
- (12) Targeted Performance Initiative Working Group "Modernising the Management of the Prison Service: An Independent Report." by the Targeted Performance Initiative Working Group, Chaired by Lord Laming of Tewin CBE.

VII. Grievance

- (1) Cripe, C. A. (2003) "A General View of Prisoners' Rights Under the Constitution." In C. A. Cripe. *Legal Aspects of Corrections Management*. (pp. 163-193) Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.
- (2) "John Howard Society of Alberta." (1998) *Inmate Rights and Grievance Options*.
- (3) Ministry of Justice, the Netherlands (2001) *Convicted of an Offence*. [http://www.justitie.nl/english/Images/23_37076.pdf].
- (4) Prisons and Probation Ombudsman for England and Wales (2004) "Welcome to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman for England and Wales Website." [<http://www.ppo.gov.uk/index.htm>].
- (5) Secretary of State for the Home Department (2003) "Toward Resettlement: Prisons and Probation." Ombudsman for England and Wales Annual Report 2002-2003. "Independent investigation of complaints for a just and humane penal system."
- (6) Wall II, A.T. (1999) "Inmate Grievance Procedures." In P.M. Carlson and J.S. Garrett (Eds.) *Prison and Jail Administration* (pp. 268-274) Gaithersburg: An Aspen Publication.

VIII. Community Corrections

- (1) Albrecht, H. (2001) "Post-Adjudication Dispositions in Comparative Perspective." In M. Tonry and R. Frase (eds.) *Sentencing and Sanctions in Western Countries* (pp. 293-330) NY: Oxford University Press.
- (2) Correctional Service Canada (2001) "Backgrounders." [http://198.103.98.138/text/pubed/feuilles/condrls_e.shtml].
- (3) Correctional Service Canada (2003) "Protecting Society Through Community Corrections." [http://198.103.98.138/text/pblct/protect/broch_e.shtml].
- (4) Correctional Service Canada (1999) "Human Rights in Community Corrections." [http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/publct/wgroup/toce_e.shtml].
- (5) Cripe, C.A. (2003) "Probation and Parole, Community Corrections, Fines." In C. A. Cripe. *Legal Aspects of Corrections Management*. (pp. 283-309) Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.
- (6) Daubney, D. (2002) "Striking a Balance: A Strategy to Encourage Community Corrections in Canada." *Corrections Today*, vol. 64, No.1, February 2002.
- (7) Ellis, T. and Winstone, J. (2002) "The Policy Impact of a Survey of Programme Evaluations in England and Wales." In G. Bernfeld et al. (eds). *Offender Rehabilitation and Treatment Effective Programs and Policies to Reduce Re-Offending*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- (8) Harris, P. and Smith, S. (1996) "Developing Community Corrections. An Implementation Perspective." In *Choosing Correctional Potions That Work* (pp. 183-221).

- (9) Joutsen, M (1998) "Why have alternatives not been adopted more fully and what needs to be done?" - The European Experience. Helsinki: HEUNI [<http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/forum/bprisons/english/solgene.html>].
- (10) Petersilia, J (2002) "Community Corrections." In J.Q. Wilson and J. Petersilia (Eds.). *Crime: Public Policies for Crime Control* (pp. 451-508) Oakland: ICS Press.
- (11) Petersilia, J. (2001) "Prisoner Reentry: Public Safety and Reintegration Challenges." *The Prison Journal* Vol.81 No.3.
- (12) Raynor, P. and Vanstone, M. (2001) "Straight Thinking on Probation: Evidence-Based Practice and the Culture of Curiosity." In G. Bernfeld et al. (eds). *Offender Rehabilitation and Treatment Effective Programs and Policies to Reduce Re-Offending*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

IX. Penal Reform

- (1) Christie. N. (1998) "Penal Law and the Civil Society on the Dangers in Overcriminalization." Bogota August 1998. [http://folk.uio.no/christie/dokumenter/penal_law_columbia.htm].
- (2) Christie. N. (2004) "The Global Village." [http://folk.uio.no/christie/dokumenter/the_global_village.htm].
- (3) Dunkel, F. and Snacken S. (2000) "Prisons in Europe-Recent Developments and Problems in East and West." A paper presented at the 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, 16 November.
- (4) Farrington, D., Petrosino A., and Welsh B. (2001) "Systematic Reviews and Cost-Benefit Analyses of Correctional Interventions". *The Prison Journal* Vol.81 No.3.
- (5) Frase, R. S. (2001) "Comparative Perspectives on Sentencing Policy and Research." In M. Tonry and R. Frase (eds.) *Sentencing and Sanctions in Western Countries* (pp. 259-292) NY: Oxford University Press.
- (6) Lake, R. (2003) "Finland: Norwegian Professor Nils Christie Questions Prohibitionist Approach." [<http://www.mapinc.org/ccnews/v03/n1467/a03.html?103>].
- (7) Lord Woolf (Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales) (2001) "The Woolf Report: a Decade of Change?" [<http://www.dca.gov.uk/judicial/speeches/31-1-01.htm>].
- (8) King, R.D., and Maguire M. (1994) "Contexts of Imprisonment: An International Perspective." *The British Journal of Criminology* Vol.34 1994.
- (9) Kurki, L. (2001) "International Standards for Sentencing and Punishment." In M. Tonry and R. Frase (eds.) *Sentencing and Sanctions in Western Countries* (pp. 331-378) NY: Oxford University Press.
- (10) Morgan, R. (2001) "International Controls on Sentencing and Punishment." In M. Tonry and R. Frase (eds.) *Sentencing and Sanctions in Western Countries* (pp. 379-404) NY: Oxford University Press.
- (11) Roberts, J. V. and Gabor T. (2004) "Living in the Shadow of Prisons: Lessons from the Canadian Experience in Decarceration." *The British Journal of Criminology* Vol.44 2004.
- (12) Sparks, R. (1994) "Can Prisons Be Legitimate? Penal Politics, Privatization, and the Timeliness of an Old India." *The British Journal of Criminology* Vol.34 1994.

Experts and Participants List

Visiting Experts

Prof. Nils CHRISTIE	Professor Institute of Criminology, Faculty of Law, University of Oslo, Norway
Ms Cristina ROJAS RODRIGUEZ	Experta Asociada del ILANUD San José, Costa Rica
Mr Michael SPURR	Director of Operations H.M. Prison Service, United Kingdom
Ms Chomil KAMAL	Deputy Director/Chief Probation Officer Probation Services Branch for Permanent Secretary (Community Development and Sports), Ministry of Community Development and Sports, Singapore

Overseas Participants

Mr Hany Mohamad Nasseh GABR	Deputy Chief Investigations Section, Alexandria Police Department, Egypt
Mr Orisi Vuki KATONIBAU	Staff Officer Administration Fiji Prison Service, Fiji
Mr Maju AMBARITA	Head Section Finance Internal Controlling, Jakarta Prosecutor Office, Jakarta, Indonesia
Mr ABDUL AZIZ Bin Mohamad	Head of Unit Internal Audit Unit, Prison Department Malaysia, Ministry of Internal Security, Malaysia

Mr Rungit SINGH a/l Jaswant Singh	Senior Federal Counsel Attorney General's Chambers, Prime Minister's Department, Malaysia
Mr Julio Ometei RINGANG	Chief Division of Correction, Bureau of Public Safety, Ministry of Justice, Palau
Mr Mark Mengepe MEWERIMBE	Chief Inspector Officer In-Charge-Prosecution, Department of Police, Boroko Police Station, Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea
Mr Hernan Gallo GRANDE	Chief Inspectorate Bureau of Jail Management and Penology, Philippines
Mr Saidamir Badriddinovich SAIDOV	Head, Operations Unit Ministry of Internal Affairs, Tajikistan
Mr Pongtorn JANOUDOM	Principal Research Judge Court of Appeal Region IV, Thailand
Mr Somphop RUJJANAVET	Penologist 7 Chief of Information and International Conference Section, Department of Corrections, Ministry of Justice, Thailand
Mr Patelisio Leniti PALE	Assistant Probation Officer Probation Services, Ministry of Justice, Tonga
Mr Hamish GARAE	Station Sergeant Vanuatu Police Force, Vanuatu

Mr Jonah MUZAMBI	Officer Commanding District Zimbabwe Republic Police, Ministry of Home Affairs, Zimbabwe
Ms Mildred Bernadette Baquilod ALVOR	State Counsel V Office of the Chief State Counsel, Department of Justice, Philippines
Mr Eric Wai-fung LAW	Superintendent Tai Lam Centre for Women, Hong Kong Correctional Services Department, Hong Kong
Ms Soo-Hee KIM	Correctional Supervisor Su-Won Detention Center, Korea
Japanese Participants	
Mr Osamu AOKI	Senior Chief Programme Supervisor Matsumoto Juvenile Prison
Mr Toshihiro FUKUGAKI	Probation Officer Kobe Probation Office
Mr Keiichi ICHINOSE	Superintendent Second Investigation Division, National Police Agency
Ms Hatsue MATSUBAYASHI	Probation Officer Yamaguchi Probation Office
Ms Mikako MATSUSHITA	Family Court Probation Officer Asahikawa Family Court
Mr Koichi NAKAMURA	Assistant Judge Tokyo District Court
Mr Yuichiro OKUNO	Public Prosecutor Hiroshima District Public Prosecutors Office
Ms Noriko SHIBATA	Public Prosecutor Kochi District Public Prosecutors Office

Mr Yasuaki SUGAWARA

Section Chief
Enforcement Division,
Immigration Bureau,
Ministry of Justice

Mr Akira TAKANO

Assistant Judge
Tokyo District Court

Ms Sachiko TOKUDA

Chief Specialist
Katano Juvenile Training School for Girls

Mr Masahiro TOMOI

Superintendent
Community Safety Planning Division,
National Police Agency

**NINTH SPECIAL SEMINAR FOR SENIOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE
OFFICIALS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA**

The Ninth Special Seminar for Senior Criminal Justice Officials of the People's Republic of China was held from 21 February - 11 March 2004. The Theme of the Seminar was "Effective Criminal Justice Administration in Accordance with United Nations Standards and Norms: The Proper Way for the Protection of Rights and Punishment of Crimes".

Thirteen senior criminal justice officials and the UNAFEI faculty comparatively discussed contemporary problems faced by China and Japan in relation to the above theme.

Mr ZHANG, Yi	Director International Division, Department of Judicial Assistance and Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Justice
Ms XU, Xia	Counsellor Penal Law Division, Criminal Law Department, Legislative Affairs Commission of the Standing Committee of the NPC
Ms DU, Bing	Counsellor Law and Regulation Division, Department of Legislative Affairs, Ministry of Justice
Mr MENG, Xian Jun	Director Division of Research, Bureau of Prison Administration, Ministry of Justice
Mr DONG, Shi Hong	Senior Judge Criminal Adjudication Chamber No.2
Ms LI, Hui	Senior Judge Chamber for Adjudication, Supervision
Mr WANG, Jun	Deputy Director General Public Prosecution Department, Supreme People's Procuratorate

Mr WANG, Shu Qing	Deputy Director Procurator-General's Office of General Office, Supreme People's Procuratorate
Mr CHEN, Ru Hai	Vice Director People's Reception Office, General Office, Ministry of Public Security
Mr ZHAO, Bin	Deputy Director Division for Legal Enforcement, Supervision, Legal Department, Ministry of Public Security
Ms ZHAO, Shu Huan	Officer Department of Judicial Assistance and Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Justice
Mr HUANG, Huan Guang	Deputy Director General Bureau of Re-education through Labor, Guangxi Autonomous Region
Ms HE, Chun Yun	Officer Legal Aid Center of China

**THIRD SEMINAR ON THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM
FOR TAJIKISTAN**

The Third Seminar on the Judicial System for Tajikistan was held from 1 March to 19 March 2004 at UNAFEI. The seminar focused on measures for preventing juvenile crime, treatment of juvenile offenders in correctional facilities and support for reintegration of offenders into society after release.

Mr RAKHMONOV Yusufkhon Akhmadovich	Chief Military Prosecutor General Prosecutor's Office
Mr NUROV Sirojiddin Kutbidinovich	Deputy Director Prison No. 6, Department of Punishment, Ministry of Justice
Mr MIRZOSHARIFOV Akbar Partovovich	Head of the Group Prison No.7, Department of Punishment, Ministry of Justice
Mr YULDASHEV Rajab Davlatmandovich	Prosecutor Prosecutor's Office of Firdavsi District, Dushanbe City
Mr ASHUROV Habibullo Tabarovich	Deputy Chairman Court of the Sino District, Dushanbe City
Mr TURAEV Navruz Dostonovich	District Inspector of Police (Juvenile Inspector) Department of Internal Affairs of Jeleznodorozhniy District, Dushanbe City
Mr KHOLMIRZOEV Azam Mirzohotamovich	Executive Secretary Commission of Juvenile Affairs, Administration of Sogd Region
Mr NORMATOV Ulugbek Solievich	Deputy Chief Department of Justice, Administration of Sogd Region
Mr SATTOROV Abdujabor Salomovich	Judge Supreme Court of Tazhikistan

Mr SHOEV Isroil Nazaralievich	Chief Department of Law Support for Citizens, Ministry of Justice
Mr RAUFOV Suhrob Holmurodovich	Executive Secretary Commission of Juvenile Affairs, Administration of Khatlon Region
Mr KAYUMOV Abduvasit Gafarovich	Tutor of Juvenile Prisoners Correctional Facility No.9/7, Department of Punishment, Ministry of Justice
Mr SAMADOV Navruz Abdulkhamidovich	Head of Sector Law Department, President Administration
Mr MIRZOEV Mirzoakhmad Saidovich	Deputy Director National Center of the Out-of-School Educational Works, Ministry of Education
Mr MAHMADOV Dilshod Emomnazarovich	Chief Field Officer Department of Criminal Investigation, Ministry of Internal Affairs

INFORMATION ABOUT FORTHCOMING PROGRAMMES

1. The 1st Training Course on Strengthening the Anti-Corruption Capacity in Thailand

The 1st Training Course on “Strengthening the Anti-Corruption Capacity in Thailand” is a new course which will be held from June 28 - July 23, 2004.

2. The 128th International Training Course

The 128th International Training Course entitled “Measures to Combat Economic Crime, including Money Laundering” will be held from August 30- October 7, 2004.

Rationale

Economic crime is one of the most serious problems which the international community is now faced with. Economic crime includes a broad range of illegal activities: from conventional types such as fraud, embezzlement, breach of trust and corruption to newly recognized types such as offences in which criminals abuse the financial system; offences against free and fair trade; violation of intellectual property rights; fraudulent price manipulation and insider trading in the stock/financial markets; and money laundering. These new types of crimes, especially large-scale cases, have drawn the public’s attention recently. Economic crime also covers many activities instrumental to the above mentioned offences, such as forgery of documents and payment cards and computer related crimes, especially the misuse of the Internet. Economic crime furthermore encompasses corporate crimes including window-dressing, tax evasion and violation of regulations, and on the other hand, consumer fraud such as pyramid scheme which can often involve many victims. In addition, the definition and the scope of fraud itself differs from one country to another, and in some countries fraud embraces a very wide range of dishonest activities. Furthermore, experience has shown us that these various forms of economic crimes are often interwoven and interrelated; for example, a criminal group may be involved in fraud or embezzlement using various fraudulent methods in collusion with corrupt public officials or company executives, and then launder their ill-gotten money.

The reason why economic crime has become more serious is that it now often takes place beyond national borders. The globalization of the economy as well as rapid development and the worldwide spread of communications technology, including the Internet has offered to criminals new and easier opportunities to commit economic crime transnationally. Economic crime sometimes creates a great number of victims and substantial loss, leads to the bankruptcy of companies, and can also cause great loss to public property. Besides such direct damage, this crime may pose a deleterious impact on legitimate business, undercut the confidence in and reputation of the financial system, destabilize the market economy and ultimately undermine the sound socio-economic development in each country. One of the characteristics of recent economic crime is the complex and sophisticated nature of its modus operandi. The use of high-technology has been growing drastically; criminals fully exploit the Internet and electronic commerce, for example, they conduct multiple frauds against many victims simultaneously, and also carry out identity theft and identity fraud as well as consumer fraud and auction fraud using

fraudulent or fake web-sites. The transnational nature of this crime hampers its detection, and makes the tracing and return of the proceeds of crime much more difficult. In addition to that, evidence which is preserved in computers can be instantaneously altered or destroyed.

Another remarkable characteristic is that most economic crimes are committed on a large scale by groups in a well-organized fashion, and such groups range from organized criminal groups to legitimate companies. In such cases, it is difficult for the authorities to gather information from insiders and to see the whole picture of their illegal activities, which hinders the authorities from bringing the leaders to justice.

Among the economic crimes, money laundering should be our main focus. Criminals, whose ultimate purpose is to make money, always conceal and launder their ill-gotten proceeds and then reinvest them into further illegal activities or into legitimate business to make even more profits. According to research by the United Nations and others, estimates of the amount of money laundered globally in one year range from between \$500 billion and \$1 trillion. Money laundering is one of the economic crimes, which can undermine the integrity and stability of legitimate economic and financial systems. It also poses an immeasurable threat to the sound development of countries' economic and financial systems and it may even threaten the stability and the security of the government as well. In addition, due to its transnational nature, money laundering has a negative impact on the international economic and financial system.

Furthermore, money laundering techniques have become increasingly sophisticated and complicated. For example, criminals cunningly use shell corporations and off-shore financial centers as a safe haven for illicit funds. They target countries and areas where the regulations and law enforcement are not effective. In recent years, the involvement of professionals such as lawyers and accountants is of great concern. With stricter examination of customers by financial institutions, criminals often use alternative remittance systems such as underground banking in order to evade the laws and regulations.

The United Nations has granted priority to combating economic crime so as to address this global issue effectively. The United Nations adopted the UN Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances in 1988, which requires State Parties to criminalize money laundering and take necessary measures to trace, freeze and forfeit the proceeds in relation to drug offences. The United Nations also adopted the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime in 2000, which comprehensively provides for various practical measures to effectively tackle transnational organized crime, and requires State Parties to extend the scope of predicate offences of money laundering beyond drug trafficking to all serious crimes. Where economic crime is committed in organized way, this Convention is applicable and the countries can combat it in a concerted manner based on it. The United Nations furthermore adopted the UN Convention against Corruption in October 2003, which requires State Parties to criminalize bribery of foreign public officials and to facilitate the return of government assets to the country of origin. This Convention provides for a comprehensive strategy against corruption, including preventive measures, and this is applicable to economic crime in connection with corrupt practices in the public sector.

At the 11th UN Congress to be held in Thailand (Bangkok) in 2005, the provisional agenda "Economic and Financial Crimes: Challenges to Sustainable Development" has been approved, and a workshop on the topic of "Measures to Combat Economic Crime, Including Money Laundering" is scheduled to take place. In view of the magnitude of this topic, UNAFEI, in

collaboration with the Government of Sweden, is going to coordinate this Workshop and is now in the process of preparing for it. This Workshop will include a panel discussion to be made by several experts based on a hypothetical case scenario of economic crime. This will provide an opportunity to exchange best practices and information in the fight against economic crime among countries, including improvement of legal frameworks, innovative practical approaches and international cooperation.

The other international fora have also actively addressed this issue, especially the Financial Action Task Force on money laundering (FATF) established by the G-7 Summit in 1989, which developed the international standards known as “The Forty Recommendations”, which set out a comprehensive blueprint for countries to implement effective anti-money laundering programmes. The FATF examines the 29 member countries and territories’ progress in implementing “The Forty Recommendations” through self-assessment and a mutual evaluation procedure, and also publishes a list of Non-Cooperative Countries and Territories to encourage those countries to improve their programmes. “The Forty Recommendations” was revised in 2003 in order to strengthen the mechanisms to control money laundering, reflecting new best practices. In addition, since 1997 regional initiatives have been taken, for example the Asia/Pacific Group on Money Laundering (APG) has addressed this issue to facilitate the implementation of internationally accepted money laundering standards.

Each country has to recognize the gravity of this new challenge and tackle economic crime, including money laundering with more effective countermeasures.

To begin with, we need to examine ways to improve investigation, prosecution and trial. First we should take into consideration the establishment of a special investigation unit or agency consisting of experts who have sufficient expertise and capacity to appropriately tackle complicated economic crimes. Secondly, considering that influential politicians and high-ranking public officials may sometimes be deeply involved in economic crimes, the investigative agencies should act independently so as not to be influenced by them. Thirdly, concerning the investigative methods, in addition to the improvement of conventional methods, new types of investigative techniques such as interception of communications and undercover operations should be introduced and utilized. Moreover, it is necessary to consider introducing a system of protection of whistle-blowers and/or immunity for the purpose of collecting information and critical statements. It is also imperative to establish enforceable measures to collect records from financial institutions and not to be hampered by bank secrecy laws. Fourthly, at the trial stage, in some cases where witnesses are reluctant to testify due to fear of retaliation by the offenders or criminal groups, we need to explore measures for securing their testimony, such as a witness protection programme.

Next, we need to review and strengthen our legal framework to combat various types of emerging economic crimes, and to discuss the punishment of legal persons. There are various views in respect of the imposition of sanctions against economic crimes: for example, some say that criminal sanctions against economic crime are too lenient, and others say that civil or administrative sanctions should be utilized more in combination with criminal punishment. Since we need to pay due attention to various factors, it is important to determine what kinds of sanctions against economic crime are more effective and should be taken.

Because economic crime is committed in order to gain profit, it is most effective and critical to deprive criminals of the proceeds of crime. By doing so, we can deprive criminals of

their incentive to commit crime. It is therefore imperative to establish an appropriate legal framework for the forfeiture and confiscation of illegal proceeds as well as for freezing their funds. To this end we have to strengthen and implement the mechanisms for tracing money both domestically and internationally when it is transferred overseas.

It is also necessary to establish mechanisms to combat money laundering such as to: promote customer due diligence (CDD) measures in the financial institutions such as identifying the beneficial owner to prevent anonymous accounts being opened; impose a legal duty on financial institutions to make suspicious transaction reports (STR) to the designated authority; establish a Financial Intelligent Unit (FIU); and ensure that designated law enforcement authorities have responsibility for money laundering investigations.

Due to the global nature of economic crime, the harmonization of countermeasures by all countries and international cooperation is indispensable, especially so as not to create safe havens for criminals and their illicit proceeds. If some countries do not join our concerted battle, the illicit money will flow into those countries to be laundered. In this context, each country needs to work together by implementing the above-mentioned international standards. In addition, we have to make every effort to explore better ways to ensure that international cooperation, including information exchange mechanisms and mutual legal assistance and extradition is carried out in a more effective and expeditious manner.

On the other hand, the importance of “prevention” of economic crime cannot be overlooked. Every government and corporation should be required to establish a legal and/or organizational system of “good governance” so that transparency and accountability is ensured. It is worthy of consideration to introduce independent monitoring organizations and/or an ombudsmen system for this purpose. Additionally public awareness and education in relation to economic crime is essential.

In consideration of the above, UNAFEI, as a regional institute (affiliated with the United Nations) for the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders, is holding the 128th International Training Course on the theme of “Measures to Combat Economic Crime, including Money Laundering”.

Objectives

Giving due consideration to the above rationale, this Course will explore effective countermeasures against economic crime including money laundering. By sharing and discussing lessons and practical examples which the participants will provide, we will be able to explore more effective countermeasures against it.

In this Course, “Economic Crime” will not include illicit drug trafficking or trafficking in human beings. The predicate offences of “Money Laundering” will include any offences and we will discuss money laundering relating to illicit drug trafficking or trafficking in human beings, however, we will not discuss the situation and countermeasures against illicit drug trafficking and trafficking in human beings itself because we would like to focus our discussion on economic crime and money laundering. Please refer to the offences which are mentioned in Paragraph 1 of the above “Rationale” as economic crimes, although we have not made a list of included and excluded offences.

In the discussions of this course, focus will be placed on the following elements: In the group workshops, we will discuss a hypothetical case scenario which UNAFEI will prepare, and it will include various issues relating to (2)-(4) of the following.

(1) Current situation of economic crime including money laundering:

Actual situation of this crime in each country, what serious offences are committed in each country, modus operandi, case examples, recent trends and problems which each country encounters, etc.

(2) Effective methods for investigation, prosecution and trial regarding economic crime, including money laundering:

(a) The measures for ensuring the effectiveness of investigative agencies

(b) Effective measures to collect information (including utilization of informants)

(c) Effective utilization of traditional investigative methods

(d) The measures for ensuring effective investigation of banks (including bank secrecy issues)

(e) Utilization of new investigative techniques, such as

- Controlled delivery

- Electronic surveillance and communications interceptions, etc

- Undercover operations

- Immunity

(f) Protection of witnesses (both at the investigative stage and the trial stage)

(g) Other effective methods

(3) Legal frameworks for controlling economic crime including money laundering, problems regarding its implementation and solutions (discussions will be held from the viewpoint of the implementation of international standards such as the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (hereinafter "TOC Convention"), the UN Convention against Corruption (hereinafter "Corruption Convention") and "the Forty Recommendations" developed by the FATF):

(a) Legal framework for the punishment of money laundering and other forms of economic crimes (Arts. 5, 6, 8 and 23 of TOC Convention, Arts. 15-29 of Corruption Convention and Art. 1 of the Forty Recommendations)

(b) Punishment and sanctions (including civil and administrative sanctions) against legal persons (Art. 10 of TOC Convention, Art.26 of Corruption Convention, Arts. 2 and 17 of the Forty Recommendations.)

- (c) Establishment of the suspicious transactions reporting system, and the introduction of and the activities of Financial Intelligence Units (FIU) (Art.7 of TOC Convention, Art. 14 of Corruption Convention and Arts. 13-16 and 26 of the Forty Recommendations)
 - (d) Cooperation by banks and non-bank financial institutions (Art. 12 (6) of TOC Convention, Arts. 31(7) and 40 of Corruption Convention and Art. 28 of the Forty Recommendations)
 - (e) Confiscation of the proceeds and assets derived from crimes, criminal/civil forfeiture, freezing systems, collection of the value of the proceeds, asset sharing and other related systems (Arts. 12-14 of TOC Convention, Art. 31 of Corruption Convention and Arts. 3 and 38 of the Forty Recommendations)
 - (f) Asset recovery, especially the return of assets out flowed to foreign countries (Art. 14 (2) of TOC Convention, Chapter V, especially Art. 57, of Corruption Convention)
 - (g) Shifting the burden of proof to the defendant, and any other methods of alleviating the prosecutors' burden of proof (Art. 12 (7) of TOC Convention, Art. 20 of Corruption Convention and Art.3 of the Forty Recommendations)
 - (h) (h) Other anti-money laundering systems/strategies (Art. 14 of Corruption Convention and Arts. 5-12, 18-20 and 23-25 of the Forty Recommendations)
 - (i) (i) Measures to strengthen international cooperation, including information exchange and joint investigations (Arts. 16-20, 27, 28 and 29 of TOC Convention, Chapter IV of Corruption Convention and Arts. 36-40 of the Forty Recommendations)
- (4) Preventive measures against economic crime including money laundering:
- (a) Administrative regulation of economic activities
 - (b) Corporate governance (e.g. audit systems, outside directors and disclosure systems, etc.)
 - (c) Establishment of a system of monitoring economic activities (e.g. Securities and Exchange Surveillance Commission for securities crime, reporting obligations, inspection and correction orders, etc.)
 - (d) Public awareness and other educative measures.

ADMINISTRATIVE NEWS

Faculty Changes

Mr Toru Mura, formerly Professor of UNAFEI, was transferred to the Tokyo District Court on 1 April 2004.

Mr Kenji Teramura, formerly Professor of UNAFEI, was transferred to the Yokohama Juvenile Classification Home on 1 April 2004.

Mr Yasuhiro Tanabe, formerly Professor of UNAFEI, was transferred to the Tokyo District Public prosecutors Office on 1 April 2004.

Ms Sue Takasu, formerly Professor of UNAFEI, was transferred to the Tokyo District Public Prosecutors Office on 1 April 2004.

Mr Masato Uchida, formerly a Professor of the Training Institute for Correctional Personnel, joined UNAFEI as a Professor on 1 April 2004.

Mr Takafumi Sato, formerly a Prosecutor at the Tokyo District Public Prosecutors Office, joined UNAFEI as a Professor on 1 April 2004.

Ms Megumi Uryu, formerly a Prosecutor at the Tokyo District Public Prosecutors Office, joined UNAFEI as a Professor on 1 April 2004.

Mr Iichiro Sakata, formerly a Judge with the Gifu District/Family Court, joined UNAFEI as a Professor on 1 April 2004.

Mr Motoo Noguchi, formerly a Prosecutor at the Tokyo District Public Prosecutors Office, Hachioji Branch, joined UNAFEI as a Professor on 25 June 2004.

Overseas Trips by Staff

Mr Takafumi Sato (Professor) visited Yangon, Myanmar to attend the FATF Seminar as an expert in the field of mutual legal assistance from 9 May to 13 May 2004.

Mr Kunihiko Sakai (Director) and Mr Keisuke Senta (Professor) visited Bangkok, Thailand to attend the Regional Preparatory Meeting for the 11th U.N. Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice from 28 March to 1 April 2004.

Mr Kunihiko Sakai (Director) and Mr Keisuke Senta (Professor) visited Vienna, Austria to attend the 13th Session of the U.N. Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice from 10 May and 21 May 2004.

Mr Kunihiko Sakai (Director) and Mr Keisuke Senta (Professor) visited Stockholm, Sweden to attend the preparatory meeting for the 11th U.N. Congress Workshop on Measures to Combat Economic Crime, including Money Laundering from 22 May and 26 May 2004.

Ms Tamaki Yokochi (Professor) visited Cagayan de Ora, the Philippines to attend and give a lecture at the 9th National Convention and 7th National Training Institute of the Probation and Parole Officers League of the Philippines Inc.

FACULTY AND STAFF OF UNAFEI

Faculty:

Mr Kunihiko Sakai	Director
Ms Tomoko Akane	Deputy Director
Mr Keisuke Senta	Professor, Chief of Training Division
Mr Masato Uchida	Professor, Chief of Research Division
Mr Kei Someda	Professor, Chief of Information and Library Science Division
Mr Takafumi Sato	Professor
Ms Megumi Uryu	Professor
Mr Iichiro Sakata	Professor
Ms Tamaki Yokochi	Professor
Mr Hiroyuki Shinkai	Professor, 127th Course Programming Officer
Mr Simon Cornell	Linguistic Adviser

Secretariat:

Mr Kiyoshi Ezura	Chief of Secretariat
Mr Masaki Iida	Deputy Chief of Secretariat

General and Financial Affairs Section:

Mr Yoshihiro Miyake	Chief
Mr Takanobu Sano	
Mr Osamu Miyakawa	
Mr Yuki Yoshi Tatsuda	
Mr Mitsuo Dai	Driver
Mr Teruo Kanai	Maintenance
Ms Emiko Aruga	

Training and Hostel Management Affairs Section:

Mr Ryousei Tada	Chief
Mr Tatsufumi Koyama	
Ms Chika Yamashita	
Ms Minako Fujimura	
Ms Tsuburu Miyagawa	127th Course Assistant Programming Officer

International Research Affairs Section:

Mr Seiji Yamagami Chief
Ms Keiko Noda Librarian

Secretarial Staff:

Ms Yukari Ishikawa
Ms Kumiko Yanagisawa

Kitchen, Chef:

Mr Misao Saito

JICA Coordinator:

Ms Sayuri Nakajima

UNAFEI Home Page: <http://www.unafei.or.jp/>

UNAFEI E-mail: unafei@moj.go.jp