

UNAFEI NEWSLETTER

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

No. 122 *Established*
February 2007 *1961*

IN THIS ISSUE

	<i>Page</i>
LETTER FROM THE DIRECTOR	1
THE 135th INTERNATIONAL SENIOR SEMINAR	3
“PROMOTING PUBLIC SAFETY AND CONTROLLING RECIDIVISM USING EFFECTIVE INTERVENTIONS WITH OFFENDERS: AN EXAMINATION OF BEST PRACTICES”	
Seminar Rationale	3
Seminar Summary	6
Lecture Topics	7
Individual Presentation Topics	8
Group Workshop Sessions	10
Observation Visits	13
Group Study Tour	14
Special Events	15
Reference Materials Distributed	17
Experts and Participants List	22
THE SEVENTH TRAINING COURSE ON THE JUVENILE DELINQUENT TREATMENT SYSTEM FOR KENYA	26
NINTH INTERNATIONAL TRAINING COURSE ON CORRUPTION CONTROL IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE	28
INFORMATION ABOUT FORTHCOMING PROGRAMMES	
The Third Seminar on the Criminal Justice System for Central Asia	30
The Twelfth Special Seminar for Senior Criminal Justice Officials of the People's Republic of China	30
The Second Country Specific Training Course on the Revitalization of the PPA Volunteer Probation Aides System for the Philippines	30
The 136th International Training Course	30
ADMINISTRATIVE NEWS	
Overseas Trips by Staff	35
FACULTY & STAFF OF UNAFEI	36

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 135th International Senior Seminar on "Promoting Public Safety and Controlling Recidivism Using Effective Interventions with Offenders: An Examination of Best Practices", which took place from 12 January to 15 February 2007.

In this Seminar we welcomed eighteen overseas participants: ten from Asia, four from Latin America, two from Africa, one from the Caribbean and one from the UNODC; and seven Japanese participants. They included police officers, correctional officers, judges, public prosecutors, probation officers, an immigration official and other high-ranking public officials. As this Newsletter demonstrates, the Seminar was extremely productive. It consisted of individual presentations, group workshop sessions, visits to relevant criminal justice agencies, and lectures by visiting experts and faculty members.

The United Nations Standard Minimum Rules on the Treatment of Prisoners (1955) states that, in addition to protecting society, the ultimate purpose of imprisonment is the offender's reintegration into society. Since these Rules were established there has been greater realisation that custodial sentences are not always appropriate and may hinder the rehabilitation process. Many countries have therefore sought non-custodial measures for certain classes of offenders with a view to aiding their rehabilitation and eventual reintegration into society.

In 1990, in order to establish rules and guidelines for such non-custodial measures, the international community adopted the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-Custodial Measures (the Tokyo Rules). In 2005 The United Nations adopted the Bangkok Declaration which strengthens the promotion of comprehensive measures for crime prevention and encourages the use and application of applicable UN Standards and Norms.

In light of the above-mentioned UN instruments, and the mounting evidence and acceptance that treatment programmes can be effective in reducing recidivism and therefore have a positive effect on crime prevention, UNAFEI, as a regional institute of the UN Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme Network, undertook this Seminar.

During the Seminar the participants diligently and comprehensively examined the best practices of the effective interventions that aim at the prevention and/or reduction of recidivism of offenders. The participants shared their own experiences and knowledge of the issues, and identified problems and areas in which improvements could be made. After engaging in in-depth discussions with the UNAFEI faculty and visiting experts, they presented group reports.

I would like to offer my sincere congratulations to all the participants upon their successful completion of the Seminar, made possible by their strenuous efforts. My heartfelt gratitude goes to the visiting experts who contributed a great deal to the Seminar'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 Seminar. 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 Seminar.

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 135th International Senior Seminar. I hope that the experience they gained during the Seminar 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.

February 2007

相澤 恵一

Mr. Keiichi Aizawa
Director, UNAFEI

THE 135TH INTERNATIONAL SENIOR SEMINAR

"PROMOTING PUBLIC SAFETY AND CONTROLLING RECIDIVISM USING EFFECTIVE INTERVENTIONS WITH OFFENDERS: AN EXAMINATION OF BEST PRACTICES"

Seminar Rationale

When society punishes an offender with imprisonment, there is little disagreement that the expected role of such punishment is to prevent the offender from re-offending and to promote public safety. However, there is much discussion concerning the rationale for punishment in general; retribution, incapacitation, deterrence, rehabilitation, and so on.

Currently, many are advocating harsher punishment for offenders partly due to the increasing fear of crime in society. Such calls have been strengthened by "correctional pessimism": that no correctional treatment program that has been implemented since the 1960s under the rehabilitative ideal, has actually accomplished its purpose i.e., a reduction in recidivism (Nothing Works).

However, the application of various sentencing guidelines, which were first applied in the United States based on the retributive ideal or "Just Desert" model which was to counter the rehabilitative ideal, has resulted in a considerable increase in the prison population in many countries. Also many arguments have been made concerning the deterrent effects (either general or specific) of punishment to suppress recidivism; however, there seems to be no agreement on this issue.

On the other hand, various standards and norms have been established for the institutional treatment of prisoners in the international community, starting from the adoption of "United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners"¹ at the first United Nations Congress for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders held in Geneva in 1955. Many countries endeavour to use and apply such standards and norms. For example, the "United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners" states that the ultimate purpose of imprisonment is to protect society against crime, at the same time it should also aim at offenders' reintegration into society.

In view of improving the treatment of offenders, it is not efficient to confine all offenders to penal institutions in order to punish them. 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. Non-custodial measures are more conducive to social integration of offenders and facilitate their rehabilitation by allowing them continuous contact with the community. In 1990 the United Nations adopted "United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-Custodial Measures (the Tokyo Rules)",² which stipulates

¹ "World Social Situation". ECOSOC Resolution 663 (XXIV). (Annex Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners.) 31 Jul 1957.

² United Nations Standard and Minimum Rules for Non-Custodial Measures (Tokyo Rules). General Assembly Resolution 45/110. 14 December 1990.

guidelines and standards concerning various non-custodial measures.

Since the 1990s, a re-evaluation of programs that aim at the rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders has been made from the point of view of "What Works" not from the pessimistic point of view of "Nothing Works". Thus now, a consensus is being established concerning the models of effective intervention that aim at the prevention and/or reduction of recidivism.

According to the consensus, effective interventions that aim at the prevention and/or reduction of recidivism should be based on empirically tested and appropriate assessments of the risk and need factors of individual offenders, and the interventions should address their needs. More precisely, the interventions should: (1) be used primarily with higher risk offenders; (2) target the known criminogenic predictors of crime and recidivism; and (3) be based on the behavioral and learning theory. Upon their implementation, it is important that the interventions should: (4) meet "responsivity" of offenders; (5) be carried out in the community rather than in institutions, and if it is necessary to carry them out in an institution they should be community-oriented; (6) be implemented by well trained staff; and (7) follow offenders after they have completed the program and give structured relapse prevention and aftercare.

Such effective intervention models have already been implemented in institutions, such as prisons, and in the community, such as while on probation, in many countries in the form of cognitive behavioral therapy, social skills training and motivational interviewing. An empirical evaluation of their outcomes is also being carried out.

Moreover, such interventions that aim at preventing and/or reducing recidivism can be carried out not only in traditional treatment settings, such as in institutions or in the community, but also at various stages in the criminal justice process, such as the police, prosecution and trial stage, in conjunction with non-custodial measures. Such interventions are actually carried out in some countries and jurisdictions in the form of a "Prolific and other Priority Offender (PPO) Scheme" that prioritize the police's attention to known offenders who are responsible for committing a disproportionately large number of offences and introduces them to treatment programs in order to solve their problems. Another example is a "re-entry court" where a judge actively participates in the re-entry process of released offenders into society. It is very important that such interventions that aim at preventing and reducing recidivism should be carried out seamlessly and in a coordinated manner not only by criminal justice agencies but also through collaboration with other relevant agencies.

Reflecting such insights, the United Nations adopted the Bangkok Declaration on the occasion of the 11th United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice held in Bangkok, Thailand in 2005. The Declaration urges Member States to "recognize that comprehensive and effective crime prevention strategies can significantly reduce crime and victimization ... [, and] ... urge that such strategies address the root causes and risk factors of crime ..."³ Member States are also urged to "endeavour to use and apply the United Nations standards and norms in [their] national programs for crime prevention and criminal justice [and] to facilitate appropriate training for law enforcement officials, including prison officials, prosecutors, the judiciary and other relevant professional groups, taking into account those norms and standards and best practices at the international level"⁴. Therefore, it is very important to discuss and examine the expe-

³ Bangkok Declaration: Synergies and Responses: Strategic Alliances in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, Item 10. <http://www.unodc.org/pdf/crime/congress11/BangkokDeclaration.pdf>.

⁴ Bangkok Declaration: Synergies and Responses: Strategic Alliances in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, Item 29.

riences and practices that aim at the prevention and reduction of recidivism and evaluate their adaptability, sustainability and cost-effectiveness in order to incorporate such ideas into improving future treatment of offenders in respective countries.

Based on the above, this seminar aims to study best practices of the effective interventions that aim at the prevention and/or reduction of recidivism of offenders in the participating countries and provide an opportunity to examine necessary and effective measures to promote offenders' re-integration into society through the provision of effective programmes at each stage of the criminal justice process.

- (1) Examination and analysis of policies that aim at the prevention and/or reduction of recidivism in the respective countries
 - The current situation of crime
 - The current situation of recidivism
 - The current policies to protect society from recidivists
 - Extent to which diversion is used
 - The current situation of treatment programmes in institutions and the community
- (2) Problems faced by implementing policies that aim at the prevention and/or reduction of recidivism in respective countries and possible future challenges
 - Problems and challenges facing legal systems that aim to prevent and/or reduce recidivism and at protecting society from recidivists
 - Problems and challenges of treatment programmes in institutions
 - Problems and challenges of treatment programmes and supervision of offenders in the community
 - Problems and challenges of collaboration between related agencies
- (3) Examination of more effective treatment models for the prevention of recidivism and policies to reduce recidivism
 - Identification of effective policies and treatment models in the respective stages of the criminal justice process that reduce recidivism
 - Appropriate coordination among agencies responsible for implementing policies that aim at the reduction of recidivism
 - Ways in which to utilize research to identify effective policy
 - Identification of effective policy and models and an examination of the adoptability of those in the respective countries
 - Possibility of international cooperation.

Seminar Summary

Lectures

In total, ten lectures were presented by visiting experts and five by the Professors of UNAFEI. Seven 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 Seminar by encouraging discussions after their own lectures, participating in the discussions of other programmes, and conversing with the participants on informal occasions. The lecturers and lecture topics are listed on page seven.

Individual Presentations

Each Japanese and overseas participant delivered an individual presentation, which introduced the actual situation, problems and future prospects of his/her country. These papers were compiled onto a compact disk and distributed to all the participants. The titles of these individual presentation papers are listed on pages eight and nine.

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 their group discussions. These reports were subsequently presented in the plenary meeting and report-back session, where they were endorsed as the reports of the Seminar. Brief summaries of the Group Workshop reports are provided on pages ten through twelve.

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 Seminar'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 thirteen through sixteen.

Lecture Topics

Visiting Experts' Lectures

- 1) Dr. Tapio Lappi-Seppälä
 - Controlling Prisoner Rates: The Experience of Finland
 - Crime Prevention and Community Sanctions in Scandinavia
- 2) Dr. Peter J. P. Tak
 - Methods of Diversion Used by the Prosecution Services in the Netherlands and Other Western European Countries
- 3) Ms. Jennie Amison
 - Work of Halfway Houses in the US: Impact of the Current Re-entry Movement
- 4) Mr. Peter Wheelhouse
 - Home Office Initiatives to Address the Reduction of Crime and/or Controlling Recidivism, such as the Conditional Cautioning and the Restriction (Drug Treatment) on Bail
 - The Impacts of the Prolific and other Priority Offenders Programme and its Significance
- 5) Dr. Brian A. Grant
 - Reducing Recidivism by Applying the Principles of Risk, Need and Responsivity
 - Effective Correctional Programmes
- 6) Mr. Kwok Leung-ming
 - The Hong Kong Correctional Department's Effort to Reduce Recidivism, Especially Mobilization of Community Resources and Successful Reintegration of Offenders
- 7) Dr. William L. Marshall
 - Basics of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy for Offenders

UNAFEI Professor's Lectures

- 1) Mr. Haruhiko Higuchi
 - Police in Japan
- 2) Ms. Kayo Ishihara
 - Investigation and Prosecution in Japan
- 3) Mr. Ichiro Sakata
 - The Criminal Justice System in Japan: The Courts
- 4) Ms. Tae Sugiyama
 - Community-Based Treatment of Offenders in Japan
- 5) Mr. Hiroyuki Shinkai
 - Institutional Corrections in Japan

Individual Presentation Topics

Overseas Participants

- 1) Mr. Rodrigo Bonach Batista Pires (Brazil)
 - The APAC's Programme: A Brazilian Model of Effective Intervention with Offenders on Preventing and Controlling Recidivism
- 2) Mr. Tongzhi Yu (China)
 - Contemporary Recidivism and its Control in China
- 3) Mr. Boketshu Mike Mbongo (Democratic Republic of Congo)
 - Country Report
- 4) Ms. Maria Magdalena Rodriguez Valdivieso (El Salvador)
 - Country Report
- 5) Mr. Getachew Erena Negera (Ethiopia)
 - Country Report
- 6) Mr. Javier Francisco Leiva Gamoneda (Honduras)
 - The Police and Crime in Honduras
- 7) Ms. Diah Ayu Noorsinta Hidayati (Indonesia)
 - Correctional Institutions Searching for an Effective Intervention in Promoting Public Safety and Controlling Drugs Dependant Recidivism
- 8) Ms. Marcia Angela Reid (Jamaica)
 - Country Report
- 9) Mr. Raja Shahrom Bin Raja Abdullah (Malaysia)
 - Promoting Public Safety and Controlling Recidivism Using Interventions Against Illicit Drug Offenders: An Examination of Past Practices
- 10) Mr. Bin Sulong Nor Afifi (Malaysia)
 - Human Development Plan - A Rehabilitative Programme by the Malaysian Prisons Department to Control Recidivism and Promote Public Safety
- 11) Mr. Abdul Baaree Yoosuf (Maldives)
 - Country Report
- 12) Mr. Ko Ko Chit (Myanmar)
 - Country Report
- 13) Mr. Syed Waseem Raza Jaffery (Pakistan)
 - Country Report
- 14) Mr. Sukit Chua-Intra (Thailand)
 - Thai Criminal Justice and Recidivism

- 15) Mr. Somphop Rujjanavet (Thailand)
 - Improving the Reintegration of Offenders into the Community: Current Situation of Thai Corrections
- 16) Mr. Daniel Manuel Zambrano Jovez (Venezuela)
 - Institutional Credibility of the Municipal Police from the Perspective of Their Formation: Police Officials' Academic Excellence as a Premise of Civic Coexistence
- 17) Mr. Young-Hoon Ha (Korea)
 - Country Report
- 18) Mr. Demostenes Chryssikos (UNODC)
 - United Nations Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice - Drug Courts and the UNODC Related Work

Japanese Participants

- 19) Mr. Toshitaka Ito
 - Effective Intervention with Offenders by a Judge in Japan
- 20) Mr. Toshiaki Kataoka and Mr. Kenichi Oguri
 - Measures that Aim at the Prevention and Reduction of Recidivism - Prosecution of Japan
- 21) Mr. Ken Ogushi and Mr. Kazuki Ueda
 - Challenges/Problems and Possible Solutions for Corrections in Japan
- 22) Ms. Toshiko Suganuma and Mr. Goro Udo
 - The Strengths and Weaknesses of Japan's Community-Based Treatment System for Offenders

Group Workshop Sessions

Group 1

**THE USE OF EFFECTIVE INTERVENTIONS IN REDUCING RECIDIVISM
AND PROMOTING PUBLIC SAFETY AT THE PROSECUTION AND
SENTENCING STAGE**

Chairperson	Mr. Raja Shahrom Bin Raja Abdullah	(Malaysia)
Co-Chairperson	Mr. Toshiaki Kataoka	(Japan)
Rapporteur	Mr. Getachew Erena Negera	(Ethiopia)
Co-Rapporteurs	Mr. Abdul Baaree Yoosuf	(Maldives)
	Mr. Demostenes Chryssikos	(UNODC)
Members	Mr. Tongzhi Yu	(China)
	Ms. Toshiko Suganuma	(Japan)
	Mr. Ko Ko Chit	(Myanmar)
Visiting Expert	Dr. Peter J. P. Tak	(The Netherlands)
Advisers	Prof. Kayo Ishihara	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Megumi Uryu	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Ichiro Sakata	(UNAFEI)

Report Summary

After discussions it became apparent to the Group that alternative intervention models that go beyond the conventional criminal justice process of prosecution, sentencing and imprisonment, such as diversion mechanisms at both the prosecution and sentencing stage and schemes targeting specific categories of offenders, may well be effective. Therefore, they contended, agencies, etc. should establish a collaboration network to ensure a holistic and integrated strategy is implemented.

The Group then made the following recommendations to reduce recidivism and increase public safety at the prosecution and sentencing stage. 1. Where necessary, legislative reform should be carried out as a first element and component of strategies. 2. There should be various options such as suspended sentences and other non-custodial measures available at the pre-trial and sentencing stage and rehabilitation should always be considered when applying these measures. 3. A more integrated approach should be followed to enable better coordination among national and local agencies. 4. Focal points in each agency involved in intervention models with offenders should be designated and a communication network established between them to boost coordination and facilitate concerted action. 5. A database on recidivism should be developed so that policies based on reliable data can be pursued. 6. The appropriate infrastructure should be established and resources should be made available. 7. Programmes aimed at enhancing the skills of law enforcement, prosecutorial and judicial authorities, etc. should be implemented. 8. Mechanisms aimed at assessing the effectiveness of intervention should be developed. 9. Partnerships with NGOs, etc. should be built to allow for multi-stakeholder involvement in the implementation of intervention schemes. 10. In seeking alternative models of effective interventions with offenders the role of the community should be considered and restorative justice approaches can be considered as a response to crime problems, especially with regard to less serious offences.

Group 2

**THE USE OF EFFECTIVE TREATMENT PROGRAMMES IN REDUCING
RECIDIVISM AND PROMOTING PUBLIC SAFETY WHILE THE OFFENDER
IS SERVING HIS/HER SENTENCE (IN PENAL INSTITUTIONS OR THE
COMMUNITY)**

Chairperson	Ms. Marcia Angela Reid	(Jamaica)
Co-Chairpersons	Mr. Bin Sulong Nor Afifi	(Malaysia)
	Mr. Ken Ogushi	(Japan)
Rapporteur	Mr. Somphop Rujjanavet	(Thailand)
Co-Rapporteur	Mr. Rodrigo Bonach Batista Pires	(Brazil)
Members	Mr. Javier Francisco Leiva Gamoneda	(Honduras)
	Ms. Diah Ayu Noorsinta Hidayati	(Indonesia)
	Mr. Goro Udo	(Japan)
	Mr. Kazuki Ueda	(Japan)
Visiting Expert Advisers	Dr. Brian A. Grant	(Canada)
	Prof. Koji Yamada	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Masato Uchida	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Shintaro Naito	(UNAFEI)

Report Summary

Group 2 began their discussions by looking at the current situation and problems that inhibit effective rehabilitation while offenders are serving their sentences, including, overcrowding, lack of community support, insufficient education and vocational training, etc. The Group then discussed treatment with an emphasis on selecting appropriate offenders for appropriate treatment and the identification of effective treatment models, and focused on the best practice treatment models of Brazil, Jamaica, Indonesia, Thailand and Japan. They then discussed cooperation with other agencies and the associated challenges and problems. Finally, they looked at monitoring and evaluation of treatment.

Group 2 then made the following recommendations for effective treatment to reduce recidivism and promote public safety whilst the offender is serving his/her sentence. 1. Comprehensive assessment methods should be implemented to improve management of prison systems, such as establishing a database. 2. The most important treatment targets should be identified, e.g. giving priority to the highest risk offenders. 3. The most effective treatment methods should be identified and comprehensive treatment provided, e.g. cognitive behavioural therapy, enhancement of family and community participation, etc. 4. Resources should be revised and concentrated on target groups. 5. Collaboration with other agencies should be developed and expanded. 6. Public awareness of the importance of family and community in the reintegration process of ex-prisoners should be increased, e.g. strengthening the network of potential employers, encouraging the development of family relationships during an offender's incarceration, etc.

The Group concluded that over the past decade key challenges in the reintegration of offenders had emerged due to various issues and that in order to solve these problems four basic principles have to be taken into account in developing assessment and treatment services to meet the criminogenic needs of offenders and their cultural diversities. These are the risk, need, responsivity and professional discretion assessments.

Group 3

**THE USE OF EFFECTIVE INTERVENTIONS IN REDUCING RECIDIVISM
AND PROMOTING PUBLIC SAFETY AFTER THE OFFENDER HAS SERVED
HIS/HER SENTENCE**

Chairperson	Mr. Young-Hoon Ha	(Korea)
Co-Chairpersons	Mr. Kenichi Oguri	(Japan)
	Mr. Sukit Chua-Intra	(Thailand)
Rapporteur	Mr. Syed Waseem Raza Jaffery	(Pakistan)
Co-Rapporteur	Mr. Toshitaka Ito	(Japan)
Members	Mr. Boketshu Mike Mbongo	(D. R. of Congo)
	Ms. Maria M. Rodriguez Valdivieso	(El Salvador)
	Mr. Daniel Manuel Jovez Zambrano	(Venezuela)
Visiting Experts	Mr. Peter Wheelhouse	(United Kingdom)
	Dr. William L. Marshall	(Canada)
Advisers	Prof. Hiroyuki Shinkai	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Tae Sugiyama	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Haruhiko Higuchi	(UNAFEI)

Report Summary

Group 3 began their discussions by noting that the alarming increase in crime throughout the world had forced the international community to explore new avenues to protect the public from criminals. In the pursuit of this goal the rehabilitation of offenders was being seriously examined and it was noted that reintegration demands that the scope of the legal system be enlarged so that the future life of the ex-offender in the community is considered.

The Group were in agreement from the outset that released ex-offenders must be rehabilitated to help their reintegration into society. They recommended that an assessment on the basis of Need/Risk factors be made before their release, and if required, they should attend a rehabilitation programme for further treatment. It was a matter of great debate as to whether such programmes should be made compulsory.

The Group then made the following recommendations. 1. An aftercare programme is a necessity and should be based upon the standard assessment of the offenders upon their entry into prison. a) Offenders should be gradually reintegrated into society, and where applicable halfway houses available. b) Specialised and motivated staff should be recruited. c) Volunteers may serve a useful purpose in implementing specialized programmes at minimal cost. 2. A post release rehabilitation programme should be implemented. a) Up to date records should be kept and assessments made to judge the success of the programme. b) Offenders should be given some form of motivation to join these programmes or possibly a coercive system introduced. 3. Coordination among related organizations and NGOs, etc. should be improved and the personnel in government organisations should share information with each other. 4. Community involvement and public awareness should be encouraged. Seminars, workshops and media campaigns, etc. may help to change people's attitudes and informal organisations that perform rehabilitative activities encouraged by the government. 5. To ensure the sustainability of programmes they should be consistent, adaptable, suitable, feasible, etc. and political support should be fostered 6. To protect the public and reduce crime, known high risk ex-offenders could be supervised by the police or a vigilance committee made up of respected citizens.

Observation Visits

<u><i>Date</i></u>	<u><i>Agency/Institution</i></u>	<u><i>Main Persons Concerned</i></u>
Jan 24	Tokyo District Public Prosecutors Office	• Mr. Shotaro Tochigi Chief Prosecutor
	Ministry of Justice	• Mr. Jinen Nagase Minister of Justice
	Research and Training Institute of the Ministry of Justice	• Mr. Eiji Matsunaga President
Feb 1	National Police Agency	• Mr. Tsuneshi Kajiwara Community Safety Bureau
	Kawagoe Juvenile Prison	• Mr. Manabu Nakajima Director of General Affairs Section
Feb 5	Supreme Court	• Mr. Yuki Furuta Justice of the Supreme Court
	Tokyo District Court	• Mr. Yu Shiraki Chief Judge

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>
Feb 7-9	Sapporo, Hokkaido	Halfway House Taikain	• Mr. Hideharu Kamiguchi Director
		Sapporo Prison	• Mr. Kiyomasa Murakami Warden

Special Events

Jan 12 *Welcome Party*

Jan 15, 16, 22 and 25 *Japanese Conversation Classes*

The overseas participants attended four Japanese conversation classes, where they were taught practical Japanese expressions. The Sensei (teacher) was Ms. Junko Toyoguchi.

Jan 19 *Table Tennis Tournament*

The participants and staff held an exciting table tennis tournament followed by a prize giving ceremony and a small party.

Jan 24 *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. Hiroshi Obayashi, at the Lawyers Club, Tokyo.

Jan 30 *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. The discussion was followed by dinner and a friendship party at UNAFEI.

Feb 2 *Public Lecture Programme*

The Public Lecture Programme is conducted annually to increase social awareness of criminal justice issues through comparative international study. The Programme, sponsored by the Asia Crime Prevention Foundation (ACPF), the Japan Criminal Policy Society (JCPS) and UNAFEI, was held in the Grand Hall of the Ministry of Justice and was attended by distinguished guests, UNAFEI alumni and the participants of the 135th International Senior Seminar.

This year, Mr. Peter Wheelhouse, from the United Kingdom Home Office, and Dr. Brian A. Grant, from Correctional Services Canada, were invited as speakers. They presented papers on "The Impacts of the Prolific and other Priority Offenders Programme and its Significance", and "Reducing Recidivism by Applying the Principles of Risk, Need and Responsivity", respectively.

Feb 2 *UNAFEI Alumni Reception*

The UNAFEI Alumni Association held an enjoyable reception for the participants at the Lawyers Club.

Feb 5 *ACPF Nangoku-Kai Party*

The ACPF Nangoku Branch hosted an enjoyable party for the participants at the Pacific Hotel Tokyo.

Feb 7-9 *Hokkaido Study Tour*

In addition to the observation visits, the participants were able to enjoy trips to the Sapporo Brewery and Lake Shikotsu for the Ice Statue Festival. The participants also visited Odori Park where they enjoyed the exhibits of the Snow Festival. The ACPF Sapporo branch welcomed the participants and held an enjoyable reception in their honour.

Feb 14 *Toshiba Fuchu Complex*

The participants had an opportunity to take a tour of the Toshiba Fuchu Complex.

Feb 15 *Farewell Party*

Reference Materials Distributed

I. UN Conventions, Standards and Norms

1. UN Compendium of United Nations Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, Vienna, United Nations.
2. UN. 2005. Bangkok Declaration.

II. An Overview of the Seminar Theme and Problems

1. National Institute of Correction. 1999. Promoting Public Safety Using Effective Interventions with Offenders. United States Department of Justice.
2. Solicitor General Canada. 2002. Influences on Canadian Correctional Reform: Working Papers of the Correctional Law Review 1986 to 1988. Solicitor General Canada.
3. Holloway, Katy, Trevor Bennett and Claire Lower. 2004. "Trends in drug use and offending: the results of the NEW-ADAM Programme 1999-2002." London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
4. Gossop, Michael. 2005. Drug misuse treatment and reductions in crime: findings from the National Treatment Outcome Research Study (NTORS). London: National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse, UK.
5. US Congress. 2005. The Second Chance Act of 2005.
6. Walmsley, Roy. 2003. World Prison Population List (fifth edition). London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
7. Walmsley, Roy. 2005. World Prison Population List (sixth edition). London: International Centre for Prison Studies.

III. Recidivism

1. Castillo, Ruben, William K. Sessions, et. al. 2004. Measuring Recidivism: The Criminal History Computation of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines. United States Sentencing Commission.
2. Makkai, Toni and Jason Payne. 2003. Drugs and Crime: a Study of Incarcerated Male Offenders. Canberra Australian Institute of Criminology.
3. Mulligan, Robert A. 2002. Comprehensive Recidivism Study. Boston Massachusetts Sentencing Commission.
4. Smith, Paula, et. al. 2002. The Effects of Prison Sentences and Intermediate Sanctions on Recidivism: General Effects and Individual Differences. Public Works and Government Services, Canada.
5. Steurer, Stephen J., et. al. (eds.). 2001. Three State Recidivism Study. Lanham Correctional Education Association.
6. Wartna, Bouke et. al. 2004. The Dutch Recidivism Monitor (WODC 2004). <http://champpenal.revues.org/document445.htm>.

IV. Policy Reactions

A. Diversion

1. Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission. 2001. Human Rights Brief No. 5: Best practice principles for the diversion of juvenile offenders. Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission.

2. Kennedy School. Harvard University. 2005. What is Community Prosecution? http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/criminaljustice/research/community_prosecution.htm.
3. Seymour, M. (undated). Alternatives to Custody: For Business in the Community Ireland.

B. Prolific and Priority Offenders Programme

1. Criminal Justice Interventions Programme. (Undated). Criminal Justice Interventions Programme and Prolific and Other Priority Offenders Programme Partnership Guidance for CJITs and PPO Schemes. London: Criminal Justice Interventions Programme Drugs Strategy Directorate.
2. Dawson, Paul. 2005. Home Office Development and Practice Report 46: Early Findings from the Prolific and Other Priority Offenders Evaluation. London: The Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
3. Drug Intervention Programme. 2006. Drug Intervention Programme and Prolific and Other Priority Offenders Programme Emerging Practice and lessons Learned. London: Home Office.
4. Government Office for London. 2005. Prolific and Other Priority Offender Scheme "The London Model": Guidance for Setting up and Running Prolific and Other Priority Offender Schemes for Adult Offenders in London. Government Office for London.
5. Prolific and Priority Offenders Project Team. 2004. Prolific and Other Priority Offender Strategy Supplementary Guidance: Rehabilitate and Resettle Framework.
6. UK Home Office. 2004. Conditional Cautioning: Code of Practice Home Office.

C. Drug Courts

1. The Comptroller and Auditor General. 2004. The Drug Treatment and Testing Order: Early lessons. London: The Stationery Office.
2. Hough, Mike, et. al. 2003. "The impact of Drug Treatment and Testing Orders on offending: two-year reconviction results." London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
3. The National Association of Drug Court Professionals. 1997. Defining Drug Courts: The Key Components. Washington: Office of Justice Program, Department of Justice.
4. United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime. 2005. Drug Treatment Courts Work! Vienna: United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime.
5. UNDCP. 2000. UNDCP Model Drug Court (Treatment and Rehabilitation of Offenders) Bill.
6. United States Government Accountability Office. 2005. Adult Drugs Courts: Evidence Indicates Recidivism Reductions and Mixed Results for Other Outcomes. United States Government Accountability Office.

V. Correctional Programmes

A. General: Effective Correctional Interventions

1. Bogue, Brad, et. al. 2004. Implementing Evidence-Based Principles in Community Corrections: Leading Organizational Change and Development. National Institute of Corrections.
2. Bogue, Brad et. al. 2004. "Implementing Evidence-Based Practice in Community Corrections: The Principles of Effective Intervention." National Institute of Corrections.
3. Gendreau, Paul, et. al. 2006. "Practicing Psychology in Correctional Settings" in *The Handbook of Forensic Psychology* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley.
4. Gendreau, Paul et. al. 2006. "The Theory of Effective Correctional Interventions: Empirical Status and Future Directions." in *Taking Stock: The Status of Criminology Theory*. Piscataway: Transaction Press.
5. Goggin, Claire and Paul Gendreau. 2006. "Chapter 7 The Implementation and Maintenance of Quality Services in Offender Rehabilitation Programmes." In *Offending Behaviour Programmes: Development, application, and controversies*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
6. Gendreau, Paul, et. al. 2000. The Effects of Community Sanctions and Incarceration on

Recidivism.

http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/compendium/2000/chap_3_e.shtml.

7. Gornik, Mark. (Undated). Moving from Correctional Program to Correctional Strategy: Using Proven Practices to Change Criminal Behavior.
8. Harper, Gemma and Chloe Chitty (eds.). 2005. Home Office Research Study 291. The impact of corrections on re-offending: a review of "what works". London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
9. House of Commons. 2005. Rehabilitation of Prisoners: First Report of Session 2004-05 (1). London: The Stationery Office Limited.
10. Joplin, Lore, et. al. 2004. "Using an Integrated Model to Implement Evidence-based Practices in Corrections."

B. Risk & Needs Assessment

1. Andrews, Donald. 2000. Principles of Effective Correctional Programs. http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/compendium/2000/chap_2_e.shtml.
2. Andrews, Donald and James Bonta. 1998. "An Overview of the Psychology of Criminal Conduct" *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. Cincinnati: OH Anderson Publishing Company.
3. Andrews, Donald and James Bonta 1998. "Defining Criminal Behavior and Exploring Variability in Criminal Conduct." *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. Cincinnati: OH Anderson Publishing Company.
4. Bonta, James. 2000. Offender Assessment: General Issues and Considerations. http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/compendium/2000/chap_4_e.shtml.
5. Motiuk, Larry. 1998. "Using dynamic factors to better predict post-release outcome." *FORUM in Corrections Research Vol. 10 No 3*. Correctional Service Canada.
6. Motiuk, Larry and Ralph Serin. 1998. Situating risk assessment in the reintegration potential framework". *FORUM in Corrections Research Vol. 10, No. 1*. Ottawa Correctional Service Canada.
7. Taylor, Gilbert. 1998. "Offender needs providing the focus for our correctional interventions." *FORUM in Corrections Research Vol. 10 No 3*. Correctional Service Canada.

C. Employment and Education

1. Gendreau, Paul et. al. 1998. "Case need domain: Employment." *FORUM in Corrections Research Vol. 10 No 3*. Correctional Service Canada.
2. Gillis, Christa A. 2000. Offender Employment Programming. http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/compendium/2000/chap_10_e.shtml.
3. Latendresse, Mark and Franca Cortoni. 2005. Increasing Employability Related Skills Among Federal Male Offenders: A Preliminary Analysis of the National Employability Skills Program Ottawa. Research Branch Correctional Service Canada.
4. Stevens, Dennis J. 2000. Education Programming for Offenders. http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/compendium/2000/chap_9_e.shtml.

D. Cognitive Behavioural Therapy

1. Cann, Jenny, et. al. 2003. "Understanding What Works: Accredited cognitive skills programmes for adult men and young offenders." London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
2. Friendship, Caroline, et. al. 2002. "An evaluation of cognitive behavioural treatment for prisoners." London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
3. Ramsay, Malcolm (Ed). 2003. Prisoners' drug use and treatment: Seven studies. Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.

E. Motivational Interviewing

1. Clark, Michael D. 2005. "Motivational Interviewing for Probation Staff: Increasing the Readiness to Change." *Federal Probation* Vol. 69 No. 2.
2. Clark, Michael D., et. al. 2006. "Motivational Interviewing for Probation Officers: Tipping the Balance Toward Change". *Federal Probation* Vol. 70 No.1.
3. Rollnick, Stephen and William R. Miller. 1995. What is MI?
<http://motivationalinterview.org/clinical/whatismi.html>.
4. Serin, Ralph. 2001. "Improving program performance among offenders." *FORUM in Corrections Research* Vol. 13. No. 1. Correctional Service Canada.
5. Stewart, Lynn and Janice Cripps Picheca. 2001. "Improving offender motivation for programming." *FORUM in Corrections Research* Vol. 13 No. 1. Correctional Service Canada.
6. Weekes, John, et. al. 2001. "Increasing offender participation in programs." *FORUM in Corrections Research* Vol. 13. No. 1. Correctional Service Canada.

F. Issues Related to Programme Delivery

1. Gendreau, Paul, Claire Goggin, and Paula Smith. 2000. Obstacles to Effective Correctional Program Delivery.
http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/compendium/2000/chap_6_e.shtml.
2. Kennedy, Sharon M. 2000. Treatment Responsivity: Reducing Recidivism by Enhancing Treatment Effectiveness.
http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/compendium/2000/chap_5_e.shtml.
3. Leschied, Alan W. 2000. Implementation of Effective Correctional Programs.
http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/compendium/2000/chap_7_e.shtml.
4. Preson, Denise L. 2000. Addressing Treatment Resistance in Corrections
http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/compendium/2000/chap_8_e.shtml.
5. Serin, Ralph. 1998. "Treatment responsivity, intervention, and reintegration: A conceptual model." *FORUM in Corrections Research* Vol. 10 No.1. Correctional Service Canada.
6. Tellier, Claude and Ralph C. Serin. 2000. The Role of Staff in Effective Program Delivery.
http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/compendium/2000/chap_21_e.shtml.

G. Other Issues

1. Lightfoot, Lynn O. 2000. Programming for Offenders with Substance Abuse and Dependence Problems.
http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/compendium/2000/chap_14_e.shtml.
2. Violato, Claudio, Mark Genuis and Elizabeth Oddone-Paolucci. 2000. Treatment and Intervention Approaches with Families.
http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/compendium/2000/chap_11_e.shtml.

H. Programme Evaluation

1. Brown, Shelley. 2000. Cost-Effective Correctional Treatment.
http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/compendium/2000/chap_27_e.shtml.
2. Gaes, Gerry. 2000. Program Evaluation: Guidelines for Asking the Right Questions.
http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/compendium/2000/chap_22_e.shtml.
3. Moutiuk, Laurence L. 2000. Contributing to Safe Reintegration: Outcome Measurement.
http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/compendium/2000/chap_23_e.shtml.

I. Community Correction

1. Brown, Shelley. 2001. "Encouraging community release and appropriate supervision." *FORUM in Corrections Research* Vol. 13. No. 1. Correctional Service Canada.
2. Brown, Shelley and Edward Zamble. 1998. "Community supervision: Current practices and future directions." *FORUM in Corrections Research* Vol. 10. No.1. Ottawa Correctional Service

of Canada.

3. Motiuk, Larry. 2001. "The safe return of offenders through selection, intervention and supervision." *FORUM in Corrections Research* Vol. 13 No. 1. Correctional Service Canada.
4. Petersilla, Joan. 2004. "What Works in Prisoner Reentry? Reviewing and Questioning the Evidence." *Federal Probation* Vol. 68 No.2.
5. Pisapio, David. 2001. "Managing offender risk through revocations." *FORUM in Corrections Research* Vol. 13 No. 1. Correctional Service Canada.

VI. Reentry

1. District of Columbia. 2003 Comprehensive Reentry Strategy for Adults in the District of Columbia: Action Plan.
2. Roman, Caterina Couvis and Jeremy Travis. 2004. Final Report Taking Stock: Housing, Homelessness, and Prisoner Reentry. Urban Institute Justice Policy Center.

Experts and Participants List

Visiting Experts

Dr. Tapio Lappi-Seppala	Director National Research Institute of Legal Policy Finland
Dr. Peter J. P. Tak	Professor of Law Radboud University of Nijmegen The Netherlands
Ms. Jennie Amison	Executive Director Gemeinschaft Home Virginia United States
Mr. Peter Wheelhouse	Programme Director Drug Interventions Programme & Prolific and Other Priority Offenders Programme Home Office United Kingdom
Dr. Brian A. Grant	Director Addictions Research Centre Correctional Service Canada
Mr. Kwok Leung-ming	Commissioner Correctional Services Department The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region People's Republic of China
Dr. William L. Marshall	Director Rockwood Psychological Services Canada

Overseas Participants

Mr. Rodrigo Bonach Batista Pires	Police Chief/Deputy Director of the Federal District Penitentiary Civil Police of Federal District/Federal District Penitentiary Brazil
----------------------------------	---

Mr. Tongzhi Yu	Judge Beijing High People's Court China
Mr. Boketshu Mike Mbongo	Central Director Frontier Service Immigration Department Democratic Republic of the Congo
Ms. Maria Magdalena Rodriguez Valdivieso	Director Ilopango Readaption Centre for Women El Salvador
Mr. Getachew Erena Negera	Head Planning and Research Department Ethiopian Federal Police Ethiopia
Mr. Javier Francisco Leiva Gamoneda	Instructor National Police Academy Honduras
Ms. Diah Ayu Noorsinta Hidayati	Staff Directorate of Narcotics Affairs Directorate General of Correction Ministry of Law and Human Rights Indonesia
Ms. Marcia Angela Reid	Deputy Superintendent of Police Community Relations Branch Jamaica Constabulary Force Jamaica
Mr. Raja Shahrom Bin Raja Abdullah	Deputy Head of Criminal Investigation Department Johor Police Contingent Royal Malaysia Police Malaysia
Mr. Bin Sulong Nor Afifi	Director Alor Star Prison Malaysia
Mr. Abdul Baaree Yoosuf	Judge Criminal Court Maldives
Mr. Ko Ko Chit	Director (Planning) Correctional Department Ministry of Home Affairs Myanmar

Mr. Syed Waseem Raza Jaffery	Additional Secretary Public Prosecution Department Government of the Punjab Pakistan
Mr. Sukit Chua-Intra	Judge Dusit Municipal Court Thailand
Mr. Somphop Rujjanavet	Director Academic Group of Correctional Studies Department of Corrections Thailand
Mr. Daniel Manuel Zambrano Jovez	Academy Director Autonomous Institute Chacao Police Department Caracas Venezuela
Mr. Young-Hoon Ha	Director Industries and Vocational Training Division Gyong-ju Correctional Institution Korea
Mr. Demosthenes Chryssikos	Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer Criminal Conventions Section Division for Treaty Affairs United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
Japanese Participants	
Mr. Toshitaka Ito	Judge Tokyo District Court
Mr. Toshiaki Kataoka	Public Prosecutor Tokyo District Public Prosecutors Office
Mr. Kenichi Oguri	Deputy Director Research Department Research and Training Institute Ministry of Justice
Mr. Ken Ogushi	Head Grievance Review and Investigation Unit Tokyo Regional Correction Headquarters

Ms. Toshiko Suganuma

Director
General Affairs Division
Chugoku Regional Parole Board

Mr. Goro Udo

Director
Rehabilitation Research and Liaison
Office
Kanto Regional Parole Board

Mr. Kazuki Ueda

Research and Development Officer
Naniwa Juvenile Training School

**THE SEVENTH TRAINING COURSE ON THE JUVENILE
DELINQUENT TREATMENT SYSTEM FOR KENYA**

UNAFEI held the Seventh Training Course on the Juvenile Delinquent Treatment System for Kenya from 10 October to 2 November 2006. The participants comprised officials working for the prevention of delinquency and the treatment of juvenile delinquents in Kenya including the children's department, the children's court, the police, probation officers, corrections officers and a volunteer children's officer. The Course exposed Kenyan officials to the workings of the Japanese juvenile justice and treatment systems through lectures, a practicum and observation visits to relevant agencies.

Mr. George Gachuhi Kibuku	Assistant Director of Children's Services Department of Children's Services Ministry of Home Affairs
Ms. Elizabeth Adema Mbuka	Chief Children's Officer Department of Children's Services Ministry of Home Affairs
Mr. Japheth Otieno Okomo	Senior Children's Officer Naivasha Children's Office
Mr. John Gichimu Miako	Headteacher Getathuru Rehabilitation School
Ms. Truphenah Cheptek Chemining'wa	Manager Kirigiti Rehabilitation School
Mr. Hadi Sheikh Mohamed	Senior Children's Officer Garissa District Children's Office
Mr. Charles Mageka Mogere	Senior Housemaster Eldoret Children's Remand Home
Mr. Henry Muthui Wamai	Volunteer Children's Officer Naivasha District
Ms. Lydia Nyokabi Ngatia	District Probation Officer Nakuru Probation Service
Mr. Cosmas Ndambuki Kimondolo	Manager/Probation Officer Kimumu Probation Training Centre
Ms. Teresia Mumbua Matheka Wekulo	Senior Resident Magistrate Nakuru Law Courts
Ms. Judith Elizabeth Ragot	Senior Resident Magistrate Nairobi Children's Court

Mr. Billy Parseen Koshal

Superintendent of Prisons
Shikusa Borstal Institution

Ms. Beverline Ilego Lungatso

Chief Officer I
Kamiti Youth Corrective Training Centre

Ms. Halima Abdi Mohamed

Chief Inspector
Kitale Police Station

Ms. Grace Muchiru Maina

Chief Inspector
Police Headquarters

**NINTH INTERNATIONAL TRAINING COURSE ON
CORRUPTION CONTROL IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE**

UNAFEI conducted the Ninth International Training Course on Corruption Control in Criminal Justice from 16 October to 16 November 2006. In this Course, Japanese and foreign officials engaged in corruption control comparatively analyzed the current situation of corruption, methods of corruption prevention, and measures to enhance international cooperation.

Mr. Jamal Khan Nasiry	President of Minister's Office Ministry of Justice Afghanistan
Mr. S. M. M. Akhtar Hamid Bhuiyan	Deputy Assistant Director Anti-Corruption Commission Bangladesh
Mr. Alpha Diallo	Administrator National Anti-Corruption Agency Guinea
Mr. Hold Bun	Investigator Corruption Eradication Commission Indonesia
Mr. Dudu Duswara Machmudin	Ad hoc Judge Corruption Criminal Court of the Central Jakarta District Court Indonesia
Mr. Aibek Omokeyev	Head of Department National Agency of the Kyrgyz Republic for Prevention of Corruption Kyrgyzstan
Ms. Carolina Azarias	Prosecutor Anti-Corruption Branch Attorney General's Office Mozambique
Ms. Sandra Miller	Chief Legal Officer Office of Prosecutor General Ministry of Justice Namibia
Mr. Lohit Chandra Shah	Registrar Special Court Kathmandu Nepal

Mr. Jesus Alfredo Fuentes Gonzales	Associate Professor Academy of the Magistracy and Superior Judge Huaura Superior Court Peru
Mr. Clarence Joseph Nelson	Senior Judge Samoa District Court Samoa
Mr. Mduduzi Eyril Yende	Senior Superintendent Commercial Branch South African Police Service South Africa
Ms. Yuphawan Purisinsith	Judge Juvenile and Family Section Phuket Provincial Court Thailand
Mr. Francisco De Carvalho	Senior Auditor and Investigator Office of the Inspector General Timor-Leste
Ms. Alice Komuhangi	Senior State Attorney Acting Head of the Fraud Unit Directorate of Public Prosecutions Uganda
Ms. Ayako Nakagawa	Judge Osaka District Court Japan
Mr. Masafumi Nakamura	Prosecutor Nagoya District Public Prosecutors Office Okazaki Branch Japan
Mr. Shigeyuki Takaoka	Prosecutor Osaka District Public Prosecutors Office Japan

INFORMATION ABOUT FORTHCOMING PROGRAMMES

1. The Third Seminar on the Criminal Justice System for Central Asia

The Third Seminar on the Criminal Justice System for Central Asia will be held from 26 February to 15 March 2007 at UNAFEI. The Seminar is entitled "Effective Measures and Enhancement of Treatment for Drug Abusers in the Criminal Justice Process".

2. The Twelfth Special Seminar for Senior Criminal Justice Officials of the People's Republic of China

The Twelfth Special Seminar for Senior Criminal Justice Officials of the People's Republic of China will be held from 5 to 22 March 2007. Ten participants and four course counsellors will take part. The theme of the Seminar is "International Cooperation in Criminal Justice".

3. The Second Country Specific Training Course on the Revitalisation of the PPA Volunteer Probation Aides System for the Philippines

Twelve participants from the Philippines will take part in the Second Country Specific Training Course on the Revitalisation of the PPA Volunteer Probation Aides System for the Philippines, which will be held tentatively from 17 to 26 April 2007.

4. The 136th International Training Course

The 136th International Training Course entitled "Effective Measures for the Treatment of Juvenile Offenders and their Reintegration into Society" will be held from 29 May to 28 June 2007.

Rationale

The establishment within the criminal justice system of a separate process for juvenile offenders from adult offenders gained greater importance from the second half of the 19th century⁵. At present, legal systems that, for example, ensure the physical separation of juveniles from adults at all stages of the criminal justice process and provide special treatment, education and welfare for juveniles, exist to some extent in many countries. However, the actual situation in regard to both the legal basis and practice concerning the treatment of juvenile offenders in many countries is far from satisfactory. Thus it is necessary that more countries become aware of the importance of this issue and take action to implement changes to their laws and/or practice to improve their juvenile justice systems.

In view of the importance of this issue, the United Nations has taken action to establish standards for the administration of juvenile justice systems. At the United Nations congresses on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, held every five years since 1955, the management of the treatment of juveniles and the prevention of juvenile delinquency/crime has frequently been discussed. These discussions have resulted in "The United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (the Beijing Rules)"⁶ in 1985, the "United Nations Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency (the Riyadh Guidelines)"⁷

⁵ The establishment of a juvenile court in the State of Illinois in the US in 1899 was noted by justice systems around the world.

⁶ <http://www.ohcr.org/english/law/beijingrules.htm>.

and the "United Nations Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty"⁸ in 1990. Paragraph 24 of the Vienna Declaration on Crime and Justice: Meeting the Challenges of the Twenty-first Century (A/CONF.187/4/Rev.3), adopted by the Tenth United Nations Congress held in Vienna in 2000, also underlines the importance of taking measures to prevent juveniles in difficult circumstances from becoming delinquent or candidates for recruitment by criminal groups. And paragraph 25 stresses developing crime prevention strategies addressing the root causes and risk factors of crime and victimization (although these strategies do not cover only juveniles)⁹. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, adopted in 1989, contains several provisions which call upon States Parties to ensure a juvenile justice system based on humanitarianism, the guarantee of due process and the expansion of diversion (particularly in Articles 37, 39 and 40)¹⁰. Currently, more than 190 countries have ratified this Convention, and the Committee on the Rights of the Child¹¹ is monitoring and examining the progress made by States Parties in realizing the obligations laid down in the Convention¹².

While there is recognition of the necessity for the improvement of the juvenile justice system in many parts of the world, and the efforts by nations for the efficient treatment of juveniles in conflict with the law in accordance with United Nations instruments have continued, states are still faced with numerous challenges in administering juvenile justice.

Ensuring due process in the juvenile justice system is the number one priority. In this respect, in some countries the international instruments are often disregarded.¹³ Juveniles are often subject to long-term detention pending trial, insufficient investigation into their background and circumstances of the offence they have committed, a lack of notification to parents/guardians, denial of legal counsel and incarceration with adult prisoners. These countries often face a host of problems that impede them following the international instruments such as a lack of legislation that specifically addresses juveniles, an inability to implement existing relevant legislation, poor management and administration, and a lack of record/data keeping. In addition, officials often lack an awareness of the rights and/or are insufficiently concerned about the well-being of the juveniles.

Efficient management and treatment of juvenile offenders in correctional institutions is an area requiring particular attention. In some countries, due to the limited alternative measures of disposition and the insufficient management of diversion, many juveniles serve long periods in custody. In addition, young offenders and those in need of care and protection are often kept in custody with older juveniles/adult offenders. In other countries, where crime committed by juveniles is a serious social problem, the judicial organizations are urged to review and amend previ-

⁷ http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/h_comp47.htm.

⁸ http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/h_comp37.htm.

⁹ Vienna Declaration on Crime and Justice: Meeting the Challenges of the Twenty-first Century. Para. 24, 25.
http://www.unodc.org/pdf/crime/a_res_55/res5559e.pdf.

¹⁰ Convention on the Rights of the Child: General Assembly Resolution 44/25 November 1989: Art. 35, 39, 40.

¹¹ Established by Sub-section 1, Art. 43 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

¹² States Parties undertake to submit to the Committee reports on the measures they have adopted which give effect to the rights recognized herein and on the progress made on the enjoyment of those rights regularly. (Sub-section 1, Art. 44).

¹³ United Nations Secretary-General's Study on Violence against Children (2005). Summary Report on the Thematic Meeting on Violence against Children in Conflict with the Law, 4-5 April 2005 Geneva. Available at: <http://www.violencestudy.org/r180>.

ous measures by which juvenile offenders have been treated in a "protective" and "educational" manner. In such countries, the juvenile's responsibility for his/her crime and the necessity for the protection of the community have being emphasized due to the fear and concern of the general public and the victims' complaints of a too lenient juvenile justice system. As a result juvenile justice has become progressively punitive, with the transfer of juvenile offenders to the criminal courts, extended detention and increased supervision upon release from correctional institutions. However, it remains to be seen whether these "harsher" measures are actually effective in preventing crimes committed by juveniles.

In addition, members of society are also increasingly voicing their concerns about the results of correctional treatment. The efficacy of the correctional treatment/education of juveniles (For example how the level of the juvenile's "Risk" of offending/re-offending has been reduced; and how the treatment has addressed the juveniles "Needs"¹⁴ that have possibly led to their delinquency.) is becoming increasingly important to the agencies in charge of the treatment of juveniles.

Furthermore, the importance of the provision of effective community-based treatment for juvenile offenders should be emphasized. Treatment in community settings is divided roughly into three areas in accordance with the stage of disposition, namely, educational/protective diversion without resort to trial; various final disposition measures including probation, community service orders, electronic monitoring, treatment for specific problems (drugs, alcohol, etc.); and supervision after release from correctional institutions. The provision of individualized treatment based on the risk/needs of each juvenile is required at each stage. In addition, investigation into the background and circumstances of the juvenile offender, assessment of his/her risk/needs, proper record keeping and the systematic coordination among the stakeholders is necessary. It is important that community-based treatment and institutional treatment are continuous and consistent ("Through-care").

Moreover, there is much debate concerning the reintegration of juveniles in conflict with the law into society. At present, there are many judicial systems that are under pressure to re-examine the current aftercare system premised on early release from correctional institutions; this has led to them being more cautious and thus subjecting juveniles to longer periods of incarceration. Society is increasingly demanding that juveniles take responsibility for their crimes, and the rights of victims and the safety of society are being given greater priority. However, there is some concern about the lack of "socialization" of juvenile offenders who have served long periods of custody. The development of a program which will be effective both for the reduction of re-offending ("risk") of juveniles and for the juvenile's re-integration into society, considering the feelings of victims and the demands for safety by the community, is required.

One of the recent practices which merit our attention within the area of the rights, needs and interests of victims and communities and the reintegration of juvenile offenders has been the restorative justice approach. Recently, various types of restorative justice approaches such as "Victim Offender Mediation", "Family Group Conferencing", "Restorative Community Service", "Victim Impact Panels", etc. have been used in the frontline of juvenile justice systems in several countries. And more recently, a "Balanced and Restorative Justice approach" has been introduced which tries to balance three demands, namely, community protection (administering punishment or supervision according to the risk posed by the juvenile), accountability of the juvenile (restoring

¹⁴ In the juvenile justice system "needs" usually refer to the factors that are important for the rehabilitation of a particular juvenile offender. The offender may have problems relating to their physical/mental health, substance abuse, education, social skills, etc. The results of a needs assessment help determine which interventions or programs would be most beneficial for the particular juvenile.

the damage to victims and the community, through compensation, social service orders, etc.) and competency development of the juvenile (administering treatment to a juvenile according to his/her needs to enable him/her to take a constructive and productive role in the community). The Balanced and Restorative Justice approach attempts to give juvenile offenders more support by providing an educational, practical program for rehabilitation, taking into consideration both victims and the community. The above-mentioned Vienna Declaration referred for the first time to the necessity of restorative justice policies mainly in support of victims of crime (para. 27 and 28). In addition, the "Bangkok Declaration", adopted at the Eleventh United Nations Congress held in Bangkok in 2005, stressed the importance of further developing restorative justice policies, procedures and programs to promote not only the interests of victims but also the rehabilitation of offenders (para. 32)¹⁵.

Giving due consideration to the above, this International Training Course intends to identify the recurrent and newly raised challenges within the area of juvenile justice, especially the issue of the treatment of juveniles and their reintegration into society, as well as the best practices to meet these challenges. By analyzing the actual situation and problems, and sharing experiences of types of treatment which have achieved a certain degree of success, it is hoped that we will arrive at the most effective measures for each participating country.

Objectives

The focus of discussions in this Training Course will be as follows:

1. The current situation and problems faced by each jurisdiction throughout the legal proceedings for juveniles and their effective countermeasures
 - (i) Current situation and legal framework of arrest, detention, transfer between agencies, prosecution and trial
 - (ii) Current situation and challenges in relation to the investigation and social inquiry
 - (iii) Current situation and challenges in relation to the risk and needs assessment
 - (iv) Current situation and challenges in adjudication and disposition
 - a) Challenges involved in introducing a diversion program
 - b) Disposition considering the restitution/minimization of damage to the victim
2. Effective measures in the institutional treatment of juvenile offenders
 - (i) Assessment of the degree of risk ("high risk" juveniles vs. "low risk" juveniles) and individual needs and classification accordingly
 - (ii) Development of an effective treatment program in accordance with the risk and needs assessment
 - (iii) Effective institutional treatment program considering victims/restitution of the harm caused to the victim
 - (iv) Appropriate administration of the institution and staff
 - (v) Establishing and maintaining a complete record of each juvenile and linking it to a database
 - (vi) Cooperation and collaboration with community-based treatment services ("Through-care")
 - (vii) Cooperation and collaboration with other organizations for effective institutional treatment (judicial, welfare, educational agencies, NGOs, etc.)
3. Effective measures for the community-based treatment of juvenile offenders

¹⁵ Bangkok Declaration: Synergies and Responses - Strategic Alliances in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, Para. 32. <http://www.unodc.org/pdf/crime/congress11/BangkokDeclaration.pdf>.

- (i) Assessment of the degree of risk ("high risk" juveniles vs. "low risk" juveniles) and individual needs and classification accordingly
 - (ii) Development of an effective treatment program in accordance with the risk and needs assessment
 - (iii) Cooperation and collaboration with Institutional treatment services ("Through-care")
 - (iv) Cooperation and collaboration with other organizations for effective Community-based treatment (judicial, welfare, educational agencies, NGOs, etc.)
 - (v) The possibility of using community resources, including volunteers, for effective community-based treatment
4. Effective measures to promote the reintegration of juveniles into the community
- (i) Measures for an aftercare system which allows the effect of the correctional treatment to be maintained and reduces the risk of re-offending and also enhances the juvenile's ability to reintegrate into the community
 - a) Effective use of half-way houses/rehabilitation aid hostels
 - b) Cooperation among the related agencies (welfare/medical services, schools, NGOs, volunteers, etc.)
 - c) Effective programs to enhance the juvenile offender's ability to reintegrate into the community
 - (ii) Effective measures to restore the harm/damage caused by juvenile offenders
 - a) General topics of restorative justice - theoretical basis
 - b) The possibility of using restorative justice approaches within the field of juvenile justice, such as victim-offender mediation programs (VOM), family group conferencing (FGC) programs, balanced restorative justice approaches, etc.

ADMINISTRATIVE NEWS

Overseas Trips by Staff

Mr. Hiroyuki Shinkai (Professor) visited Vancouver, Canada from 21 to 27 October 2006 to attend the Annual General Meeting of the International Prison and Correctional Association.

Mr. Keisuke Senta (Deputy Director) visited Beijing, China from 23 to 25 October 2006 to attend the IAACA Conference where he delivered a speech on the activities of UNAFEI in regard to anti-corruption.

Mr. Keiichi Aizawa (Director), Ms. Megumi Uryu (Professor) and Mr. Hitoshi Nishimura (Co-Deputy Chief of Secretariat) visited Jakarta, Indonesia from 18 to 24 November 2006 to attend and make an oral intervention at the 11th ACPF World Conference on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice.

Mr. Hiroyuki Shinkai (Professor), Mr. Hideshi Ohashi (Staff) and Ms. Yoko Hosoe (Staff) visited Auckland, New Zealand from 25 November to 2 December 2006 to attend the Asia and Pacific Conference of Correctional Administrators where Mr. Shinkai made a presentation on UNAFEI's activities and the present Seminar.

Mr. Keiichi Aizawa (Director), Mr. Keisuke Senta (Deputy Director), Ms. Kayo Ishihara (Professor), Mr. Shintaro Naito (Professor), Mr. Iichiro Sakata (Professor), Mr. Seiji Yamagami (Staff) and Mr. Etsuya Iwakami (Staff) visited Bangkok, Thailand from 23 November to 2 December 2006, to attend the In-Country Training Course under the three-year project on "Strengthening the Anti-Corruption Capacity in Thailand".

Mr. Keiichi Aizawa (Director) and Ms. Kayo Ishihara (Professor) visited Bangkok, Thailand from 27 to 29 November 2006 to attend and make an oral intervention at the ADB/OECD Ninth Anti-corruption Initiative of Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. Keiichi Aizawa (Director) visited the United Nations offices in Geneva, Switzerland from 14 to 20 December 2006.

Mr. Keiichi Aizawa (Director) visited Italy from 15 to 17 December 2006 to attend and contribute to the discussion of the 2006 PNI Coordination Meeting and International Conference on the United Nations Convention against Corruption as a Way of Life.

Ms. Megumi Uryu (Professor) visited Helsinki, Finland from 21 to 26 January 2007 to attend the Heuni 25th Anniversary Symposium and made a presentation on Technical Activities in the Traditional Areas of Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice.

Ms. Tae Sugiyama (Professor) and Mr. Koji Yamada (Professor) visited Manila, the Philippines to attend the In-country Training Programme of the Parole and Probation Administration of the Philippines, sponsored by JICA. Mr. Yamada delivered the Director's Remarks. Ms. Sugiyama attended from 17 to 20 January, 2007 and Mr. Yamada attended from 15 to 18 January 2007.

FACULTY AND STAFF OF UNAFEI

Faculty

Mr. Keiichi Aizawa	Director
Mr. Keisuke Senta	Deputy Director
Mr. Motoo Noguchi	Professor
Mr. Haruhiko Higuchi	Professor
Ms. Tae Sugiyama	Professor, Chief of Information and Library Science Division
Mr. Hiroyuki Shinkai	Professor, 135th Seminar Programming Officer
Mr. Koji Yamada	Professor
Mr. Masato Uchida	Professor, Chief of Research Division
Ms. Megumi Uryu	Professor
Ms. Kayo Ishihara	Professor, 135th Seminar Deputy Programming Officer
Mr. Shintaro Naito	Professor
Mr. Iichiro Sakata	Professor, Chief of Training Division
Mr. Simon Cornell	Linguistic Adviser

Secretariat

Mr. Junichi Ebara	Chief of Secretariat
Mr. Kazuyuki Kawabe	Co-Deputy Chief of Secretariat
Mr. Hitoshi Nishimura	Co-Deputy Chief of Secretariat

General and Financial Affairs Section

Mr. Hideshi Ohashi	Chief
Ms. Ayako Tanaka	
Ms. Yoko Hosoe	
Ms. Chiemi Matsuura	
Mr. Keiji Matsui	Driver
Ms. Chieko Izui	

Training and Hostel Management Affairs Section

Mr. Seiji Yamagami	Chief
Mr. Masayuki Tanuma	
Ms. Yukari Ishikawa	135th Seminar Assistant Programming Officer
Mr. Hideyuki Inoue	

International Research Affairs Section

Mr. Etsuya Iwakami	Chief
Ms. Masumi Tomita	Librarian

Secretarial Staff

Ms. Nobuko Seki	
-----------------	--

Kitchen

Mr. Misao Saito

Chef

JICA Coordinator

Mr. Takao Mori

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

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