

UNAFEI NEWSLETTER

UNAFEI

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

No. 161
March 2020

Established
1961

IN THIS ISSUE

	<i>Page</i>
LETTER FROM THE DIRECTOR.....	1
THE 174TH INTERNATIONAL SENIOR SEMINAR.....	3
PREVENTION OF REOFFENDING AND FOSTERING SOCIAL INCLUSION: FROM POLICY TO GOOD PRACTICE	
Seminar Rationale.....	3
Seminar Summary.....	11
Lecture Topics.....	12
Individual Presentation Topics.....	14
Group Workshop Sessions.....	17
Observation Visits.....	20
Group Study Tours.....	21
Special Events.....	22
Reference Materials.....	23
Expert and Participant List.....	24
The 22nd UNAFEI UNCAC Training Programme.....	27
INFORMATION ABOUT FORTHCOMING PROGRAMMES.....	31
The Comparative Study of the Criminal Justice Systems of Japan and Nepal.....	31
The 175th International Training Course.....	31
The 176th International Training Course.....	31
FACULTY AND STAFF OF UNAFEI.....	32

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 174th International Senior Seminar on the “Prevention of Reoffending and Fostering Social Inclusion: From Policy to Good Practice”, which took place from 16 January to 14 February 2020. In this Seminar, we welcomed 7 Japanese participants and 16 overseas participants: 9 from Asia, 4 from Africa, 1 from Oceania, 1 from South America and 1 from the Caribbean. The participants included judges, prosecutors, police officers, probation officers and other public officials involved in the field of criminal justice and prevention of reoffending. As this newsletter demonstrates, the Seminar was extremely productive. It consisted of lectures by visiting experts, ad hoc lecturers, UNAFEI faculty members, individual presentations, visits to relevant criminal justice agencies, and group-workshop and plenary sessions.

Ensuring a safe and inclusive society is one of the fundamental goals of any criminal justice system, and traditional policies and practices have focused on the imposition of punitive criminal punishment as a means of “correcting” criminal behaviour. However, practice has shown that many offenders return to crime upon release from prison, often engaging in worse conduct upon release than when they originally entered custody. Breaking the cycle of reoffending requires a shift in mentality and policy from punishment to rehabilitation. Effective rehabilitation can be achieved with individually tailored treatment based on each offender’s unique risk and needs as determined by reliable assessment tools. Likewise, social reintegration can be achieved with the provision of community supervision and support. Thus, criminal justice practitioners should pursue policies and practices that incorporate rehabilitative perspectives into penalties and case dispositions, promote interventions, treatment and support tailored to offenders’ individual needs, and utilize multi-stakeholder partnerships and engage the community in the social reintegration of offenders.

UNAFEI, as one of the institutes of the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme Network, held this Seminar to offer participants an opportunity to clarify and analyse the current situation of efforts to prevent reoffending in each participating jurisdiction. Additionally, the participants were able to share experiences, gain knowledge, and build a human network of counterparts.

During the Seminar, the participants diligently and comprehensively examined the main theme, primarily through a comparative analysis. The participants shared their own experiences and knowledge of the issues and identified problems and areas in which improvements could be made. With the academic and practical input from the visiting experts, ad hoc lecturers and UNAFEI faculty—and the in-depth discussions they had with each other—the participants are now better equipped to enhance the policies and practices related to the prevention of reoffending in their respective jurisdictions.

I would like to offer my sincere congratulations to all of the participants upon their successful completion of the Seminar, made possible by their strenuous efforts. My heartfelt gratitude goes out to the visiting experts and ad hoc lecturers 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 that helped diversify the Seminar.

I would also like to express my great appreciation to the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) for its immeasurable support throughout the Seminar. At the same time, a warm

tribute must be paid to the Asia Crime Prevention Foundation (ACPF) and its branch organizations for their substantial contributions to our activities. 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 home, 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 jurisdictions' criminal justice systems, and towards the benefit of international society as a whole.

Finally, I would like to reiterate my best regards to the participants of the 174th 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.

March 2020

Handwritten signature in Japanese characters: 瀬戸毅 (Seto Takeshi).

SETO Takeshi
Director, UNAFEI

THE 174th INTERNATIONAL SENIOR SEMINAR

PREVENTION OF REOFFENDING AND FOSTERING SOCIAL INCLUSION: FROM POLICY TO GOOD PRACTICE

Seminar Rationale

Introduction

In order to build a safe and inclusive society, it is crucial not only to prevent reoffending but also to facilitate offenders' rehabilitation and reintegration as responsible members of society. The international community has been fully conscious of the importance of social inclusion of those who committed crimes and has taken steps towards its achievement.

In 2015, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the "2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development" (or Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)),¹ and Goal 16 of the SDGs is to "promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels" (Goal 16). Towards the goal of building inclusive societies, it is important for criminal justice authorities to take measures to ensure each offender's rehabilitation and reintegration into society as a law-abiding citizen.

Although the main purpose of criminal proceedings is to clarify the facts of the offence through investigation and prosecution, and then to decide a proportionate penalty or case disposition, the importance of offender rehabilitation should not be underestimated. It is well known that simply putting the offenders in prison neither prevents them from reoffending nor facilitates their rehabilitation. Ultimately, almost all imprisoned offenders return to society. Therefore, the whole criminal justice process should seek to impose effective measures for offender rehabilitation and reintegration into society.

At each phase of the criminal justice process, appropriate decisions should be made and adequate interventions, treatment and support should be provided. In particular, first, in deciding a penalty or case disposition, rehabilitative perspectives should be taken into consideration. Second, it is important to provide interventions, treatment and support responding to each offender's needs. In doing so, the individual's characteristics, such as criminogenic needs and protective factors for rehabilitation should be properly assessed and identified.

Further, rehabilitation and social reintegration of offenders cannot be accomplished only through measures that fall within the mandate and expertise of criminal justice authorities. A variety of authorities, expertise and assistance is necessary in deciding adequate penalties and their alternatives, providing necessary interventions and treatment responding to individual needs for rehabilitation, ensuring rehabilitative environments and processes in correctional institutions and in the community, and promoting public understanding and acceptance. Certain areas for support are mainly vested within the authority of non-criminal justice public agencies at the state or local level. Some areas of expertise or assistance are unavailable without the involvement of NGOs and other private-sector organizations and individuals. It is of vital

¹ General Assembly resolution 70/1.

importance to take a multi-faceted approach with active participation of a wide range of relevant sectors and persons in a concerted manner, including understanding and acceptance of the public at large. Public-private partnership and active involvement of the community are particularly important to ensure the continuity of interventions, treatment and support for the imprisoned persons, to achieve their smooth reintegration into community after release.

In this respect, Target 17.17 of the SDGs seeks to “encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships”. This Target is relevant to reducing reoffending and facilitating the offenders’ rehabilitation and reintegration. Also, the “Doha Declaration”, adopted at the 13th Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice,² emphasizes the importance of public-private partnership and engaging members of society in crime prevention and the treatment of offenders, and refers to “strengthen[ing] public-private partnerships in preventing and countering crime in all its forms and manifestations” (paragraph 10 (h)), “partnering and supporting community initiatives and fostering the active participation of citizens in ensuring access to justice for all, including awareness of their rights, as well as their involvement in the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders, including by creating opportunities for community service and supporting the social reintegration and rehabilitation of offenders, and in that regard to encourage the sharing of best practices and the exchange of information on relevant social reintegration policies and program[me]s and on relevant public-private partnerships” (paragraph 10 (k)) and “encourag[ing] the active participation of the private sector in crime prevention, as well as in social inclusion program[me]s and employability schemes for vulnerable members of society, including victims and those released from prison” (paragraph 10 (l)).

Penalties and case dispositions with due regard to rehabilitative perspectives

Many types of penalties and case dispositions are available in criminal proceedings as possible options. However, the availability of such options varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, due to the diversity in criminal justice systems and social, cultural or other backgrounds. As one of the options, non-custodial penalties or dispositions may be available at the pre-trial phase, sentencing phase and post-sentencing phase. Non-custodial options at the pre-trial phase include a decision not to prosecute, to suspend prosecution, and to divert the case from criminal proceedings, such as through the mediation process and use of therapeutic measures for substance abusers. Options at the sentencing phase include a fine, community sanctions and suspension of imprisonment sentence. Options at the post-sentencing stage, which are for incarcerated offenders, include parole and conditional release. Some of these non-custodial sanctions themselves involve supervision or other interventions, treatment, or support in the community. Other non-custodial measures can be applied in combination with or without community supervision or other treatment, etc. This flexibility enables the sentencing or other decision-making institution to tailor the non-custodial options to each offender’s unique risk and needs. Further, restorative justice programmes at various phases are available in a number of jurisdictions, and they can pave the way for non-custodial measures and early release.

The availability of such options and the extent to which they can be applied differs from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. For example, in a number of jurisdictions, non-custodial penalties are only applicable to certain less serious crimes. Furthermore, even where a wide range of

² General Assembly resolution 70/174 of 17 December 2015.

non-custodial penalties or dispositions is stipulated by law, jurisdictions apply them differently in practice.

In sentencing or case dispositions, “proportionality” shall be ensured; however, other factors such as the rights of victims, protection of the society and the fundamental rights of the offenders are more or less taken into consideration. Although such understanding is common to most jurisdictions, the application in practice varies. For instance, a “proportionate” penalty for a specific crime is understood differently in different countries. Also, a decision to impose a non-custodial sentence is much more likely to occur in jurisdictions where the general public has a positive attitude towards offender rehabilitation in the community and where community corrections systems are in place. Some jurisdictions have codified legislation options for non-custodial sanctions but have little or no application in practice due to low levels of public understanding or the lack of authorities or institutions responsible for community-based treatment.

As for the release of prisoners before the expiration of their sentenced term (e.g. parole, conditional release), there are differences among countries in terms of legal status, eligibility criteria and decision-making processes. Also, it should be noted that a number of countries have such options in their legislation but rarely apply them in practice.

It is well known that imprisonment has a large, adverse effect on social reintegration due to stigmatization. Moreover, if the offender had to serve a long-term custodial sentence, it is highly likely that, at the time of release, the person will have lost his or her community ties, including family relationships and employment. This, of course, causes big challenges in the offender’s rehabilitation and reintegration. In contrast, community sanctions, which allow the offenders to continue their lives in the community and avoid social barriers stemming from incarceration have positive implications for preventing reoffending. Furthermore, excessive use of imprisonment results in prison overcrowding, which often greatly hampers proper prison management. This poses negative impacts on the quality and quantity of interventions, treatment and support designed for rehabilitation and reintegration.

Therefore, criminal justice authorities, with due consideration to proportionality and other factors, must seek less restrictive sanctions or dispositions and apply imprisonment as the “last resort”. Even where an imprisonment sentence is imposed, criminal justice authorities should consider the possibility of early release.

The United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-custodial Measures (Tokyo Rules) and the United Nations Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders (Bangkok Rules) promote active use of non-custodial measures at each phase of the criminal justice process. These UN standards and norms refer to, but do not specifically aim at, offender rehabilitation or reducing reoffending, but the effective use and application of non-custodial measures is indispensable to the facilitation of rehabilitation and social reintegration of offenders.

However, it should be noted that non-custodial measures are not always the best option to prevent reoffending and facilitate offenders’ rehabilitation. In some cases, non-custodial measures will not be effective without appropriate community supervision and support, whereas in other cases, excessive use of supervision etc. for low-risk offenders may result in net-widening that actually increases their reoffending risk due to unnecessary interventions. Therefore, in deciding adequate penalties and their alternatives, and providing necessary

interventions and treatment for rehabilitation, it is necessary to conduct an assessment to identify the offenders' individual needs and social environments representing their risk factors and protective factors for their social reintegration. For this purpose, it is also necessary to have mechanisms to collect adequate information at relevant phases of the criminal justice process. For instance, to make a decision at the pre-trial and sentencing phases, in addition to collecting evidence on the offence and impacts on victims, information on risk and needs factors should be collected in order to take account of rehabilitative perspectives. Such information includes the offender's accommodation and employment situation, available support from the community, and so on. In some jurisdictions, such information is provided in the pre-sentencing report, whereas in some jurisdictions, it can be collected during criminal investigations. At the post-sentence phase for imprisoned offenders, in many jurisdictions, risk and needs assessments are conducted in prisons for the purpose of providing adequate interventions and treatment, and assessment on social-environment factors are conducted to identify the circumstances after release.

Interventions, treatment and support for preventing reoffending and facilitating offender rehabilitation and social reintegration

(1) Interventions, treatment and support tailored to individual needs

Assessment plays a key role in providing adequate interventions, treatment and support tailored to individual needs. The offender's needs can be addressed only where the interventions, treatment and support are based on an adequate assessment. Through an adequate assessment, the offender's risk factors and protective factors for rehabilitation will be identified. The assessment should cover the facts of the crime as well as the offender's human capital and social capital elements, such as the offender's personal abilities, self-efficacy and physical, mental, psychological or social difficulties, family relations, accommodation and employment situation, and available support from the community for living by oneself.

In correctional institutions, the following interventions, treatment and support can be effective for rehabilitation of offenders: treatment programmes for specific types of offenders such as sex offenders and drug abusers; vocational training and employment support; and strengthening family relations which form the base for the offender's daily life support after release.

In the community setting, treatment programmes for specific types of offenders are also effective, and a wide range of interventions, treatment and support options should be available in order to respond to each offender's specific needs. Such options include supervision and guidance through face-to-face interviews, enhancement of family relations, housing and employment support, support for education, and healthcare and social welfare services for the elderly and disabled.

There are many legal and practical challenges in providing adequate interventions, treatment and support tailored to offenders' individual needs.

First, many jurisdictions confront prison overcrowding problems, or face prison management challenges due to the prevalence of violence and corruption inside prisons. Facing such challenges, it is difficult to ensure rehabilitative environments and provide effective interventions, treatment and support, since these prisons, in dealing with such challenges, lack adequate capacity and resources to provide the inmates with tailor-made interventions, treatment and support. Furthermore, in such prisons, it is quite often the case that human rights violations and inhumane, unjust and unfair treatment against inmates are prevalent, thereby

deteriorating the rehabilitative environment. Prison management and treatment in line with international standards, *inter alia*, the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prison (the Nelson Mandela Rules) and the Bangkok Rules, are of vital importance in order to ensure rehabilitative prison environments and processes, which will form a basis for effective interventions, treatment and support.

Second, it is not easy for incarcerated offenders to return to the community and restart their lives upon release, due to a number of social barriers that they face. Therefore, ensuring their smooth transition from prison to society has been a big challenge. In this regard, continuity in the interventions, treatment and support is extremely important to reduce their reoffending risks and facilitate rehabilitation. Interventions, treatment and support in prisons should aim at preparing for return to the community and building bridges with community-based approaches. One example of what prisons can provide is to establish and maintain regular contacts between the inmates and their family members during their incarceration period—connecting imprisoned offenders with those who will support their daily lives can serve as good preparation for their post-release lives.

Third, there are quite a few countries that have not established or sufficiently applied community corrections. Because legislation, by-laws or guidelines are underdeveloped, designated authorities or bodies are not equipped with a sufficient level of expertise and resources to conduct community supervision and support, and public understanding, acceptance and community involvement remain low. In some jurisdictions that have developed community corrections, there are still difficulties in providing interventions, treatment and support corresponding to the specific needs of offenders.

Given that community-based treatment is, as compared to imprisonment, more cost-effective and that it is easier to facilitate social reintegration of offenders as it enables offenders to receive necessary interventions, treatment and support while living in the community, countries should be fully mindful of the importance of community-based treatment and should endeavour to develop and actively use community-based approaches.

(2) Forming multi-stakeholder partnerships and engaging the community

Given the variety of needs of offenders, it is evident that criminal justice authorities alone are not able to provide all necessary interventions, treatment and support. In order to facilitate social reintegration of offenders, it is necessary to address various areas for support such as employment, accommodation, education, healthcare, and social welfare. Criminal justice authorities, in particular correctional authorities, should coordinate and cooperate with relevant public- (from the state to local level) and private-sector entities and individuals in the community. Relevant private-sector entities or individuals include bodies or persons engaged in healthcare, social welfare, education, etc., employers, and peer support groups. To this end, criminal justice authorities should identify, activate and mobilize existing community resources and make efforts to build robust partnerships with these stakeholders. Seamless and effective interventions and support can be provided only with a multi-stakeholder approach, engaging all relevant stakeholders, such as state and local governments, public- and private-sector entities from various fields, and community members. Moreover, since offenders return and live their lives in the community, community-based approaches cannot be pursued without understanding and acceptance of the community members. Therefore, it is crucial to sensitize the general public and community members in order for them to understand that the rehabilitation of offenders and their social inclusion is the best way to prevent reoffending and

to establish a safe and inclusive society. A high level of awareness in, and cooperation from, the community can accelerate setting up successful partnerships with various stakeholders.

However, it is not easy to form partnerships with private sector entities, engage the community in rehabilitative activities, and foster public understanding and acceptance. To facilitate this, efforts should be made to carry out effective and efficient awareness-raising activities. Awareness-raising activities should be addressed towards various target groups and should be conducted in an appropriate manner by various means suitable for each target, for example: (i) the general public, by explaining the importance of support for offenders' rehabilitation and reintegration, and fostering understanding of the necessity of accepting offenders' return to society; and (ii) bodies or persons providing support to offenders, by establishing understanding and willingness to support ex-offenders in areas such as education, accommodation, employment, social welfare, and peer support.

In awareness-raising activities for the general public, new and cost-effective media such as the Internet, social networking services (SNS) and mobile phone applications are actively used, in addition to conventional advertisements on TV or in newspapers. In order to convince possible stakeholders to become involved in rehabilitative support, face-to-face consultation or other forms of direct communication means should be undertaken.

Main Theme

The main theme of the programme is "Prevention of Reoffending and Fostering Social Inclusion: From Policy to Good Practice". This programme mainly focused on policies and practices that (1) incorporate rehabilitative perspectives into penalties and case dispositions, (2) promote interventions, treatment and support tailored to offenders' individual needs and (3) form multi-stakeholder partnerships and engage the community in the social reintegration of offenders.

This programme was designed to guide each participating country on the development and improvement of their respective criminal justice systems and administration. The expected outcome of this programme was the identification of key elements of best policies and practices to promote measures tailored to each offender's needs to facilitate their rehabilitation and reintegration into society. Further, the programme sought to identify practices that will enhance public understanding of the field of crime prevention and criminal justice. The participants were encouraged to focus on policies and practices that can be commonly shared among the participating countries regardless of the differences in their legal systems, culture and society.

Through a variety of lectures, presentations, discussions, observation tours and intensive group workshops, participants learned the theories, underlying principles and practical experiences of other countries. The programme enabled participants to acquire new and different viewpoints on, and inspire them to revisit and consider, possible ways to improve their own systems and practices. The experience of gaining a multifaceted view and an understanding by each participant of his or her own system and practices will eventually contribute to renewed or improved policies concerning effective measures tailored to individual's need with due regard to rehabilitative perspectives in their respective countries. Further, it will lead to enhanced rehabilitation of relevant offenders, their reintegration into the community and crime prevention, and will ultimately contribute to the building of stable, peaceful and inclusive societies based on core values such as human rights and the rule of law.

In addition, the programme promoted the formation of a personal and professional network among the participants, which will benefit each one of them and their respective countries in

the future by the sharing of updated information, thus enhancing international cooperation in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice.

Key Topics of the Seminar

The following are key topics that were addressed during the seminar:

- (1) Current situation and challenges in the imposition of penalties and case dispositions with due regard to rehabilitative perspectives
 - a. Whether and to what extent rehabilitative perspectives can be taken into consideration when deciding penalties or case dispositions in the participating countries
 - b. Non-custodial options available
 - Types of non-custodial penalties and dispositions available at pre-trial (e.g. non-prosecution, diversion from criminal proceedings), sentencing (e.g. fine, community sanction, suspended sentence) and post-sentencing (e.g. parole, conditional release, remission, furlough) phases, and whether they are conditional upon community supervision or other interventions, treatment or support (e.g. treatment programme, mediation)
 - Mechanisms to determine non-custodial measures
 - i) Decision-making authority (e.g. judiciary, prosecution, parole board)
 - ii) Process by which information is collected (e.g. social inquiry for pre-sentencing report, criminal investigation, in-prison assessment)
 - Conditions/eligibility criteria for applying non-custodial measures (e.g. types of crime, gravity of the penalty, length of imprisonment served, agreement to participate in a restorative justice programme) and factors taken into consideration
 - c. Current situation of, and practical challenges in, sentencing and case dispositions from a rehabilitative perspective
 - Current status (including statistics on non-custodial measures)
 - Practical challenges in effective information gathering, in taking account of rehabilitative factors in the case disposition, sentencing and post-sentencing release, and in selecting effective interventions, treatment or support in the community
- (2) Intervention, treatment and support tailored to individual needs
 - a. Effective assessment
 - b. Current situation and practical challenges in interventions, treatment and support in institutional settings
 - Interventions, treatment and support tailored to each inmate's needs (e.g. guidance, treatment programmes for specific types of offenders, vocational training, religious programmes, coordination for post-release employment, education, family relations and accommodation)
 - Challenges in maintaining proper prison management
 - c. Current situation and practical challenges in building bridges from prison to the community

- Cooperation and coordination between institutional and community corrections authorities
 - d. Current situation and practical challenges in community-based treatment
 - Interventions, treatment and support tailored to each offender's needs (e.g. community supervision, treatment programmes for specific types of offenders, support in the areas of accommodation, employment, education, healthcare, social welfare service and family relations)
 - Challenges in the introduction and active use of community corrections
- (3) Forming multi-stakeholder partnerships and engaging the community in social reintegration
- a. Public and private stakeholder involvement and areas of cooperation and support
 - b. Current situation and challenges in identifying existing community resources and building and maintaining robust partnerships with stakeholders
 - c. Effective awareness-raising activities to promote partnerships and public understanding

Each participant was required to submit an Individual Presentation Paper regarding the above-mentioned topics as they apply to his or her country, and to explain and discuss these topics in his or her individual presentation.

Seminar Summary

Lectures

During the Seminar, the participants attended 41 lectures, including 7 presented by the visiting experts, 3 by ad hoc lecturers, and 7 by the faculty of UNAFEI, as well as a meeting with Japanese Volunteer Probation Officers. Three distinguished criminal justice practitioners served as UNAFEI's visiting experts. They lectured on issues relating to the main theme of the Seminar and contributed significantly beyond their lectures by encouraging discussions after their lectures, participating in the discussions of other programmes, and conversing with the participants on informal occasions. Additionally, the ad hoc lectures were delivered by officers of Japan's Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, and Public Employment Security Office. The lecturers and lecture topics are listed on pages 12 to 13.

Individual Presentations

During the second week of the seminar, all participants delivered individual presentations which introduced the situation, problems and future prospects of the participants' countries. These papers were compiled onto a USB memory stick and distributed to all the participants. The titles of these individual presentation papers are listed on pages 14 to 16.

Group Workshop Sessions

Group workshop sessions provided the participants with the opportunity to further examine the sub-topics 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 responses to a previously distributed questionnaire. 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 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, each group prepared a presentation based on the group discussions. These were subsequently presented in the plenary report-back session. Brief summaries of the group workshop reports are provided on pages 17 to 19.

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 20 to 22.

Lecture Topics

Visiting Experts' Lectures

1) Dr. Matti Joutsen

- Re-assessing the Role of Community-Based Sentences in the Context of the Sustainable Development Goals

2) Ms. Jana Špero

- Resocialization and Rehabilitation of Offenders in the Community—Croatian Probation Service (1)
- Resocialization and Rehabilitation of Offenders in the Community—Croatian Probation Service (2)

3) Mr. Matthew Wee Yik Keong

- Reducing Reoffending: Preparing the Offender in Prison
- Engaging the Community for Seamless Transition to Reduce Reoffending

UNAFEI Professors' Lectures1) Ms. WATANABE Machiko, *Professor*, UNAFEI

- Criminal Justice System in Japan, Investigation and Prosecution

2) Mr. HOSOKAWA Hidehito, *Professor*, UNAFEI

- Criminal Justice System in Japan, Criminal Trials and Juvenile Procedure

3) Mr. FURUHASHI Takuya, *Professor*, UNAFEI

- Corrections in Japan

4) Ms. KITAGAWA Mika, *Professor*, UNAFEI

- Community Corrections in Japan

5) Mr. YOKOTA Naoyuki, *Assistant Commissioner, Adjunct Professor*, UNAFEI

- Criminal Justice System in Japan: Police

6) Mr. WATANABE Hiroyuki, Professor, UNAFEI

- Difficulty Obtaining Public Understanding for Offender Rehabilitation—Facing Opposition Movements

Ad Hoc Lectures

1) Mr. OKAMOTO Yasuhiro

Deputy Director, Planning and Reoffending Prevention Promotion Office, Secretarial Division, Ministry of Justice

- Measures and Practices for Prevention of Reoffending in Japan

2) Mr. ETOU Shouhei

Deputy Director, Employment Support Office, Employment Development Policy Planning Division, Employment Security Bureau, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare

- Employment Support for Preventing Reoffending

3) Mr. MIYASHITA Yousuke

Chief Vocational Guidance Officer, Special Assistance Department, Kawagoe Public Employment Security Office

- Hello Work Kawagoe's Efforts on the Employment Support Projects for Ex-offenders

Individual Presentation Topics

Overseas Participants

- 1) Ms. Ana Cristina BANDEIRA LINS (Brazil)
 - Prevention of Reoffending and Ensuring Social Integration – Legal Aims vs. Reality in Brazil
- 2) Ms. Marietta Roseline BEHIRI (Cote d'Ivoire)
 - Prevention of Reoffending and Fostering Social Inclusion: From Policy to Good Practice
- 3) Mr. Braulio Jose FELIZ CABRERA (Dominican Republic)
 - Overview of the Dominican Penitentiary System
- 4) Mr. Oka Parama Budita ANAK AGUNG (Indonesia)
 - Role of the Divine State of Indonesian Judges in Preventing Reoffending and Facilitating Offender Rehabilitation and Social Reintegration
- 5) Ms. Winanti (Indonesia)
 - Drug Abuse Treatment for Inmates in Preventing the Recidivism of Drug Offences in Indonesia
- 6) Ms. Belinda Mumbua KIILU (Kenya)
 - Prevention of Reoffending and Fostering Social Inclusion: From Policy to Good Practice, a Kenyan Perspective
- 7) Ms. Lilian Akinyi OTIENO (Kenya)
 - Intervention, Treatment and Support Tailored to Offender's Individual Needs in Kenya
- 8) Mr. Vanhnakone CHANTHAPANYA (Lao PDR)
 - Criminal Justice: Situation of Rehabilitation, Reintegration and Community-Based Treatment of Offenders in the Lao PDR
- 9) Mr. Justus Asante KISHINDO (Malawi)
 - Community Service Sentences in Malawi: Management Challenges and Possible Solutions
- 10) Mr. Mohammad Azlin Bin SADARI (Malaysia)
 - Malaysia's Policy on Counter Terrorism and De-radicalization Strategy

- 11) Ms. Aminath RASHEED (Maldives)
 - Forming Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships and Engaging the Maldives Community in Social Reintegration
- 12) Mr. Soe Naing (Myanmar)
 - Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice in Myanmar
- 13) Mr. Laimo ASI (Papua New Guinea)
 - The Abuse of Alcohol and Illicit Drugs in the City
- 14) Mr. R. Pathirannehelage Don P.P. RATNAYAKE (Sri Lanka)
 - The Sentencing Dilemma: Thinking beyond Boundaries – Role of Sentencing Court in Rehabilitation and Reintegration –
- 15) Ms. Chotima SURARITTHIDHAM (Thailand)
 - Juvenile Crime Prevention in Thailand
- 16) Ms. Supattra Pakasith Warotamasikkhadit (Thailand)
 - Prison Overcrowding Problems and Solutions through Non-Custodial Measures in Thailand

Japanese Participants

- 17) Ms. HAYASHI Kyoko (Japan)
 - Implementation of Interventions, Treatment, and Support for the Prevention of Repeat Offences and Social Reintegration in Probation Supervision, and Cooperation with other Institutions through the Drug Abuse Prevention Programme
- 18) Ms. INADA Mitsuyo (Japan)
 - Preventing Reoffending through the Expansion of Parole Investigation and Re-Entry Coordination by the Regional Parole Board
- 19) Mr. ISHIHARA Junichi (Japan)
 - Challenges for Fostering Social Inclusion in a New-Type Prison in Japan
- 20) Mr. MATSUMURA Tadanori (Japan)
 - Efforts to Prevent Recidivism at the Japanese Public Prosecutor's Office

21) Ms. MIYAGAWA Tsubura (Japan)

- Effective Treatment and Support for Rehabilitation of Delinquent Juveniles in Japan

22) Mr. SHIRAISHI Atsushi (Japan)

- Issues of the Choice of Suspension of Imprisonment Sentence Due to the Use of Social Resources

23) Ms. TATEOKA Yoshiko (Japan)

- Efforts of Family Courts to Prevent Juvenile Reoffending in Japan

Group Workshop Sessions

Group 1

**EFFECTIVELY INCORPORATING REHABILITATIVE PERSPECTIVES INTO
PENALTIES AND CASE DISPOSITIONS**

Chairperson	Ms. Ana Cristina Bandeira Lins	(Brazil)
Co-Chairperson	Mr. Pamila Ratnayke	(Sri Lanka)
Rapporteur	Ms. Supattra Warotamasikkhadit	(Thailand)
Co-Rapporteur	Ms. Belinda Mumbua Kiilu	(Kenya)
Members	Ms. Marietta Roseline Behiri	(Cote d'Ivoire)
	Mr. Laimo Asi	(Papua New Guinea)
	Mr. SHIRAIISHI Atsushi	(Japan)
	Ms. INADA Mitsuyo	(Japan)
Advisers	Prof. WATANABE Machiko	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. FUTAGOISHI Ryo	(UNAFEI)

Report Summary

Group 1 considered the problems, challenges and solutions to the inclusion of rehabilitative perspectives in criminal justice dispositions. Despite the adoption of the Tokyo Rules almost 30 years ago to promote the use of non-custodial measures, incarceration and punitive approaches remain popular and overutilized. By considering the barriers to the use of non-custodial measures, Group 1 sought to identify solutions that might promote the inclusion of rehabilitative perspectives throughout all relevant stages of the criminal justice process.

The group found that all of the participating countries had adopted common non-custodial measures such as non-prosecution, suspended proceeding, suspended sentence and fines, but the adoption of other measures (community work, community fine, and restorative justice) varied widely. Even where available, the mindset of criminal justice authorities was considered an impediment to the use of non-custodial measures. One of the fundamental problems with the underuse of non-custodial measures is that it results in prison overcrowding—an environment that undermines the effectiveness of offender treatment and rehabilitation. Other barriers to the inclusion of rehabilitative perspectives in the criminal justice system include legal impediments, the prevailing public attitude that supports punitive justice, the lack of analysis of individual risk and needs (i.e., the lack of individually tailored treatment), and the lack of synergy between various agencies.

After considering the problems and challenges, the group proposed a number of possible solutions: first, adopting laws and policies to foster the inclusion of rehabilitative perspectives, such as depenalization of minor drug-use crimes; second, alternatives to pre-trial detention through the use of bail, electronic monitoring, house arrest and similar practices; third, designing evidence-based programmes to provide treatment as an alternative to incarceration; fourth, conducting risk-needs assessments and tailoring treatment to the individualized needs of each offender; fifth, promoting awareness of the benefits of the use of non-custodial measures among criminal justice practitioners, the general public and the media; and sixth, the creation of synergies among communities and key stakeholders to foster the rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders into society.

In conclusion, the group found non-custodial measures to be more effective in terms of treatment and cost to the correctional system. It was noted that most jurisdictions are better prepared to incorporate rehabilitative perspectives into juvenile dispositions than adult dispositions. Accordingly, the group encouraged criminal justice practitioners to include rehabilitative perspectives at all relevant stages of the criminal justice system and to expand the use of non-custodial measures.

Group 2**PROMOTING INTERVENTION, TREATMENT AND SUPPORT TAILORED TO OFFENDERS' INDIVIDUAL NEEDS**

Chairperson	Mr. ISHIHARA Junichi	(Japan)
Co-Chairperson	Ms. Winanti	(Indonesia)
Rapporteur	Mr. Justus Kishindo	(Malawi)
Co-Rapporteurs	Ms. Chotima Suraritthidham	(Thailand)
	Ms. TATEOKA Yoshiko	(Japan)
Members	Mr. Mohammad Azlin Bin Sadari	(Malaysia)
	Mr. Braulio Jose Feliz Cabrera	(Dominican Republic)
Adviser	Prof. KITAGAWA Mika	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. FURUHASHI Takuya	(UNAFEI)

Report Summary

Group 2 reported that reoffending is a common issue faced by criminal justice systems throughout the world and, thus, discussed the importance of breaking the cycle of crime by providing offenders with individually tailored treatment based on effective risk assessment. The group considered the challenges and good practices faced by the participating countries in providing tailored treatment by considering five key issues: the justice system, human resources, assessment, specific treatment programmes, and community awareness.

Regarding *the justice system*, prison-based treatment programmes are often hindered by overcrowding, while treatment in the community suffers from a lack of human resources or even the lack of functional probation or community supervision systems. Citing a prison reform model in the Dominican Republic and the use of probation officers and volunteer probation officers in Japan, the group suggested that countries can enhance their own practices by reviewing those of other countries.

Regarding *human resources* and *assessment*, quality assessments require thorough examination of offenders' risks and needs, but such assessments require personnel with the qualifications and skills necessary to conduct assessment and subsequent treatment. Countries must invest in human resources and assessment by providing relevant training and developing effective assessment tools.

Regarding *specific treatment programmes*, offenders resort to crime due to a wide variety of reasons, such as family conflicts, chronic drug use, history of abuse, and physical and mental impairment. Treatment programmes must be designed to address these unique needs, and they must also be evaluated to confirm effectiveness.

Finally, regarding *community awareness*, the community has an important role to play in the rehabilitation and social reintegration of offenders. In fact, the community will only harm itself by excluding offenders or by failing to provide them with necessary support. Under those circumstances, offenders will return to crime. Thus, public awareness programmes like the Yellow Ribbon Project in Singapore hold great promise in building trust between the community, government and offenders.

The group concluded by offering the following recommendations: first, all countries should consider establishing or improving probation systems to implement community-based treatment; second, treatment programmes should be tailored to offenders' individual needs and should be provided in custodial and non-custodial settings; third, improving the quality of risk-needs assessments in order to conform treatment programmes to offenders' needs; fourth, building the capacity of practitioners who conduct assessment and treatment through education and training; fifth, enhancing public awareness of and support for the importance of offender rehabilitation and reintegration.

Group 3**FOSTERING PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING AND MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PARTNERSHIPS FOR ACCEPTANCE OF OFFENDERS**

Chairperson	Mr. Vanahnakone Chanthapanya	(Lao PDR)
Co-Chairperson	Mr. MATSUMURA Tadanori	(Japan)
Rapporteur	Mr. Aminath Rasheed	(Maldives)
Co-Rapporteur	Ms. MIYAGAWA Tsubura	(Japan)
Members	Mr. Oka Parama Budita Anak Agung	(Indonesia)
	Ms. Lilian Akinyi Otieno	(Kenya)
	Mr. Soe Naing	(Myanmar)
	Ms. HAYASHI Kyoko	(Japan)
Adviser	Prof. MORIKAWA Takeshi	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. WATANABE Hiroyuki	(UNAFEI)

Report Summary

Group 3 considered the importance of public understanding and multi-stakeholder partnerships to the social reintegration of offenders. The group found that overcoming public stigma against offenders is a prevalent issue faced by many countries. This issue was approached by discussing the challenges, best practices and solutions to fostering public awareness, acceptance of offenders into the community and acceptance of ex-inmates into the community.

The group noted a number of good practices aimed at fostering awareness in the participating countries. These practices included national strategies to support offender rehabilitation, holding exhibitions to promote offender rehabilitation, the implementation of crime prevention plans by local agencies, and community support programmes like volunteer probation officers in Japan and community probation volunteers in Kenya and Indonesia. Despite the existence of such practices, many offenders face stigmatization, social exclusion and other burdens as they attempt to reintegrate into society—these burdens often lead to reoffending. Former inmates face the harshest stigma and discrimination compared to other offenders. They are viewed as vicious criminals who are likely to reoffend. This makes it difficult for them to find housing, obtain employment, receive health care or otherwise lead normal lives. Even though members of the public sympathize with former inmates' need to be accepted into society, they nevertheless refuse to accept former inmates as neighbours when they return to the community.

To overcome these challenges, the group stressed the importance of changing public perceptions of offenders. To raise public awareness, the group highlighted the role of awareness-raising campaigns such as the Yellow Ribbon Project in Singapore and the “Hogo chan” mascot in Japan. To ensure that offenders are provided with necessary support in the community, the group encouraged the expansion of community support services like probation, employment support, and community work orders (community service), which helps to demonstrate the value that offenders can bring to the community. Halfway houses and employment support were raised as important measures to reintegrate and destigmatize former inmates upon their return to the community. Finally, the group emphasized the importance of persuading community members of the value of supporting offenders upon re-entry by demonstrating how such support can be effective at reducing crime and reoffending.

In conclusion, Group 3 stated that multi-stakeholder partnerships and increased public awareness of the challenges faced by offenders upon reintegration into society are important factors to reduce or eliminate stigmatization of and discrimination against offenders.

Observation Visits

<u><i>Date</i></u>	<u><i>Agency/Institution</i></u>	<u><i>Main Persons Concerned</i></u>
22 Jan.	Supreme Court	Ms. HOKARI Marie (Officer, Secretarial Division, General Secretariat)

Group Study Tours

<u><i>Date</i></u>	<u><i>Location</i></u>	<u><i>Agency/Institution</i></u>	<u><i>Main Persons Concerned</i></u>
5 Feb.	Hiroshima	Hiroshima Prison	• Mr. KOMATSU Kazutoshi (Director of General Affairs Department)
6 Feb.	Kyoto	Kyoto Probation Office	• Ms. SAKONJI Ayako (Chief Probation Officer)
7 Feb.	Kyoto	Halfway House “Meishin”	• Mr. FUJITA Morito (Facility Manager)

Special Events

16 Jan. *Welcome Party*

20, 21, 23 Jan. *Japanese Conversation Classes*

The overseas participants attended three Japanese conversation classes and learned practical Japanese expressions.

22 Jan. *Courtesy Call to the Minister of Justice
and
Reception by the Vice-Minister of Justice*

At the conclusion of their courtesy visit to the Minister of Justice, Ms. MORI Masako, a reception was held for the participants by the Vice-Minister of Justice, Mr. TSUJII Hiroyuki, at the Danwa-shitsu lounge on the 20th floor of the ministry building, overlooking Hibiya Park.

24 Jan. *UNAFEI International Table Tennis Tournament*

The UNAFEI Table Tennis Tournament was held in the auditorium. Mixed teams of international participants, Japanese participants, and UNAFEI faculty and staff were formed, and competed against each other.

28 Jan. *Social with Volunteer Probation Officers*

The participants had an opportunity to exchange views with Japanese Volunteer Probation Officers at a social at UNAFEI.

1 Feb. *Home Visits*

The Volunteer Probation Officers Association of UNAFEI's Activities kindly organized a home visit programme. The hosts were Mr. ISHIZAKI Toshikazu, Ms. MITSUHASHI Yuko, Mr. TANAKA Kimio, Ms. SHIBATA Kazuko and Mr. TAKAYANAGI Kaichi. They kindly invited the participants to their homes.

13 Feb. *Farewell Party*

A party was held to bid farewell to the participants.

Reference Materials

**UNAFEI'S 174TH INTERNATIONAL SENIOR SEMINAR
LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS**

1	Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
2	United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules)
3	United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-custodial Measures (The Tokyo Rules)
4	Commentary on the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-custodial Measures (Tokyo Rules)
5	United Nations Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders (the Bangkok Rules)
6	Dr. Matti Joutsen Expanding the Use of Non-custodial Measures UNAFEI Resource Material Series. No. 38. p. 181-196
7	Introductory Handbook on the Prevention of Recidivism and the Social Reintegration of Offenders (Data only)

Expert and Participant List

Visiting Experts

Dr. Matti Joutsen	Special Advisor Thailand Institute of Justice
Ms. Jana Špero	Assistant Minister Directorate for Prison System and Probation Ministry of Justice Republic of Croatia
Mr. Matthew Wee Yik Keong	Chief Executive Officer Singapore Corporation of Rehabilitative Enterprises (SCORE)

Overseas Participants

Ms. Ana Cristina Bandeira Lins	Federal Prosecutor Office of Federal Prosecution in Sao Paulo State Federal Prosecution Service Brazil
Ms. Marietta Roseline Behiri	Investigating Judge Office of the President of the Court in Abidjan Ministry of Justice Cote d'Ivoire
Mr. Braulino Jose Feliz Cabrera	Assistant of General Director General Directorate National Police Dominican Republic
Mr. Oka Parama Budita Anak Agung	Head of the District Court District Court of Prabumulih Supreme Court Indonesia
Ms. Winanti	Clinical Psychologist Ministry of Law & Human Rights Narcotic Prison Class IIA Jakarta Indonesia
Ms. Belinda Mumbua Kiilu	Principal State Counsel International Law Division Office of the Attorney General and Department of Justice

	Kenya
Ms. Lilian Akinyi Otieno	Senior Probation Officer Probation and Aftercare Service / Field Services Probation and Aftercare Service Kenya
Mr. Vanhnakone Chanthapanya	Director of Administrative and Social-Cultural Laws Division Department of Legislation Ministry of Justice Lao PDR
Mr. Justus Asante Kishindo	Senior Deputy Registrar High Court and the Supreme Court of Appeal Malawi Judiciary Malawi
Mr. Mohammad Azlin Bin Sadari	Assistant Commissioner of Police (ACP) Crime Prevention & Community Safety Department Royal Malaysia Police Malaysia
Ms. Aminath Rasheed	Head of Crime Prevention Unit Crime Prevention and Public Affairs Maldives Police Service Maldives
Mr. Soe Naing	Police Lieutenant Colonel Training Department Police Officer Tactical Training Institute Myanmar Police Force Myanmar
Mr. Laimo Asi	Deputy Commander National Capital District / Central Command Royal Papua New Guinea Constabulary Papua New Guinea
Mr. R. Pathirannehelage Don P.P. Ratnayake	High Court Judge Judicial Service Commission Judiciary Sri Lanka
Ms. Chotima Suraritthidham	Director Juvenile Observation and Protection Center Department of Juvenile Observation and Protection Ministry of Justice Thailand

Ms. Supattra Pakasith
Warotamasikkhadit

Senior Professional Level Officer
Office of Justice Affairs
Ministry of Justice
Thailand

Japanese Participants

Ms. HAYASHI Kyoko

Chief of Planning and Coordination Division
Yokohama Probation Office

Ms. INADA Mitsuyo

Chief of General Affairs Division
Chugoku Regional Parole Board

Mr. ISHIHARA Junichi

Principal Supervisor
International Affairs Division
Fuchu Prison

Mr. MATSUMURA Tadanori

Public Prosecutor
Tokyo District Public Prosecutors' Office

Ms. MIYAGAWA Tsubura

Chief Instructor
Okinawa Female Juvenile Training School

Mr. SHIRAISHI Atsushi

Judge
Mito District Family Court, Tsuchiura Branch

Ms. TATEOKA Yoshiko

Deputy Chief Family Court Investigating Officer
Fukuoka Family Court

THE 22ND UNAFEI UNCAC TRAINING PROGRAMME

The 22nd UNAFEI UNCAC Training Programme was held from 9 October to 14 November 2019. Thirty-five participants attended: 25 overseas participants and 6 Japanese participants. The main theme of the programme was *Detection, Investigation, Prosecution and Adjudication of High-Profile Corruption*.

Overseas Participants

Ms. Fahima Sirat	Judge Primary Court of the Anti-Corruption Justice Center Afghanistan
Ms. Mariam Galstyan	Head of Anti-Corruption Policy Development Division Anti-corruption and Penitentiary Policy Development Department Ministry of Justice Armenia
Ms. Most Selina Akhter Moni	Deputy Director Special Inquiry and Investigation Anti-Corruption Commission Bangladesh
Mr. Alexandre Collares Barbosa	Federal Prosecutor Criminal Division of the Prosecution Office in Parana State Federal Prosecution Service Brazil
Mr. Roger Dalea Mongoli	Judge and Legal Advisor Justice DRC Republic Prosecutor's Office D.R. Congo
Mr. Sanjay Prakash Singh	Acting Inspector/Chief Investigator Legal Practitioners Unit, Judicial Department High Court Fiji
Mr. Hendra Eka Saputra	Prosecutor Prosecution Corruption Eradication Commission Indonesia

Mr. Mohannad Ahmad Abu-Morad	Director of Legal Affairs Department The Integrity and Anti-Corruption Commission Jordan
Ms. Gulzhan Shugumbayeva	Investigator Investigation Division Department of Anti-Corruption Agency Kazakhstan
Ms. Lampang Sixiengvang	Technical Officer Interpol Department Ministry of Public Security Lao PDR
Mr. Fidelis Kondwani Chinsakaso	Senior Investigations Officer Investigations Anti-Corruption Bureau Malawi
Mr. Nik Syahril Bin Nik Abdul Rahman	Deputy Public Prosecutor Appellate & Trial Division Attorney General's Chambers Malaysia
Mr. Sanjeev Pokharel	Section Officer/Investigation Officer Human Resources & Management Division Commission for the Investigation of Abuse of Authority Nepal
Mr. Ibrahim Amadou Djirmey	Judge of Investigation High Court of Niamey Ministry of Justice Niger
Mr. Faisal Majeed Khan	District & Sessions Judge / Judge Anti-Corruption. Court High Court of Azad Jammu and Kashmir Pakistan
Mr. Jorge Luis Venegas Rivera	Assistant Prosecutor Third Criminal Superior Prosecutor of the Santa Public Ministry Peru
Ms. Joan Moyatu Sandeke Bull	Senior State Prosecutor and Legal Officer Criminal Investigations Department Sierra Leone Police Sierra Leone

Ms. Dushmanthee Indeera Rajapakse	Assistant Director Legal Department Commission to Investigate Allegations of Bribery or Corruption Sri Lanka
Ms. Arphatharee Arsapaviriya	Judge Research Justice Division of the Supreme Court Thailand
Ms. Silawan Panom	Inquiry Officer (Senior Professional Level) Bureau of Public Sector Corruption Inquiry 1 Office of the National Anti-Corruption Commission Thailand
Ms. Olga Lunova	Judge, Acting Head of the Court Vugledar Town Court of Donetsk Region Ukraine
Ms. Olesia Victorivna Marenych	Chief Specialist-Legal Counsel International Legal Division, Legal Department The National Anti-Corruption Bureau Ukraine
Mr. Akmaljon Botirovich Mamatov	Leading Specialist Center of Researching Judicial Problems Supreme School of Judges under the Supreme Judicial Council Uzbekistan
Mr. Thuy Thanh Nguyen	Deputy Chief Inspector People's Procuracy of Hanoi Supreme People's Procuracy Viet Nam
Ms. Venrandah Munyoro	State Counsel II Attorney General's Office Ministry of Justice Legal and Parliamentary Affairs Zimbabwe

Japanese Participants

Mr. ISOYA Takeshi	Prosecutor Nagoya District Public Prosecutors' Office, Okazaki Branch
Ms. MINAMI Urara	Judge Osaka District Court

Mr. MORI Kazuya	Superintendent Criminal Affairs Bureau National Police Agency
Ms. TAKAHASHI Kana	Public Prosecutors' Assistant Officer (Senior Investigator) Osaka District Public Prosecutors' Office
Ms. UJIMA Mayumi	Securities Investigator Securities and Exchange Surveillance Commission
Mr. YOSHIKAWA Takuya	Prosecutor Osaka District Public Prosecutors' Office

INFORMATION ABOUT FORTHCOMING PROGRAMMES

1. The Comparative Study of the Criminal Justice Systems of Japan and Nepal

From 19 to 27 February 2020, UNAFEI will host the Comparative Study on Criminal Justice Systems of Japan and Nepal in Tokyo, Japan. Ten Nepalese participants will attend to study and discuss “Challenges to the Implementation of the New Criminal Procedure Code and the Sentencing and Execution Act in Nepal”.

2. The 175th International Training Course

From May to June 2020, UNAFEI will host the 175th International Training Course in Tokyo, Japan. The main theme of the course is “Achieving Inclusive Societies through Effective Criminal Justice Policies and Practices”. Government officials from across Southeast Asia and other parts of the world, including Japan, and visiting experts and lecturers will attend.

3. The 176th International Training Course

From August to September 2020, UNAFEI will host the 176th International Training Course in Tokyo, Japan. The main theme of the course is “Treatment of Women Offenders (tentative)”. Government officials from across Southeast Asia and other parts of the world, including Japan, and visiting experts and lecturers will attend.

FACULTY AND STAFF OF UNAFEI

Faculty:

Mr. SETO Takeshi	Director
Ms. ISHIHARA Kayo	Deputy Director
Ms. KITAGAWA Mika	Professor 174th Course Programming Officer
Ms. WATANABE Machiko	Professor 174th Course Deputy Programming Officer
Mr. FUTAGOISHI Ryo	Professor
Mr. OTANI Junichiro	Professor
Mr. HOSOKAWA Hidehito	Professor
Mr. WATANABE Hiroyuki	Professor
Dr. YAMAMOTO Mana	Professor Chief of Research Division
Mr. FURUHASHI Takuya	Professor
Mr. MORIKAWA Takeshi	Professor Chief of Information and Public Relations
Mr. Thomas L. Schmid	Linguistic Adviser

Secretariat:

Mr. FUJITA Takeshi	Chief of Secretariat
Mr. KOSEKI Takahiro	Chief of Training and Hostel Management Affairs Section

Training and Hostel Management Affairs Section:

Mr. ONDA Keisuke	Senior Officer 174th Course Assistant Programming Officer
Ms. IINUMA Hazuki	Officer 174th Course Assistant Programming Officer
Mr. SAITO Masato	Senior Officer
Ms. MATSUDA Mariko	Officer
Mr. KONDO Tomohiro	Officer

International Research Affairs Section:

Ms. IWAKATA Naoko	Librarian
-------------------	-----------

Secretarial Staff:

Ms. YAMADA Hisayo	Officer
-------------------	---------

Kitchen:

Ms. ODAGIRI Maki	Chef
------------------	------

JICA Coordinator for the 174th International Senior Seminar:
Ms. IDE Wakako JICA

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

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