

MAIN ACTIVITIES OF UNAFEI (1 January 2009 - 31 December 2009)

I. ROLE AND MANDATE

The Asia and Far East Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (UNAFEI) was established in Tokyo, Japan in 1961 pursuant to an agreement between the United Nations and the Government of Japan. Its goal is to contribute to sound social development in Asia and the Pacific region by promoting regional co-operation in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice, through training and research.

UNAFEI has paid utmost attention to the priority themes identified by the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. Moreover, UNAFEI has been taking up urgent, contemporary problems in the administration of criminal justice in the region, especially problems generated by rapid socio-economic change (e.g., transnational organized crime, corruption, economic and computer crime and the reintegration of prisoners into society) as the main themes and topics for its training courses, seminars and research projects.

II. TRAINING

Training is the principal area and priority of the Institute's work programmes. In the international training courses and seminars, participants from different areas of criminal justice discuss and study pressing problems of criminal justice administration from various perspectives. They deepen their understanding, with the help of lectures and advice by the UNAFEI faculty, visiting experts and ad hoc lecturers. This so-called "problem-solving through an integrated approach" is one of the chief characteristics of UNAFEI programmes.

Each year, UNAFEI conducts two international training courses (six weeks' duration) and one international seminar (five weeks' duration). One hundred and forty nine government officials from various overseas countries receive fellowships from the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA; an independent administrative institution for ODA programmes) each year to participate in all UNAFEI training programmes.

Training courses and seminars are attended by both overseas and Japanese participants. Overseas participants come not only from the Asia-Pacific region but also from the Middle and Near East, Latin America and Africa. These participants are experienced practitioners and administrators holding relatively senior positions in criminal justice fields.

During its 48 years of existence, UNAFEI has conducted a total of 143 international training courses and seminars, in which approximately 3,438 criminal justice personnel have participated, representing 117 different countries. UNAFEI has also conducted a number of other specialized courses, both country and subject focused, in which hundreds of other participants from many countries have been involved. In their respective countries, UNAFEI alumni have been playing leading roles and holding important posts in the fields of crime prevention and the treatment of offenders, and in related organizations.

A. The 141st International Senior Seminar

1. Introduction

The 141st International Senior Seminar was held from 13 January to 13 February 2009. The main theme was "The Improvement of the Treatment of Offenders Through the Enhancement of Community-Based Alternatives to Incarceration". In this Seminar, 16 overseas participants and nine Japanese participants attended.

2. Methodology

Firstly, the Seminar participants respectively introduced the current position regarding the role and function of criminal justice agencies in their country in regard to the main theme. The participants were then divided into two group workshops as follows:

Group 1: The Use of Community-Based Alternatives at Pre-Trial and Trial Stages to Reduce Overcrowding in Prisons

Group 2: Effective Measures to Improve the Treatment of Offenders through the Enhancement of Community-Based Alternatives to Incarceration at the Post-Sentencing Stage

Each Group elected a chairperson, co-chairperson(s), a rapporteur and co-rapporteur(s) in order to facilitate the discussions. During group discussion the group members studied the designated topics and exchanged views based on information obtained through personal experience, the Individual Presentations, lectures and so forth. Later, Plenary Meetings were held to discuss the interim outline of the Group Workshop reports and to offer suggestions and comments. During the final Plenary Meetings, drafts of the Group Workshop reports were examined and critiqued by all the participants and the UNAFEI faculty. Based on these discussions, the Groups further refined their reports and presented them in the Report-Back Sessions, where they were endorsed as the Reports of the Seminar. The full texts of these Reports are published in UNAFEI Resource Material Series No 79.

3. Outcome Summary

(i) *The Use of Community-Based Alternatives at Pre-Trial and Trial Stages to Reduce Overcrowding in Prisons*

Group One discussed the availability of bail in each represented country, along with the discretionary powers of the police and prosecution services and interventions at the adjudication stage.

On the topic of bail, the group heard that where it is available, the number of suspects or defendants who benefit from it is not very high. Lengthy procedures, stringent requirements, and conservative and reluctant judges were cited as some reasons for this. The participants later discussed police discretion in granting bail. In many of the participating countries, the police play a very important role in the criminal justice system and have the authority to grant bail in minor cases.

On the topic of discretionary powers of the police, the participants discussed the role of the police, not only in arrest, bail-release and disposition of cases, but also in restorative justice, mediation and alternative dispute resolution. Regarding police discretion, the group recommended that any discretion should be exercised within clear guidelines; that police, as the first point of contact in that criminal justice system should play a role in mediating settlements or minor disputes, subject to legal supervision; and that police investigations should be completed without delay.

Following further discussions and comparisons of prosecutorial and adjudicative practices relevant to the topic, the group agreed that each country should promote community-based alternatives to incarceration as much as possible under its own legal system and the following recommendations were made.

1. That stringent efforts be made to ensure that Alternative Dispute Resolution, Diversion, Settlement, and Restorative Justice Practices are used at the pre-trial, mid-trial and trial stages;
2. That alternative 'court systems' such as Traffic Courts, Family Courts, Small Claims Court, etc. be implemented where applicable, which could free the judiciary to address indictable matters in a more speedy manner;
3. That all phases of the process - investigation, prosecution and trial - be conducted and concluded in a more efficient manner;
4. That the discretionary powers exercised by the police and prosecution services, with respect to closing and suspending criminal cases, should be overseen by appropriate bodies to ensure accountability and transparency to prevent corruption;
5. That creative public awareness campaigns be undertaken to sensitize the public about the benefits of community-based alternatives to custodial sentencing;

MAIN ACTIVITIES OF UNAFEI

6. That wider use of community-based alternatives, such as probation, suspension of execution of sentences, community service, compensation to the victim, etc. be made by judges at the adjudication stage without prejudice to each country's judicial system;
7. That strategies (training, increased sensitization, awareness) be developed to encourage every sphere of the judiciary to make greater use of the legally provided mechanisms permitting the use of community-based alternatives to custodial sentencing in their sentencing practices;
8. That international co-operation for the provision of technical assistance and capacity building ought to be pursued.

(ii) Effective Measures to Improve the Treatment of Offenders through the Enhancement of Community-Based Alternatives to Incarceration at the Post-Sentencing Stage

Group Two discussed the above subject according to the following agenda: 1. Current mechanisms of community-based alternatives to incarceration employed by each represented country; 2. Current situations and problems facing existing legal systems and/or practice of the above-mentioned mechanisms; 3. Countermeasures under current legal systems and/or practice of the above-mentioned mechanisms; 4. Identification of other effective intervention models; 5. Measures to monitor and evaluate all mechanisms discussed.

The following recommendations were made.

1. That non-custodial options be considered as effective rehabilitation strategies;
2. That sentencing officers who utilize alternative sentencing options should be cognizant of the human rights of the sentenced offenders;
3. That recidivism rates be continuously monitored;
4. That risk assessments be used as efficient supervision or monitoring systems for community-based non-custodial options;
5. That inmates be evaluated during incarceration and post-release, to follow up on their progress or otherwise;
6. That reliable procedures be established to evaluate the effectiveness of all measures to prepare for the acceptance and reintegration of released offenders by society, including the availability of adequate shelter and sustenance, and community attitudes;
7. That effective public education programmes be implemented in order to sensitize and inform the public about community-based alternatives to incarceration;
8. That human and financial resources be increased to enhance the administration of community-based alternatives to incarceration;
9. That there is continuous research in these areas through public education forums, conferences, seminars and networking at the national, regional and international levels.

B. The 142nd International Training Course

1. Introduction

The 142nd International Training Course was held from 11 May to 29 June 2009. The main theme was "Effective Countermeasures against Overcrowding of Correctional Facilities". In this Course, 14 overseas participants, two international observers and eight Japanese participants attended.

2. Methodology

The objectives of the Course were primarily realized through the Individual Presentations and Group Workshop sessions. In the former, each participant presented the actual situation, problems and future

prospects of their country with respect to the main theme of the Course. The Group Workshops further examined the subtopics of the main theme. To facilitate discussion, the participants were divided into three groups to discuss the following topics under the guidance of faculty advisers:

Group 1: Effective Countermeasures against Overcrowding of Correctional Facilities

Group 2: Sentencing and Alternative Punishment

Group 3: Post-Sentencing Disposition and Treatment Measures

The three groups elected a chairperson, co-chairperson(s), rapporteur and co-rapporteur(s) to organize the discussions. The group members studied the designated subtopics and exchanged their views based on information obtained through personal experience, the Individual Presentations, lectures and so forth. During the course, Plenary Meetings were held to discuss the interim outline of the Group Workshop reports and to offer suggestions and comments. During the final Plenary Meeting the drafts of the Group Workshop reports were examined and critiqued by all the participants and the UNAFEI faculty. Based on these discussions, the Groups further refined their reports and presented them in the Report-Back Sessions, where they were endorsed as the reports of the Course. The full texts of the reports are published in full in Resource Material Series No. 80.

3. Outcome Summary

(i) *Effective Countermeasures against Overcrowding of Correctional Facilities*

The group discussed the above subject by dividing the matter into three subtopics: (i) alternatives to pre-trial detention; (ii) diversion from criminal justice procedure; and (iii) speedy trial measures.

With regard to alternatives to pre-trial detention, the group discussed police power to release suspects on bail; house arrest or police detention; placing a suspect under the supervision of a person or institution; electronic monitoring; prohibiting a suspect from leaving a particular area; investigation without arrest; prohibiting a suspect/accused from going to particular places or meeting named individuals; confiscation of the suspect's passport; and release with an order to pledge financial or other property, such as bail.

Regarding diversion from criminal justice procedure, the group discussed absolute or conditional discharge; decriminalization; and restorative justice. Regarding absolute or conditional discharge, it was argued that victims should be able to request independent review of such decisions. Regarding decriminalization, the group agreed that while it can be effective, public opinion must be obtained and considered before any decision is made. Regarding restorative justice, the group identified its merits (alleviates overcrowding; saves time and money; lessens the workload of criminal justice personnel; satisfies victims; and avoids stigmatizing offenders) and demerits (lack of specific and general deterrence; does not halt recidivism; risk of injustice to some offenders; and public insecurity). The group agreed that while the definition of what constitutes a minor offence differs from country to country, restorative justice should only be used for minor cases, according to the jurisdiction in which the offence was committed. The group recommended that the establishment of an independent and neutral mediating body in the process is fundamental.

Regarding speedy trial measures, the group discussed (i) summary proceedings and speedy trial and (ii) pre-trial preparation systems, which the group agreed were effective in reducing overcrowding. The group identified some factors in a slow trial process:

- No fixed timeframe for investigation and prosecution;
- Minimum number of judges in some countries;
- Unclear and lengthy legal processes;
- Behaviour of stakeholders such as defence lawyers.

The group made the following recommendations:

1. There is a need to set fixed timeframes for investigation and prosecution; however, there should be a provision to allow for extensions of the timeframe depending on the nature of each case;

MAIN ACTIVITIES OF UNAFEI

2. There should be flexibility in the recruitment procedure or policies and appointment of sufficient numbers of judges;
3. The use of summary proceedings is recommended to avoid wasting time and resources;
4. There is a need to utilize pre-trial preparation/arrangement.

(ii) Sentencing and Alternative Punishment

The group carefully considered the theme according to the following agenda: (i) alternative punishments to custodial sanction, including their functions and dysfunctions, sentencing policy, and difficulties in implementing non-custodial measures; (ii) alternative punishments and other interests; (iii) other issues relative to justice policy.

The group discussed the above topic with consideration for the diverse cultural, political and socio-economic background of each participant's country, and its recommendations also take into consideration each country's readiness for change. At the outset, the group recommended that the Tokyo Rules 8.1 and 8.2 give a sample of the alternative sentences which could be implemented by countries according to need.

The group agreed that overcrowding exists in the correctional facilities of each of the represented countries, and that measures to reduce overcrowding should begin even at the sentencing stage. Utilizing alternatives to imprisonment is a sustainable way of effecting behavioural change within the community, and serves the interest of both the offender and society.

Regarding topic (i), alternative punishments to custodial sanctions, the group considered types of non-custodial sanctions and how these ought to be prioritized to increase effectiveness and best reduce overcrowding. They also discussed the functions and dysfunctions of non-custodial sanctions and administrative or other structures that can support alternative punishments. The final matter for discussion under this topic was sentencing policy, such as how to apply the scale of existing penal value, and difficulties and possible solutions in utilizing non-custodial sanctions.

Regarding topic (ii), alternative punishments and other interests, the group discussed the importance of upholding victims' rights; upholding social security; penal function and alternative punishments; and the offender's human rights.

Under the final topic, other issues relative to justice policy, the group highlighted the importance of speedy trial. It also addressed the complex topic of decriminalization. Finally, the group addressed the system of restorative justice. The group agreed that it is an interesting concept with some merit in cases of minor crimes, but that there may be difficulties in implementing the model in cultures which favour a retributive model of justice.

Having carefully considered the situation and practices in each participating country, the group agreed upon the following recommendations.

1. Each non-custodial sentence has its own merits and demerits; the most appropriate sentence should be imposed on a case-by-case basis with due regard for all circumstances of the case;
2. All agencies in the criminal justice system, including NGOs, should collaborate to ensure that the system works smoothly and seamlessly when implementing and utilizing non-custodial measures;
3. Open dialogue in a public forum is required to increase the public's understanding of the functions/dysfunctions and pros and cons of custodial and non-custodial sentences;
4. The public should be informed of the respective costs of imprisonment and non-custodial sanctions;
5. Countries which cannot immediately establish a large probation service should utilize the skills of reputable members of the community who are willing to serve as voluntary probation officers, under a core team of professional advisers;

6. An offender's ability to pay a fine should be assessed at the sentencing stage. The offender should be permitted to make the payment in instalments if unable to pay the total amount at once;
7. Social enquiry reports can be an important tool for deciding an appropriate sentence;
8. Certain offences should be decriminalized; thus, persons who commit such offences would be directed to undergo rehabilitation rather than imprisoned;
9. Speedy trial should be implemented as a feature of the law as it is the most important step to prevent unnecessary detention;
10. To facilitate the introduction of alternative sanctions, many legal systems must make administrative changes and amend their laws.

(iii) Post-Sentencing Disposition and Treatment Measures

The group divided its discussion into two parts: (i) post-sentencing dispositions (which lower prison populations); and (ii) effective treatment programmes (which lower recidivism). The group also addressed evaluation of treatment programmes.

Under "post-sentencing dispositions" the group addressed parole; halfway houses; work/study release; remission; pardon; other measures related to early release; and other forms of early release. Participants agreed on the effectiveness of all schemes in reducing prison populations. Concerns were raised about victims' negative attitude to early release and the risk of releasing dangerous offenders, the latter requiring accurate scientific identification of offenders. The group considered the administrative measures necessary for remission and made the following recommendations: computerization of records and the creation of a sufficient database; monitoring; public education; and the setting of conditions of eligibility.

Under "effective treatment programmes" the group addressed assessment and classification of inmates, in which the seriousness of the crime committed, types of offences, length of sentence and security risk to staff and other prisoners must be considered. They also addressed evidence-based treatment programmes, which they defined to mean programmes whose effectiveness in reducing recidivism has been proved through rigorous statistical reviews. The group further considered "other effective programmes". They considered the following such programmes: family visits, sports, educational/vocational training, mental health services, religious or spiritual services, aftercare supervision of discharged offenders, social service treatment programmes for discharged inmates, offenders' criminal records, and public education, campaign and awareness-raising for the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders.

On the subject of evaluation of treatment programmes, the group discussed items necessary for evaluation and listed possible items thus: recidivism, cost-effectiveness, and success rate. Evaluation can be macro or micro in focus, and timing of the evaluation is another important variable. The group debated whom should conduct an evaluation and agreed that third party evaluation is a good option. The group noted that evaluation: informs authorities of the effectiveness of their programmes; maintains the quality of programmes; and verifies for the taxpayer the effectiveness of programmes. The weaknesses of evaluation are that "success" can be defined ambiguously and that standards of evaluations are not easily set. Using third parties and widely accepted standards could help to address these weaknesses.

The group agreed that all post-sentencing dispositions and treatment programmes discussed were effective in tackling overcrowding and recommended development and endeavour in the following areas:

1. Acquisition of support from government authorities;
2. Exploration of resources;
3. Soliciting of public acceptance of and support for rehabilitation of offenders;
4. Comprehensive, complementary, and aligned strategies to ensure that post-sentencing dispositions, treatment programmes and publicity campaigns are mutually reinforcing and reflect the aims of reducing overcrowding and rehabilitating offenders.

C. The 143rd International Training Course

1. Introduction

The 143rd International Training Course was held from 28 September to 5 November 2009. The main theme was “Ethics and Codes of Conduct for Judges, Prosecutors and Law Enforcement Officials”. Ten overseas participants and five Japanese participants attended.

2. Methodology

The participants of the 143rd Course endeavoured to explore the investigation, prosecution and trial of cybercrime. This was accomplished primarily through a comparative analysis of the current situation and the problems encountered. The participants’ in-depth discussions enabled them to put forth effective and practical solutions.

The objectives were primarily realized through the Individual Presentations and the Group Workshop sessions. In the former, each participant presented the actual situation, problems and future prospects of their country with respect to the main theme of the Course. To facilitate discussions, the participants were divided into two groups.

Each Group elected a chairperson, co-chairperson, rapporteur and co-rapporteur(s) to organize the discussions. The group members studied the situation in each of their countries and exchanged their views based on information obtained through personal experience, the Individual Presentations, lectures and so forth.

Group 1: Ethics and Codes of Conduct for Judges, Prosecutors and Law Enforcement Officials

Group 2: Codes of Conduct for Judges, Prosecutors and Law Enforcement Officials

Plenary Meetings were later held to discuss the interim outline of the Group Workshop reports and to offer suggestions and comments. During the Plenary Meetings, drafts of the Group Workshop reports were examined and critiqued by all the participants and the UNAFEI faculty. Based on these discussions, the Groups further refined their reports and presented them in the Report-Back Sessions, where they were endorsed as the reports of the Course. The reports will be published in full in UNAFEI Resource Material Series No. 80.

3. Outcome Summary

(i) Ethics and Codes of Conduct for Judges, Prosecutors and Law Enforcement Officials

The group discussed the above topic according to the following agenda: 1. Current situation and issues concerning corruption or misconduct in the judiciary and prosecutorial/law enforcement authorities; 2. Legal ethics, professional responsibilities and codes of conduct in the judiciary and prosecutorial/law enforcement authorities; 3. Other measures to prevent corruption and misconduct in the judiciary and prosecutorial/law enforcement authorities; 4. Appointment, education and training; 5. Procedural regulations; and 6. Recommendations.

Regarding misconduct and misconduct in the judiciary, most participants stated that significant problems exist in the respective countries, and that inefficiency and bribery are a major obstacle to accessing justice. All agreed that poor remuneration, absence of effective monitoring systems and weak implementation of existing codes of conduct are major contributing factors to this situation.

Regarding codes of conduct, most countries have such codes for civil servants generally, but they do not apply to the justices of the highest courts. All members agreed that codes are necessary and that careful attention should be given to their implementation. For the exercise of discretionary power, effective guidelines are also considered necessary by the group members.

In terms of other measures to prevent corruption and misconduct, the group agreed that a separate independent oversight committee could be effective; they likewise agreed on this point in terms of overseeing that procedural regulations were adhered to. On the matter of training, the group agreed that initial training must be of sufficient length and must be supplemented by periodic refresher in-service training.

The group emphasized the 3Rs essential in fighting corruption:

REFRAIN: Do not participate in corruption;
RESIST: Resist corruption whenever and wherever detected;
REPORT: If all fails, report to the authorities.

The group formulated the following recommendations.

1. The appropriate authorities should adopt codes of conduct and codify other relevant matters;
2. The codes should accommodate core values like independence, impartiality, integrity, propriety, equality, competence and diligence;
3. Judges, prosecutors and law enforcement officials should have their own specific codes depending on the legal system and job concerned;
4. Discretionary power should be exercised with reference to transparent guidelines. Those who exercise such power should be held accountable to a proper authority. Judges and prosecutors should make clear the reasons for their final dispositions;
5. An internal independent oversight committee should monitor adherence to the codes of conduct. This body may include members from outside the jurisdiction, and its membership should not change frequently. An outside oversight body, like the Inspector General's Office in the USA, may look after serious violations;
6. Review of performance evaluation systems is required, and job rotation and asset declarations should be considered;
7. Effective complaint reporting systems should be developed and public officers who discover misconduct should be obliged to report it;
8. Codes of conduct should be disseminated inside and outside the relevant professional organizations;
9. Selection/recruitment should be transparent, effective and merit-based, and should apply equally to all. A basic legal training system, such as Japan's, may be adopted;
10. The career and professional and personal moral and ethical behaviour of candidates for judicial appointment may be examined;
11. Periodical on-the-job training should supplement initial training;
12. Moral and ethical education should be incorporated into the education system from elementary level;
13. Disciplinary procedures should be clearly delineated and violations should be dealt with severely;
14. Proceedings, violations and disciplinary measures should be transparent;
15. Judicial independence, job security and adequate remuneration should be assured;
16. Strong political will is required to curb corruption, as is co-operation from NGOs and the media.

(ii) Codes of Conduct for Judges, Prosecutors and Law Enforcement Officials

Group Two discussed the above topic according to an agenda similar to that of Group One. The group first defined the term "corruption" to mean "the abuse of entrusted power for private gain by a public official". The group identified low remuneration as a cause of corruption but differed as to the degree to which it is a cause. As a basis for its later discussions the group assumed that it had the duty to design a code of conduct for criminal justice officials of a newly established country. While such a code should incorporate the Bangalore Principles, the group agreed that the code should also be "localized" and that prior to establishing a code a country should assess the capacity of its judiciary, prosecution and police. The group agreed that

MAIN ACTIVITIES OF UNAFEI

implementation of any code is vital and that an independent authority should be established to monitor compliance.

For judges, the group members listed the following principles as important: some members felt that the principles could be prioritized, while others felt that only a person exhibiting all of the principles would be a good judge:

- (i) Independence;
- (ii) Impartiality and Integrity;
- (iii) Propriety;
- (iv) Equality, Competence and Diligence

For prosecutors, the group identified the following minimum standards of behaviour:

- (i) Professional Conduct and Competency: prosecutors must be at all times well-informed of changes to the law;
- (ii) Independence;
- (iii) Impartiality;
- (iv) Role in Criminal Proceedings: prosecutors must treat the defendant fairly, and consider the rights of the victim and the greater community too;
- (v) Co-operation (with other law enforcement officials).

For law enforcement officials, the group listed the following principles to be included in a code of conduct:

- (i) Honesty, Integrity, Confidentiality and Spirit of Sacrifice;
- (ii) Fairness, Tolerance, Appearance and Impairment: police officers must remain calm at all times, maintain good conduct and appearance and must not be under the influence of drugs or alcohol while on duty;
- (iii) Use of Force, Abuse of Authority and Lawful Order: the police must only exert force to the extent that it is absolutely necessary;
- (iv) Co-operation and Partnership: police must establish good working relationships with their international counterparts.

Regarding appointment, education and training, the group agreed that selection of judges, prosecutors and law enforcement officials should be based on merit, with consideration for the applicant's integrity. Education should not merely be lecture-based, but should include adult learning methods.

Following its discussions, the group observed that international covenants and instruments that relate to codes of conduct and ethical behaviour of judges, prosecutors and law enforcement officials are minimum standards only. The group further observed that there are certain values common to all criminal justice officials but that the aspects and missions of the organizations vary and will therefore have different impacts.

The group agreed that a written code of conduct for judges, prosecutors and law enforcement officials was indeed important to fight corruption and unethical conduct. Such a code should reflect the citizens' aspirations for their justice system and should incorporate the traditional and social and cultural values of the people. It should also address historical events that might have led to the establishment of the code. The code of conduct must be coupled with efforts to train officials on a continuous basis on the required behaviour and ethics. Constant advisory support should be provided and harsh punishment should be implemented in the event of violations.

The work of judges, prosecutors and law enforcement officials and the decisions made by them affect the daily life of the citizenry. A high level of ethical behaviour and equality and fairness in the performance of the duties of judges, prosecutors and law enforcement officials are not only favourable, but can be considered a right of all citizens.

D. Special Seminars and Courses

1. The Fifth Seminar on Criminal Justice for Central Asia

The Fifth Seminar on Criminal Justice for Central Asia was held from 23 February to 6 March 2009. The main theme was “Countermeasures for Drug Offences and Related Crimes and Enhancement of International Co-operation in the Criminal Justice Process”. Eleven criminal justice officials from Central Asian countries (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan) attended.

2. The 14th Special Seminar for Senior Criminal Justice Officials of the People’s Republic of China

The 14th Special Seminar for Senior Criminal Justice Officials of the People’s Republic of China was held from 2 to 19 March 2009. The main theme was “Enhancement of Community-Based Alternatives to Incarceration at All Stages of the Criminal Justice Process”. Ten participants and three course counsellors attended.

3. The Fourth Country Specific Training Course on the Community-Based Treatment of Offenders through the Holistic Approach to Volunteer Resource Development for the Philippines

The Fourth Country Specific Training Course on the Community-Based Treatment of Offenders through the Holistic Approach to Volunteer Resource Development for the Philippines was held from 29 June to 9 July 2009. One administrator from the Parole and Probation Administration, 12 Parole and Probation Officers and one Volunteer Probation Aide from the Philippines discussed measures to improve communication and feedback, and measures to promote Volunteer Probation Aide Associations.

4. The Twelfth International Training Course on the Criminal Justice Response to Corruption

The Twelfth International Training Course on the Criminal Justice Response to Corruption was held from 13 July to 2 August 2009. In this Course, 17 overseas participants and six Japanese participants, all of whom were officials engaged in corruption control, comparatively analysed the current situation of corruption, methods of combating corruption, and measures to enhance international co-operation.

5. The 15th Special Seminar for Senior Criminal Justice Officials of the People’s Republic of China

The 15th Special Seminar for Senior Criminal Justice Officials of the People’s Republic of China was held from 16 November to 3 December 2009. Fifteen participants attended.

6. The Third Regional Seminar on Good Governance for Southeast Asian Countries

The Third Regional Seminar on Good Governance for Southeast Asian Countries, jointly hosted by UNAFEI, the Department of Justice of the Republic of the Philippines and the UNODC Regional Centre, Bangkok was held from 9 to 12 December 2009 in Manila, the Philippines. The main theme was “Measures to Freeze, Confiscate and Recover Proceeds of Corruption, Including Prevention of Money Laundering”. Approximately 23 participants from seven countries, comprising judges, prosecutors and other law enforcement officials attended.

III. TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION

A. Regional Training Programmes

1. Short-Term Experts in Kenya

Two UNAFEI professors were dispatched to Kenya, from 25 July to 8 August 2009, to carry out research for the next phase of the Project for Capacity Building of Child Care and Protection Officers in the Juvenile Justice System of Kenya. One professor returned to Kenya from 5 October to 12 December 2009 to assist in the next phase of the Project.

2. Short-Term Experts in Latin America

Two UNAFEI faculty members visited Costa Rica and Nicaragua from 10 to 24 August 2009. In Costa Rica they jointly hosted, with ILANUD, a course on Criminal Justice Reform in Latin America in which seven countries were represented. In Nicaragua, they held a follow-up seminar on the specific situation in that country.

3. Short-Term Expert in the Philippines

A UNAFEI professor was dispatched from 31 August to 7 September 2009 as a Short-Term Expert to participate in the Training Course for Professional Probation Officers.

MAIN ACTIVITIES OF UNAFEI

B. Third Regional Seminar on Good Governance for Southeast Asian Countries

UNAFEI, the Department of Justice of the Republic of the Philippines and the UNODC Regional Centre for Asia and the Pacific held the Third Regional Seminar on Good Governance for Southeast Asian Countries in Manila, the Philippines from 9 to 12 December 2009. Approximately 23 participants from seven countries, Cambodia, Indonesia, the Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, and Thailand, attended the Seminar. The main theme of the Seminar was “Measures to Freeze, Confiscate and Recover Proceeds of Corruption, Including Prevention of Money Laundering”.

IV. INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTATION SERVICES

The Institute continues to collect data and other resource materials on crime trends, crime prevention strategies and the treatment of offenders from Asia, the Pacific, Africa, Europe and the Americas, and makes use of this information in its training courses and seminars. The Information and Library Service of the Institute has been providing, upon request, materials and information to United Nations agencies, governmental organizations, research institutes and researchers, both domestic and foreign.

V. PUBLICATIONS

Reports on training courses and seminars are published regularly by the Institute. Since 1971, the Institute has issued the Resource Material Series, which contains contributions by the faculty members, visiting experts and participants of UNAFEI courses and seminars. In 2009, the 77th, 78th and 79th editions of the Resource Material Series were published. Additionally, issues 128 to 130 (from the 141st Seminar to the 143rd Course respectively) of the UNAFEI Newsletter were published, which included a brief report on each course and seminar and other timely information. These publications are also available on UNAFEI's web site <http://www.unafei.or.jp/english>.

VI. OTHER ACTIVITIES

A. Public Lecture Programme

On 30 January 2009, the Public Lecture Programme was conducted in the Grand Conference Hall of the Ministry of Justice. In attendance were many distinguished guests, UNAFEI alumni and the 141st International Senior Seminar participants. This Programme was jointly sponsored by the Asia Crime Prevention Foundation (ACPF), the Japan Criminal Policy Society (JCPS) and UNAFEI.

Public Lecture Programmes increase the public's awareness of criminal justice issues, through comparative international study, by inviting distinguished speakers from abroad. This year, Dr. Kittipong Kittayarak, Permanent Secretary for Justice, Ministry of Justice, Thailand, and Ms. Christine Glenn, Chief Executive of the Parole Board of England and Wales, were invited as speakers. They presented papers entitled “The Probation Service in Thailand: 30 Years in Fostering Reintegration” and “Tilting the Scales”, respectively.

B. Assisting UNAFEI Alumni Activities

Various UNAFEI alumni associations in several countries have commenced, or are about to commence, research activities in their respective criminal justice fields. It is, therefore, one of the important tasks of UNAFEI to support these contributions to improve the crime situation internationally.

C. Overseas Missions

Former Professor Tae Sugiyama, Professor Tetsuya Sugano, and Mr. Yuichi Kitada (Staff) visited Manila, the Philippines, from 12 to 17 January 2009 to attend the “In-country Training Programme on Revitalization of the Volunteer Probation Aide System”.

Former Professor Junichiro Otani and Mr. Hitoshi Nakasuga (former Co-Deputy Chief of the Secretariat) visited Singapore from 15 to 20 February to undertake research on community-based treatment alternatives to incarceration in preparation for the United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, held in Brazil in April 2010.

Former Director Keiichi Aizawa visited Korea from 11 to 13 March to attend the International Seminar and Ceremony to Commemorate the 20th Anniversary of the Korean Institute of Criminology. Mr. Aizawa

made a speech to the Seminar on the topic of “Criminal Justice Policy and International Co-operation”.

Former Deputy Director Takeshi Seto, Professor Naoyuki Harada and Mr. Ikuo Kosaka (Staff) visited Manila, the Philippines from 24 to 28 March to prepare for the Third Regional Seminar on Good Governance for Southeast Asian Countries, held in Manila in December 2009, co-hosted by The National Prosecution Service, Department of Justice of the Philippines, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific, and UNAFEI.

Former Director Keiichi Aizawa, Professor Naoyuki Harada, former Professor Tae Sugiyama and former Professor Junichiro Otani visited Vienna, Austria from 16 to 24 April to attend the 18th Session of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. The Director made a statement to the Commission and Ms. Sugiyama sat as a panellist in the Plenary Discussion Session on “Penal Reform and the Reduction of Prison Overcrowding”.

Former Director Keiichi Aizawa, Professor Junichi Watanabe and Mr. Hideo Takahashi (Staff) visited Bangkok, Thailand from 30 June to 5 July 2009 to attend the Regional Preparatory Meeting for the Twelfth Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, held in Brazil in April 2010.

Professor Tetsuya Sugano and Professor Toru Kawaharada were dispatched to Nairobi, Kenya from 25 July to 8 August 2009 to carry out research for the next phase of the Project for Capacity Building of Child Care and Protection Officers in the Juvenile Justice System of Kenya.

Director Masaki Sasaki, Professor Ayako Sakonji and Mr. Masato Fujiwara (Co-Deputy Chief of the Secretariat) visited China from 10 to 19 August 2009 to meet Chinese criminal justice officials in preparation for the 15th Seminar on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice for the People’s Republic of China, held at UNAFEI in November 2009.

Former Deputy Director Takeshi Seto and Professor Jun Oshino visited Costa Rica and Nicaragua from 10 to 24 August 2009. In Costa Rica, they jointly hosted, with ILANUD, a course on Criminal Justice Reform in Latin America in which seven countries were represented. In Nicaragua, they held a follow-up seminar on the specific situation in that country.

Director Masaki Sasaki visited Cambridge, England from 29 to 31 August 2009 to attend the 27th International Symposium on Economic Crime. Director Sasaki made a keynote address at the Symposium. The Director also visited Stockholm, Sweden, from 1 to 3 September 2009, to attend a meeting at the Ministry of Justice.

Professor Ayako Sakonji was dispatched to the Philippines from 31 August to 7 September 2009 as a Short-Term Expert to participate in the Training Course for Professional Probation Officers.

Professor Naoyuki Harada and Mr. Ikuo Kosaka (Staff) visited Manila, the Philippines from 7 to 11 September 2009 to make preparations for the Third Regional Seminar on Good Governance for Southeast Asian Countries, held in Manila from 9 to 12 December 2009.

Professor Ayako Sakonji returned to the Philippines from 27 September to 10 October 2009 to participate in the Monitoring and Evaluation Programme for Volunteer Probation Aide Activity.

Professor Tetsuya Sugano returned to Kenya on 5 October to 12 December 2009 to assist in the next phase of the Project for Capacity Building of Child Care and Protection Officers in the Juvenile Justice System of Kenya.

Professor Junichi Watanabe went to Barbados from 24 October to 2 November 2009 to attend the 11th Annual General Meeting and Conference of the International Corrections and Prisons Association.

Professor Junichi Watanabe and Mr. Kazuyuki Nagata (Staff) visited Perth, Australia from 14 to 21 November 2009 to attend the 29th Asian and Pacific Conference of Correctional Administrators.

MAIN ACTIVITIES OF UNAFEI

Director Masaki Sasaki, Deputy Director Haruhiko Ukawa, Professor Naoyuki Harada, Ms. Yoshiko Kawashima (Staff) and Mr. Ikuo Kosaka (Staff) went to Manila, the Philippines, to attend the Third Regional Seminar on Good Governance for Southeast Asian Countries, which was held from 9 to 12 December 2009. The topic of the Seminar was “Measures to Freeze, Confiscate and Recover Proceeds of Corruption, including Prevention of Money-Laundering”. UNAFEI, the Department of Justice of the Republic of the Philippines and the UNODC Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific co-hosted the Seminar.

Professor Naoyuki Harada visited Hong Kong, China from 14 to 17 December 2009 to attend the Fourth ICAC Symposium co-hosted by the Independent Commission against Corruption (ICAC) and the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF).

Professor Jun Oshino visited Courmayeur, Italy, from 9 to 14 December 2009 to attend the annual Co-ordination Meeting of the Programme Network Institutes.

D. Assisting ACPF Activities

UNAFEI co-operates and corroborates with the ACPF to improve crime prevention and criminal justice administration in the region. Since UNAFEI and the ACPF have many similar goals, and a large part of ACPF’s membership consists of UNAFEI alumni, the relationship between the two is very strong.

E. Courtesy Visit of Her Royal Highness Princess Bajrakitiyabha of Thailand

Her Royal Highness Princess Bajrakitiyabha of Thailand paid a courtesy visit to UNAFEI on 25 August 2009. HRH Princess Bajrakitiyabha was accompanied by senior officials of the Office of the Attorney General of Thailand. The Royal delegation toured the UNAFEI facilities and attended a briefing on UNAFEI’s activities with Director Masaki Sasaki and UNAFEI faculty. HRH Princess Bajrakitiyabha is herself a public prosecutor and a goodwill ambassador for UNIFEM and has a particular interest in the treatment of female offenders in the criminal justice system. Her Royal Highness previously met a UNAFEI delegation headed by Director Keiichi Aizawa at the 18th Session of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice in Vienna in April 2009.

VII. HUMAN RESOURCES

A. Staff

In 1970, the Government of Japan assumed full financial and administrative responsibility for running the Institute. The Director, Deputy Director and approximately nine professors are selected from among public prosecutors, the judiciary, corrections, probation and the police. UNAFEI also has approximately 15 administrative staff members, who are appointed from among officials of the Government of Japan, and a linguistic adviser. Moreover, the Ministry of Justice invites visiting experts from abroad to each training course and seminar. The Institute has also received valuable assistance from various experts, volunteers and related agencies in conducting its training programmes.

B. Faculty Changes

Ms. Tae Sugiyama, formerly a Professor of UNAFEI, was transferred and appointed a Senior Probation Officer of Tokyo Probation Office on 1 April 2009.

Mr. Junichiro Otani, formerly a Professor of UNAFEI, was transferred and appointed an attorney of the Criminal Affairs Bureau of the Ministry of Justice on 1 April 2009.

Mr. Ryuji Tatsuya, formerly a Professor of UNAFEI, was transferred and appointed Chief of the International Affairs Division of Fukushima Prison on 1 April 2009.

Mr. Koji Yamada, formerly a Professor of UNAFEI, was transferred and appointed a Senior Probation Officer of Matsuyama Probation Office on 1 April 2009.

Ms. Fumiko Akahane, formerly a public prosecutor of Tokyo District Public Prosecutors Office, joined UNAFEI as a Professor on 1 April 2009.

ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2009

Mr. Toru Kawaharada, formerly a Senior Probation Officer of Utsunomiya Probation Office, joined UNAFEI as a Professor on 1 April 2009.

Ms. Ayako Sakonji, formerly a probation officer of Osaka Probation Office, joined UNAFEI as a Professor on 1 April 2009.

Mr. Junichi Watanabe, formerly a specialist of the Legal Affairs Section of the Correction Bureau of the Ministry of Justice, joined UNAFEI as a Professor on 1 April 2009.

Mr. Keiichi Aizawa, Director of UNAFEI, was appointed to the Supreme Prosecutors Office on 17 July 2009.

Mr. Masaki Sasaki, formerly the Chief of Naha District Public Prosecutors Office, was appointed Director of UNAFEI on 21 July 2009.

Mr. Takeshi Seto, Deputy Director of UNAFEI, was transferred and appointed to Tokyo High Prosecutors Office on 24 September 2009.

Mr. Haruhiko Ukawa, formerly a public prosecutor of Tokyo High Public Prosecutors Office, was appointed Deputy Director of UNAFEI on 24 September 2009.

VIII. FINANCES

The Ministry of Justice primarily provides the Institute's budget. UNAFEI's total budget for its programmes is approximately ¥101 million per year. Additionally, JICA and the ACPF provide assistance for the Institute's international training courses and seminars.