

UNAFEI NEWSLETTER

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

No. 138
June 2012

Established
1961

IN THIS ISSUE

	<i>Page</i>
LETTER FROM THE DIRECTOR	1
THE 151ST INTERNATIONAL TRAINING COURSE	3
EVIDENCE-BASED TREATMENT OF OFFENDERS	
Course Rationale	3
Course Summary	5
Lecture Topics	6
Individual-Presentation Topics	8
Group-Workshop Sessions	10
Observation Visits	12
Group Study Tour	13
Special Events	14
Reference Materials	15
Experts and Participants List	19
The Twelfth Country-Focused Training Course on the Juvenile-Delinquent Treatment System for Kenya	22
The Eighth Seminar on Criminal Justice for Central Asia	24
INFORMATION ABOUT FORTHCOMING PROGRAMMES	26
The 15th UNAFEI UNCAC Training Programme	26
The 152nd International Training Course	26
ADMINISTRATIVE NEWS	29
Faculty Changes	29
Overseas Trips by Staff	29
FACULTY AND STAFF OF UNAFEI	30

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 151st International Training Course on “Evidence-Based Treatment of Offenders”, which took place from 16 May to 22 June 2012.

In this Course, we welcomed eight Japanese and 15 overseas participants: four from Africa, five from Asia, one from Latin America and the Caribbean, and five from Oceania. Two international observers also attended, both from Asia. The participants and observers included corrections officers, probation officers, police officers, prosecutors, and other high-ranking public officials.

As this newsletter demonstrates, the Course was extremely productive. It consisted of individual presentations, group-workshop and plenary sessions, visits to relevant criminal justice agencies, and presentations by faculty members, visiting experts, and ad hoc lecturers.

The ultimate goal of any correctional intervention is to prevent and reduce reoffending, and there is a growing recognition that programmes solely based upon experience and intuition do not produce satisfactory results. Information about “what works”, generated through research or evaluation using accepted scientific methods, should guide the treatment of offenders. This is the essential philosophy of the “evidence-based approach.”

There are two major components to the evidence-based treatment of offenders: appropriate risk assessment and proper implementation of treatment programmes. Offender risk assessment is important for two reasons. First, there are risk factors that can be changed and that cannot be changed. In order to bring about behavioural change, treatment programmes need to address risk factors that can be changed. This in turn requires the offender’s risk factors to be properly identified. Second, research has shown that reoffending cannot be reduced unless the service level (such as intensity, frequency and duration) of the treatment programme is matched to the offender’s risk level.

The evidence-based approach also requires the proper implementation of treatment programmes that are proven to be effective. For a programme to be effective, literature suggests that the following conditions have to be met: (1) the programme must be provided at the correct service level that matches each offender’s risk of reoffending; (2) the programme must be designed to address risk factors that can be changed; and (3) the style and modes of treatment must match the learning style of each offender.

The evidence-based approach to offender treatment is relatively new. UNAFEI, as a regional institute of the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme Network, decided to hold this Course to offer participants an opportunity to deepen their understanding and share experiences and knowledge on the subject. Another objective of the programme was to establish a global network of counterparts to facilitate the exchange of updated information on country practices.

During the Course, the participants diligently and comprehensively examined the current state of evidence-based treatment of offenders in the participating countries and existing countermeasures, 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 inputs from UNAFEI faculty and the visiting experts and the in-depth discussions they had with each other, the participants are now better equipped to cope with the realities and difficulties of offender reintegration in their own countries.

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

I would like to express my great appreciation to the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) for its immeasurable support throughout the Course. 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 realisation of this Course.

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

Finally, I would like to reiterate my best regards to the participants of the 151st International Training Course. I hope that the experience they gained during the Course proves valuable in their daily work and that the bonds fostered among the participants, visiting experts, and UNAFEI staff will continue to grow for many years to come.

June 2012

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'T. Sakuma', written in a cursive style.

Tatsuya Sakuma

Director, UNAFEI

THE 151ST INTERNATIONAL TRAINING COURSE

“EVIDENCE-BASED TREATMENT OF OFFENDERS”

Course Rationale

The ultimate goal of any correctional intervention is to prevent and reduce reoffending, and there is a growing recognition that programmes solely based upon experience and intuition do not produce satisfactory results. Information about “what works”, generated through research or evaluation using accepted scientific methods, should guide the treatment of offenders. This is the essential philosophy of the “evidence-based approach.”

There are two major components to the evidence-based treatment of offenders: appropriate risk assessment and proper implementation of treatment programmes. First, each offender’s risk factor must be identified, and then, programmes proven to be effective and corresponding to the identified risk must be properly implemented.

Offender Risk Assessment

Offender risk assessment is important for two reasons. First, there are risk factors that can be changed and that cannot be changed. In order to bring about behavioural change, treatment programmes need to address risk factors that can be changed. This in turn requires the offender’s risk factors to be properly identified. Second, research has shown that reoffending cannot be reduced unless the service level (such as intensity, frequency and duration) of the treatment programme is matched to the offender’s risk level.

Various tools have been developed to assess the risks of the offender. Such tools must be used with sufficient understanding of their underlying theoretical components, and the result must be reflected in each offender’s treatment plan.

Offender Treatment Programmes

The evidence-based approach also requires the proper implementation of treatment programmes that are proven to be effective. For a programme to be effective, literature suggests that the following conditions must be met:

- (1) The service level of the programme is linked with each offender’s risk of reoffending;
- (2) The programme is designed to address risk factors that can be changed; and
- (3) The style and modes of treatment match the learning style of each offender.

To properly implement the programme, the facilitator must understand its theoretical bases, the conditions under which it is to be applied, and its anticipated course and expected outcomes. Further, the implementation should be monitored and evaluated to ensure feedback on each offender’s treatment plan and for the improvement of the programme itself.

Objectives of the Programme

The evidence-based approach to offender treatment is relatively new. This programme offered participants an opportunity to deepen their understanding and share experiences and knowledge on the subject. Another objective of the programme was to establish a global network of counterparts to

facilitate the exchange of updated information on country practices.

In order to achieve these objectives, this programme provided an opportunity to identify and examine current situations and challenges existing in participants' countries and to build participants' knowledge of possible measures to improve current practice.

These objectives were achieved via lectures and participants' dialogue and discussions.

Major topics studied were the following:

1) Understanding of the current situation

Discussed the following matters regarding offender treatment in each country:

- (i) Methods to assess offenders (classification, risk assessment, etc.)
- (ii) Utilization of result of the assessment
- (iii) Type, outline, and evaluation of offender treatment programmes

2) Theory/Practice

Studied the theory and practice of evidence-based treatment of offenders

(i) Offender risk assessment

- Theory and tools
- Methods of developing the tools
- Practical problems and solutions
- Examples of advanced practices

(ii) Offender treatment programme

- Conditions of effective treatment programmes
- Methods of developing effective treatment programmes
- Methods of evaluating the effectiveness of the programmes
- Practical problems and solutions
- Examples of advanced practices

Each participant submitted an Individual Presentation Paper regarding the above-mentioned topic as it applies to the participant's country and explained these topics in the participant's individual presentation.

Course Summary

Lectures

In total, 19 lectures were presented - nine by the visiting experts, four by ad hoc lecturers and six by the faculty of UNAFEI. Three distinguished criminal justice practitioners from abroad served as UNAFEI visiting experts. They lectured on issues relating to the main theme and contributed significantly to the Course by encouraging discussions after their own lectures, participating in the discussions of other programmes, and conversing with the participants on informal occasions. Additionally, distinguished senior officials of the Government of Japan delivered ad hoc lectures. The lecturers and lecture topics are listed on pages 6 to 7.

Individual Presentations

During the first two weeks, each Japanese and overseas participant delivered an individual presentation, which introduced the actual situation, problems, and future prospects of his or her country. 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 8 to 9.

Group-Workshop Sessions

Group-workshop sessions further examined 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 questionnaires previously distributed. Selected participants served as chairpersons, co-chairpersons, rapporteurs or co-rapporteurs, and faculty members served as advisers. Each group's primary responsibility was to explore and develop their designated topics in the group-workshop sessions. The participants and UNAFEI faculty studied the topics and exchanged their views based on information obtained through personal experience, the individual presentations, lectures, and so forth. After the group-workshop sessions, reports were drafted based on the discussions in their groups. These reports were subsequently presented in the plenary meeting and report-back session, where they were endorsed as the reports of the Course. Brief summaries of the group-workshop reports are provided on pages 10 and 11.

Visits and Special Events

Visits to various agencies and institutions in Japan helped the participants obtain a more practical understanding of the Japanese criminal justice system. In addition to the Course's academic agenda, many activities were arranged to provide a greater understanding of Japanese society and culture with the assistance of various organizations and individuals, including the Asia Crime Prevention Foundation (ACPF). For more detailed descriptions, please refer to pages 12 and 13.

Lecture Topics

Visiting Experts' Lectures

- 1) Dr. Laurence Louis Motiuk
 - Risk/Needs Assessment: From Theory and Methods to Policy and Practice
 - The Effectiveness, Efficiency and Relevancy of Correctional Programmes: A System's Perspective
 - The Evolution of Evidence-Based Correctional Programmes in Canada
- 2) Dr. Edward James Latessa
 - Overview of Correctional Programmes in the USA
 - Designing More Effective Correctional Programmes Using Evidence-Based Practices
 - Evaluating Correctional Programmes
- 3) Mr. Timothy Leo
 - The Introduction of Evidence-Based Practice within an Organisation Undergoing Transformational Change
 - Current Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) in the Singapore Prison Service
 - Using Evidence-Based Knowledge to Create a Throughcare System

UNAFEI Professors' Lectures

- 1) Mr. Naoya Oyaizu, *Professor*, UNAFEI
 - Activities of the Japanese Police in the Great East Japan Earthquake
- 2) Mr. Shinichiro Iwashita, *Professor*, UNAFEI
 - The Criminal Justice System in Japan – Investigation/Prosecution
- 3) Mr. Yuichi Tada, *Professor*, UNAFEI
 - The Criminal Justice System in Japan: The Courts
- 4) Mr. Koji Yoshimura, *Professor*, UNAFEI
 - Institutional Corrections in Japan – Penal Institutions and Treatment of Inmates
- 5) Ms. Mayu Yoshida, *Professor*, UNAFEI
 - Institutional Corrections in Japan: Juvenile Correctional Institutions
- 6) Mr. Ryo Tsunoda, *Professor*, UNAFEI
 - Community-Based Treatment of Offenders System in Japan

Ad Hoc Lectures

- 1) Ms. Kiyoko Nishioka
Specialist, Juvenile Treatment Division, Correction Bureau, Ministry of Justice
 - Development of the Ministry of Justice Risk-Assessment Tool

- 2) Ms. Kayoko Tajima
Special Assistant to the Director, Supervision Division, Rehabilitation Bureau, Ministry of Justice
 - Current Situation and Issues of Treatment Programmes for Community-Based Treatment of Offenders in Japan

- 3) Mr. Kazuhiko Hikasa
Assistant to the Director, Prison Service Division, Ministry of Justice
 - Treatment Programmes for Institutional Correction in Japan and the System for Verifying the Effects

- 4) Ms. Yuko Matsushima & Mr. Yusuke Inozume
Classification Officers, Fuchu Prison
 - Treatment Programmes for Institutional Correction in Japan and the System for Verifying the Effects

Individual-Presentation Topics

Overseas Participants

- 1) Mr. Carlos Alberto Restrepo Salazar (Colombia)
 - Structure of Police and Prison System in Colombia
- 2) Mr. Pierre Bulenge Shindano (Democratic Republic of the Congo)
 - Treatment of Offenders – the Democratic Republic of Congo Case
- 3) Mr. Mahmoud Ibrahim Al-Qudah (Jordan)
 - Treatment Programmes for the “Special Categories” of Inmates in Jordan (Takfiri Inmates)
- 4) Mr. Nick Maingi Makuu (Kenya)
 - Evidence-Based Treatment of Offenders (Current Situation of Offenders’ (Risk) Assessment or Treatment Programme in Kenya)
- 5) Mr. Charles Mutembei Gerrard (Kenya)
 - Current Situation of Evidence-Based Treatment of Offenders in Kenya
- 6) Mr. Moosa Rameez (Maldives)
 - Treatment and Rehabilitation of Offenders in the Maldives
- 7) Mr. Abderahim Rahouti (Morocco)
 - “Reception and Orientation Commission” as a Prison Reform Measure to Improve Offenders’ Treatment in Morocco
- 8) Mr. Samuel Morales Ramarui (Palau)
 - Prison Operation and Treatment of Offenders in Palau
- 9) Ms. Mari Angeli Lucero Rafanan (Philippines)
 - Treatment of Offenders in the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology
- 10) Ms. Faagutu Natalie Samuelu-Vaalotu (Samoa)
 - Evidence-Based Treatment of Offenders in Samoa
- 11) Ms. Fonethip Cholchaipaisal (Thailand)
 - Enhancing Self-Esteem Programme for Juveniles under Probation
- 12) Mr. Padet Ringrawd (Thailand)
 - Evidence-Based Treatment of Offenders: Treatment of Drug-Addicted Offenders in Thailand
- 13) Mr. Jacob Bani (Vanuatu)
 - Evidence-Based Treatment of Offenders
- 14) Mr. Trevor Rex Rarua (Vanuatu)
 - The Vanuatu Probation Services

- 15) Ms. Florina Shem (Vanuatu)
• Evidence-Based Treatment of Offenders

Observers

- 16) Mr. Chun-kit Lawrence Chow (Hong Kong)
• Evidence-Based Treatment of Offenders: Risk and Needs Assessment and Management Protocol for Offenders in Correctional Services Department of Hong Kong
- 17) Mr. Jong-won Yoon (Korea)
• Risk Assessment of Offenders in Korea

Japanese Participants

- 18) Mr. Keishi Kawai
• Suspension of Prosecution in Japan
- 19) Mr. Taiki Matsuura
• Social Investigation Support Tools as a Challenge of Evidence-Based Practice in the Family Court
- 20) Mr. Akinobu Mizobuchi
• The Sentence and Offender Risk Assessment in Japanese Criminal Trials
- 21) Mr. Takashi Nozaki
• The Wide Range of Japanese Statutory Penalties and their Use in Practice
- 22) Ms. Minako Ogawa
• Overview and Challenges: Japan's Evidence-Based Offender Treatment Programmes in the Community
- 23) Ms. Mariko Yabuuchi
• Risk Assessment of Juvenile Sex Offenders – Through the Analysis of Existing Tools
- 24) Ms. Mana Yamamoto
• Evidence-Based Practice in Japanese Prisons: A Focus on the Sex Offender Treatment Programme

Group-Workshop Sessions

Group 1

RISK/NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF OFFENDERS

Chairperson	Mr. Abderahim Rahouti	(Morocco)
Co-Chairperson	Ms. Florina Shem	(Vanuatu)
Rapporteur	Mr. Chun-kit Lawrence Chow	(Hong Kong)
Co-Rapporteur	Mr. Akinobu Mizobuchi	(Japan)
Members	Mr. Carlos Alberto Restrepo Salazar	(Colombia)
	Mr. Pierre Bulenge Shindanao	(DR of the Congo)
	Mr. Mahmoud Ibrahim Al-Qudah	(Jordan)
	Mr. Charles Mutembi Gerrard	(Kenya)
	Mr. Samuel Morales Ramarui	(Palau)
	Ms. Cholchaipaisai Fonethip	(Thailand)
	Mr. Taiki Matsuura	(Japan)
	Ms. Mariko Yabuuchi	(Japan)
Advisers	Prof. Ryo Tsunoda	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Mayu Yoshida	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Yuichi Tada	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Shinichiro Iwashita	(UNAFEI)

Report Summary

Group 1 discussed risk/needs-assessment tools in terms of their definition, importance, use, effectiveness, and limitations. Following their discussions, they noted that challenges to the successful implementation of such tools include resistance from supervisors, staff, inmates, and the community; overcrowding in correctional institutions; lack of financial support; and lack of facilitating legislation. Nevertheless, the Group is strongly committed to promoting the use of such tools and made the following recommendations: 1. evidence-based treatment of offenders is preferable to systems that rely on professional experience and subjective evaluation; 2. participants are urged to make considerable efforts to contribute to the development or implementation of risk/needs-assessment in their respective countries; 3. many of the represented countries are urged to review and amend their laws to incorporate risk/needs-assessment tools; 4. represented countries are urged to establish bilateral, regional, and international partnerships to enhance evidence-based practices, to exchange experiences, and to share updated information; 5. most of the represented countries are urged to hire qualified staff in sufficient numbers to allow adequate implementation of risk/needs-assessment tools; 6. most of the represented countries are recommended to reconsider correctional infrastructure, which directly impacts the outcome of risk/needs-assessment classification, accommodation, and programming; 7. all participants, both Group 1 and Group 2, are requested to strive to continuously exchange experiences and updated information.

The Group concluded that while experience from all countries demonstrates that risk/needs-assessment tools and evidence-based treatment of offenders is a new concept, the Group's study during this course shows that evidence-based assessment is important to better decision making and better management of offenders. Not all represented countries have yet developed risk/needs-assessment tools, but all agree that they shall endeavour to do so or to enhance existing risk/needs tools in their respective countries. Finally, the Group noted that the ad hoc lecturers and Visiting Experts highlighted the effectiveness and importance of risk/needs assessment as evidence-based treatment to reduce reoffending and to improve correctional management in a systematic and scientific way.

Group 2**EVIDENCE-BASED-OFFENDER-TREATMENT PROGRAMMES**

Chairperson	Ms. Mana Yamamoto	(Japan)
Co-Chairperson	Mr. Trevor Rex Rarua	(Vanuatu)
Rapporteur	Ms. Mari Angeli Lucero Rafanan	(Philippines)
Co-Rapporteur	Mr. Keishi Kawai	(Japan)
Co-Rapporteur	Mr. Takashi Nozaki	(Japan)
Members	Mr. Nick Maingi Makuu	(Kenya)
	Mr. Moosa Rameez	(Maldives)
	Ms. Faagutu Natalie Samuelu-Vaalotu	(Samoa)
	Mr. Padet Ringrawd	(Thailand)
	Mr. Jacob Bani	(Vanuatu)
	Mr. Jong-won Yoon	(Korea)
	Ms. Minako Ogawa	(Japan)
Advisers	Prof. Koji Yoshimura	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Akiko Tashiro	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Kumiko Izumi	(UNAFEI)
	Prof. Fumihiko Yanaka	(UNAFEI)

Report Summary

The Group based its discussion on the following agenda: 1. ideas learnt from the Visiting Experts' lectures; 2. the current situation of correctional programmes in each participant's country; 3. the challenges of implementing an evidence-based programme. From the VE's lectures, the participants learnt essential elements of effective treatment programmes, such as the risk, need, and responsivity (RNR) principle, cognitive behaviour treatment, and new trends such as the Good Lives Model and Desistance Theory. The Group also examined the issue of Process and Outcome Evaluation. Based on their discussions, the Group identified four general categories of challenges. Each challenge is followed by a recommendation.

1. Staff: A number of issues can contribute to staffing challenges, including poor or insufficient training, frequent rotation, lack of technical staff, poor motivation, and resistance to change. *Recommendation:* Proper training of assured quality; increased consideration for retention of knowledgeable staff for longer periods of time; simplified tools for exchange of information when staff rotation/turnover is inevitable; hiring of technical staff for implementation of treatment; stress management support for staff experiencing work or family-related problems.

2. Programming: Cultural conflict, inconsistency, lack of evaluation tools, and low offender motivation can be detrimental to treatment programming. *Recommendation:* Programmes developed in foreign countries must be adapted to suit the respective countries in which they might later be used.

3. Capital Resources: Funding and infrastructural challenges are common to the introduction of new treatment programmes. *Recommendation:* In the event that requests for increased budgets are unsuccessful, donors can be tapped. The media can promote public awareness of and support for treatment. Reduced recidivism will reduce prison costs and should lead to raised budget allocations.

4. Information: Poor communication between stakeholders (often in differing locations) hinders the success of treatment programmes. *Recommendation:* Appropriate IT databases should be provided to allow easy access to, and retrieval of, information by all stakeholders. Modern IT should redress the problem of physical isolation and distance.

Observation Visits

<i>Date</i>	<i>Agency/Institution</i>	<i>Main Persons Concerned</i>
23 May	Tokyo District Public Prosecutor's Office	• Mr. Keiichi Watanabe (Chief Prosecutor)
	Ministry of Justice	• Mr. Toshio Ogawa (Minister of Justice)
31 May	Training Institute for Correctional Personnel	• Ms. Yuka Saeki (Director, General Affairs Section)
1 June	Yokohama Probation Office	• Mr. Mutsumi Muto (Principal Probation Officer)
	Yokohama Juvenile Classification Home	• Ms. Akiko Baba (Director)
4 June	Fuchu Prison	• Mr. Yukihisa Fukui (Senior Researcher)
5 June	Tokyo District Court	• Mr. Ryosuke Fujimaki
	Supreme Court	• Mr. Tomoyuki Yokota (Justice)
7 June	Tokyo Family Court	• Mr. Fumio Shimahara (Acting Chief Judge)
18 June	Medical Juvenile Training School "Kanagawa Iryo Shonenin"	• Ms. Makiyo Ishibashi (Superintendent)

Group Study Tour

<i>Date</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Agency/Institution</i>	<i>Main Persons Concerned</i>
13 June	Hiroshima	Chugoku Regional Parole Board and Hiroshima Probation Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Kyoko Yamada (Board Member, Chugoku Regional Parole Board)
14 June	Hiroshima	Halfway House “With Hiroshima”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Kanichi Yamada (Director)
	Shimane	Shimane Asahi Rehabilitation Program Center	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Fumiya Tezuka (Warden)
15 June	Osaka	Juvenile Training School for Girls “Katano Joshi Gakuin”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Takeji Imazu (Superintendent)
	Kyoto	Volunteers of Rehabilitation Chion-in Temple	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Takamichi Mitsunari (Volunteer Probation Officer)

Special Events

16 May *Welcome Party*

18, 21, 22 May *Japanese Conversation Classes*

The overseas participants attended three Japanese conversation classes and learned practical Japanese expressions. The *sensei* (teachers) were Ms. Mariko Hirano and Ms. Kazuko Syukuya from Nihongo-no-kai.

19 May *Grand Sumo Tournament Visit and ACPF Kisei Branch Party*

Following a tour of Asakusa, including a visit to Sensoji Temple, the participants attended the Grand Sumo Tournament at the Ryogoku Kokugikan, Tokyo. They later enjoyed a party hosted by the Kisei Branch of the ACPF, held at the Daiichi Ryogoku Hotel.

23 May *Courtesy Call to the Ministry of Justice and Reception by the Vice-Minister of Justice*

At the conclusion of their courtesy visit to the Minister of Justice, Mr. Toshio Ogawa, a reception was held for the participants by the Vice-Minister of Justice, Mr. Katsuyuki Nishikawa, at the Danwa-shitsu lounge on the 20th floor of the ministry building, overlooking Hibiya Park.

25 May *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. All participants, faculty and staff celebrated later in Lounge B.

29 May *The Way of Tea (Tea Ceremony)*

The participants participated in a “*cha-no-yu*” or “*sado*”, a formal Japanese tea ceremony, kindly hosted by Soroptimist International Tokyo, Fuchu.

30 May *Social with Volunteer Probation Officers*

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

1 June *Yokohama Bay Dinner Cruise*

The participants enjoyed a sunset cruise and dinner aboard the *Marine Rouge*, hosted by the ACPF Yokohama Branch.

21 June *Farewell Party*

A party was held to bid farewell to the participants.

Reference Materials

A. Evidence-Based Practice - General

1. Roger K. Warren and the Crime and Justice Institute, *Evidence-Based Practice to Reduce Recidivism: Implications for State Judiciaries* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections, 2007).
2. Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, *Evidence Based Correctional Practices* (2007), available at http://dcj.state.co.us/ors/pdf/docs/CCJJ_EBP_rpt_v3.pdf.
3. Ralph C. Serin and the Crime and Justice Institute, *Evidence-based practice: Principles for Enhancing Correctional Results in Prisons* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections, 2005).
4. Crime and Justice Institute at Community Resources for Justice, *Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections, 2009).
5. James Bonta and D. A. Andrews, *Risk-Need-Responsivity Model for Offender Assessment and Rehabilitation* (n.p.: Public Safety Canada, 2007).
6. Guy Bourgon et al., *Translating "What Works" into Sustainable Everyday Practice: Program Design, Implementation and Evaluation* (Ottawa: Public Safety Canada, 2009).
7. James Bonta et al., *The Strategic Training Initiative in Community Supervision: Risk-Need-Responsivity in the Real World* (Ottawa: Public Safety Canada, 2010).
8. J. Stephen Wormith, *Adhering to principles of effective correctional treatment: Academic musings of a former clinician and administrator* (2007).
9. Shelley L. Brown, *Cost-Effective Correctional Treatment* (2000).
10. Paul Gendreau, Claire Goggin and Paula Smith, *Cumulating Knowledge: How Meta-Analysis can Serve the Needs of Correctional Clinicians and Policy-Makers* (2000).
11. Chris Trotter, *Effective Supervision of Offenders* (2010).
12. Adult Probation Services Division, *Eight Evidence-Based Principles for Effective Interventions & Timeline of Significant Events in Arizona Probation* (2010).
13. Stephen D. Howell, *Evidence Based Practice in Community Corrections: The British Columbia Experience* (2006).
14. Elyse Clawson, Brad Bogue, and Lore Joplin, *Implementing Evidence-based Practices in Corrections* (2005).
15. *Implementing Evidence-Based Principles in Community Corrections: A Case Study of Successes and Challenges in Maine* (U.S. Department of Justice. National Institute of Corrections, 2001).
16. *Implementing Evidence-Based Practice in Community Corrections: The Principles of Effective Intervention* (U.S. Department of Justice. National Institute of Corrections, and Crime and Justice Institution, 2004).
17. *Motivational Interviewing in Corrections a Comprehensive Guide to Implementing MI in Corrections* (U.S. Department of Justice. National Institute of Corrections, 2012).
18. *Reducing re-offending framework: Setting the scene PAPER NO. 1* (Corrections Victoria, 2004).
19. Paul Gendreau et al., *Running Head: PRACTICING PSYCHOLOGY IN CORRECTIONAL SETTINGS* (2006).
20. National Offender Management Service, *The impact of corrections on re-offending: a review of 'what works'* (2004).
21. Don A. Andrews, *The Importance of the Appropriate Management of Risk and Reintegration Potential* (1999).
22. D.A. Andrews & R.D. Hoge1, *The psychology of criminal conduct and principles of effective prevention and rehabilitation* (1999).
23. Christopher T. Lowenkamp, Edward J. Latessa & Alexander M. Holsinger, *The Risk Principle in*

Action: What Have We Learned From 13,676 Offenders and 97 Correctional Programs? (2006).

24. Paul Gendreau, Paula Smith, and Sheila French, *The Theory of Effective Correctional Intervention: Empirical Status and Future Directions* (2006).
25. National Institute of Corrections, U. S. Department of Justice, and Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, *Tools of the trade a guide to incorporating science in to practice* (n.d.).
26. Sharon M. Kennedy, *Treatment Responsivity: Reducing Recidivism by Enhancing Treatment Effectiveness* (2000).
27. Lore Joplin et al., *Using an Integrated Model to Implement Evidence-based Practices in Corrections* (2004).
28. Friedrich Lösel, *What Works in Offender Rehabilitation: A Global Perspective* (2010).

B. Risk/Needs Assessment

1. Don A. Andrews, *Recidivism Is Predictable and Can Be Influenced: Using Risk Assessments to Reduce Recidivism* (1989).
2. Larry Motiuk, *Classification for Correctional Programming: the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) Process* (1999).
3. James Bonta, *Do we need theory for offender risk assessment?* (1997).
4. Gilbert Taylor, *Implementing risk and needs classification in the Correctional Service of Canada* (1999).
5. James Bonta, *Offender Assessment: General Issues and Considerations* (2000).
6. Laurence L. Motiuk, *Offender Risk Assessment: A Critical Role* (2006).
7. Laurence L. Motiuk and Frank J. Porporino, *Offender Risk/Needs Assessment: A Study of Conditional Releases* (1989).
8. International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy, *Risk Assessment & Risk Management: A Canadian Criminal Justice Perspective* (n.d.).
9. Larry Motiuk, *The Community Risk/Needs Management Scale: An effective supervision tool* (1999).
10. Shelley L. Brown and Laurence L. Motiuk, *The Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA)* (2005).
11. Laurence L. Motiuk and Shelley L. Brown, *The Validity of Offender Needs Identification and Analysis in Community Corrections* (1993).
12. Thomas Blomberg et al., *Validation of the Compas Risk Assessment Classification Instrument* (2010).

C. Correctional Programmes

1. California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation & University of California, Irvine, *Effective Correctional Programmes* (2006).
2. James McGuire, *Defining Correctional Programs* (2000).
3. — *Development of a Program Logic Model to Assist Evaluation* (2000).
4. Dennis J. Stevens, *Education Programming for Offenders* (2000).
5. Friedrich Lösel, *Effective correctional programming: What empirical research tells us and what it doesn't* (1999).
6. Daryl G. Kroner & Masaru Takahashi, *Every Session Counts: The differential impact of previous programmes and current programme dosage on offender recidivism* (2011).
7. David Robinson, *Factors Influencing the Effectiveness of Cognitive Skills Training* (1999).
8. Alan W. Leschied, *Implementation of Effective Correctional Programs* (2000).
9. Mark Gornik, *Moving from Correctional Program to Correctional Strategy: Using Proven Practices to Change Criminal Behavior* (n.d.).
10. Paul Gendreau, Claire Goggin, and Paula Smith, *Obstacles to Effective Correctional Program Delivery* (2000).
11. Christa A. Gillis, *Offender Employment Programming* (2000).
12. Paul Gendreau, *Principles of Effective Correctional Programming* (1999).

13. Donald A. Andrews, *Principles of Effective Correctional Programs* (2000).
14. Audrey Concilio, *Correctional program and site accreditation in Canada* (2003).
15. Gerry Gaes, *Program Evaluation: Guidelines for Asking the Right Questions* (2000).
16. Ralph C. Serin, *Program Evaluation: Intermediate Measures of Treatment Success* (2000).
17. Claude Tellier and Ralph C. Serin, *The Role of Staff in Effective Program Delivery* (2000).

D. Sexual Offenders

1. R. Karl Hanson et al., *Effectiveness of Treatment for Sexual Offenders: Risk, Need, and Responsivity* (2009).
2. Arthur Gordon, *Applying the risk principle to sex offender treatment* (1999).
3. Franca Cortoni & Kevin L. Nunes, *Assessing the Effectiveness of the National Sexual Offender Program* (2007).
4. Leslie Helmus et al., *Assessing the Risk of Older Sex Offenders: Developing the Static-99R and Static-2002R* (2011).
5. R. Karl Hanson et al., *Assessing the risk of sexual offenders on community supervision: The Dynamic Supervision Project* (2007).
6. W.L. Marshall and Sharon Williams, *Assessment and treatment of sexual offenders* (2000).
7. Amy Phenix et al., *Coding Rules for Static-2002* (2002).
8. Lawrence Ellerby et al., *Current Practices in Canadian Sexual Abuser Treatment Programs: The Safer Society 2009 Survey* (2010).
9. R. Karl Hanson, *The Accuracy of Recidivism Risk Assessments for Sexual Offenders: A Meta-Analysis* (2007).
10. Kelly M. Babchishin, R. Karl Hanson, and Leslie Helmus, *The RRASOR, Static-99R and Static-2002R All Add Incrementally to the Prediction of Recidivism among Sex Offenders* (2011).
11. R. Karl Hanson and Andrew Harris, *The Sex Offender Need Assessment Rating (SONAR): A Method for Measuring Change in Risk Levels* (2000).
12. R. Karl Hanson, *The Validity of Static-99 with Older Sexual Offenders* (2005).

E. Drug Offenders

1. Ojmarrh Mitchell et al., *The Effectiveness of Incarceration-Based Drug Treatment on Criminal Behavior* (2006).
2. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *Matrix Clients Handbook* (2006).
3. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *Matrix Clients Treatment Companion* (2006).
4. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *Matrix Counselor Treatment Manual* (2006).
5. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *Matrix Family Education Manual* (2006).
6. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *Principles of Drug Abuse Treatment for Criminal Justice Populations – Second Edition* (2009).
7. Lynn O. Lightfoot, *Programming for Offenders with Substance Abuse* (2000).
8. Dan Kunic, *The Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse (CASA)* (2006).

F. Violent Offenders

1. Franca Cortoni, Kevin Nunes, and Mark Latendresse, *An Examination of the Effectiveness of the Violence Prevention Program* (2006).
2. Craig Dowden, Kelley Blanchette, and Ralph Serin, *Anger Management Programming For Federal Male Inmates: An Effective Intervention* (1999).
3. Mary Ann Campbell, Sheila French, and Paul Gendreau, *Assessing the Utility of Risk Assessment Tools and Personality Measures in the Prediction of Violent Recidivism for Adult Offenders* (2007).
4. Larry Motiuk, Carson Smiley, and Kelley Blanchette, *Intensive programming for violent offenders: A comparative investigation* (1999).
5. Ralph C. Serin and Denise L. Preston, *Programming for violent offenders* (2000).
6. D. Elaine Pressman, *Risk Assessment Decisions for Violent Political Extremism* (2009).

7. Guy Bourgon and James Bonta, *Risk Assessment For General Assault And Partner Abusers* (2004).
8. Ralph Serin and Shelley Brown, *Strategies for enhancing the treatment of violent offenders* (1999).
9. Ralph C. Serin and Donna L. Mailloux, *The Utility of Clinical and Actuarial Risk Assessments for Offenders in Pre-Release Psychiatric Decision-Making* (2000).
10. R. Karl Hanson, Leslie Helmus, and Guy Bourgon, *The Validity of Risk Assessments for Intimate Partner violence: A Meta-Analysis* (2007).
11. Ralph C. Serin and Denise L. Preston, *Violent Offender Programming* (2000).

G. Female Offenders

1. Doris Fortin, *A correctional programming strategy for women* (2004).
2. D. A. Andrews & Craig Dowden, *A meta-analytic investigation into effective correctional intervention for female offenders* (1999).
3. Kelley Blanchette, *Classifying female offenders for correctional interventions* (1999).
4. — *Effective Correctional Practice with Women Offenders* (2000).
5. Nancy L. Stableforth, *Effective corrections for women offenders* (1999).
6. Larry Motiuk and Mark Nafekh, *Reintegration potential profiles for federally sentenced women* (1999).

H. Juvenile Offenders

1. Robert D. Hoge, *Advances in the Assessment and Treatment of Juvenile Offenders* (2008).
2. — *Issues In The Assessment of Juvenile Offenders* (2009).
3. — *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Assessment and Treatment* (2009).

Experts and Participants List

Visiting Experts

Dr. Laurence Louis Motiuk	Special Adviser Infrastructure Renewal Group Correctional Service Canada Canada
Dr. Edward James Latessa	Professor & Director School of Criminal Justice University of Cincinnati USA
Mr. Timothy Hee Sun Leo	Chief Psychologist & Director Psychological & Correctional Rehabilitation Division Singapore Prison Service Singapore

Overseas Participants

Mr. Carlos Alberto Restrepo Salazar	Major Intelligence Division National Police of Colombia Colombia
Mr. Pierre Bulenge Shindano	Vice Prosecutor High Court Prosecutor Office Democratic Republic of the Congo
Mr. Mahmoud Ibrahim Al-Qudah	Deputy Director Correction and Rehabilitation Center Correction and Rehabilitation Department Public Security Directorate Jordan
Mr. Nick Maingi Makuu	District Probation Officer Probation and Aftercare Service Office of the Vice-President and Ministry of Home Affairs Kenya
Mr. Charles Mutembei Gerrard	Senior Superintendent Meru Main Prison Kenya Prisons Service Office of the Vice President and Ministry of Home Affairs Kenya

Mr. Moosa Rameez	Senior Administration Officer Parole Unit Department of Penitentiary and Rehabilitation Services Ministry of Home Affairs Maldives
Mr. Abderahim Rahouti	Director of the Training Academy Division of Recruitment, Training and Improvement of Competences The Directorate of the Penitentiary Administration and Insertion Morocco
Mr. Samuel Morales Ramarui	Police Supervisor Bureau of Public Safety Ministry of Justice Palau
Ms. Mari Angeli Lucero Rafanan	Chief Administrative Division Directorate for Investigation and Prosecution Bureau of Jail Management and Penology Philippines
Ms. Faagutu Natalie Samuelu-Vaalotu	Principal Probation and Parole Officer Probation and Parole Services Ministry of Justice and Courts Administration Samoa
Ms. Fonethip Cholchaipaisal	Senior Probation Officer Probation Development Bureau Rehabilitation Offender Group Department of Probation Ministry of Justice Thailand
Mr. Padet Ringrawd	Director Office of Drug Suppression and Prevention Department of Corrections Ministry of Justice Thailand
Mr. Jacob Bani	Prison Manager Correctional Centre/Prison Department of Correctional Services Vanuatu
Mr. Trevor Rex Rarua	Probation Officer Corrections – Probation Services Section

Department of Correctional Services
Vanuatu

Ms. Florina Shem

Custodial Assessment Officer
Luganville Correctional Centre
Department of Correctional Services
Vanuatu

Observers

Mr. Chun-kit Lawrence Chow

Principal Officer
Lai Chi Kok Reception Centre
Hong Kong

Mr. Jong-won Yoon

Chief Inspector
Seoul Detention Center
Korea

Japanese Participants

Mr. Keishi Kawai

Public Prosecutor
Utsunomiya District Public Prosecutor's
Office

Mr. Taiki Matsuura

Senior Family Court Probation Officer
Tokyo Family Court

Mr. Akinobu Mizobuchi

Assistant Judge
Tokyo District Court

Mr. Takashi Nozaki

Public Prosecutor
Kochi District Public Prosecutor's Office

Ms. Minako Ogawa

Probation Officer
Treatment Division
Chiba Probation Office

Ms. Mariko Yabuuchi

Classification Officer
Treatment Division
Wakayama Prison

Ms. Mana Yamamoto

Official
Prison Service Division
Ministry of Justice

**THE TWELFTH COUNTRY-FOCUSED TRAINING COURSE
ON THE JUVENILE-DELINQUENT TREATMENT SYSTEM FOR KENYA**

The Twelfth Country-Focused Training Course on the Juvenile-Delinquent Treatment System for Kenya was held from 14 February to 9 March 2012 at UNAFEI. Fourteen participants attended.

Mr. Justus David Muthoka	Acting Senior Assistant Director Department of Children Services Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development
Mr. Philip Ngolya Nzenge	Principal Children's Officer Department of Children Services Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development
Ms. Esther Wasige	Chief Children's Officer Department of Children Services Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development
Mr. Alfred Bethwel Dieto Abomah	Chief Children's Officer Department of Children Services Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development
Mr. Francis Kisilu Katiku	Chief Children's Officer Department of Children Services Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development
Ms. Beatrice Mbera Obutu	Chief Children's Officer Department of Children Services Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development
Mr. Philip Omolo Nyagigo	Principal Probation Officer Probation and Aftercare Services Office of the Vice President and Ministry of Home Affairs
Ms. Serah Makaa John	Chief Probation Officer Probation and Aftercare Services Office of the Vice President and Ministry of Home Affairs
Mr. Andrew Kimunguyi Nyongesa	Chief Probation Officer Probation and Aftercare Services Office of the Vice President and

Mr. Jacob Kiptuei A. Sum	Ministry of Home Affairs Chief Probation Officer Probation and Aftercare Services Office of the Vice President and Ministry of Home Affairs
Ms. Susan Nyaboke Nyasinga	Senior Social Welfare Officer Kenya Prisons Service Office of the Vice President and Ministry of Home Affairs
Mr. Aggrey Adagi Obeli	Senior Superintendent of Prisons Shimo La Tewa Borstal Kenya Prisons Service Office of the Vice President and Ministry of Home Affairs
Ms. Ronaldine Mocho Washika Wachira	Senior Resident Magistrate Kapenguria Law Court Judiciary
Mr. Denis Wafula Wanjala	Sergeant Police Headquarters Kenya Police Service

THE EIGHTH SEMINAR ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE FOR CENTRAL ASIA

The Eighth Seminar on Criminal Justice for Central Asia was held from 29 February to 15 March 2012 at UNAFEI. The Seminar was entitled “Addressing Corruption which Hinders Countermeasures for Drug Offences and Other Crimes: Especially, Ethics and Codes of Conduct for Judges, Prosecutors and Law Enforcement Officials”. Nine participants attended from four Central Asian countries, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.

Mr. Kaken Kassabulatov	Judge Almaty District Court Kazakhstan
Mr. Aibek Nurakhmetov	Head of the Division Department of International Cooperation Kazakhstan
Mr. Azamat Ibraimov	Deputy Head Office for the Supervision of the Legality of Executive Organizations of Local Governments Prosecutor General’s Office Kyrgyzstan
Mr. Naimjon Bobokalonov	Head of the Division Department of Internal Affairs in Sughd Region Ministry of Internal Affairs Tajikistan
Ms. Mavzhyuda Kasymova	Judge Council of Justice in Tursunzoda City Tajikistan
Mr. Dzhamshed Sangov	Head of the Department Department of Investigation of Special Criminal Cases General Prosecutor’s Office Tajikistan
Mr. Jahongir Mamasoliev	Investigator Main Criminal Investigation Department Ministry of Internal Affairs Uzbekistan
Mr. Djakhangir Mirsafaev	Senior Investigator of Cases of Special Importance Department on Combating Economic Crimes and Corruption General Prosecutor’s Office

Mr. Yoqub Ziyodulloyev

Uzbekistan

Judge
Supreme Court
Uzbekistan

INFORMATION ABOUT FORTHCOMING PROGRAMMES

1. The 15th UNAFEI UNCAC Training Programme

The 15th UNAFEI UNCAC Training Programme will be held from 11 October to 14 November 2012. In this Course, seven Japanese and 26 overseas officials engaged in corruption control will comparatively analyse the current situation of corruption, methods of combating corruption and measures to enhance international cooperation.

2. The 152nd International Training Course

The 152nd International Training Course is scheduled for 23 August to 28 September 2012. The main theme of the Course is “Trafficking in Persons – Prevention, Prosecution, Victim Protection and Promotion of International Cooperation”. Sixteen overseas participants and six Japanese participants will attend.

Rationale

Trafficking in persons is a heinous crime that grievously harms its victims. Every year, thousands of men, women, and children are trafficked and subjected to sexual exploitation, forced labour, slavery or other forms of exploitation. Many of them are exposed to multiple and chronic traumatising events such as restriction of movement, direct physical violence, and verbal and psychological abuse, causing a number of physical and mental health problems that are difficult to recover from.

The growing recognition that trafficking in persons is a global problem resulted in the adoption of the “Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children,” supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

The Protocol entered into force on 25 December 2003, and its purposes are: (a) to prevent and combat trafficking in persons, paying particular attention to women and children; (b) to protect and assist the victims of such trafficking, with full respect for their human rights; and (c) to promote cooperation among States Parties in order to meet those objectives (Article 2).

Prevention

Human trafficking is difficult to detect, and once committed, its negative impacts on victims are difficult to redress. Therefore, prevention should be a major component of any anti-human-trafficking policies or programs. In this regard, the Trafficking in Persons Protocol requires States Parties to strengthen border control (Article 11) and take measures to prevent the misuse of travel and identity documents (Article 12). Awareness-raising efforts (Article 9) are also essential as they can alert vulnerable groups to the risks of victimisation; mobilise public support for measures to detect and prevent trafficking; and encourage victims to come forward.

Prosecution

Trafficking in persons is carried out by several actors in an organized and clandestine way. Traffickers change methods and routes constantly, and victims are often transported across national borders. These elements make trafficking in persons a particularly difficult crime to investigate and successfully prosecute. Witness protection, measures to encourage accomplice testimony, and special investigative techniques such as controlled delivery, electronic surveillance, and undercover operations are examples of useful tools to prosecute sophisticated, organized criminal activity.

Another characteristic of trafficking in persons cases is the often-encountered difficulty in obtaining the full cooperation of the victims. They are placed under a blend of control measures such as

violence, coercion, and deception by the traffickers, and many victims are led to believe it disadvantageous to cooperate with the authorities. They may even show hostility towards law enforcement officers. Investigators and prosecutors need to know how to deal with these challenges.

Victim Protection

The Trafficking in Persons Protocol contains several specific provisions calling for protection of trafficking victims. States Parties are required to consider implementing measures to provide for physical, psychological, and social recovery of victims, including provision of appropriate housing; medical, psychological and material assistance; and employment, education and training opportunities (Article 6, paragraph 3). In addition, States Parties are required to consider adopting measures that permit victims to remain in their territories (Article 7), and they should also cooperate and facilitate the repatriation of the victims (Article 8).

Promoting International Cooperation

A significant proportion of trafficking-in-persons cases are transnational, and even domestic cases may involve victims or offenders who originate from an outside jurisdiction. These transnational elements aggravate the complexity and difficulties of investigation and prosecution.

Varying legal requirements and restrictions, jurisdictional problems, differences in criminal law and procedure, lack of coordination, and translation and language problems are some of the most frequently experienced barriers to international cooperation and mutual legal assistance.

Objectives of the Programme

The objective of this Course is to offer participants an opportunity to share experiences, gain knowledge, and examine measures against trafficking in persons. In order to achieve this purpose, the Course programme will provide an opportunity to examine the current situations and problems existing in the respective countries.

Specific topics to be addressed are the following;

- 1) Definition of trafficking in persons
- 2) The actual situation of trafficking in persons
 - (i) The current situation of trafficking in persons
 - (ii) Modus Operandi and means of trafficking in persons
 - (iii) Forms of exploitation
 - (iv) Analysis of the causes of trafficking in persons
- 3) Measures for Prosecution
 - (i) Criminalisation of trafficking in persons and related acts
 - (ii) Obstacles to the investigation of trafficking in persons
 - (iii) Detecting trafficking in persons
 - (iv) Victim-related issues (Identification of victims, interviewing victims, and victim protection during investigations)
 - (v) Witness protection and measures to encourage cooperation (immunity grants, mitigation of punishment, etc.)
 - (vi) Special investigative techniques (controlled delivery, electronic surveillance, undercover operations, etc.)
 - (vii) International cooperation (extradition, mutual legal assistance, law-enforcement cooperation)
 - (viii) Confiscation of proceeds of crime

4) Measures for Protection

- (i) Immigration Status
- (ii) Assistance for living (residence, translation, medical care, psychological care, etc.)
- (iii) Reintegration (education, vocational training, etc.)
- (iv) Assistance to return home
- (v) Assistance for restitution and compensation

5) Measures for Prevention

- (i) Border control
- (ii) Measures against misuse of travel and identity documents
- (iii) Awareness raising.

ADMINISTRATIVE NEWS

Faculty Changes

Mr. Naoyuki Harada, formerly a professor of UNAFEI, was transferred to the Tokyo District Public Prosecutor's Office on 1 April 2012.

Mr. Yuichiro Wakimoto, formerly a professor of UNAFEI, was transferred to Fukuoka Prison on 1 April 2012.

Ms. Ayako Sakonji, formerly a professor of UNAFEI, was transferred to Wakayama Probation Office on 1 April 2012.

Mr. Haruhiko Higuchi, formerly a professor of UNAFEI, was appointed as a professor of the National Police Academy on 1 April 2012.

Mr. Shinichiro Iwashita, formerly a public prosecutor of Tokyo District Public Prosecutor's Office, Tachikawa Branch, was appointed as a professor of UNAFEI on 1 April 2012.

Mr. Koji Yoshimura, formerly an officer of the International Affairs Division of Yokohama Prison, was appointed as a professor of UNAFEI on 1 April 2012.

Ms. Akiko Tashiro, formerly an officer at Yokohama Probation Office, was appointed as a professor of UNAFEI on 1 April 2012.

Mr. Naoya Oyaizu, formerly a staff member of the Policy Research Center of the National Police Academy, was appointed as a professor of UNAFEI on 1 April 2012.

Overseas Trips by Staff

Deputy Director Haruhiko Ukawa, Professor Naoyuki Harada, Professor Kumiko Izumi, and Professor Fumihiko Yanaka visited Malaysia, Cambodia, Thailand and Indonesia from 14 to 24 February 2012, to hold preparatory meetings for future Good Governance Seminars for Southeast Asian Countries. The UNAFEI delegation also discussed the possibilities of future co-hosting cooperation with the Malaysian and Indonesian anti-corruption authorities.

Professor Yuichiro Tada, Ms. Yoshiko Tani (Staff) and Mr. Takashi Okaniwa (Staff) visited Beijing, China from 6 to 9 March 2012 to attend the Seminar on Regional Cooperation in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, held at the College for Criminal Law Science of Beijing Normal University. Professor Tada gave an introduction of UNAFEI's activities to the Seminar.

Director Tatsuya Sakuma and Professor Shinichiro Iwashita visited Vienna, Austria from 22 to 29 April to attend the 21st session of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, held at the United Nations Office in Vienna.

Deputy Director Haruhiko Ukawa visited Hong Kong, China from 8 to 12 May 2012 to attend the Fifth session of the Independent Commission against Corruption.

FACULTY AND STAFF OF UNAFEI

Faculty:

Mr. Tatsuya Sakuma	Director
Mr. Haruhiko Ukawa	Deputy Director
Mr. Motoo Noguchi	Professor
Ms. Kumiko Izumi	Professor
Mr. Fumihiko Yanaka	Professor
Mr. Shinichiro Iwashita	Professor
Mr. Yuichi Tada	Professor, Chief of Training Division
Mr. Naoya Oyaizu	Professor
Mr. Ryo Tsunoda	Professor, Chief of Information and Library Service Division
	151st Course Programming Officer
Mr. Koji Yoshimura	Professor, Chief of Research Division
Ms. Akiko Tashiro	Professor, 151st Course Deputy Programming Officer
Ms. Mayu Yoshida	Professor, 151st Course Deputy Programming Officer
Ms. Grace Lord	Linguistic Adviser

Secretariat:

Mr. Takashi Hagiwara	Chief of Secretariat
Mr. Seiichi Sugiyama	Co-Deputy Chief of Secretariat
Mr. Takeshi Fujita	Co-Deputy Chief of Secretariat

General and Financial Affairs Section:

Mr. Hiroki Miyazaki	Chief Officer
Mr. Masato Honda	Officer
Ms. Aoi Hichiguro	Officer

Training and Hostel Management Affairs Section:

Mr. Shinichi Yamamoto	Chief Officer
Mr. Yoshiki Fukuta	Chief Officer
Ms. Rie Suzuki	Officer
Mr. Shinichi Inoue	Officer, 151st Course Assistant Programming Officer

International Research Affairs Section:

Mr. Takuya Furuhashi	Officer
Ms. Naoko Iwakata	Librarian

Secretarial Staff:

Ms. Hisayo Yamada	Officer
-------------------	---------

Kitchen:

Ms. Sae Sakai	Chef
---------------	------

JICA Co-ordinator for the 151st International Training Course:

Ms. Kiyomi Hoshino	JICA
--------------------	------

