

UNAFEI NEWSLETTER

UNAFEI

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

No. 164
March 2022

Established
1961

IN THIS ISSUE

	<i>Page</i>
LETTER FROM THE DIRECTOR.....	1
THE 177 TH INTERNATIONAL SENIOR SEMINAR.....	3
PREVENTING REOFFENDING THROUGH A MULTI-STAKEHOLDER APPROACH	
Seminar Rationale.....	3
Seminar Summary.....	13
Lecture Topics.....	14
Individual Presentations.....	15
Group Workshop Presentations.....	17
Reference Materials	19
Expert and Participant List	20
INFORMATION ABOUT FORTHCOMING PROGRAMMES	23
The 178 th International Training Course	23
The Second Youth International Training Course	23
FACULTY AND STAFF OF UNAFEI.....	24

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 177th International Senior Seminar on Preventing Reoffending Through a Multi-Stakeholder Approach, which took place online from 12 January to 3 February 2022. In this Seminar, we welcomed 19 overseas participants: 2 from Africa, 13 from Asia, 3 from Latin America and 1 from Europe. The participants included judges, prosecutors, police officers and other public officials involved in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice. As this newsletter demonstrates, the Seminar was extremely productive. It consisted of lectures by a specialist lecturer, ad hoc lecturers, UNAFEI faculty members, individual presentations and interactive online discussion sessions.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development seeks to create a world in which no one is left behind. In pursuit of that goal, the Kyoto Declaration – adopted at the 14th United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice – recognizes the importance of multidisciplinary, multi-stakeholder partnerships in preventing crime and reducing reoffending. These diverse stakeholders can be found in the public and private sectors, bringing a wide array of expertise and resources to offender rehabilitation and social reintegration. However, to realize the benefits of the multi-stakeholder approach, justice systems must first incorporate rehabilitative perspectives into penalties and case dispositions and actively promote interventions, treatment and support tailored to offenders' individual needs.

UNAFEI, as one of the institutes of the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme Network, held this Seminar to offer participants an opportunity to clarify and analyse the current situation of multi-stakeholder involvement in offender rehabilitation and social reintegration in each participating country and to explore more effective practices for doing so. Additionally, the participants were able to share experiences, gain knowledge, and build a human network of counterparts.

During the Seminar, the participants diligently and comprehensively examined the main theme, primarily through a comparative analysis. The participants shared their own experiences and knowledge of the issues and identified problems and areas in which improvements could be made. With the academic and practical input from the specialist lecturer, ad hoc lecturers and UNAFEI faculty – and the in-depth discussions they had with each other – the participants are now better equipped to enhance the policies and practices related to the multi-stakeholder approach to offender rehabilitation and social reintegration in their respective countries.


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

I would also like to express my great appreciation to the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) for its immeasurable support throughout the Seminar. At the same time, a warm tribute must be paid to the Asia Crime Prevention Foundation (ACPF) and its branch organizations for their substantial contributions to our activities. Lastly, I owe my gratitude to all the individuals whose unselfish efforts behind the scenes contributed significantly to the successful realization of this Seminar.

With the knowledge and perspectives gained through this training course, 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 towards the benefit of international society as a whole.

Finally, I would like to reiterate my best regards to the participants of the 177th International Senior Seminar. I hope that the experience they gained during the Seminar proves valuable in their daily work and that the bonds fostered among the participants, the specialist lecturer and UNAFEI staff will continue to grow for many years to come.

March 2022



MORINAGA Taro
Director, UNAFEI

THE 177th INTERNATIONAL SENIOR SEMINAR

PREVENTING REOFFENDING THROUGH A MULTI-STAKEHOLDER APPROACH

Seminar Rationale

1. Introduction

In order to build a safe and inclusive society, it is crucial not only to prevent reoffending but also to facilitate offenders' rehabilitation and reintegration as responsible members of society. In 2015, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the "2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development" (or Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs))¹. Goal 16 is to "promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels". To build inclusive societies, it is important for criminal justice authorities to take measures to ensure that each offender is successfully rehabilitated and reintegrated into society as a law-abiding citizen.

The United Nations standards and norms in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice recognize and encourage rehabilitative approaches. For instance, the revised United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules) (General Assembly resolution 70/175, annex), in particular, highlight the fact that the purposes of imprisonment—namely, "to protect society against crime and to reduce recidivism"—can only be achieved if the period of imprisonment is used to ensure the reintegration of offenders into society upon release, so that they can lead law-abiding and self-supporting lives. The Nelson Mandela Rules recognize the necessity to tailor treatment to the individual needs of offenders by assessing the risks that prisoners may pose and the needs that they may have and preparing a programme of treatment suitable to their needs, capacities and dispositions. With regard to offenders with special needs, in particular women, the United Nations Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders (the Bangkok Rules) (General Assembly resolution 65/229, annex) emphasize the importance of careful individual assessments taking account of those needs and specific rehabilitation and reintegration programmes. Similarly, the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-custodial Measures (the Tokyo Rules) (General Assembly resolution 45/110, annex) promote the use of non-custodial measures, such as probation, parole and fines, and emphasize the importance of the involvement of volunteers and other community resources. To achieve the social reintegration of offenders, it is important that criminal justice authorities respect these provisions.

Also, the Kyoto Declaration adopted at the 14th United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice² sets out a number of provisions to address the issue of reducing reoffending and emphasizes the importance of ensuring rehabilitative environments in prison and in the community towards social reintegration (paragraphs 37–42).

Practitioners at every stage of the criminal justice process should consider appropriate interventions, treatment and support which will help each offender to live a sustainable, sound

¹ General Assembly resolution 70/1.

² A/CONF.234/16 (2021).

life without reoffending, including after criminal justice sanctions have ended. In doing so, the individual's characteristics, such as criminogenic needs and protective factors for rehabilitation should be properly assessed, identified and addressed in the interventions, treatment and support.

Offenders have a wide range of risk, needs and strengths which should be addressed, such as employment, housing, education, social welfare, healthcare, family relations and peer support. This calls for a tailored approach to the individual's interventions, treatment and support. In particular, sustainable employment is a key factor for successful reintegration, as it is not simply a source of income but helps offenders to reconnect with the community and contributes to the enhancement of their self-esteem, self-confidence and self-efficacy. Adequate housing can be identified as another key factor. The lack of suitable housing poses a reoffending risk and is a major challenge that former prisoners face at the time of re-entry. Without adequate accommodation, it is extremely difficult to sustain employment and live independently. Further, the Covid-19 pandemic brought about tremendous impacts on every aspect of our daily lives, and its negative impacts have been particularly severe on vulnerable populations, including released offenders, facing social, economic and other specific needs. Therefore, their needs arising from, or amplified by the pandemic, should not be underestimated in seeking tailored interventions and support.

In order to facilitate social reintegration of offenders, it is necessary to address these various areas for support. Given the variety of needs of offenders, it is evident that criminal justice authorities alone are not able to provide all necessary interventions, treatment and support. Also, we should be mindful that criminal justice authorities can only intervene in the lives of offenders within the scope of the criminal justice process and said authorities' mandate to carry out criminal justice sanctions and guide rehabilitation. In other words, they are usually prohibited from providing supervision or support to people after the expiration of sentences, which quite often takes place long before their successful social reintegration. Therefore, a variety of authorities, expertise and assistance is necessary in deciding adequate penalties and their alternatives and providing necessary interventions, treatment and support responding to individual needs for rehabilitation. This also applies to ensuring rehabilitative environments and processes in correctional institutions and in the community, and promoting public understanding and acceptance.

Authority over certain areas of support is mainly vested in public agencies outside of the justice sector at the state or local level. Some areas of expertise or assistance are unavailable without the involvement of NGOs and other private-sector organizations and individuals. It is of vital importance to take a multi-stakeholder approach with active participation of a wide range of relevant sectors and persons in a concerted manner, including understanding and acceptance of the public at large. Public-private partnership and active involvement of the community are particularly important to ensure the continuity of interventions, treatment and support for the imprisoned persons, in light of their smooth reintegration into the community after release. Relevant stakeholders include, but are not limited to, job assistance agencies, employers, temporary-housing agencies and suppliers, schools, welfare agencies, healthcare services and facilities, family members, and faith-based organizations, NGOs and community volunteers which provide various types of support including peer support.

Target 17.17 of the SDGs seeks to "encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships", which is relevant to reducing reoffending and facilitating offenders'

rehabilitation and reintegration. Also, the Kyoto Declaration, encourages the Member States to “Promote multi-stakeholder partnerships to reduce reoffending by fostering inter-agency coordination among relevant government authorities, such as employment and social welfare agencies and local governments, as well as public-private partnerships between those authorities and the community, including cooperating employers and community volunteers who support the long-term and social reintegration of offenders”(paragraph 39) and “Raise awareness of the importance of the public acceptance of offenders as members of the community and the significance of community engagement in assisting their long-term and social reintegration”(paragraph 40).

2. Selecting and Providing Effective Interventions, Treatment and Support

a. Penalties and case dispositions with due regard to rehabilitative perspectives

At each phase of the criminal justice process, appropriate decisions should be made, and adequate interventions, treatment and support should be provided. In deciding a penalty or case disposition, rehabilitative perspectives should be taken into consideration. In particular, it should be noted that imprisonment alone is insufficient to prevent reoffending and that it has a large adverse effect on social reintegration prospects caused by stigmatization, restricted contacts with the outside world, including the offender’s family, and the risk of institutionalization, that is, the risk for people to spend long periods of time in prison and to develop deficits in their social and life skills. This is particularly true where the prisons are overcrowded, whereby their rehabilitative environments are undermined. Whereas imprisonment can have a positive impact on reducing reoffending if the prison environment is appropriate and if prison administrations follow a rehabilitative approach, community-based treatment is more cost-effective and better supports the social reintegration of offenders, as it enables offenders to benefit from necessary interventions and support while maintaining their lives in the community and avoiding social barriers stemming from institutionalization. Thus, imprisonment should be imposed as a measure of “last resort”, without prejudice to the principle of proportionality, the protection of society and the rights of the victims, and adequate use of non-custodial measures should be encouraged. Furthermore, the Covid-19 pandemic has increased recognition of the importance of their active use. By the nature of its closed setting, prisons are vulnerable to the spread of viruses, resulting in the health risks of inmates and a number of restrictions leading to less opportunities for rehabilitation programmes and severe limitations to contacts with the outside world. The infection risks and other negative impacts are aggravated by prison overcrowding, and therefore, it has been reiterated that non-custodial measures should be used more flexibly at each phase of the criminal justice process to alleviate this emerging challenge.

The Tokyo Rules stress the importance of non-custodial measures and state that “Member States shall develop non-custodial measures within their legal systems to provide other options, thus reducing the use of imprisonment, and to rationalize criminal justice policies, taking into account the observance of human rights, the requirements of social justice and the rehabilitation needs of the offender” (article 1.5).

Many types of penalties and case dispositions are available in criminal proceedings as possible options. However, the availability of such options varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, due to the diversity in criminal justice systems and social, cultural or other backgrounds. As one of the options, non-custodial penalties or dispositions may be available at the pre-trial, sentencing and post-sentencing phases. Non-custodial options at the pre-trial phase include a decision not to prosecute, to suspend prosecution and to divert the case from criminal proceedings, such as through the mediation process and use of therapeutic measures

for substance abusers with or without the consent or order of the court. Options at the sentencing phase include a fine, community sanctions and suspension of imprisonment. Options at the post-sentencing stage, which are for incarcerated offenders, include parole and conditional release. Some of these non-custodial sanctions themselves involve supervision or other interventions, treatment or support in the community. Other non-custodial measures can be applied in combination with or without community supervision or other treatment etc. This flexibility enables the sentencing or other decision-making institution to tailor the non-custodial options to each offender's unique risk and needs. Further, restorative justice programmes at various phases are available in a number of jurisdictions, and they can pave the way for non-custodial measures and early release.

The availability of such options and the extent to which they can be applied differs from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. For example, in a number of jurisdictions, non-custodial penalties are only applicable to certain less serious crimes. Furthermore, even where a wide range of non-custodial penalties or dispositions is stipulated by law, jurisdictions apply them differently in practice. Also, a decision to impose a non-custodial sentence is much more likely to occur in jurisdictions where the general public has a positive attitude towards offender rehabilitation in the community and where community corrections systems are in place. Some jurisdictions have codified options for non-custodial sanctions but have no or little application in practice due to low levels of public understanding or the lack of authorities or institutions responsible for community-based treatment.

Furthermore, in sentencing or case dispositions, "proportionality" is the guiding principle that balances factors such as the nature of the criminal act, the rights of victims, protection of society and the fundamental rights of the offenders. It should be noted that limits in practice based on this understanding may impede incorporating rehabilitative perspectives in sentencing and case dispositions.

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

Further, it should be noted that non-custodial measures that involve community supervision are not always the best option to prevent reoffending and facilitate offenders' rehabilitation. In some cases, excessive use of supervision etc. for low-risk offenders may result in "net-widening", which actually increases reoffending risk due to unnecessary interventions. Also, even for the offenders to whom applying community supervision seems to be effective, necessary intervention and support for the offender greatly varies by each case. Therefore, in deciding adequate penalties and their alternatives, and providing necessary interventions and treatment for rehabilitation, it is necessary to conduct an assessment to identify the offenders' individual needs and social environments representing their risk factors and protective factors for their social reintegration.

For this purpose, it is also necessary to have mechanisms to collect adequate information at relevant phases of the criminal justice process. For instance, to make a decision at the pre-trial and sentencing phases, in addition to collecting evidence on the offence and impacts on victims, information on the offender's risk, needs and strengths should be collected in order to take account of rehabilitative perspectives. Such information includes the offender's accommodation and employment situation, available support from the community and so on.

In some jurisdictions, such information is provided in the pre-sentencing report, whereas in some jurisdictions, it can be collected during criminal investigations.

At the post-sentencing phase for imprisoned offenders, in many jurisdictions, risk and needs assessments are conducted in prisons for the purpose of providing adequate interventions and treatment, and assessment on social environment factors is conducted to identify the circumstances after release. In addition, if, prior to the decision, criminal justice authorities and relevant stakeholders can improve the offender's social environment to a more rehabilitative one, that will encourage the decision-making institutions, including the judiciary, to take more lenient and rehabilitative options. For instance, if, prior to prosecution or sentencing, efforts have been made to ensure that, for instance, the offender's family or employer is well prepared to appropriately support the offender after release, this may encourage imposition of a non-custodial sanction. As another example at the post-sentencing phase for imprisoned offenders, similar coordination starting from the early stage of imprisonment leads to active use of early release options and minimizes the term of imprisonment.

b. A multi-stakeholder approach to interventions, treatment and support

Assessment plays a key role in providing adequate interventions, treatment and support tailored to individual needs. The offender's needs can be addressed only where the interventions, treatment and support are based on an adequate assessment. Through an adequate assessment, the offender's risk factors and protective factors for rehabilitation will be identified. The assessment should cover the facts of the crime as well as the offender's human and social capital, such as the offender's personal abilities, self-efficacy, and physical, mental, psychological, or social difficulties, family relations, accommodation and employment situation, and available support from the community to help offenders live independently. Factors identified on the basis of assessments lead to effective interventions and treatment that support the offender's reintegration into the community. Sharing this information with relevant stakeholders, to the extent necessary and as long as it does not hamper rehabilitative purposes, creates an important basis for effective multi-stakeholder cooperation.

It is necessary to involve various public and private stakeholders in the interventions, treatment and support both in correctional institutions and in the community. For instance, treatment programmes targeting specific groups of offenders (e.g. sex offenders, drug addicts) should be conducted in cooperation with medical institutions, rehabilitation centres and so forth. To provide effective vocational training and other job assistance, actual demands in the labour market should be reflected, and such assistance is possible only with the involvement of public and private employment agencies and companies. Housing support and coordinating family relations can be facilitated in cooperation with community members and the private sector, such as NGOs and volunteers. For offenders with physical or mental disabilities, it is necessary to cooperate with medical, social welfare, and healthcare services and facilities.

There are a number of challenges and issues in the rehabilitation process that should be addressed with a multi-stakeholder approach. First, it is not easy for incarcerated offenders to return to the community and restart their lives upon release, due to the social barriers they face. Therefore, ensuring their smooth transition from prison to society has been a major challenge. In this regard, continuity in the interventions, treatment and support is extremely important to reduce their reoffending risks and facilitate rehabilitation. Interventions, treatment and support in prisons should aim at preparing for return to the community and building bridges with community-based approaches. Close coordination and cooperation between prison and community-based treatment authorities/providers is of vital importance. Moreover, seamless

and effective interventions and support can be provided only with a multi-stakeholder approach, engaging all relevant stakeholders, such as state and local governments, public and private sector entities from various fields, and community members. For instance, coordination of their social environments, such as with family members, employers, relevant private-sector organizations, NGOs and community volunteers, from an early stage of incarceration contributes to offenders' smooth reintegration into society and reduces the risk of reoffending.

Second, many countries have not established or sufficiently applied community corrections, because legislation, regulations or guidelines are underdeveloped, designated authorities or bodies are not equipped with a sufficient level of expertise and resources to conduct community supervision and support, and public understanding, acceptance and community involvement remain low. Some jurisdictions that have developed community corrections programmes still face difficulties in providing interventions, treatment and support corresponding to the specific needs of offenders, which is largely due to the lack or insufficiency of the involvement of relevant non-criminal-justice stakeholders. It is imperative to develop and actively use community-based approaches, including by establishing effective partnerships with relevant public and private stakeholders and raising public awareness.

Third, it is not an easy task for criminal justice authorities to find and involve necessary stakeholders in the community, because in order to respond to individual needs of offenders, a wide variety of issues should be addressed, and many possible stakeholders in the community are not familiar with or interested in criminal justice and rehabilitation of offenders. Also, among jurisdictions which have developed a certain level of multi-stakeholder cooperation, many do not have adequate platforms or coordinating mechanisms for criminal justice institutions and other stakeholders to regularly cooperate and communicate with each other.

To overcome these challenges and form robust partnerships with stakeholders, there are several important approaches—strong government-wide policy or legislation to promote a multi-stakeholder approach in preventing reoffending and facilitating offender rehabilitation, establishing platforms or networks among criminal justice authorities and other stakeholders covering important areas of support (e.g. employment, housing) at the community level, mobilizing and activating existing community resources and inviting them as new partners, and awareness-raising activities at all necessary levels.

In seeking new partners from existing community resources, it is effective to cooperate with active partners and make use of their knowledge, expertise and networks. In particular, NGOs, faith-based organizations and community leaders are usually very good partners in discovering and engaging new stakeholders. For instance, community leaders and community volunteers have very good knowledge about the community and have strong ties with its members; thus, with their help, criminal justice authorities are often able to approach a suitable stakeholder, such as for the provision of re-entry housing.

To involve necessary stakeholders and establish successful partnerships, it is crucial to broaden understanding on the necessity and importance of offender rehabilitation. Also, each stakeholder's role should be clearly defined.

Moreover, an equal partnership of criminal justice authorities and stakeholders is important. Having said that, it is effective for criminal justice authorities, within their roles, to take necessary lead in the interventions, treatment and support, while showing due respect to, and making full use of, expertise and strengths of each stakeholder. For instance, in the case of

volunteer probation officers (community volunteers used in a number of jurisdictions who are mandated to assist probation services in community supervision, re-entry coordination), it is essential that criminal justice authorities (usually probation authorities) clarify their role in each case, giving due consideration to their expertise and knowledge, and build their capacity through proper training. Moreover, criminal justice authorities need to advise and guide them when they face difficulties in conducting interventions and providing support.

Furthermore, building trust with, and giving dedicated support and incentives to, stakeholders facilitates their participation. For instance, in the case of job assistance for released offenders, providing continuous support to employers as partner–stakeholders is key for successful partnerships to ensure sustainable employment. More specifically, in the process of employment of an offender after release, first, the relevant authority (which may be a criminal justice or other cooperating agency) will need to properly explain to the employer about the offender’s character and any substantial support (e.g. subsidies as incentives, consultation with the authorities) which the employer can expect during the period of employment. Such explanations relieve the anxiety employers face prior to employing offenders. Also, providing timely support to both the employer and offender, or being prepared to do so, such as by meeting and holding necessary consultations with each of them, and taking immediate and proper actions whenever a risk in continuing the employment arises, will contribute to maintaining a good working environment, the stability of the offender’s employment, and to foster the employer’s willingness to cooperate with the authorities on offender rehabilitation.

In addition, since offenders return to and live their lives in the community, a multi-stakeholder, community-based approach engaging the private sector and the community cannot be pursued without the understanding and acceptance of the community members. Therefore, it is crucial to sensitize the general public and community members in order for them to understand that the rehabilitation of offenders and their social inclusion is the best way to prevent reoffending and to establish a safe and inclusive society. A high level of awareness in, and cooperation from, the community can accelerate setting up successful partnerships with various stakeholders.

Successful practices to build firm partnerships between criminal justice authorities and various stakeholders promote public understanding of criminal justice policies and the importance of offender rehabilitation among stakeholders, thereby contributing to effective interventions, treatment and support. Moreover, a robust network of stakeholders not only contributes to each offender’s rehabilitation but also to strengthening community ties and to preventing crime in general in the local community.

3. Main Theme and Objectives of the Seminar

The main theme of the seminar was “Preventing Reoffending through a Multi-stakeholder Approach”. This seminar mainly focused on policies and practices that (1) incorporate rehabilitative perspectives into penalties and case dispositions, (2) promote interventions, treatment and support tailored to offenders’ individual needs and (3) form multi-stakeholder cooperation and partnerships for social reintegration of offenders.

This seminar was designed to guide each participating country on the development and improvement of their respective criminal justice systems and administration. The expected outcome was the identification of key elements of best policies and practices to promote a multi-stakeholder approach to facilitate crime prevention and rehabilitation and social

reintegration of offenders. Further, the seminar sought to identify practices that will enhance public understanding of the field of crime prevention and criminal justice. The participants were encouraged to focus on policies and practices that can be commonly shared among the participating countries regardless of the differences in their legal systems, cultures and societies.

Through a variety of lectures, presentations, discussions and intensive group workshops, participants learned the theories, underlying principles and practical experiences of other countries. The seminar enabled participants to acquire new and different viewpoints on, and inspired them to revisit and consider, possible ways to improve their own systems and practices. The experience of gaining a multifaceted view and an understanding by each participant of his or her own system and practices will eventually contribute to renewed or improved policies concerning the effective measures to promote a multi-stakeholder approach to facilitate crime prevention and rehabilitation and social reintegration of offenders in their respective countries. Further, it will contribute to the building of stable, peaceful and inclusive societies based on core values such as human rights and the rule of law.

In addition, the seminar promoted the formation of a personal and professional network among the participants, which will benefit each one of them and their respective countries in the future by the sharing of updated information, thus enhancing international cooperation in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice.

4. Key Topics of the Seminar

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

- (1) Current situation and challenges in the imposition of penalties and case dispositions with due regard to rehabilitative perspectives
 - a. Whether and to what extent rehabilitative perspectives can be taken into consideration when deciding penalties or case dispositions in the participating countries
 - b. Non-custodial options available
 - Types of non-custodial penalties and dispositions available at pre-trial (e.g. non-prosecution, diversion from criminal proceedings), sentencing (e.g. fine, community sanction, suspended sentence) and post-sentencing (e.g. parole, conditional release, remission, furlough) phases, and whether they are conditional upon community supervision or other interventions, treatment or support (e.g. treatment programmes or mediation)
 - Mechanisms to determine non-custodial measures
 - i) Decision-making authorities (e.g. the judiciary, prosecution, parole board)
 - ii) Process by which information is collected (e.g. social inquiry for pre-sentencing reports, criminal investigation, in-prison assessment)
 - Conditions/eligibility criteria for applying non-custodial measures (e.g. types of crime, gravity of the penalty, length of imprisonment served, agreement to participate in a restorative justice programme) and other factors taken into consideration
 - c. Current situation of, and practical challenges in, sentencing and case dispositions from a rehabilitative perspective
 - Current status (including statistics on non-custodial measures)
 - Practical challenges in effective information gathering, in taking account of

- rehabilitative factors in case dispositions, sentencing and post-sentencing release, and in selecting effective interventions, treatment or support in the community
 - Stakeholders essential for effective information gathering, case dispositions, sentencing and post-sentencing release decisions, and implementation of interventions, treatment and support in the community
 - Practical challenges in cooperating with non-criminal-justice stakeholders
- (2) Interventions, treatment and support tailored to individual needs and multi-stakeholder partnerships
- a. Current situation of effective assessment and related challenges
 - b. Smooth transition from prison to the community
 - Cooperation and coordination between institutional and community corrections authorities
 - Types of non-criminal-justice stakeholders including community stakeholders (e.g. faith-based organizations, community leaders, community volunteers, medical institutions and NGOs) essential for smooth transition from prison to society through, for instance, re-entry coordination
 - Challenges in ensuring an offender's smooth transition from prison to the community
 - c. Establishment and promotion of community-based treatment
 - Current situation of, and practical challenges in, establishment and active use of community-based treatment (e.g. lack of legislation, no organization in charge of community-based treatment, low level of public awareness, lack or insufficiency in the involvement of stakeholders in the community)
 - d. Current situation of, and practical challenges in, interventions, treatment and support for reintegration of offenders
 - Prevalent risk, needs (e.g. lack of employment or proper job skills, lack of suitable accommodation, illiteracy, drug addiction, cognitive distortion, physical/mental disabilities, low self-esteem) and strengths (e.g. positive attitudes towards work and support by family) of the offenders in the participating countries, and essential areas corresponding to these factors (e.g. employment, education, healthcare, social welfare, family relations)
 - Effective interventions, treatment and support to address offenders' risks, needs and strengths (e.g. treatment programmes for specific types of offenders, job assistance, housing support, support by family, peer group support, medical care) and relevant public and private stakeholders which, in cooperation with criminal justice authorities, provide such interventions, treatment and support
 - Practical challenges in interventions, treatment and support for reintegration of offenders
 - e. Multi-stakeholder cooperation and partnerships for reintegration of offenders into society
 - Current situation of, and practical challenges in, developing a multi-stakeholder approach
 - Effective measures for involving new stakeholders from existing community resources (e.g. making use of knowledge, expertise and networks of active partner

- stakeholders such as NGOs, faith-based organizations and community leaders)
- Effective measures for establishing robust and sound partnerships with non-criminal-justice stakeholders (e.g. deepening stakeholders' understanding on rehabilitation, training, defining each stakeholder's role, giving incentives, providing continuous support, taking necessary lead in the interventions)
- Effective awareness-raising activities to promote partnerships and public understanding

Seminar Summary

Lectures

During the Seminar, the participants attended a variety of lectures, presentations and discussion sessions, including 2 presented by the specialist lecturer, 2 by ad hoc lecturers and lectures by faculty members of UNAFEI, as well as a session with Japanese Volunteer Probation Officers. The distinguished lecturers addressed issues relating to the main theme of the Seminar and contributed significantly beyond their lectures by answering the participants' questions during online question and answer sessions. A criminologist from the United Kingdom was the specialist lecturer, and the ad hoc lectures included a Japanese public prosecutor and officials from the Correction Bureau of Japan. See 'Lecture Topics' for more information.

Individual Presentations

During the Seminar, all participants delivered individual presentations which introduced the situation, problems and future prospects of the participants' countries. These papers were distributed to all the participants. Each presentation was followed by a Q&A session, in which additional information on practices in each jurisdiction was shared. See 'Individual Presentations' for more information.

Group Workshops

Group workshops provided the participants with the opportunity to further examine the subtopics of the main theme. In order to have intense discussions, the sessions were conducted in four small groups. Through consultations in groups, some members were assigned to chairpersons, co-chairpersons, rapporteurs or co-rapporteurs, and UNAFEI faculty members served as advisers. The participants exchanged their views based on information obtained through personal experience, the individual presentations, lectures and so forth. Each group was required to discuss common challenges and recommended actions. As the primary output of the seminar, each group delivered a presentation on the outcome of the discussions in the plenary report-back session, where their presentations were further discussed by the participants and UNAFEI faculty members. See 'Group Workshop Presentations' for more information.

Lecture Topics

Specialist's Lectures

1) Dr. Will Hughes

Senior Lecturer in Criminology, London Metropolitan University, United Kingdom

- Community sentences for rehabilitation of offenders and preventing reoffending
- Multi-stakeholder approaches for effective supervision and support of offenders

UNAFEI Professors' Lectures

1) Ms. SASAKI Ayako

Mr. OTSUKA Takeaki

- Individualized Assessment in the Prison Setting and Effective Reentry Coordination in Japan

2) Mr. HOSOKAWA Hidehito

- Non-Custodial Sentences in Japan

3) Mr. OTSUKA Takeaki

- Promoting Measures for Reducing Reoffending

Ad Hoc Lectures

1) Mr. HONDA Yuichiro

*Public Prosecutor, Chief, Social Reintegration Support Office, General Affairs Department,
Tokyo District Public Prosecutors' Office*

- Efforts of the Social Reintegration Support Office

2) Mr. SUZUIKI Takayuki

Specialist, Correction Bureau, Ministry of Justice

Mr. TOMIZAWA Satoshi

Specialist, Correction Bureau, Ministry of Justice

- Public-Private Partnership in Employment Support

Individual Presentations

- 1) Mr. Namik HASANOV (Azerbaijan)
 - Preventing Reoffending by Linking Social Reintegration and Public Safety
- 2) Ms. Gina Maria LAMARCHE LEONARDO (Dominican Republic)
 - Social Reintegration of Deported Dominicans
- 3) Mr. Hugo Antonio GONZALEZ GODINEZ (Guatemala)
 - Crime Prevention in Guatemala
- 4) Ms. Hada Lucia HURTADO LUARTE (Guatemala)
 - Preventing Reoffending through a Multi-stakeholder Approach
- 5) Ms. Vilaysinh DAINHANSA (Lao PDR)
 - Current Situation and Challenges in the Imposition of Penalties and Case Dispositions with Regard to Rehabilitation Perspectives in Lao P.D.R.
- 6) Mr. Faraj Salim NAJI (Libya)
 - Alternative Penalties and the Position of the Libyan Penal Code on Them
- 7) Mr. Afzainizam Bin ABDUL AZIZ (Malaysia)
 - Current Situation and Challenges in the Imposition of Penalties and Case Dispositions with Due Regard to Rehabilitative Perspectives: Power to Compound by the Public Prosecutor
- 8) Ms. Noor Haslinda Binti CHE SEMAN (Malaysia)
 - Current Situation and Challenges in the Imposition of Penalties and Case Dispositions with Due Regard to Rehabilitative Perspectives: Focusing on Compulsory Attendance Orders (CAO)
- 9) Ms. Mariyam FEZLEEN (Maldives)
 - Current Situation and Challenges in the Imposition of Penalties and Case Dispositions with Due Regard to Rehabilitative Perspectives
- 10) Ms. Fathimath Naheeda THOHIR (Maldives)
 - Interventions, Treatment and Support Tailored to Individual Needs and Multi-stakeholder Partnerships – Maldives Scenario

- 11) Mr. Fidelis Obi AJUKURA (Nigeria)
 - Preventing Reoffending through a Multi-stakeholder Approach: Nigeria's Experience
- 12) Ms. Riza Soriano ARDEPOLLA (Philippines)
 - The Barangay Drug Clearing Programme: A Holistic and Whole-of-Nation Approach in Curbing the Drug Menace in the Philippines
- 13) Mr. Hemal Prashantha DEMATAHERA GAMAGE (Sri Lanka)
 - Preventing Reoffending through Interventions, Treatment and Support Tailored to Individual Needs and Multi-stakeholder Partnerships in Sri Lanka
- 14) Mr. Thusara Ruwan Kumara MUDALI THENANNAHELAGE (Sri Lanka)
 - Supervision of Released Criminals and Its Impact on Preventing Reoffending in Sri Lanka
- 15) Mr. Ramakamalan VINAYAGAMOORTHY (Sri Lanka)
 - Non-custodial Sentence and Prevention of Crime in the Criminal Justice System of Sri Lanka
- 16) Ms. Nayomi Thamara WICKRAMASEKERA (Sri Lanka)
 - Sentencing and Alternative Punishment in Sri Lanka and Its Challenges from a Rehabilitative Perspective
- 17) Ms. Disaya MEEPIEN (Thailand)
 - Beyond the Halfway House: Together We Create Chance
- 18) Ms. Artitaya RAWEEPRAAYURABUT (Thailand)
 - Promoting Community Safety with the Probation System
- 19) Ms. My Hanh Thi PHAN (Viet Nam)
 - Crime Situation in Viet Nam and the Policy of Community Reintegration for Prisoners and Those Who Have Completed Their Prison Sentences

Group Workshop Presentations

Group A

Title of presentation:

- Diversion and Rehabilitation of Vulnerable Populations

Chairperson	Ms. Noor Haslinda Binti CHE SEMAN (Malaysia)
Co-Chairperson	Ms. Artitaya RAWEEPRAYURABUT (Thailand)
Rapporteur	Ms. Gina Maria LAMARCHE LEONARDO (Dominican Republic)
Members	Mr. Hugo Antonio GONZALEZ GODINEZ (Guatemala)
	Ms. Vilaysinh DAINHANSA (Lao PDR)
Advisers	Prof. OTSUKA Takeaki (UNAFEI)
	Prof. WATANABE Machiko (UNAFEI)

Group B

Title of presentation:

- Preventing Reoffending through a Multi-stakeholder Approach

Chairperson	Ms. Disaya MEEPIEN (Thailand)
Rapporteur	Ms. Hada Lucia HURTADO LUARTE (Guatemala)
Co-Rapporteur	Mr. Afzainizam Bin ABDUL AZIZ (Malaysia)
Co-Rapporteur	Ms. Riza Soriano ARDEPOLLA (Philippines)
Member	Ms. My Hanh Thi PHAN (Viet Nam)
Advisers	Prof. MIYAGAWA Tsubura (UNAFEI)
	Prof. OKUDA Yoshinori (UNAFEI)

Group C

Title of presentation:

- Multi-stakeholder Approaches for Effective Supervision and Support of Offenders

Chairperson	Ms. Nayomi Thamara WICKRAMASEKERA (Sri Lanka)
Rapporteur	Ms. Fathimath Naheeda THOHIR (Maldives)
Co-Rapporteur	Mr. Fidelis Obi AJUKURA (Nigeria)
Member	Mr. Hemal Prashantha DEMATAHERA GAMAGE (Sri Lanka)
Advisers	Prof. OTSUKA Takeaki (UNAFEI)
	Prof. HOSOKAWA Hidehito (UNAFEI)

Group D

Title of presentation:

- Challenges in Preventing Recidivism

Chairperson	Mr. Thusara Ruwan Kumara MUDALI THENANNAHELAGE (Sri Lanka)
Rapporteur	Ms. Mariyam FEZLEEN (Maldives)
Members	Mr. Namik HASANOV (Azerbaijan)
	Mr. Ramakamalan VINAYAGAMOORTHY (Sri Lanka)
Advisers	Prof. MIYAGAWA Tsubura (UNAFEI)
	Prof. YAMANA Rompei (UNAFEI)

Reference Materials

**UNAFEI'S 177TH INTERNATIONAL SENIOR SEMINAR
LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS**

List of Reference Materials (177th International Senior Seminar)	
1	Kyoto Declaration on Advancing Crime Prevention, Criminal Justice and the Rule of Law: Towards the Achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
2	United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-custodial Measures (The Tokyo Rules)
3	Introductory Handbook on the Prevention of Recidivism and the Social Reintegration of Offenders

Expert and Participant List

Specialist Lecturer

Dr. Will Hughes
Senior Lecturer in Criminology
London Metropolitan University
United Kingdom

Overseas Participants

Mr. Namik HASANOV
Inspector
Operation-Regime Department
Penitentiary Service, Ministry of Justice
Azerbaijan

Ms. Gina Maria LAMARCHE
LEONARDO
In charge at the Vice Ministry of Citizen
Coexistence
Ministry of Interior and Police
Dominican Republic

Mr. Hugo Antonio GONZALEZ
GODINEZ
Correctional Advisor
Advanced Tactical Support Group (ATSG) Corporation
Guatemala

Ms. Hada Lucia HURTADO
LUARTE
Assistant Prosecutor
Special Prosecution Against Impunity
Public Ministry
Guatemala

Ms. Vilaysinh DAINHANSA
Deputy Director General
The planning and International Cooperation Department
The Office of the Supreme People's Prosecutor
Lao PDR

Mr. Faraj Salim NAJI
Lecturer
Training Department
High Judicial Institute, Ministry of Justice
Libya

Mr. Afzainizam Bin ABDUL
AZIZ
Deputy Public Prosecutor
Prosecution Division
Attorney General's Chambers
Malaysia

Ms. Noor Haslinda Binti CHE
SEMAN
Deputy Public Prosecutor
Prosecution Division
Attorney General's Chambers
Malaysia

Ms. Mariyam FEZLEEN	Assistant Prosecutor General Prosecution Department Prosecutor General's Office Maldives
Ms. Fathimath Naheeda THOHIR	South Sub-regional Commander / Chief Inspector of Police South Police Maldives Police Service Maldives
Mr. Fidelis Obi AJUKURA	Deputy Superintendent of Corrections General Duty Nigerian Correctional Service Nigeria
Ms. Riza Soriano ARDEPOLLA	Supervisor PDEA Barangay Drug Clearing Program - Office of the Director General Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency Philippines
Mr. Hemal Prashantha DEMATAHERA GAMAGE	Director Criminal Investigation Department Sri Lanka Police Sri Lanka
Mr. Thusara Ruwan Kumara MUDALI THENANNAHELAGE	Director / Senior Superintendent Criminal Records Division Sri Lanka Police Sri Lanka
Mr. Ramakamalan VINAYAGAMOORTHY	High Court Judge High Court Judicial Service Commission Sri Lanka
Ms. Nayomi Thamara WICKRAMASEKERA	High Court Judge High Court Judicial Service Commission Sri Lanka
Ms. Disaya MEEPIEN	Acting Director Research and Development Institute Department of Juvenile Observation and Protection, Ministry of Justice Thailand

Ms. Artitaya
RAWEEPRAAYURABUT

Probation Officer
Surat Thani Probation Office
Department of Probation, Ministry of Justice
Thailand

Ms. My Hanh Thi PHAN

Deputy Head
Criminal Investigation Division
The Office of Investigation Police Agency,
Ministry of Public Security
Viet Nam

INFORMATION ABOUT FORTHCOMING PROGRAMMES

1. The 178th International Training Course

From 14 June to 7 July 2022, UNAFEI will host the 178th International Training Course online. The main theme of the Seminar is “Cybercrime and Digital Evidence”. Approximately 25 overseas participants will attend.

2. The Second Youth International Training Course

From 1 to 5 August 2022, UNAFEI will host the 2nd Youth International Training Course. Approximately 20 youth from overseas and Japan are expected to participate.

FACULTY AND STAFF OF UNAFEI

Faculty:

Mr. MORINAGA Taro	Director
Ms. IRIE Junko	Deputy Director
Ms. WATANABE Machiko	Professor
Mr. HOSOKAWA Hidehito	Professor
Mr. OKUDA Yoshinori	Professor
Mr. YAMANA Rompei	Professor
Ms. MIYAGAWA Tsubura	Professor
	177th Seminar Deputy Programming Officer
	Chief of Research Division
Ms. TAKAI Ayaka	Professor
Ms. SASAKI Ayako	Professor
Mr. OTSUKA Takeaki	Professor
	177th Seminar Programming Officer
	Chief of Information and Public Relations
Ms. TANAKA Mii	Professor
Mr. Thomas L. Schmid	Linguistic Adviser

Secretariat:

Mr. TADA Ryosei	Chief of Secretariat
Mr. YAMAMOTO Shinichi	Chief of Training and Hostel Management Affairs Section

Training and Hostel Management Affairs Section:

Mr. TATSUKAWA Masashi	Senior Officer
	177th Seminar Assistant Programming Officer
Mr. YOSHIHARA Daiki	Senior Officer
Mr. FUJISAKI Takuma	Senior Officer
Ms. MUKAI Saori	Officer
	177th Seminar Assistant Programming Officer
Ms. OTANI Makiko	Officer

International Research Affairs Section:

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

Secretarial Staff:

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

JICA Coordinator for the 177th International Senior Seminar:
Ms. HISA Keiko JICA

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

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