

MAIN ACTIVITIES OF UNAFEI (1 January 2016 – 31 December 2016)

I. ROLE AND MANDATE

The Asia and Far East Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (UNAFEI) was established in Tokyo, Japan in 1962 pursuant to an agreement between the United Nations and the Government of Japan. Its goal is to contribute to sound social development in the Asia and the Pacific region by promoting regional cooperation in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice, through training and research.

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

II. TRAINING

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

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

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

By the end of 2016, UNAFEI had conducted a total of 164 international training courses and seminars. Over 5,000 criminal justice personnel representing 136 different countries and administrative regions have participated in these seminars. UNAFEI also conducts a number of other specialized courses, both country and subject focused, in which hundreds of other participants from many countries have been involved. In their respective countries, UNAFEI alumni have been playing leading roles and hold important posts in the fields of crime prevention and the treatment of offenders, and in related organizations.

A. The 162nd International Senior Seminar

1. Introduction

The 162nd International Senior Seminar was held from 13 January to 12 February 2016. The main theme was "Multi-agency Cooperation in Community-Based Treatment of Offenders". Fifteen overseas participants and six Japanese participants attended the Seminar.

2. Methodology

Firstly, the Seminar participants respectively introduced the roles and functions of criminal justice agencies in their countries in regard to the main theme. After receiving lectures from UNAFEI Professors and visiting experts, the participants were then divided into three group workshops as follows:

Group 1: Effective Multi-agency Cooperation in Terms of Implementation of Non-custodial Measures at Each Stage of the Criminal Justice Process

Group 2: Effective Models for Multi-agency Cooperation in Community-Based Treatment of Offenders

Group 3: Information Sharing in Multi-agency Cooperation

Each Group elected a chairperson, co-chairperson(s), a rapporteur and co-rapporteur(s) in order to facilitate the discussions. During group discussion, the group members studied the designated topics and exchanged views based on information obtained through personal experiences, the Individual Presentations, lectures and so forth. The Groups presented their reports during the Report-Back Session, where they were endorsed as the Reports of the Seminar. The full texts of these Reports were published in UNAFEI Resource Material Series No. 99.

3. Outcome Summary

(i) Effective Multi-agency Cooperation in Terms of Implementation of Non-custodial Measures at Each Stage of the Criminal Justice Process

Group 1 stressed that multi-agency cooperation is necessary to reduce recidivism, facilitate reintegration, promote non-custodial measures, and establish a safer community. Additionally, the group concluded that multi-agency cooperation is necessary at all stages of the criminal justice process, including the pre-trial, trial, and post-trial stages.

During the discussion, multi-agency cooperation was considered from several perspectives: (a) the types of offenders who should be targeted, (b) the ideal structure of multi-agency cooperation, (c) information sharing and analysis, (d) problems of legislation, and (e) evaluation.

Regarding the types of offenders that should be targeted, the group emphasized focusing on low-risk and first-time offenders, as well as offenders with special needs, such as the chronically ill, the disabled, the elderly and juveniles. The group also felt that multi-agency cooperation would be facilitated by expanding sentencing options available to judges other than incarceration.

The ideal structure for multi-agency cooperation should take a holistic approach to offender rehabilitation by involving all relevant government agencies, the private sector and the general public (i.e., community involvement). Examples of key organizations include NGOs, hospitals, welfare facilities and community resources. Private entities should be encouraged to participate in offender rehabilitation through the availability of government subsidies to, for example, businesses that employ ex-offenders.

Multi-agency cooperation cannot succeed without effective information sharing and analysis. Relevant agencies need information about the offenders in order to match their treatment needs with available services. However, information sharing raises the issue of confidentiality, as well as the willingness of the offender to cooperate. To the extent possible, the group concluded that information sharing should be based on the offender's consent.

Regarding problems of legislation, the group explained that gaps exist between various forms of criminal justice legislation, such as penal laws, criminal procedure codes, probation acts, and prison acts. These gaps limit the ability of relevant agencies to collaborate with each other, and the gaps must be bridged by special legislation, MOUs or other agreements between agencies.

Once these gaps are bridged and collaborative procedures are established, these procedures must be evaluated by each agency involved and by independent bodies to assess effectiveness. Indicators of success include lowered recidivism rates, reduction in prison overcrowding, expanded sentencing options that encourage diversion and non-custodial measures, and positive feedback from the private sector and the

MAIN ACTIVITIES OF UNAFEI

community.

(ii) Effective Models for Multi-agency Cooperation in Community-Based Treatment of Offenders

Group 2 was tasked with developing ideal models for multi-agency cooperation and considered such models from the perspective of types of offenders to be targeted, the ideal structure for cooperation, and necessary legislation. The group members agreed that although there is no single programme that can be considered the most effective, an effective model should be designed to reduce recidivism, using evidence-based practices.

Criminal justice systems should be prepared to provide assistance to both low-risk and serious offenders. Typically, multi-agency cooperation is believed to benefit offenders who do not pose a risk to society. Offenders should be assessed individually, based on each offender's specific crimes and rehabilitation needs, by applying the analytical framework of the Risk-Needs-Responsivity Model. However, there is an emerging trend in which reformed serious offenders, drug offenders and sexual offenders are being given second chances to re-enter the community, and the group agreed that the individualization of sentences and treatment is the preferred model.

The group reported that multi-agency cooperation exists where there is complementary and overlapping provision of services to the offender by both government and NGOs. Agencies that provide services to offenders include cooperative employers, labour organizations, hospitals, special schools, self-help groups, e.g., "AA", community settlement support centres, community justice centres and local government. The group identified numerous challenges to multi-agency cooperation and proposed solutions in its group workshop report.

After reviewing the participating countries' legislation to facilitate multi-agency cooperation, the group proposed that the following topics should be addressed in ideal legislation: (1) monitoring and controls instituted by the government on how resources are spent on offenders, (2) information sharing between agencies, (3) financial auditing and reports, and (4) each ministry directly related to the services being provided by an NGO should take direct control.

The importance of programme evaluation was discussed by the group, which acknowledged that the reduction of the recidivism rate is one important measure of effectiveness. However, satisfying the offenders' criminogenic needs, such as employment, housing and medical care is fundamentally important for the rehabilitation process. Accordingly, other measures of effectiveness include the number of offenders who receive support upon re-entry and the number of offenders who start and continue to work successfully.

The group concluded that successful models for multi-agency cooperation will include: (1) the development of mutual understanding between agencies and individuals, (2) active information sharing, employing the "through care" model, (3) the enactment of legislation that encourages community-based treatment, and (4) securing sufficient budgetary resources, political will, and the support of the public.

(iii) Information Sharing in Multi-agency Cooperation

Group 3 reported on issues surrounding information sharing in the context of multi-agency cooperation in community-based treatment of offenders by considering the types of offenders and offences that should be targeted, information sharing and analysis, and problems in legislation.

Collaborative multi-agency partnerships are necessary to ensure successful implementation of offender treatment programmes. Although practices and opinions differ from country to country, the group concluded that the treatment needs of *all* offenders should be addressed through multi-agency cooperation and that recidivists should be prioritized due to their great need for support. Information sharing between relevant agencies plays a crucial role in achieving the desired treatment goals.

Recognizing the need to protect personal information and that laws vary among the participating countries, the group agreed that it is necessary to share the following categories of information among relevant agencies: (1) the offender's biographical data, (2) the nature of the offence, (3) the offender's history of previous offences, (4) the offender's general health and mental conditions, (5) behaviour and conduct while in a correctional facility, (6) behaviour and conduct while in a residential community, (7) education and skills

training/level, (8) employment history, (9) the offender's compliance with previous court orders and sentences, and (10) the circumstances and environment of the victim, and any compensation or civil commitment condition to which the offender is subjected by the court.

Due to the sensitivity of such information, the group identified numerous problems associated with multi-agency information sharing. However, the group also recommended solutions, such as establishing standard operating procedures to ensure that personal information is properly protected, obtaining the offender's consent when necessary, establishing secure IT systems, and conducting periodic review of information-sharing practices.

The group stressed the importance of formal written procedures for requesting information between agencies. However, proper information sharing can be ensured by establishing shared databases that can be accessed by agencies that need the information. While the offender's personal information should be shared among relevant agencies, information shared with private agencies should be limited to that which is necessary to complete the offender's treatment, and private agencies must use discretion when handling personal or sensitive information.

On the topic of legislation, the group agreed that distinct legislation is necessary to establish a legal basis for multi-agency cooperation and information sharing. However, legislation cannot address all issues that will be encountered, making the execution of multi-agency MOUs, regular meetings between agencies, and the establishment of better professional rapport between agencies important factors for successful multi-agency cooperation.

B. The 163rd International Training Course

1. Introduction

The 163rd International Training Course was held from 11 May to 22 June 2016. The main theme was "Children as Victims and Witnesses". Twenty-three overseas participants and seven Japanese participants attended the Course.

2. Methodology

The objectives of the Course were primarily realized through the Individual Presentations, lectures by visiting experts and Group Workshop sessions. In the former, each participant presented the actual situation, problems and future prospects of his or her country with respect to the main theme of the Course. The Group Workshops further examined the subtopics of the main theme. To facilitate discussion, the participants were divided into three groups to discuss the following topics under the guidance of faculty advisers:

Group 1: Special Measures in Dealing with Child Victims and Witnesses in the Criminal Justice Process

Group 2: Ideal Measures to Protect Children as Witnesses in the Investigation and Trial Phases

Group 3: Improving Skills and Practices in Interviewing Child Victims and Witnesses during Inquiry and Testimony

The three groups each elected a chairperson, co-chairperson(s), a rapporteur and co-rapporteur(s) to organize the discussions. The group members studied the designated subtopics and exchanged their views based on information obtained through personal experience, the Individual Presentations, lectures and so forth. The Groups presented their reports during the Report-Back Session, where they were endorsed as the reports of the Course. The full texts of the reports were published in full in Resource Material Series No. 100.

3. Outcome Summary

(i) Special Measures in Dealing with Child Victims and Witnesses in the Criminal Justice Process

Group 1 reviewed the status of special measures for the protection of child victims and witnesses in each of the participating countries and proposed detailed recommendations for such special measures that should be considered for adoption. The recommendations are intended to ensure that the criminal justice system is sensitized to child victims and witnesses.

The group identified weaknesses in investigation and adjudication of cases involving violence against

MAIN ACTIVITIES OF UNAFEI

children (VAC) that are common among many countries. VAC is under-reported and under-detected. Many countries lack training and special procedures for investigating VAC cases, as well as special provisions to protect child victims and witnesses. Likewise, the adjudicatory process lacks training and special provisions that elicit credible testimony from children, such as child-friendly hearing rooms, video-link testimony, etc.

To improve detection and reporting, the group recommended a number of measures. Increasing public awareness is important for effective reporting, and countries are encouraged to identify target groups, focus on issues of VAC that are relevant to the country and use social media and other marketing strategies to reach the public. Also, countries should identify the risk factors and indicators of VAC using an evidence-based approach. Reporting should be confidential and easily accessible by establishing a 24/7 toll-free helpline, and mandatory reporting of VAC should be legally required.

During investigation and trial, special measures should be implemented to protect child victims and witnesses from re-victimization and to ensure the credibility of their statements. Skilled and trained investigators are needed to conduct child-sensitive forensic interviews. At trial, children should be permitted to testify from special rooms by video link so that the child cannot see the accused, and questions directed to the child should be asked by a qualified expert.

Throughout the criminal justice process, special protective measures should be used to safeguard the best interests of the child. To do so, the group also pointed out that the rights of the suspect/defendant must not be taken for granted. Only when necessary and as a last resort, the child should be placed in temporary protective custody with a relative, foster family, shelter for victims of abuse, etc. All relevant criminal justice and social welfare agencies should be involved in this process, and guidelines should be developed to monitor the status of the child. Additionally, the child's identity should be protected by the issuance of a non-disclosure order by the court, and court proceedings related to children should be conducted as closed hearings.

(ii) Ideal Measures to Protect Children as Witnesses in the Investigation and Trial Phases

Group 2 considered measures to protect child witnesses during the investigation and trial phases. The group agreed to focus on child witnesses because such laws, measures and practices are particularly lacking in many jurisdictions, whereas legislation on violence against children is more prevalent. Throughout the workshop, the group drew on a number of international resources, particularly the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the United Nation's Model Law on Justice in Matters involving Child Victims and Witnesses of Crime and Related Commentary, as well as the best practices of the participating countries.

The purpose of the investigation phase is to obtain the best evidence possible to secure a conviction and to secure justice for the child. This can only be accomplished if child witnesses receive the necessary support. For child witnesses, the prevention of re-victimization, e.g., reliving a traumatic experience that was endured or observed by the child in multiple interviews, takes high priority. The group found that victim support agencies and specially trained support persons are necessary to provide care, comfort and counselling to child witnesses throughout the criminal justice process. Likewise, specially trained investigators are needed to conduct child-sensitive forensic interviews to elicit a complete and credible account of the offence and to protect the child's psychological well-being. Other measures to be employed during the investigation stage include the use of child-friendly interview rooms, the use of technical communication aids, e.g., dolls, to help the child explain what happened, and the limitation of the number and duration of interviews, based on the age and mental state of the child.

Child witnesses also require support during the trial phase. It is important to protect a child's privacy by prohibiting the disclosure of his or her identity through the criminal justice process. Further, the child's physical safety and mental state should be protected by avoiding direct contact with the offender, which can be achieved through measures such as witness shielding and the admission of video-recorded testimony into evidence. Additionally, child-friendly waiting areas are important to ease the child's state of mind so that he or she can testify comfortably.

The group offered the following recommendations for the protection of child witnesses: (1) enacting special laws that provide for measures such as limiting the number of interviews, requiring that questioning of children be conducted according to the child's age and mental capacity, requiring in camera sessions,

removal of the accused from the courtroom during the child's testimony, etc., (2) establishing special agencies to support child witnesses during and after the judicial process, (3) initiating training for personnel dealing with child witnesses, (4) providing experts to assist in interviewing child witnesses and (5) providing separate child-friendly investigation and waiting rooms.

(iii) Improving Skills and Practices in Interviewing Child Victims and Witnesses during Inquiry and Testimony

Group 3 focused on improving skills and practices for interviewing child victims and witnesses. The group noted that for many years, child victims and witnesses were treated in the same manner as adults. As many adults find the criminal justice processes to be intimidating and difficult to comprehend, this is particularly true for children. In response, many countries have adopted special procedures to ease the burdens on children who take part in the criminal justice system, but further measures are needed to address their unique needs as witnesses.

The group reviewed the current status of interviewing child victims and witnesses, finding that current practices often jeopardize the collection of credible evidence. Children are routinely interviewed multiple times, which causes re-victimization of the child and can result in inconsistent statements due to the fact that children face the obstacles of language, mental development and maturity. Moreover, children are particularly susceptible to the power of suggestion. Often due to a lack of training, many investigators lack sufficient interviewing skills, and many cases are dismissed when the investigator fails to elicit credible evidence from the child. Additionally, many countries lack child-friendly interviewing rooms, which are necessary to provide children with an environment in which the child feels comfortable explaining how he or she was victimized. In situations where the child is forced to confront the perpetrator before the interview or giving testimony, the child is likely to be overcome by fear, and the child may refuse to give the statement. Meanwhile, delays in the criminal justice procedure can cause memories to fade, making it impossible to collect credible evidence. Lacking in many jurisdictions, support services for child victims and witnesses are crucial to adequate fact-finding because these services provide children with the sense of security they need to tell their stories and the counselling they need to heal.

To overcome these challenges, the group identified 12 recommendations to improve interviewing of child victims and witnesses: (1) the drafting of standard operating procedure manuals, (2) reducing the time gap between the first interview and the giving of testimony, (3) establishing multi-disciplinary investigation teams, (4) use of separate interview rooms for children, (5) providing interviewers with relevant training, (6) introduction of child-friendly practices, (7) asking questions designed to measure the child's memory, (8) asking open-ended questions during interviews, (9) audio or video recording of interviews, (10) use of video link technology during trial testimony, (11) enhancing legal aid for children, and (12) conducting regular debriefing for officers to reduce burnout. Finally, because children are less likely than adults to report abuse by filing a formal complaint, law enforcement agencies require legislative support to investigate abuse based on suspicion.

C. The 164th International Training Course

1. Introduction

The 164th International Training Course was held from 14 August to 23 September 2016. The main theme was "Effective Measures for Treatment, Rehabilitation and Social Reintegration of Juvenile Offenders". Twenty-four overseas participants (including two observers) and seven Japanese participants attended.

2. Methodology

The participants of the 164th Course endeavoured to explore the topic primarily through a comparative analysis of the current situation and the problems encountered. The participants' in-depth discussions enabled them to put forth effective and practical solutions.

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

Each Group elected a chairperson, co-chairperson(s), rapporteur and co-rapporteur(s) to organize the

MAIN ACTIVITIES OF UNAFEI

discussions. The group members studied the situation in each of their countries and exchanged their views based on information obtained through personal experience, the Individual Presentations, lectures and so forth. Both groups examined the course theme. The Groups presented their reports in the Report-Back Sessions, where they were endorsed as the reports of the Course. The reports were published in full in UNAFEI Resource Material Series No. 101.

3. Outcome Summary

(i) Dealing with Children: Diversion, Court Action, Cooperation

Group 1 focused on the role of diversion in the rehabilitation of juveniles in conflict with the law within the context of the participating countries' juvenile justice systems and the international standards set forth in the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice ("The Beijing Rules").

Due to factors such as environment, lack of experience and stage of mental development, juveniles in conflict with the law are particularly responsive to rehabilitative and social reintegration approaches. Measures that divert these juveniles from the traditional criminal justice system are more effective than a traditional retributive approach. Thus, diversion redirects juveniles to the community support services they need to get their lives back on track.

The Beijing Rules establish standards for the administration of juvenile justice, and one of the fundamental concepts is the establishment of a competent judicial authority, such as family or juvenile courts, that specializes in handling cases involving juveniles. Other key principles of a fair and effective juvenile justice system include: involvement of parents, guardians and legal counsel; the use of social inquiry reports; a variety of disposition measures so as to avoid institutionalization to the greatest extent possible; avoidance of unnecessary delay in the disposition of cases; ensuring the confidentiality of case records involving juveniles; and the need for professionalism and training for juvenile justice practitioners.

The group stressed the importance of inter-organizational cooperation with related governmental agencies and other criminal justice practitioners, such as the police, prosecutors, the courts, probation, and juvenile correctional facilities. Such cooperation is necessary for the smooth functioning of the juvenile justice system, and all countries reported some level of interaction between these agencies. Furthermore, all group members agreed that public-private partnerships can support rehabilitation through the establishment of private halfway houses, finding employment for juveniles and teaching them vocational skills, organizing volunteers to support rehabilitation, and so on.

The treatment, rehabilitation and social reintegration of juveniles into society requires a holistic approach on the part of all stakeholders of the criminal justice system, as well as the active participation of the community and the private sector. To ensure that these goals are met, the group recommended, among others, (1) the use of enlightening and educational diversion programmes tailored to juveniles, (2) promoting volunteerism to encourage citizens to work with juveniles, (3) information sharing by and between governmental agencies and the private sector to enhance services provided to juveniles, and (4) the collection of data on recidivism to assess current diversion methods.

(ii) The Ideal Juvenile Justice Model, Key Innovations and Practices

The group members considered the ideal model for juvenile justice by focusing on four main themes: (1) procedures for appropriate treatment; (2) risk/needs assessment and treatment programmes; (3) reintegration; and (4) inter-agency cooperation and governmental support.

Appropriate treatment of juveniles in conflict with the law requires specialized juvenile justice personnel, such as police, prosecutors, family/juvenile courts, rehabilitation centres, and professional and volunteer probation officers. The group identified the challenges of the lack of appropriate legislation, budget and skilled human resources. Additionally, more efforts should be taken to consider the rights of victims throughout the juvenile justice process.

Risk/needs assessment was identified as a key component of an ideal juvenile justice system. Low risk juveniles can be treated in the community while high risk juveniles can be treated in an institution to ensure the best outcomes. While some countries have advanced standardized assessment tools to guide the treatment of juveniles in conflict with the law, some countries have no tools at all. The group suggested that

countries without advanced tools perform a S. W. O. T. analysis to assess the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats with respect to juveniles in need to treatment. Once an assessment is conducted, treatment programmes such as life skills training with a focus on criminogenic needs, emotional development training and vocational training can be implemented as appropriate. Other novel approaches discussed by the group include initiatives to improve juveniles' self-reliance and decision-making abilities and the practice of including various members from the juveniles' communities, such as village elders, police officers and social welfare officials, in the process of diversion and treatment.

The group members agreed that the purpose of criminal sanctions should be the successful reintegration of the offender upon release, noting that juveniles in conflict with the law face numerous challenges during the process of reintegration into society. These challenges include the lack of resources, employment and social support, psychological problems, and difficulty dealing with the transition period, including dealing with social stigma. Noting that an ideal system would allow the individual to return to society with a "reinvented" identity, practices such as pre-release and re-entry programmes and family support measures were suggested as measures to facilitate reintegration.

Inter-agency cooperation and governmental support are also important to facilitate reintegration. Key practices identified by the group include the sharing of information between agencies through shared databases, the establishment of funds aimed at assisting ex-offenders upon their release, the implementation of risk management models, and human-resources exchanges between relevant agencies. Private sector support was also encouraged through the establishment of partnerships with businesses, non-profit organizations and faith-based organizations.

(iii) Social Reintegration

Group 3 addressed the challenges of social reintegration of juveniles in conflict with the law. The group members agreed that detention is not always the appropriate way to deal with juvenile offenders, and, thus, they proposed solutions in reference to the following points: diversion and alternative sentencing; crime prevention; and inter-agency cooperation with the community and the private sector.

Diversion, as described in the Beijing Rules, is a process through which the police, prosecutors and other agencies are empowered to dispose of cases involving juveniles without proceeding to a formal hearing. Diversion measures include cautioning, reparations, restorative justice measures, etc. Alternative sentencing is applied to juveniles who have been formally processed through the juvenile justice system, and these measures avoid typical custodial sentences. Alternative sentencing measures include probation, community service, conditional or unconditional discharge, training and rehabilitation treatment.

The group identified challenges facing social reintegration of juveniles, particularly stigmatization, lack of employment opportunities, lack of professionals with specialized skills and knowledge, the lack of availability of community resources, etc. To address these challenges, Group 3 proposed the promotion of diversion and alternative measures through professional training and use of the media, relying on volunteers to supplement the work of trained professionals, and adopting legislation that formalizes the use of diversion and alternative sentencing.

Some countries reported that they lack specific laws and strategies relating to crime prevention at the national level. It was also recognized that where such laws exist, it is often the case that crime prevention programmes lack sufficient resources and are not coordinated or sustained by various agencies involved. The group stressed the importance public awareness and education to promote crime prevention and social reintegration. These measures should be directed both at juveniles in conflict with the law and the general public through various methods including community supervision, annual crime prevention campaigns, and use of the electronic and print media.

Finally, the group agreed that inter-agency cooperation with non-governmental agencies, as well as governmental agencies, is important to foster the social reintegration of juveniles. Nevertheless, many countries lack policy guidelines and legislation, lack of awareness, and lack of sufficient resources. Countries should develop strategies, legislation and procedures for inter-agency cooperation, increase resources and incentives for such cooperation, and involve the community in seeking solutions.

III. SPECIAL TRAINING COURSES AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

A. The Third UNAFEI Criminal Justice Training Programme for French-Speaking African Countries

The third criminal justice training programme for French-speaking African countries was hosted by UNAFEI in Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire from 15-26 February. 31 practitioners from 8 French-speaking African countries discussed capacity-building for investigation, prosecution and adjudication, and measures against terrorism and organized crime.

B. The Seminar on Developing Standards on Community-based Treatment in ASEAN

From 2 to 4 March 2016 in Bangkok, Thailand, the Department of Probation of the Ministry of Justice of Thailand (DOP), the Thailand Institute of Justice (TIJ), and UNAFEI hosted the Seminar on Developing Standards on Community-based Treatment in ASEAN: Focusing on Treatment for Drug Use / Dependence Offenders. 26 senior officials from 10 ASEAN member States and Japan shared information on needs and challenges in community-based treatment.

C. The Comparative Study on Criminal Justice Systems of Japan and Nepal

The Comparative Study on Criminal Justice Systems of Japan and Nepal was held from 7 to 18 March, and 10 officials from Nepal studied effective measures of criminal procedure, including investigation, prosecution and trial.

D. Training Seminar for Prison Officials in Myanmar

The UNODC and Asia and Far East Institute training seminar for prison officials in Myanmar was held during two sessions from 6 June-15 July and 15 November-2 December. 231 participants studied prison management in line with international standards and norms.

E. The Joint Study on the Legal Systems of Japan and Viet Nam 2016 RTI - SPP Exchange Programme (Japan Session)

During the third training course on legal technical assistance for Viet Nam (4-15 July) and the joint study on the legal systems of Japan and Viet Nam (11-15 July), 12 officials from Viet Nam discussed problems related to the enforcement of the amended code of criminal procedure in Viet Nam

F. The Tenth Regional Seminar on Good Governance for Southeast Asian Countries

From 26 to 28 July 2016, UNAFEI held the Tenth Regional Seminar on Good Governance in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The main theme of the Seminar was "Contemporary Measures for Effective International Cooperation". 21 practitioners from 10 ASEAN member States discussed contemporary measures for effective international cooperation in the field of anti-corruption.

G. The Study Tour for Prison Officers in Myanmar

During the training course for prison officials from Myanmar in Japan (7-13 September), five prison officials from Myanmar studied prison management and training for prison officials in Japan.

H. The 19th UNAFEI UNCAC Training Programme

UNAFEI's annual general anti-corruption programme, the UNAFEI UNCAC Training Programme, took place from 12 October to 17 November 2016. The main theme of the Programme is "Effective Anti-Corruption Enforcement (Investigation and Prosecution) in the Area of Procurement". 30 practitioners from 26 countries discussed effective anti-corruption enforcement (investigation and prosecution) in the area of public procurement.

IV. INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTATION SERVICES

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

V. PUBLICATIONS

Reports on training courses and seminars are published regularly by the Institute. Since 1971, the Institute has issued the Resource Material Series, which contains contributions by the faculty members, visiting experts and participants of UNAFEI courses and seminars. In 2016, the 98th, 99th and 100th editions of the Resource Material Series were published. Additionally, issues 149 to 151 (from the 162nd Senior Seminar to the 164th International Training Course, respectively) of the UNAFEI Newsletter were published, which include a brief report on each course and seminar and other timely information. These publications are also available on UNAFEI's website at <http://www.unafei.or.jp/english>.

VI. OTHER ACTIVITIES

A. Public Lecture Programme

On 29 January 2016, the Public Lecture Programme was conducted in the Grand Conference Hall of the Ministry of Justice. In attendance were many distinguished guests, UNAFEI alumni and the participants of the 162nd International Senior Seminar. This Programme was jointly sponsored by the Asia Crime Prevention Foundation (ACPF), the Japan Criminal Policy Society (JCPS) and UNAFEI.

Public Lecture Programmes increase the public's awareness of criminal justice issues through comparative international study by inviting distinguished speakers from abroad. In 2016, Professor Robert Canton of De Montfort University in Leicester, United Kingdom, and Ms. Diane Williams, President Emeritus of Safer Foundation in Chicago, Illinois, United States, were invited as speakers. They presented papers entitled "The Future of Community Penalties" and "Improving Efficiency and Outcomes Through Collaborations: an NGO Perspective", respectively.

B. Assisting UNAFEI Alumni Activities

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

C. Overseas Missions

Deputy Director MORINAGA Taro visited Beijing, China from 27 to 28 January 2016 to serve as a lecturer at a workshop on the structure and function of courts and prosecution offices held by JICA in collaboration with the Office of State Law, the Legislative Affairs Commission, and the Standing Committee at the National People's Congress (NPC) of China.

Deputy Director MORINAGA Taro and Professor YOSHIMURA Koji visited Bangkok, Thailand and Yangon, Myanmar to research the criminal justice systems in Myanmar and to discuss the "Myanmar Country Programme" with related organizations.

Professor YUKAWA Tsuyoshi visited Hanoi, Viet Nam and Yogyakarta and Jakarta, Indonesia to discuss the "Tenth Regional Seminar on Good Governance for Southeast Asian Countries" with related organizations.

Professor YOSHIMURA Koji visited Seoul, Korea from 13 to 19 March 2016 to attend the 5th Asian Conference of Correctional Facilities Architects and Planners (ACCFA).

Professor YUKAWA Tsuyoshi visited Bangkok, Thailand from 11 to 13 May 2016 to attend the Expert Meeting on the Nexus between Organized Crime and Terrorism as a threat to Security and Development hosted by the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute (UNICRI) and the Thailand Institute of Justice (TIJ).

Director SENTA Keisuke and Deputy Director MORINAGA Taro visited Vienna, Austria from 23 to 27 May 2016 to attend the 25th Session of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice.

Deputy Director MORINAGA Taro and Professor YAMAMOTO Mana visited Helsinki, Finland from 12 to 18 June to attend the experts' meeting of the International Penal and Penitentiary Foundation (IPPF).

MAIN ACTIVITIES OF UNAFEI

Professor MINOURA Satoshi and AKASHI Fumiko visited Beijing, China from 17 to 19 June to attend the Asia Criminology Society 8th Annual Conference.

Professor YAMAMOTO Mana visited Manila, Philippines from 27 to 30 July to attend the workshop on developing effective intake, risk assessment, and monitoring tools and strategies for incarcerated terrorist offenders held by the Global Counter Terrorism Forum (GCTF).

Professor MINOURA Satoshi visited Bangkok, Thailand from 15 to 19 August to attend the seminar on treatment of offenders in the ASEAN region.

Professor YOSHIMURA Koji visited Yangon, Myanmar and Bangkok, Thailand from 28 August to 3 September to discuss plans for the UNODC-UNAFEI Seminar for Myanmar Prison Officials in FY2017.

Professor YUKAWA Tsuyoshi visited Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire from 17 to 24 September 2016 to discuss plans for the fourth UNAFEI Criminal Justice Training Programme for French-Speaking African Countries.

Professor WATANABE Hiroyuki and Professor AKASHI Fumiko visited Toronto, Canada from 1 to 9 October 2016 to attend the International Community Corrections Association (ICCA) 24th Annual International Research Conference.

Deputy Director MORINAGA Taro visited Phnom Penh, Cambodia from 4 to 8 October 2016 to attend UNODC workshops as a visiting expert.

Professor YOSHIMURA Koji visited Tianjin, China from 15 to 22 October 2016 to attend the 36th Asian and Pacific Conference of Correctional Administrators (APPCA) Conference.

Professor YAMAMOTO Mana and Professor MINOURA Satoshi visited Bucharest, Romania from 21 to 30 October 2016 to attend the International Corrections and Prison Association (ICPA) 18th Annual Conference.

Professor YOSHIMURA Koji visited Nay Pyi Taw, Yangon and Insein, Myanmar from 7 November to 3 December 2016 to conduct the UNODC-UNAFEI Seminar for Myanmar Prison Officials.

Director SENTA Keisuke, Deputy Director MORINAGA Taro and Professor YAMAMOTO Mana visited Bangkok, Thailand to attend the PNI Meeting (9 to 11 November 2016) held by the Thailand Institute of Justice (TIJ). Director SENTA then visited Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh, Viet Nam from 13 to 18 November to attend the Joint Study on the Legal Systems of Japan and Viet Nam. Deputy Director MORINAGA visited Yangon, Myanmar from 10 to 16 November 2016 to join the UNODC-UNAFEI Seminar for Myanmar Prison Officials with Professor YOSHIMURA.

Professor YAMAMOTO Mana visited Batam, Indonesia from 30 November to 3 December 2016 to attend the Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF)'s Detention and Reintegration Working Group.

Deputy Director MORINAGA Taro, Professor WATANABE Hiroyuki and Professor AKASHI Fumiko visited Phnom Penh, Cambodia and Vientiane, Lao PDR from 7 to 14 December 2016 to conduct a survey on the status of community-based treatment of offenders. Professor WATANABE and Professor AKASHI then visited Bangkok, Thailand from 14 to 17 December 2016 to discuss plans for the Third-Country Group Training Programme for Development of Effective Community-based Treatment of Offenders in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Viet Nam.

Professor YUKAWA Tsuyoshi and Professor HIRANO Nozomu visited Kathmandu, Nepal from 13 to 22 December 2016 to discuss plans for the Comparative Study on the Criminal Justice Systems of Japan and Nepal.

Professor MINOURA Satoshi visited New Delhi, India from 14 to 20 December to attend the 18th World Congress of Criminology.

D. Assisting ACPF Activities

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

VII. HUMAN RESOURCES

A. Staff

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

B. Faculty and Staff Changes

Mr. YAMASHITA Terutoshi, formerly Director of UNAFEI, was transferred to the Supreme Public Prosecutors Office on 11 April 2016.

Mr. SENTA Keisuke, formerly the Chief Prosecutor of the Saga District Public Prosecutors Office, was appointed as Director of UNAFEI on 11 April 2016. He was Deputy Director of UNAFEI from 2005 to 2007.

Mr. MORIYA Kazuhiko, formerly a professor of UNAFEI, was transferred to the Kurume Branch of the Fukuoka District Public Prosecutors Office on 1 April 2016.

Mr. YAMADA Masahiro, formerly manager of the Itami Branch of the Kobe District Public Prosecutors Office, was appointed as a professor of UNAFEI on 1 April 2016.

Mr. HIROSE Yusuke, formerly a professor of UNAFEI, was transferred to the Tachikawa Branch of the Tokyo District Court on 1 April 2016.

Mr. HIRANO Nozomu, formerly a judge in the Nagoya District Court, was appointed as a professor of UNAFEI on 1 April 2016.

Mr. NAGAI Toru, formerly a professor of UNAFEI, was transferred to Chiba Prison.

Ms. YAMAMOTO Mana, formerly a psychologist in the classification division at Fuchu Prison, was appointed as a professor of UNAFEI on 1 April 2016. She is an alumna of the 151st International Training Course.

VIII. FINANCES

The Ministry of Justice primarily provides the Institute's budget. UNAFEI's total budget for its programmes is approximately ¥70 million per year. Additionally, JICA and the ACPF provide assistance for the Institute's international training courses and seminars.