

**United Nations Programme Network Institutes
Technical Assistance Workshop
Vienna Austria - April 17, 2002**

**Criminal Justice Reform: Lessons Learned
Community Involvement and Restorative Justice
Rapporteur's Report**

Prepared by Brian Tkachuk¹

Background to the Workshop

At their Fifteenth Co-ordination Meeting the Programme Network Institutes (Appendix I) agreed that they should, on a standing basis, collaborate in the organisation of practical workshops and events in support of the work of the United Nations Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. These activities are in fulfilment of the Commission's mandate to provide technical assistance to Member States on relevant issues of the Programme. These efforts also build upon the success of the ancillary meetings and workshops organised by the Institutes and held during the 10th and earlier United Nations Congresses on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders.

The first collaborative event organised by the Institutes was a one-day workshop on *Prison Population: Facts, Trends and Issues*, held on the occasion of the 10th Session of the Commission on 10 May 2001². This event provided an in-depth analysis and interpretation of trends and issues relevant to all regions the world and drew attention to the alarming developments in the world's prison population.

Criminal Justice Reform: Lessons Learned Community Involvement and Restorative Justice

On 17 April 2002, at the eleventh session of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, the Programme Network Institutes held their second practical workshop on "*Community Involvement and Restorative Justice: Lessons Learned*". The workshop was organized within the framework of **Criminal Justice Reform** which was the main theme for the 2002 Commission meeting. It is also within this framework of *Criminal Justice Reform: Lessons learned* that the institutes plan to continue organizing future workshops in conjunction with Commission meetings and in support of the work of the Commission and Member States. Responsibility for the workshop preparations, contact with speakers and collection of papers was undertaken by UNICRI.

Workshop Focus, Presentations and Discussion³

Chaired by **Javier Paulinich**, Commission Vice-Chair and Honourable Ambassador for Peru, the Workshop Programme (Appendix II) featured nine presentations representing all regions of the world. The presentations provided practical and substantive solutions to further the involvement of the community in the criminal justice process, and to the

¹ Brian Tkachuk, Director Corrections Program - International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy, Vancouver BC Canada

² For full report of the workshop see B. Tkachuk and R. Walmsley, "World prison population: Facts, trends and solutions", HEUNI Papers No 15, 2001. The report, the background paper and the eight technical papers presented during the workshop are available on UNICRI's website: <http://www.unicri.it/networkpage.htm>

³ The report and papers presented during this workshop are available on UNICRI's website at: http://www.unicri.it/annual_workshop_2002htm

adoption of restorative justice practices complementary to the mainstream criminal justice systems.

Restorative Justice; Directions and Principles - Developments in Canada

Representing the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy (ICCLR&CJP - Vancouver, Canada) **Robert Cormier** led off the presentation and discussion of Restorative Justice by noting that there has been an explosion of interest in restorative justice in recent years in many countries of the world, including Canada. This explosion has brought with it a great deal of excitement as well as uncertainty surrounding the application of Restorative Justice. In an effort to address both the promising aspects and uncertainties of restorative Justice Dr. Cormier provided a summary of the directions and developments in respect of Restorative Justice in Canada, including developments that favour the adoption of international principles to guide policy and practice in this emerging field.

At the outset Dr. Cormier provided a working definition for Restorative Justice as:

...an approach to justice that focuses on repairing the harm caused by crime while holding the offender responsible for his or her actions, by providing an opportunity for the parties directly affected by a crime - victim(s), offender and community - to identify and address their needs in the aftermath of a crime, and seek a resolution that affords healing, reparation and reintegration, and prevents future harm.

He further noted that Restorative justice is often defined by way of contrast with the mainstream, adversarial system of justice in Western countries (Zehr, 1990⁴). Whereas crime in the mainstream system is defined as a violation of the state, Restorative Justice sees crime as harm done to victims and communities. While the victim in the mainstream system is largely prevented from speaking about the real losses and needs resulting from the crime, in Restorative Justice the victim plays a central role in defining the harm and how it will be repaired. Whereas the mainstream system is operated and controlled by professionals, Restorative Justice allows the community to play an active role in holding offenders responsible, supporting victims and providing opportunities for offenders to make amends.

Because restorative justice is an "approach" to justice, it has a potentially broad application to the field of justice. First it can be applied to prevent crime by using mediation to resolve conflicts before they reach the threshold of criminal behaviour. Canada has applied Restorative Justice at every stage of the criminal justice system from police diversion to the post-sentence. Although it has been applied more in cases of youth crime, it is also suitable for adults. Similarly, although it has been used more often to deal with less serious crimes, it can be applied in cases of serious crimes taking into account the more challenging interpersonal dynamics in these cases.

Dr. Cormier noted that the starting point for discussion of Restorative Justice in Canada is deeply rooted in the cultures of Aboriginal peoples. It is their deep traditions that have served to influence the development of Restorative Justice in the mainstream

⁴ Zehr, H. (1990) *Changing Lenses*, PA: Herald Press

criminal justice system. Non-governmental organizations and faith communities have also been at the forefront of innovations in Restorative Justice.

A significant milestone for Restorative Justice in Canada was the 1988 Parliamentary Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General which conducted a review of sentencing, conditional release and related aspects of corrections. This far-ranging review included a focus on the needs of victims and restorative justice. The committee recommended that the government "support the expansion and evaluation throughout Canada of victim-offender reconciliation programs at all stages of the criminal justice process". The report also recommended that the purposes of sentencing be enacted in legislation, and that these include reparation of harm to the victim and the community and promoting a sense of responsibility in offenders. This purpose and principles of sentencing were introduced in the *Criminal Code of Canada* in 1996.

Another significant milestone for Restorative Justice in Canada was the March 1997 conference *Achieving Satisfying Justice*⁵, sponsored by the Canadian Criminal Justice Association and the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy. This conference brought together representatives of government departments and non-governmental organizations, criminal justice practitioners and researchers to explore the implementation of restorative justice initiatives and plan the further expansion of the field. The Vancouver conference was a watershed for restorative justice in Canada. It raised awareness of restorative justice and served as a catalyst for subsequent action in many locations across the country.

Following the Vancouver conference a working group composed of senior officials from Federal, Provincial and Territorial governments was established with a mandate to collaborate in the elaboration of policies for restorative justice, promote and disseminate research, and share information on developments in the various Canadian jurisdictions. In May 2000, the working group prepared a consultation paper titled *Restorative Justice in Canada*⁶. This paper provides an overview of the nature and philosophy of restorative justice and its applications, a brief synopsis of key developments in legislation, policy and programs in Canada, and a list of consultation questions under five main headings. The consultation questions address the roles of government and community in restorative justice, the effects on victims, appropriate offences for restorative processes, accountability issues, and training and standards of practice. Building on these milestone events and supported by discussion at various other fora, Restorative Justice gained significant momentum in Canada throughout the 1990s.

Based on a report prepared by the Department of Justice Canada Dr. Cormier categorized Restorative Justice programmes under three core models: victim-offender mediation, family group conferencing and circles. *Victim offender mediation*, which is where the victim and the accused person are brought together with a trained mediator to discuss the crime and develop a resolution agreement, is commonly used as a post-

⁵ Scott, James (Ed.) (1997) *Achieving Satisfying Justice: A symposium on implementing Restorative Justice models*. Vancouver, BC: Canadian Criminal Justice Association March 20-23, 1997

⁶ Department of Justice Canada (2000). *Restorative Justice in Canada: A Consultation Paper*. Ottawa

charge alternative measure but may also be used post-sentence in serious cases. *Family group conferencing*, which originated in New Zealand, is based on Maori traditions and was later developed in Australia. This model engages the family in resolving conflicts involving youth. *Circles* are based on North America Aboriginal traditional practices and ceremonies where people sit in a circle and speak in turn to discuss and resolve an issue affecting the community. This model has been used in various forms including sentencing circles, healing circles in the context of community corrections and community-assisted hearings by the National Parole Board for decisions regarding the conditional release of an offender from prison into the community.

Notwithstanding the recognition of the importance of research and evaluation, there have been relatively few formal evaluations of restorative justice programs in Canada. However, evaluations of various programs including victim offender mediation and holistic Circle Healing processes, in various locations across the country, show promising results. Key findings indicate high satisfaction with the process and outcomes. The completion of restitution is more likely and the healing process generates wellness in the community. With regards to recidivism, the results of a recent meta-analysis⁷ showed a reduction of 7% due to restorative justice intervention which is a consistent finding of an earlier analysis⁸. Research has also been conducted in Canada on public attitudes towards Restorative Justice, and survey results have shown favorable attitudes to these processes.

While the search for empirical support continues, the debate on restorative justice is unfolding on various fronts. Although restorative justice holds promise to deliver a more healing and satisfying justice, there have been concerns expressed about restorative justice, particularly from victims and victims' advocates. There are concerns that restorative justice programmes will be used inappropriately, and will fail to denounce and deter serious crime. Another concern is that restorative justice programmes are dominated by non-governmental organizations with a primary mandate to assist offenders in their rehabilitation and reintegration, and that the perspective of victims has not been adequately taken into account in the design and implementation of these programmes. In particular, there are concerns about the *ad hoc* approach to restorative justice programmes and the absence of guidelines, especially in relation to victim participation, power imbalances, serious crimes and the training of facilitators. Victims are concerned that there is a lack of services to victims currently within the mainstream system and that basic services to victims will be sacrificed in order to fund restorative justice. Other concerns have emerged from academics, particularly those focusing on sentencing. Restorative justice, with its focus on repairing harm in an individualized manner, may undermine the proportionality principle of sentencing, i.e., that the severity of punishments should reflect the seriousness of the crime, as well as the principle of equity in treatment.

⁷ Latimer, J., Dowden, C., and Muise, D. (2001). *The Effectiveness of Restorative Justice Practices: A Meta-Analysis*. Ottawa Department of Justice. Canada

⁸ Bonta, J., Wallace-Capretta, S. and Rooney, J. (1998). *Restorative Justice: An Evaluation of the Restorative Resolutions Project*. Ottawa: Solicitor General Canada

Against this backdrop of development and debate, Canada has been active in international efforts at the UN aimed at establishing UN basic principles of restorative justice that would serve to guide policy and practice in this emerging field. At the ninth session of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice in April 2000, Canada introduced a resolution, which called for the elaboration of basic principles for the use of restorative justice programmes in criminal matters. This resolution builds upon the discussion on Item 6 (Offenders and Victims: Accountability and Fairness in the Justice Process) at the 10th UN Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, which concluded that there was consensus on the promise of restorative justice as well as caution regarding the need to safeguard the rights and interests of victims in the implementation of restorative justice programmes.

The resolution sought the views of Member States, relevant intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, as well as institutes of the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Network, on the desirability and the means of establishing common principles on the use of restorative justice programmes in criminal matters and the advisability of developing a new instrument for this purpose. The resolution also requested that a meeting of experts be convened to review the comments received and to examine proposals for further action in relation to restorative justice.

Canada hosted the meeting of experts in Ottawa, from October 29 to November 1, 2001. There was general agreement among the group of experts that it was desirable to establish an instrument on basic principles of restorative justice. Building from a set of preliminary draft elements of basic principles on the use of restorative justice programmes in criminal matters that was annexed to the resolution (ECOSOC 2000/14), the group of experts produced on consensus a set of "revised draft elements of a declaration of basic principles on the use of restorative justice programmes in criminal matters." This revised draft includes a preamble that encapsulates the roots, philosophy, goals and flexible application of restorative justice. In the report on the meeting, the group of experts recommended that the revised draft elements be considered and approved by the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and other United Nations policy-making bodies. The group of experts also made other recommendations pertaining to further research, information sharing among Member States, technical assistance and the dissemination of the basic principles. A resolution, titled *Basic principles on restorative justice*, has been drafted and will be tabled at the 11th Session of the Commission.

Dr. Cormier noted that despite the development of and proposed resolution to adopt the UN basic principles, the issues facing restorative justice will not evaporate. Finding a place for healing in a system that is fundamentally punitive will continue to challenge policy makers and practitioners. There will continue to be concerns regarding the application of restorative justice. Nevertheless, internationally accepted principles will assist by providing guidance that, if followed, will help to prevent the misinformed and inappropriate activities that may be undertaken under the rubric of restorative justice but do not conform to its philosophy and values.

As with any set of principles, their application in specific circumstances is the crucial piece. Although there will be debates regarding their interpretation the principles will

serve as a focal point for discussion and examination of issues that will contribute to the growth of restorative justice.

Dr. Cormier concluded his presentation by emphasizing that, despite early achievements in the use of restorative practices, future restorative justice initiatives should be supported by evaluation and research, as well as guided by principles as articulated in the resolution recommended by this Commission.

Juvenile Justice Reform in Latin America and Restorative Justice

A case study of juvenile justice in Latin America was presented by **Elias Carranza**, Director of the Latin American Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (ILANUD - San Jose, Costa Rica). The study underscored the need for juvenile justice legislation to be guided by relevant international instruments. With a focus on alternative methods for conflict resolution and non custodial measures, which may qualify as Restorative Justice practices, Mr. Carranza provided a summary of the legislative reforms to juvenile criminal justice in the countries of Latin America brought about by the *United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989)* and other relevant instruments such as the *UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty (Beijing Rules)* and the *UN Directives for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency (Riyadh Directives)*.

Two important reforms were brought about by the new legislation drafted after the Convention. The first was the introduction of legal and procedural guarantees and guarantees concerning the execution of penalties, which had not previously been extended to underage persons. The second introduced alternatives to the criminal justice system and use of non-custodial measures that greatly reduce reliance on confinement. Mr. Carranza pointed out that, although the gap between theory and practice of the changes remains significant, it is without doubt that the Convention has brought about a new outlook to the field of juvenile criminal justice in the Region.

Before the Convention came into force juvenile justice in the countries of Latin America was governed by "paternalistic" laws which:

- Refused to grant minors standing before the court and therefore denied them the ordinary guarantees applicable to adult accused, violating various rights and in particular that of defense;
- Adopted an inquisitorial approach in which the judge acted in the capacity of a *bonus pater familiae*;
- Confused criminal matters with non-legal social questions, allowing the imposition of punishment and confinement for an indefinite period;
- Relied excessively on confinement, including commitment to institutions for indeterminate periods;

By contrast, the new juvenile criminal legislation that replaced these paternalistic laws were modeled on the Convention and the above-mentioned instruments, and incorporated the following features:

- The recognition of children and adolescents as having full standing at law, albeit at a specific stage of development, which also means that they are gradually acquiring responsibilities of a legal nature, including under the criminal law system as of a specified age and different from the criminal responsibility borne by adults.
- The inclusion of options that minimize intervention by the legal system, avoiding criminal proceedings and trials (alternative methods of conflict resolution).
- The establishment of a wide range of penalties (measures) designed with an educational purpose, and those requiring deprivation of liberty should be reserved for exceptional cases, more serious offences and only where no other type of punishment is possible.
- The guarantee of due process substantially and formally equivalent to that enjoyed by adults, plus the specific guarantees applicable to adolescents by reason of their age.
- The participation by victims in the process, also bearing in mind the educational purpose behind the court's intervention.

Mr. Carranza then provided an analysis of countries that have adopted *extrajudicial alternative measures* such as *diversion, conciliation, waiving of prosecution* and *conditional suspension*, in accordance with the Convention. He noted that these practices exist in various forms and many are the same despite the fact that they carry different names. All of the jurisdictions studied incorporate mechanisms such as *diversion, optionality* and *conditional stay of proceedings*, for removal of juvenile offenders from the justice system. With the exception of Brazil, Peru and Bolivia, all of the legal systems studied include provisions for *conciliation*.

With regard to *non-custodial measures and penalties* all of the domestic legislation examined includes measures for reprimand/admonishment, supervised release and community service. Reparation of damages is specified in the laws of all countries except El Salvador and Peru. Amongst the non-custodial measures specified *supervised release* appeared to be the most reliable for use in the juvenile justice system. One possible explanation for this lies in the fact that the questioning of the paternalistic model was based on its failure to respect guarantees of due process and the use of imprisonment as the only response to criminal behavior in young people. Accordingly, the new model proposes a separate justice system specialized in dealing with juveniles, full respect for due process, and sanctions aimed at educating young offenders, reserving the threat of deprivation of liberty (confinement) for only the most heinous of crimes. Supervised release leaves the juvenile free to plan his or her life in society, at the same time providing psycho-social assistance generally through the institution charged with execution of sentences involving actual confinement.

Mr. Carranza noted that the participation of victims in the criminal justice process is a relatively new concept in Latin American legal systems. However, the new Latin American legislation on juvenile justice contain alternative mechanisms in which the victim plays an essential role not only in conciliation, but also as part of the judge's

decision to shortcut the judicial process itself. With respect to reparation of victim's damages as part of the mechanism by which a stay of proceedings is approved, the study shows that conciliation is incorporated in several laws, almost always with the same limitation: namely, that this device is not allowed where the criminal act included violence against "life and limb".

Reparation of damages as a non-custodial sanction is included in virtually all of the legislation analyzed. However, this measure is made more educational by being part of a conciliation agreement, rather than when it is ordered by the judge following delivery of a guilty verdict. It is important to note that all of the laws examined in the study view community service as a particularly important and highly effective socio-educational measure since it helps the juvenile to understand that society as a whole or specific individuals have been harmed by his or her criminal behavior, and that the provision of community service provides an opportunity to repair the damage done by the offender.

In his closing comments Mr. Carranza noted that it is for good reason that the preamble to the *Revised draft Declaration of Principles on the use of restorative justice programs in criminal matters*⁹ included the following statement affirming that the restorative approach "...provides an opportunity for victims to obtain reparation, feel safer and seek closure; allows offenders to gain insight into the causes and effects of their behavior and to take responsibility in a meaningful way; and enables communities to understand the underlying causes of crime, to promote community well being and to prevent crime". This principle is consistent with the purposes of the model of criminal responsibility for juveniles established in the United Nations *Convention on the Rights of the Child*, and with the laws of the Latin American countries analyzed in the study.

Community Involvement and Crime Prevention in Japan - The Use of Volunteer Probation Officers (VPOs)

Kunihiko Sakai, Director of the United Nations Asia and Far East Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (UNAFEI - Tokyo, Japan) presented a paper on the issue of Community Involvement in Crime Prevention in Japan through the use of Volunteer Probation Officers.

Mr. Sakai described Volunteer Probation Officers (VPOs) as private citizens who assist Professional Probation Officers (PPOs) to support offenders of all ages in their rehabilitation and enhance community crime prevention. As such their specific duties and activities are classified into the two categories of *rehabilitation aid* and *crime prevention*.

Rehabilitation aid is undertaken on referral of the case from the Chief Probation Officer (CPO) and includes activities of supervising and assisting probationers and parolees in the community, inquiring into the environment where an inmate in a correctional institution will live after release and conducting preliminary investigations on candidates for pardon. While the PPO is involved in the case as a specialist in the treatment of offenders, the VPO works as a neighbor of the offender, assisting him/her on behalf of the community. VPOs are required to submit a monthly progress reports to the

⁹ ECOSOC Resolution 2000/14, Annex, as amended by the Group of Experts on Restorative Justice.

probation office. They also provide their opinions with regard to instances such as discharge from supervision and revocation of probation but do not participate in the decision-making of dispositions.

In support of effective crime prevention VPOs carry out many activities in the community in close collaboration of probation offices, the Ministry of Justice and other national/local government ministries and agencies, schools, police, other volunteers and voluntary organizations (NGOs). Activities include conducting public relations events such as symposia and forums, local neighborhood discussion meetings, support activities and fundraising. In addition to these activities which are held throughout the year an annual nationwide campaign is held to promote public understanding for the rehabilitation of offenders. This event is organized in close collaboration with the above mentioned individuals and bodies under the auspices of the Ministry of Justice.

Representing all sectors of Society there are presently 48,642 VPOs in Japan, a number that has varied from 48,000 to 49,000 throughout the past decade. The largest contingent consists of retired persons and housewives (27%), followed by company workers (21%). The average age of VPOs is 63.4 years. Many have been working for more than ten years on average.

Mr. Sakai noted that there is a long tradition of volunteer participation in the community-based treatment of offenders in Japan. This was first acknowledged by law in 1939 with the enactment of the Judicial Rehabilitation Service Law which provided the basic framework for "Rehabilitation Workers" which were predecessors of the VPOs. The current system, brought into effect with the Volunteer Probation Officer Law in 1950, was established as a professional service in the form of a combined system that consisted of professional staff (PPOs) and volunteer citizens (VPOs).

Legally VPOs are defined as non-permanent government officials and are; therefore, entitled to obtain national compensation benefit when any bodily injury is inflicted on VPOs in the performance of their duties. However, they are not paid any remuneration for their services and the government may only pay the expenses incurred in discharging their duties. Although the term of service of the VPO is two years there is the possibility of re-appointment. In practice, and because the duties of the VPO require experience, knowledge and skill about offender treatment, most are re-appointed repeatedly.

In the selection and recruitment process a VPO's character and personality are of primary consideration. The law requires that a VPO be evaluated with respect to their character and conduct in the community, enthusiasm and availability to work, financial stability and health. Screening of candidates is conducted by a VPO Screening Committee comprised of representatives of the court, prosecution, the bar association, correctional institutions, probation and parole services, other public commissions in the community and learned citizens. Following screening, appointment of qualified candidates is made by the Minister of Justice. On appointment and at various progressive stages during their term of appointment VPOs receive training on various aspects of their work. Specialized training, such as knowledge and skills of treatment methods, is provided when required.

There are several advantages to the VPO system. As VPOs and offenders, both as probationers and parolees, live in the same community, they are able to contact each other more often including on a daily basis and anytime in case of emergency. VPOs are therefore looked upon as neighbors as opposed to a representative of the government. The VPO is also more able to provide the offender with various social resources and useful information about the community to help their rehabilitation. Finally, VPOs are in a more advantageous position to bring about a change in the public attitude towards the offender and in mobilizing social resources.

There are also problems with the VPO system. As a government criminal justice agency it should provide the same level of supervision and support to all the offenders keeping in mind that treatment methods should be individualized based on the needs and risks of offender. However; VPOs as laymen are inclined to treat offenders in accordance with their personal or inherent views that have been established through their lives leading to differential treatment of offenders from one VPO to another.

The average age of a VPO is also of concern resulting in part from the difficulty of recruiting VPOs in urban areas. Year after year the average age has become older reaching 63.4 years on average as of 1 April 2001. On the other hand, approximately 70 percent of the offenders under supervision are under 20 years of age. There is; therefore, most often a considerable age/generation between the VPO and offender. This gap may inhibit communication with each other and nullify positive influences from VPOs on the offenders.

In conclusion Mr. Sakai noted that some of the problems related to the VPO system, particular the impartiality in the treatment and supervision, may be addressed by enhancing the systematic training of VPOs. As well, the introduction of a semi-professional VPO system would entail the recruitment of VPOs with special expertise and professional experience in human services who could be assigned to special tasks such as psychological counseling and legal assistance. Finally, in terms of the generation gap and the difficulty in securing qualified candidates for VPOs in urban areas, the recruitment procedure should be reconsidered so as to get younger volunteers and specialists serving as VPOs. Since interest in volunteer activities among young people has been increasing, new ways of recruitment will be effective and also strengthen the ties with other voluntary activities.

The Involvement of Communities in Crime Prevention: The Case of African Countries

The involvement of local communities in the conciliatory and compensatory practices in African countries was the focus of a presentation by **Masamba Sita**, Research and Policy Development Advisor of the United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (UNAFRI - Kampala, Uganda).

Dr. Sita pointed out that as African countries have become more concerned with crime prevention, more and more people are detained in increasingly overcrowded prisons. At the same time Criminologists have called into question the effectiveness of imprisonment as a deterrence to crime. In fact, they have noted the side effects of imprisonment which serve to reinforce criminal behaviour leading to recidivism. Dr. Sita

further noted that when Criminal Justice operators generally talk of crime prevention, other social agencies operating at the upstream of the criminal justice system are often neglected. The contribution of these social agencies or institutions such as families, neighbourhood, churches, schools or other local institution is overlooked while their potential contribution to crime prevention is evident.

With these issues in mind and throughout the 1990's many African countries resolved to reform their criminal justice systems by way of introducing alternatives to imprisonment.

Zimbabwe, for example, has put more emphasis on non-custodial sentences and has developed an expanding network of community service as an alternative to imprisonment. Many other African countries have also initiated various reforms of their Criminal Justice System. Other types of reform include the introduction of Community Policing while a country like Tanzania is striving to revive its parole system. A common element to all of the reform initiatives undertaken is the involvement of local communities. In countries where local communities were not effectively involved the initiatives generally failed as they were rejected by the public.

Outside of the Criminal Justice Systems in Africa, many other initiatives are taken by local communities to promote safety and security. It is generally accepted that law and order prevailed in traditional African societies, mainly because every member of the society was, as it were, a policeman against the other. These traditional mechanisms are still alive and make up what criminologists generally call "Informal Controls". While it is recognised that some of these initiatives infringe Human Rights and should be rejected those considered as promising should be given deserved attention, and where possible, integrated in criminal policies.

Elaborating on specific aspects of his presentation Dr. Sita discussed in more detail the "informal" and "formal" systems of social control who depend upon each other for their effectiveness. Without informal social controls, the Criminal Justice System would soon be swamped with a multitude of crime, both serious and non-serious, and would cease to function effectively. Without the existence of the formal Criminal Justice System to provide the threat of arrest and punishment, informal social controls would face a constant challenge to their legitimacy and credibility.

Society's informal controls include a variety of measures taken, *inter alia*, by parents, schools and religious bodies. In the African context, families, neighbours, friends, and any other social network to which an individual belongs, is included. Within the informal system the solution to a situation is defined by the people viewing the situation as problematic and is not brought from outside. The agreement is reached or found on the basis of the contribution of each members of that social group often through payment restitution, negotiation and treatment, resulting to restorative justice; and sometimes through punishment when there are no alternatives and the required resources are available. Where resources are unavailable, the case may be transferred to the Formal Control System, which is also the Criminal Justice System.

"Formal systems of control" serve a dual purpose of deterring law breaking among the population at large and of apprehending, punishing and treating those who offend. Dr.

Sita noted that in some African countries, Uganda for example, Legislation is open to other styles of social control such as compensatory and reconciliatory measures.

Dr. Sita also elaborated on the concept of "Social Control" through the four styles of Social Control by Horwitz A. V. (1990:19-95): *penal, compensatory, conciliatory and therapeutic.*

The goal of the *penal style* is retribution and the solution of the problematic situation is through punishment. The *compensatory style* of social control characterises the harm as material, considers the offender liable and aims at a settlement that will be achieved through payment. In the *conciliatory* style the people involved share the liability while the aim is reconciliation through negotiation. The fourth style of social control was the *therapeutic style*, whereby the harm is personality (the behaviour being defined by members of the concerned local community as a sickness). There is no liability but in the African context someone may be accused of being responsible for the sickness of the person. The involved people will be aiming at normality and recovery of the sick person through treatment.

Taking a further look at the importance and involvement of African communities' in crime prevention programs Dr. Sita noted that an analysis of communities in Africa revealed that local communities are indeed actively and often involved in handling problematic situations out of the formal criminal justice or control system. This involvement is attributed to the survival of tribal laws or informal control systems. He also pointed out that the success of initiatives such as community service, community policing and the social rehabilitation of prisoners and street children were largely dependent on the involvement of communities. Dr. Sita elaborated on the experience of two programs; the community service scheme in Zimbabwe and the Uganda pilot project on social rehabilitation and reintegration, both of which exemplified the need for community participation to succeed. In spite of widespread recognition to the communities' important role Dr. Sita noted that the formal criminal justice system often fails to consider the involvement of communities in the fight against crime.

In conclusion of his presentation Dr. Sita commended the Group of Experts on Crime Prevention¹⁰ for including in their report, conceptual reference to and a principle which stipulates that:

" Crime prevention should be integrated into all relevant social and economic policies and programmes, including those addressing employment, education, health, housing and urban planning, poverty, social marginalisation and exclusion. Particular emphasis should be placed on communities, families, children and youth at risk".

It is thought that the implementation of such as principle in the context of Africa, with emphasis on communities and family, will find a fertile soil because the effective involvement of communities is often the aim. Community involvement also gives access to local (human, material, financial, etc.) resources that may not be otherwise available.

¹⁰ Meeting of UN Group of Experts on Crime Prevention, Vancouver, Canada - January 21-24, 2002

More importantly the communities' effective involvement leads to the successful social rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders.

Best Practices on Restorative Justice

Legislative case studies on the adoption of restorative justice processes were provided for Italy by **Renzo Orlandi**, and for Spain by **Joan Queralt** both representing the International Scientific and Professional Advisory Council (ISPAC - Milan, Italy). These case studies looked at the introduction of mediation and victim involvement in the criminal justice process and other dispositions such as stay of case, suspended sentencing, and cancellation of criminal records.

In their presentations both Professor Orlandi and Professor Queralt referred to the shortcomings of the traditional justice systems in their respective countries that prompted a search for procedural solutions and paved the way for the introduction of mediation, victim participation and other restorative justice approaches.

In Italy, where historically the objective of establishing the fact of criminal liability and incarcerating the guilty party took precedence over providing social restoration to the victim, victim/offender mediation provisions now exist to different extents. They exist in Italian criminal law, juvenile criminal law and practice, and also in a new 2002 law that allows complaints for specific offences to be made by victims to a Justice of the Peace.

In his paper Professor Orlandi pointed out that it is reasonable to assume that these practices emerged as a result of problems or debate over the effectiveness of penalties and in particular cases where imprisonment was unjustifiable both as a preventive as well a rehabilitative measure. As the offence itself often determines the sentence, and the sentence itself comes long after the offence was committed, the general preventative or re-educative aims may be lost. Further, if re-education and reintegration into society are to be the focus of penitentiary treatment, this cannot be effectively realized in situations of short terms of imprisonment.

Although provisions for mediation between perpetrator and victim exist in Italy's criminal law, they are of limited effect. The bulk of mediation practices take place in the field of juvenile criminal law and practice, which recognizes the irreparable psychological harm potentially caused to young people in prison. In Italy there is also a strict and unconditional obligation to pursue criminal proceedings if there is evidence of crime. This poses a significant obstacle to diversion methods; however, there are provisions in the Italian legislation to allow suspensions of proceedings for remission to social services and declarations of non-punishability in cases of trivial acts committed. These may be made dependent on the perpetrator's efforts to re-establish peaceful relations with the victim.

On the matter of victims, they can, in some instances, have direct access to the court and become part of the proceedings where an injured party, for specific offences, makes a complaint to a Justice of the Peace. If deemed admissible, a hearing can be set to attempt to achieve reconciliation between the parties. Legal practitioners in Italy view this new (2002) law with some skepticism; however, Professor Orlandi is of the opinion that it holds great promise.

In Spain, and not unlike other parts of the world the victim was rarely mentioned in criminal law and was incidental to criminal justice proceedings, except for limited forms of indemnification. The birth of "victimology"; however, began to change this. New approaches such as the use of mediation within the larger category of victim reparations have provided victims with an increased role to play. There are now provisions within Spanish criminal law for young offenders, allowing for mediation between a minor and a victim, as well as for setting out the terms of formal apologies and for the performance of restitution undertakings by the perpetrator for the victim.

In addition to briefly outlining the history and provisions for the use of mediation in Spain as well as in clarifying the distinction between a victim and a person adversely affected, Professor Queralt also pointed out the problems and potential shortcomings associated with mediation. His presentation focused on three particular groups of objections: politico-criminal, politico-theoretical and systematic.

There are numerous objections falling under the politico-criminal justice category. There is a belief among some criminologists and other experts, that mediation may eliminate the deterrent effect of the regular criminal justice process. Others point out that the voluntary nature of the offender and the victim's participation in the mediation process is also problematic since the former may face harsher sentencing by a judge if she/he refuses to take part, and the pressure to mediate may in fact lead to resentment and harsher consequences down the line, instead of the reconciliation being sought. Professor Queralt also noted that victims, unlike offenders, have nothing to lose by undergoing the mediation process, and that the resulting power imbalance only serves to increase the inequality between offenders and victims.

Politico-theoretical objections to mediation reflect concerns of a return to private criminal law and justice systems where mediation and the role of victims, with respect to certain offences, are perceived to operate outside of the current criminal justice structure. Pardons granted through mediation are perceived as a form of decriminalization as opposed to a legally regulated pardon which is granted under specific conditions.

Finally, the systematic objections presented by Professor Queralt are based on the shortcomings of mediation and other victim-oriented processes within the criminal justice system that fail to provide procedural safeguards for an accused. The exclusion of an investigation stage in these processes is of particular concern, given that it fails to respect the tradition of due process and has an obvious potentially prejudicial effect on the accused. It is for this reason, as well as those listed above, that Professor Queralt concludes that mediation and reparation practices can only be effective and desirable if they are put into practice within the framework of existing legal procedures and guarantees, rather than acting as a substitute for criminal procedure.

The Children at Risk (CAR) Program

Edwin Zedlewski, Senior Scientific Advisor of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ - Washington, D.C., USA) presented a case study carried out in five US cities which described the design, implementation, evaluation, and eventual expansion of a comprehensive drug prevention programme for children and juveniles entitled Children

at Risk (CAR). As the research arm of the US Department of Justice the NIJ supported the evaluation of the program. Dr. Zedlewski's presentation, highlighting the evaluative program components, brought attention to concern voiced at earlier Commission meetings that the UN should take greater care in selecting the programmes and practices that it refers to its members.

Dr. Zedlewski prefaced his presentation by noting that evaluations serve several purposes including oversight of performance, diagnosis of problem areas, and assessment of effectiveness. These uses are valuable but tend to limit the value of evaluation to specific programs. They document and assess present practice but fall short of future considerations. Rigorous evaluation provides value beyond the program being evaluated. By pointing out the strengths and weaknesses in the program evaluated, it guides developers to new program designs. It also provides the impetus for replications and refinements of the existing efforts.

Building upon earlier research that indicated that children begin experimenting with drugs and crime early in adolescence, and that one could identify certain risk factors present in families that made those children more likely to experiment, CAR was an experiment that intervened with children in high risk families. The interventions provided a variety of services to address the risk factors. Planning and program design started 1990, the program operated from 1992 to 1995 and evaluation followed youth into 1997.

The CAR field test featured close coordination between program design and program evaluation. This tight coordination between evaluation goals and program design was critical to the evaluation's ability to generalize findings across multiple sites, which proved critical to later expansion efforts.

CAR operated in some of the poorest areas of five cities (Austin, Texas; Bridgeport, Connecticut; Memphis, Tennessee; Savannah, Georgia; Seattle, Washington), targeting youth aged 11 - 13 attending a specific school in severely distressed neighborhoods. CAR interventions occurred at four distinct levels: the neighborhood and its safety; the school that experimental children attended; the families caring for these children; and the children themselves. CAR's primary goal was to prevent substance abuse in these high-risk youth. Dr. Zedlewski provided a couple of case studies to demonstrate the difficulty and of the cases undertaken in the course of the study.

CAR targeted eight risk factors that predict drug involvement:

- Pre-existing substance abuse by the child;
- Academic failure;
- Child maltreatment;
- Patterns of child violence;
- Chronic truancy;
- Crushing poverty;
- Delinquent peers; and
- Family addiction or criminality.

As a result of previous research which indicates that multiple interventions are needed to address multiple problems CAR directed its program activities toward five objectives that would be effective in preventing delinquency:

- Improving social services delivered to children and families in tough neighborhoods;
- Reducing the incidence of juvenile delinquency;
- Improving school performance;
- Strengthening family functioning; and
- Making communities safer.

Case managers were the heart of the program. In addition to their diagnostic and monitoring functions, they coordinated the delivery of multifaceted services across agencies with the other participating agencies including housing, recreation, schools, juvenile and criminal justice, and mental health. Managers coordinated eight kinds of services:

- Case management.
- Family services.
- After school and summer activity.
- Mentoring.
- Educational services.
- Incentives.
- Community policing
- Juvenile justice interventions.

A control group, formed through a random assignment process, was necessary to determine whether CAR significantly improved the futures of participants.

Evaluators followed the performance of youth in the experimental and control groups for one year after they participated in the program. After four years, evaluators were able to measure outcomes for some 500 youth (264 participants and 236 controls). Critical differences between the program participants and the control groups emerged only after the children passed through the peak years for drug experimentation, ages 14 and 15 years.

Dr. Zedlewski outlined some of the key findings of the CAR evaluation study. Across the five cities and speaking to general program effects, while adjusting for other influencing factors, CAR resulted in significant declines in drug use, drug selling, violent crime, and educational failures. CAR also seemed to be highly effective in reducing youth propensities to deal in drugs despite the high prevalence in their neighborhoods. CAR youth were at least 20 percent less likely to commit a violent crime in the past year than non-participants were. Reduced association with negative peers and association with peer support helped CAR youth gain self-esteem and resist negative role models. CAR youth were more likely to be promoted in school although they did not achieve significantly higher grades or rates of attendance.

Evaluators did not perform a formal cost-benefit analysis but a simple comparison against the cost of juvenile confinements strongly suggests that CAR helped avert significant future costs to the Criminal Justice System.

Although the final impact of CAR on the experimental youth is nearly impossible to assess the impact during the four-year period during which the youth were studied was positive with respect to the youth but negative with respect to families and neighborhoods. Negative influences did not go away; however, CAR youth seemed able to resist the influences of negative peers, dysfunctional families, and stifling neighborhood criminality to move a little higher in social progress.

By a variety of objective measures, CAR's approaches to high-risk youth demonstrated significant payoffs. Armed with these evaluation results to seek and obtain sustainable funding from philanthropic foundations, state governments and federal agencies the program has to date been expanded to 23 locations across the US.

Some of the lessons learned through the evaluation of CAR were:

- From a policy perspective, governments must understand that youth with the multitudes of problems cannot be treated with simple, one dimensional solutions;
-
- Multiple intervention programs are complex and costly to administer but they will return the investment by averting other costs later;
-
- Good evaluation brings financial support; and
- Evaluation alone is not enough and other agencies need to be involve in encouraging the adoption of proven programs in new communities.

In conclusion Dr. Zedlewski pointed out that because of the high cost of CAR, less wealthy countries would be quick to dismiss CAR as irrelevant or beyond their grasp. Instead, they should draw upon the experience of CAR or similar researched and evaluated programs and adapt them to their own environments. Borrowing and adapting tested concepts are less expensive than inventing them. Costly mistakes need not be repeated.

Crime in Islamic Sharia

Ali F. Al-Jahny, Vice-Dean, College of Graduated Studies of the Naif Arab Academy of Security Studies (NAASS - Riyadh, Saudi Arabia) described the unique characteristics associated with the *Sharia* approach to crime in Islamic countries.

Professor Al-Jahny noted that a crime, in Islamic *Sharia*, has distinct implications. In Islam crime means transgression of the boundaries of nature and the infliction of harm to individuals and groups. It also implies the self-destruction of society amounting to the eventual disruption of law and order. In *Sharia*, criminal behaviour is a devolution from the normal behaviour of an individual and in contrast to the pure nature of man as created by Allah. Man is born with goodness and kindness and with the passage of time becomes the prisoner of evil, showing no hesitation to transgress against others.

A uniqueness associated with *Sharia's* approach towards crime control is its benevolent character. More specifically, Islamic penal jurisdiction demonstrates relaxation in penalties if offenders are proven to be unsound at the time of criminal act. Another unique characteristic of the *Sharia* approach to crime is the voluntary offering on the part of the offenders who, by consequence of their offering, show their dedication for self-purification, repentance from sins and their unwavering determination to non-recidivism.

In the area of applications, *Sharia* demonstrates noteworthy aspects. First, it embraces all segments of society - ruler or ruled, rich or poor. Second, it covers all facets of human existence - life, honor and property. Third it assures tangible gains. In the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for example, and where the *Sharia* has been applied in its judicial domain, crime rates have declined to a record point. It has also achieved unprecedented peace and stability in a world of technology and sophistication of communication. These examples demonstrate that Islamic legislation is effective in eliminating crime and corruption and that it is relevant to all times and conditions and to each segment of society.

In order to highlight and put into context *Sharia's* approach to crime Professor Al-Jahny elaborated on several components to which it prescribes:

Moderation in Islam - Islamic injunctions are based on moderation. Islam disdains both extremism and exaggeration, both of which are incompatible to Islamic teachings.

Protection of Individual Freedom - Islam guarantees freedom including freedom of expression. Individual freedom in Islam is, however, not unrestricted and is constrained within certain limits. In particular, it must not be detrimental to public interests or pose a threat to the existing social culture.

Protection of individual Property - Islam ensures the protection of individual property by Divine Commands and a violation of this right is warned with severe penalties.

Social Security in Islam - One of the highlights of the Islamic political system is its ample care towards social security. *Sharia* is exhorted upon mutual cooperation and relative understanding between rich and the destitute.

State in the Role of Islam - The main concern of the State is to serve people and society as best as possible. The main focus of the Islamic state; however, is to ensure a lasting, viable, secure and stable social structure. In this regard an observer of *Sharia* will discover that crimes are accompanied with severe penalties. This is first explained by the importance of ensuring integrity of faith of the Muslim *Ummah* and social cohesiveness. Second is the value of peace and tranquility. The central notion is that each individual must enjoy the bounties of a happy life and fear and unrest must not overwhelm them.

Islamic Values - Islamic *Sharia* has enshrined social and moral values which tend to facilitate the control and prevention of crime.

In conclusion it was noted that *Sharia* has ensured the protection of human rights, instituted a social security system and has enshrined social and moral values. All these together facilitate control and the prevention of crime.

Crime Prevention and Policing¹¹

The final presentation by **Frantz Denat**, representing the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime (ICPC - Montreal, Canada) discussed the matter of policing, underlined the problems of traditional policing methods and related the experience of community policing practices that were established in an attempt to achieve better results.

In his presentation Mr. Denat brought up certain elements about police history, noting that the methods chosen to regulate relations between people in society have evolved over time. In Africa, for example, relationships were regulated through mediation exercises led by a wise man so designated by the community. In ancient Rome and Greece disagreements were settled by a class of slaves. Through these times military's were used to suppress threats of security. In the 16th century, the first organized police forces emerged to respond to changes in society and developments in the trade of goods which saw a rise in criminality. It was not until 1929 that the role of police was defined to achieve "public order" and conduct investigations.

Mr. Denat described two types of police functions: administrative (related to law and order) and judicial (related to an offence). He examined evolutions in lifestyle and insecurity. He also examined the institutional response to crime that has prevailed until now - a response that has been, to a great extent, repressive, punitive, and costly. He emphasized that a sense of insecurity has come about where there is objective insecurity and subjective insecurity which is related to factors such as the disintegration of social ties, the lack of job security, or urban development. In the face of such problems, police have to deal with different types of people (citizens, victims, and offenders) but also with institutional constraints and the successive reforms of organizations. At the same time, police are facing significant technological transformations and sophistication in communication and transportation. These reforms distance police from the general public and high-risk areas where patrolmen would normally walk to mark their presence. These reforms also discourage police, many of whom end up in a hierarchy of offices where they find themselves carrying out orders from a central location.

For too many years, police used a reactive and specialized approach, as they alone confronted offenders. The implementation of a police community (based on Peel's theories dating back to the 19th century) meets the need for linking residents and society to problem solving. In decentralized countries, community policing suggests that police authority comes under the mayor's authority. In centralized countries, where police rely on a central level, the term "police de proximité" (neighborhood police) is used. However, the basic principles remain the same: police-community partnership; police committed to their territory and its residents; police who think ahead and act in a precautionary way rather than simply react. Versatility, responsibility, and results are

¹¹ Translation of French title - Prévention de la délinquance et Police

therefore expected of police. Although the implementation of this approach has been generalized and presented as an all-purpose remedy, it is nevertheless confronted with internal resistance and numerous technical and systemic difficulties within. For example, 80% of police training focuses on professional conduct with respect to crime while this activity represents only 20% of the work in this field. At the institutional level, prevention is neither taken into consideration due to a lack of appropriate evaluation tools, nor is it upgraded at the hierarchical level. Police officers are "hired to stop the bad guys" but instead they find themselves faced with difficult social situations for which they have no training or tools. Although the risk factors of crime have been identified, the protection factors, which are not dependent upon police, are rarely set up for dealing with them. Police are perplexed and need a political vision that would allow them to situate their mission and functions within a complex and ever changing society. Police are more flexible than one would believe; they adapt to societal changes in order to survive as they wait for society to assume its responsibilities.

Conclusion

Based on the presentations and the brief discussions that followed it is apparent that a number of factors have prompted countries worldwide to pursue restorative justice and community involvement in their criminal justice and crime prevention initiatives. These include the general dissatisfaction with traditional justice systems, delays in the criminal justice process, the need to increase the role of victims and community in the criminal justice process and severe prison overcrowding which itself instigated the need to find safe and effective alternatives to imprisonment. Although it is in most instances too early to determine the full extent to which the various initiatives implemented have served to address these issues, the programs highlighted in the course of the workshop presentations lead one to conclude that they hold great promise if appropriately implemented. Consensus also emerged that ongoing research and evaluation will remain key to their continued success.

Despite their successes and vast potential it is noted that while restorative justice and community based programs exist in many countries, both principally and legislatively, they remain limited in practice. This is somewhat disconcerting in light of the promise they hold for achieving a more humane, effective and efficient criminal justice system. To this end it is hoped that events such as this workshop will serve as a catalyst for continued discussion, innovation and implementation of programs which embody the principles of restorative justice and other community based programs.

In conclusion, the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme Network Institutes are grateful for having been given the opportunity to hold this workshop. In their efforts to support of the priorities of the Commission the Institutes plan to continue organizing similar events in conjunction with Commission meetings. They also remain committed, within their respective mandates, to continuing their technical assistance activities and programme efforts in support of the Commission, including activities that will benefit worldwide criminal justice and prison reform.

The rapporteur's report, background paper and technical papers presented during the workshop will be available on UNICRI's website:

www.unicri.it

APPENDIX I

United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme Network

The United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme Network consists of the United Nations Centre for International Crime Prevention and a number of interregional and regional institutes around the world, as well as specialised centres. It has been developed to assist the international community in strengthening international co-operation in the crucial area of crime prevention and criminal justice. Its components provide a variety of services, including exchange of information, research, training and public education.

CICP - Vienna, Austria

United Nations Centre for International Crime Prevention

UNICRI - Turin, Italy

United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute

UNAFEI - Tokyo, Japan

United Nations Asia and Far East Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders

HEUNI - Helsinki, Finland

European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, affiliated with the United Nations

ILANUD - San José, Costa Rica

United Nations Latin American Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders

UNAFRI - Kampala, Uganda

United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders

ICCLR&CJP - Vancouver, Canada

International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy

ICPC - Montreal, Canada

International Centre for the Prevention of Crime

NIJ - Washington D.C., USA

National Institute of Justice

AIC - Canberra, Australia

Australian Institute of Criminology

ISISC ; Siracusa, Italy

International Institute of Higher Studies in Criminal Sciences

RAOUL Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law Lund, Sweden

ISPAC - Milan, Italy

International Scientific and Professional Advisory Council of the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Program

NAASS - Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Naif Arab Academy for Security Sciences

APPENDIX II

**Eleventh Session of the Commission on Crime Prevention
and Criminal Justice
PNI Technical Assistance Workshop**

**Criminal justice reform: lessons learned
Community involvement and restorative justice**

Vienna, 17 April 2002

AM

10:00

Opening remarks

Overview of the workshop, introduction of topics and presentation of handouts (UNICRI-CICP)

10:15

ICCLR&CJP: Restorative Justice, Directions and Principles - Developments in Canada, Robert Cormier, Director, Corrections Research, Department of Solicitor General for Canada

10:45

ISPAC: Best Practices on Restorative Justice.
Renzo Orlandi, University of Bologna
Joan Queralt, University of Barcelona

11:15

ILANUD: Juvenile Justice Reform in Latin America. Best Practices on Restorative Justice, Elias Carranza, Director

11:45

UNAFEI: Community Involvement and Crime Prevention in Japan - The use of Volunteer Probation Officers (VPOs).
Kunihiko Sakai, Director

PM

12:30

Discussion

15:00

NIJ: The Children at Risk (CAR) Programme. Dr. Edwin Zedlewski, Senior Science Advisor

15:30

NAASS: Crime in Islamic Sharia, Ali F. A. Al-Jahny, Vice-Dean, College of Graduated Studies

16:00

UNAFRI: The Involvement of (local) communities in Crime Prevention: the case of African countries Masamba Sita, Research and Policy Development Advisor

16:30

ICPC: Prévention de la délinquance et Police (Crime

Prevention and Policing), Frantz Denat, Chargé de mission

17:00 **Discussion**

17:50 **Rapporteur's concluding remarks and Workshop
Closure**