



Criminal Justice Platform Europe

Radicalisation and Violent Extremism – Barcelona 26th April 2016

Criminal Justice Platform / Centre of Legal Studies

Plenary

Chair: John Scott

Experts: Merel Molenkamp, Nikhil Roy, Steve Gorman, Tim Chapman, Serge Rومان, Said Aberkan, Hans Kieserling, Julio ZIno, Finn Grav, Olivier Cauberghs.

Participants: 78

Welcome and Introduction

The conference participants were welcomed by the **Xavier Bernardi** the Director of the Centre for Legal Studies and Specialized Training and **Armand Caldero** the Director General of the Catalonian Penitentiary Services.

The chair of the day, **John Scott**, introduced the **Criminal Justice Platform Europe** (CJPE), composed of the European Forum for Restorative Justice (EFRJ), Confederation of European Probation (CEP) and European Organisation of Prison and Correctional Services (EuroPris). He particularly appreciated the partnership of the Platform with Catalonia and the Centre for Legal Studies.

European Initiatives

Merel Molenkamp is a senior advisor at **Radicalisation Awareness Network** (RAN), Prison and Probation Group and member of Council of Europe expert group for the Handbook on radicalization. She introduced RAN as an initiative of the European Commission DG Home to tackle radicalisation. The purpose of RAN is to facilitate exchange among practitioners and other stakeholders, to support both the EU and its Member States and to disseminate the learning gathered during the RAN activities.

Ms Molenkamp stressed that radicalisation is a process, not a static place, and the focus is radicalisation that is leading to extremism and violence. She illustrated the RAN key features: training of first line



practitioners in prevention and detection; multi-agency approach including NGOs, communities at risk, victims and formers; and tailor-made interventions, adapted to local circumstances.

Nikhil Roy, Programme Development Director at **Penal Reform International**, emphasised the importance of collaboration. He stressed that the scale of the problem is much larger in the Middle East than in the EU. He indicated that for example in the UK radicalisation started to grow, while in Pakistan and Nigeria we already speak of thousands of radicalised persons. In relation to detention there is not yet a consensus on dispersion and concentration of prisoners. As e.g. a new report in England and Wales suggested to follow the model of concentration rather than dispersion. But this is not the only decision to be taken, more tools and instruments are needed to face the phenomena of radicalisation in prisons. In addition, problems such as overcrowding or ill-treatment often create an environment for radicalisation to flourish or hampers efforts for classification, separation and effective programmes to take place. Furthermore, he asserted that trainings always need to be adapted to the local context. And he stressed that more research about women and juveniles in relation to radicalisation is needed.

Good practice

Case management of prisoners of concern

Steve Gorman, Head of Counter Terrorism Unit at **NOMS** (England and Wales), presented the case management system that NOMS is using. He explained the importance for prison staff to being able to recognize prisoners displaying extremist behaviour and identify prisoners that could be a risk to national security. The processing and management of intelligence has been standardised. The detected signs of radicalisation are used to decide which kind of assessment and management actions needs to be taken. NOMS uses the so-called banding model: Based on regular evaluations and intelligence prisoners are allocated to a band according to their potential risk.

- Band 4: prisoners presenting a lower risk, remain at band 4 until the next evaluation.
- Band 3: prisoners who present ongoing concerns based on analysis of continued intelligence.
- Band 2: prisoners who present ongoing extremist concerns.
- Band 1: prisoners that present a serious threat of harm to staff or other prisoners and who are motivated by an extremist ideology.

The benefits of the band system are: good collaboration with partners; cross-agency approach;; consistency in approach; confidence in the numbers on the level of threat. In relation to concentration and dispersal, he was not in favour of concentrating all radicalized prisoners in one prison, creating a British Guantanamo would not be the solution.

Politically motivated prisoners in Northern Ireland: a restorative approach

Tim Chapman, EFRJ Board member and lecturer in restorative practices at the **University of Ulster**, illustrated the contribution that restorative justice could make to the issue of radicalization and violent extremism. The main problem often is the resistance to rehabilitation with persons whose actions are politically motivated. He noticed deficiencies and needs when dealing with radicalised prisoners who have a clear political ideology and strategy to support their violent actions. His approach combined ideas



from desistance theory and restorative justice. particularly the movement from a condemnation for IRA violent actions to a full reintegration to the society.

In the contact with the prisoners it is most important to: clarify what loyalism means; build relationships; manage one's own judgment; take into account that a visit to the prison is actually a visit to their homes; understand their sense of injustice and shame; and to focus on disengagement from violence rather than de-radicalisation. Group sessions appeared to have a positive effect on the inmate.

The Belgian approach towards radicalization: policy, infrastructure and staff training

Serge Rooman from the Penitentiary Training Centre of the **Belgian Prison Service**, mentioned that Belgium has 120 radicalised prisoners out of a total of about 11.000 prisoners. The radicalised prisoners are divided into 4 categories; 16 of them are in the most difficult category and hard to deal with. The Belgian Ministry of Justice has developed a radicalisation action plan to prevent radicalisation and to address it in prison settings. Currently, the Belgian Prison Service focusses on: reintegration; improved collection of information and analysis; improved information exchange; and basic training for adequate detection and awareness about radicalisation.

Furthermore, Mr. Rooman explained the placing policy: it was decided to not systematically concentrate prisoners in surroundings under restricted conditions based on concrete incidents or signs of radicalisation. In case of doubt it is possible to transfer to satellite prisons that have staff specifically trained on risk assessment and screening, but that have living conditions similar to those of common prisoners. Transfer to specialized wings where they are isolated as a group only takes place after analysis that shows a permanent risk for radicalising other prisoners. He stressed the need for a structural involvement of representatives of different recognized religions; and the importance of good contacts with other actors, such as Muslim communities and the need for international exchange of experiences with the EU MS.

Religious Care

Role of Muslim Chaplain

Said Aberkan, Head of Muslim chaplains of the **Belgian Prison Service** Flemish region, stated that a person who leads the prayers in prison and who discusses theological issues with prisoners needs to be a person with leadership qualities. A Muslim counsellor needs the skills of an imam and a strong educational background (e.g. criminology, communication) in order to assist the prison staff, and to assist the prisoners individually.

Mr. Aberkan argued that the process of radicalisation is caused by a wrong interpretation of the rules of Sharia. He mentioned Morocco as an example for a successful de-radicalisation program. This was achieved through opening the possibilities for dialogues inside the Moroccan prisons, engaging radicalised prisoners with Islamic scholars. Positive results in progressing de-radicalisation were achieved by debating wrong interpretations of Islam.

He recommended to engage Muslim counsellors in the rehabilitation. And these counsellors should stay connected with the prisoners once they leave the prison. This is especially important for the ones with a



radicalized profile. The need to work with the outside mosques and imams is also relevant because of their close relationships with the families.

Mr. Aberkan made the suggestion to create an European platform for facilitating a regular exchange between European Muslim prison counsellors, possibly to be coordinated by EuroPris.

Chaplaincy report EuroPris expert group on radicalisation

Julio Zino from the **Prison Service Catalonia**, and **Hans Kieserling** from the **Ministry of Justice Hessen**, both member of the EuroPris expert group on Radicalisation, presented their draft paper on Chaplaincy in prison produced by the expert group. The paper contains detailed recommendations for prison services on how to organize religious care in prisons. Prison chaplains can contribute to the cohesion of a community and to the promotion of tolerance within the own religious group and with other social groups. Amongst others they stated that the religious needs of all prisoners, such as the right to hold religious objects, have to be respected and that priests are entitled to participate in religious services. Also, it was highlighted that moderate prison chaplains must be carefully selected with the support of the religious community. Prison chaplains must be capable and ready to reconstruct ideology. Most important is to build trust between themselves and prisoners. In case of any dangers they must be willing to inform the prison authorities.

Interagency Cooperation

Outcomes RAN meeting on interagency cooperation

Finn Grav is the **RAN** chair and senior advisor on radicalisation and extremism in the Directorate of the **Norwegian Prison and Probation Service**. He reported about the outcomes of the latest RAN meeting on interagency cooperation. It is important to have a network for practitioners and stakeholders such as RAN in order to share information about motivation, ideology, intent and capacity of radicalised persons. All professionals from different agencies want to safeguard their communities, but pursue this in different ways. Generally it can be said that there is a lack of information and intelligence sharing. The culture of the agencies is not one of sharing. And the circumstances are different in the EU MS - some have a joint prison and probation service, others are separate, some prison services have their own intelligence service and others do not.

Different structures lead to different challenges such as:

- Correctional services experience providing the police and security service with information and get little response in return.
- Correctional services analyse their information and forward only processed information to the police and security service.
- Some practitioners within the different agencies tend to regard information as assets and do not pass it on without something in return
- Trust is of course an issue but society cannot rely on good relations between practitioners regarding information flow

The different agencies are to some degree in need of different information. The police aim for prosecution and prison and probation aim for rehabilitation (among other targets).



Mr. Grav concluded that agreements between agencies are needed and that the relationship between the agencies must be based on mutual trust. To remedy this, some countries have established joint intelligence centres or joint intervention teams where the different agencies sit together and get to know each other. In the latter probation usually plays a major part.

There is a need for agencies to learn to understand the legal framework and targets of the different partners. Health, social care, employment, probation, police and prisons is all examples of agencies that need to work together, especially in regard of reintegration of extremist offenders. Coordination is crucial and should be handled by one agency as far as possible. The others should have a duty to contribute.

Community policing- preventing radicalisation and extremism (CoPPRa project)

Olivier Cauberghs, Inspector **Antwerp police** and CoPPRa trainer presented the goals of the CoPPRa project: train police officers, and other practitioners in the justice chain, to make them aware of the signs of radicalisation and to inform them about their role in dealing with radicalisation. Sharing information within and between agencies is most important.

Mr. Cauberghs presented three types of de-radicalisation training which significantly improved the quality of reports about radicalisation:

A. *CoPPRa End user*: learn about the signs of radicalization (e.g. tattoo, social behaviour, pre-incident indicators, internet propaganda, etc.) in order to raise awareness of first-line practitioners such as probation and prison officers.

B. *CoPPRa Practice*: designed on how to detect those signs.

C. *CoPPRa Tailor made*: similar to CoPPRa End User but adapted to the specific partner involved in the prevention and detection of radicalisation. E.g. Prison staff working in a separate wing for radical detainees.

Six times a year a refresh course is given in collaboration with partners (intelligence services; prison and probation; etc.) to update trainers on recent trends and current topics.

Generally, CoPPRa has an advising role by giving public authorities and professionals advice on how to approach radicalisation with the aim to build trust between communities. Mr. Cauberghs concluded that it is very important to share reports and trends on radicalisation with different authorities and justice professionals in order to get everybody involved in the prevention and detection of radicalisation.

Closing

Peter van de Sande, EuroPris Board Member, closed the event and stressed the need for more exchange of knowledge and promising practices. There is no one solution that fits all, and there is also much to learn from countries outside EU.

