



## Report: “DERAD – Training Aid. The Benefit of Joint Projects”

Padua, 9-11 January, 2017



*JUST/2015/JTRA/AG/EJTR/8704 -HOME/ 2015/ISFP/AG/8774*

**Summary**

- 1. Aim of the Report. .... 3
  - Participants: ..... 3
- 2. Combining Projects. .... 3
- 3. Case Studies and Virtual Environments. .... 3
- 4. Deliverable 1.1 “Map and Analyses”. .... 4
- 5. Expert Users Group. .... 4
  - Participants..... 4
  - Collecting documents before the EUG..... 6

## 1. Aim of the Report.

This report is the result of the Steering Committee (SC) and the Experts Panel held in Padua on January 9th -10th -11th.

Considering that in November 2016 the Project Leader, together with the majority of the DERAD consortium, signed the grand agreement for ***Mobile Assistance Interagency Teams to Detect and Prevent the Escalation of Violent Radicalism. HOME/2015/ISFP/AG/8774 (Training Aid)***, the DERAD Steering Committee and EUG were combined with the first SC and EUG of the new project.

### Participants:

Enrico Sbriglia	MoJ
Rosa De Marco	MoJ
Sergio Bianchi	Agenfor
Maria Giovanna Ladu	Agenfor
Antonio Segura Serrano	University of Granada
Janis Paskous	Latvia Prison Administration
Ofelia Risnoveanu	NAP- Romania
Lubov Panayotova	European Institute
Sebastian Allertseder	Bay-FHVR
Andrej Pastorek	CVUT

## 2. Combining Projects.

Considering that a number of tasks can be shared among the projects, the leader believes that performing the two projects' activities together and treating the two projects as a program, will maximize the benefits and allow the deliverables to have a higher quality.

During the meeting the project coordinators explained the tasks partners should performed in implementing TRAINING AID.

## 3. Case Studies and Virtual Environments.

These case studies will be used in order to build the virtual environments. Symbols and elements underlined in the case studies will contribute to develop a simulation. The 3D

virtual environment requires the preparation of the cell with all the different elements necessary to reproduce the case we want to represent. This will require a detailed planning in order to be able to acquire all the different symbols indicated in the case studies and their placements for producing a video with a 3D simulation. Another instrument that can be used is a 2D representation. Pictures will allow the placement of objects through the use of Photoshop. Where symbols and elements are not sufficient in order to re-create the case studies in the virtual environment, the project can deliver a play, acted by penitentiary police officers.

Marco Boaretto will be in charge of providing 4 or 5 meaning cases that will be distributed among partners in order to understand if they are relevant also in their countries. If yes, these cases will be reproduced using 3D environments, dedicated pictures and possibly, theatrical simulations.

#### **4. Deliverable 1.1 “Map and Analyses”.**

Available on <https://derad.bitrix24.com/company/personal/user/1/disk/path/WP1/> partners will find the deliverable elaborated by the project leaders on the most significant new norms that introduced new types of terrorist crime and specifically the crime of recruitment with the aim of committing terrorism or international terrorism, training for activities with terrorist aims, conducting activities with the aim of committing terrorism, organizing and financing movements for terrorist activities.

Several partners underlined that they would have difficulty in elaborating a similar deliverable in relation with their own country. This should be addressed during the meeting in Munich.

#### **5. Expert Users Group.**

##### **Participants.**

Ioan Durnescu	Romania
Robert Richard Edmondson	Malta
Dimitra Drakaki	Greece
Mirjam Van der Kooij	Netherland
Muhammad Manwar Ali	UK
Mulbocus Omar	UK
David Munir	Portugal
Lucia Castellano	Italy
Francesca Stilla	Italy
Bernard Selwan el Khoury	Italy
Gianluca Feroce	Italy
Ettore Martano	Italy
Francesco Saverio Fontana	Italy
Raffaele Rivola	Italy
Joao Paulo Pereira Ventura	Portugal
Sylvie Cristina Lopes Dias	Portugal
Vasileios koutsoliakos	Greece
Athina Demetriou	Cyprus
Triantafyllos Karatrandos	Greece
Florentino Gregorio Ruiz Yamuza	Spain
Vincenzo Tata	Italy
Housam Najjar	Ireland
Younes Ismaeel Nanis	Libya
Ibrahim Baitalmal	Libya



### Collecting documents before the EUG.

A template was circulated among participants before the meeting in order to allow a collection of key information concerning the prison system of countries of origin of experts.

Information required included:

- Brief description of the prison system;
- Brief description of the probation system;
- Nr. of inmates with EU Citizenship;
- Nr. of probationers with EU Citizenship;
- Law concerning radicalization and foreign terrorist fighters;
- Adoption of the FDs 909/829/947
- Identification of main obstacles for the implementation of the FDs.

Following, the list of countries of origin of the experts who contributed providing the information:

- Romania;
- Portugal;
- Latvia;
- Germany;
- Greece.

Below, a summary of the documents received. For the detailed files, please refer to the *Notes Before the Meeting* available in the platform Bitrex24.

	Romania	Portogallo	Latvia	Germany	Greece
<b>Brief Description of the Prison System</b>	Romania has 18 penitentiaries with open and semi-open regime, 13 penitentiaries with close or high security regime, one prison for youth and open regime, one women prison (and 7 special sections for women in other prisons), 2 detention centres, 2 educative centres, 6 hospitals. In 23 penitentiaries there are special sections for preventive arrest. Each penitentiary unit has a surveillance judge that supervises the implementation of the prison sentence and respond to the prisoner's complains. He/she is also the head of the conditional release commission.	The current Portuguese punitive system involves, basically, the deprivation of liberty (imprisonment) and alternative measures to be implemented in the community. This include inter alia, the conditional suspension of the criminal procedure; work for the benefit of the community; replacing the imprisonment conviction by the payment of a fine; the release from prison granted on a conditional basis – under the fulfillment of a certain number of obligations to be met by the defendant. Total number of inmates: 14222.	The Latvian Prison Administration is a State administrative institution subordinated to the Ministry of Justice. Functions, tasks and competence of Administration shall be determined in Cabinet Regulations Nr.827 "Regulation of Prison Administration". The functions of Administration are ensuring the detention as a security measure and the deprivation of liberty as the execution of a criminal punishment. The system of progressive sentence execution. Prisons (from 01.01.2017.) – 9 prisons, 1 prison hospital, 1 Correctional institution for juveniles. Latvian Prison Administration and prisons' staff (on 31.12.2015.) → 2302 officials and 510.5 employees. Inmates (on 31.12.2015) – 4409 (3020 convicts, 1389 detainees)	In Germany the responsibility for the prison system belongs to the German countries ("Bundesländer"). So altogether there are 16 similar but slightly differing prison and probation systems within Germany. Seen as a whole, Germany has got 183 prisons with altogether 63.100 prisoners (31.08.2016). There is a separation between the closed imprisonment and the open imprisonment. In the open prisons the prisoners are allowed to leave the prison during the day, go to a regular work or live with their families and just have to come back in the evening. There is also the possibility to get a prison vacation for some days. About 12,6 Percent (2016) of all Prisoners in Germany were detained in open prisons.	In Greece there are 34 prisons. A) 4 agricultural, 1 central warehouse material prisons, 3 juvenile detentions (18-25 years old), 1 juvenile detention (15-18 years old), 2 female, 3 therapeutic establishments and 22 General. B) Number of inmates: 9.490 (531 women, 8.959 men and 9 juveniles (15-18 years old)). Prison staff: total 4.530 (2.116 guards, 1.807 external guards, 354 office staff, 26 psychologists, 6 sociologists, 66 social workers, 74 nurses, 16 doctors, 7 dentists, 2 pharmacists, 6 agriculturalists, 9 agriculture - livestock specialists, 6 technological agriculturalists, 10 drivers, 42 technicians). Guards are unarmed staff, working inside prison, each one responsible for his daily post (general duties, visiting area, yard, kitchen, bakery etc). External guards are armed, guarding the perimeter of the prison, moving prisoners to local courts and hospitals. Agriculturalists and agriculture – livestock specialists, can be found only in agricultural prisons and are responsible for all the production of the prison, as well as teaching inmates working in the productive posts a new occupation.
<b>Brief Description of the Probation System</b>	The National Department of Probation coordinates the activity of 42 probation services. There were 355 probation officers working in 2015 with over 42.000 probationers. At the end of 2016, the number of probationers was higher than 60.000. Most of the sentenced person are under suspended sentence or postponed sentence. Both measures replace imprisonment for up to two and, respectively, three years.	Measures and penal sanctions implemented in the community are alternative ones instead of serving an imprisonment sentences, the obligation to serve short-term prison sentences or the continuation of longer prison sentences. Those are determined by the Execution of Sentences Court, based on the relevance of those measures on a case by case basis in order to ensure the end goals of the penalties and to prevent the further commission of criminal behavior. Total number of probationers: 2737.	Probationary supervision is imposed only in cases set out in the Criminal Law, for a term of one year and up to three years. The public prosecutor, when determining probationary supervision in the penal order, may impose no more than half of the maximum duration of probationary supervision provided for in the respective Section of the Special Part of Criminal Law. During the period of probationary supervision the convicted person or person whose additional punishment has been determined by public prosecutor's penal order, shall fulfil the duties determined by the State Probation Service. If probationary service is applied together with the deprivation of liberty, the execution thereof shall be commenced following the serving of the basic punishment, but if a fine or community service is imposed – from the moment that the person begins serving the basic punishment. In cases where a person is conditionally released from the execution of a punishment of the deprivation of liberty prior to completion thereof, the additional punishment – probationary supervision – shall be commenced from the moment that the supervision of a person following the conditional release prior to completion of punishment has ended. A court may reduce the term of probationary supervision, or revoke it, pursuant to a submission by the State Probation Service. 16 744 probationers in 2014, 17 855 probationers in 2015. Members of staff in 2014 – 380, i.e. 37 employees and 343 officials. Members of staff in 2015 – 381, i.e. 37 employees and 344 officials. The current members of staff – 390, i.e. 35 employees and 355 officials.	As already written Germany is practicing a system of open detention for people with a good resocialisation prediction. Only people within their first prison penalty are allowed to participate in this programme. The exact requirements are strongly differing under the German countries. In 2016 7.982 persons participate in this programme in whole Germany (12,6 Percent). Due to very strict regulations in Bavaria only 540 Persons (4,7 Percent) of the Bavarian Prisoners were jailed in open prisons. At the same time in Berlin where the regulations are much more 23,3 Percent (914 from 3926 Prisoners) of all prisoners were in open prison forms.	Article 100 of Greek Criminal Law (summary): Suspension in penalties over three years. Suspension under surveillance. If a person sentenced to imprisonment of more than three years and up to five years, the court shall suspend execution of the sentence of the terms and under the care and supervision of social assistance server, for a specified period, which may not be less than three and not more than five years, unless it finds based specifically mentioned in the reasoning of the decision is evidence that the execution of the sentence is absolutely necessary to prevent the offender from committing further offences.
<b>Nr of Inmates with EU Citizenship</b>	At 23.12.2016 a number of 106 EU citizens were held in the Romanian prisons, from 17 states. 101 were men and 5 women.	Total number of foreign inmates: 2495. Number of foreign females: 229. Number of foreign inmates who are citizens of member states of the European Union: 651.	Foreigners (on 31.12.2015) – convicts (31 men, 1 women), detainees (70 men, 3 woman, 1 juvenile).	27,9 Percent of the inmates in German prisons have a foreign nationality. (13.273). 63100 Prisoners - 59.410 male / 3.690 female	Foreign inmates in Greek prisons 5.088. EU citizens 742. EU men citizens 672. EU women citizens 70
<b>Nr of probationers with EU Citizenship</b>	Not available.	Number of foreign persons who are citizens of member states of the European Union: 382. Total number of foreign persons: 3919. Total number of persons placed under the supervision or care of probation agencies during the year 2015: 55053.	The State Probation Service does not collect data about probationers with EU citizenship.	8.459 Persons are in Open Prisons - 7.896 of them are male and 563 are female. There is no existing official statistics about the number of foreigners in open prisons but by definition only foreigners with a permanent resident status are qualified to join the open prison form. So altogether the number has to be rather low.	No data available
<b>Law concerning radicalization and foreign fighters</b>	Not yet. However, there are some studies conducted in the penitentiary system focused on radicalization.	Radicalisation on its own is not a crime. Radicalisation might be considered from a criminal law standing point whenever certain criminal behaviours are foreseen and punished in accordance to the law. On the other hand there is no such thing as political violent extremism as a typical crime in the criminal law. A specific CT Law exists in Portugal since August 2003 (Act 52/2003 dated 22 of August). It was subject of several amendments since its approval in 2003 the latest's ones dated June 2015, to include the criminalization of trips for the purposes or with the intent of terrorism. While these amendments are not mentioning foreign terrorist fighters specifically we understand that the law was conceived in a way to cover that relatively recent criminal phenomenon, in particular the Hijrah which started in direction to Syria from late 2012 onwards.	No, in Republic of Latvia there aren't such kinds of laws that speak, control and restrict radicalization and foreign fighters. General provision of law that includes these aspects in Latvia is Section 88, 88.1, 88.2 and 88.3 of the Criminal Law. These sections define the performed terroristic actions, liability about these actions, terrorist financing, and liability about it, terrorist threat, and liability about it. National Security Concept is a document that defines threats of the Latvian State, prevention of these threats, recommendations for national security, and legal framework.	Germany implemented a law against foreign Terrorist fighters by the year 2015. With the new law it is illegal to financially support terrorist networks and institutions and travel to foreign countries for terrorist reasons, for example to get train in terror camp or similar.	There is no special law concerning radicalization and foreign terrorist fighters in Greece, but there are articles, especially 187, 187A and 187B, in the Greek Criminal Law, that define as criminal, actions related to radicalism, criminalizes behaviors that can lead to radicalization and predicts very strict penalties.
<b>Application of FDs 909,829,947</b>	Yes. By Law 302/2004 concerning international judicial cooperation all of them were adopted.	Being Framework Decisions from the EU, ratification and implementation by the Member States is mandatory. Portugal ratified those FD (2008/909, 2009/829, 2008/947) which are somehow in a stage of implementation.	Yes, Latvia accepted this Framework decision Nr. 909, 829 and 947 in 01.07.2012. At the moment there is some integration. One of them includes multi – agency cooperation between prison department and probation service. There were several meetings in year 2016, including RAN training courses and NORWAY GRANTS meeting about developing dynamic security measures in both systems. Now the major question is – how to get information that is important working with radicalized offenders from security police in legal level without prejudice different kind of laws (sensitive data, law about state secret, etc.).	All three FD's are adopted to German law.	The FDs 909, 829 and 947 have been adopted to the Greek Law since 2014 (N. 4307/15-11-2014). The level of implementation is very low. There are no statistics available for FD829 and FD947. As far as FD909 is concerned, from November 2014 to August 2016, there were 52 applications, 11 applications were made from EU member citizens held in Greek prisons, 2 of which were rejected, while there is no data for the remaining ones. 41 applications were made from Greek citizens serving time in EU state member prisons, 9 were approved and 20 rejected, while there is no data for the remaining ones.
<b>Main obstacles for the implementation</b>	Previous STEPS2 Project stressed the followings as difficulties for FD 947/2008: a) different interpretations of 'habitual residence'; b) language; c) too many competent authorities; d) - not unified judicial practice; e) lengthy procedures; f) - lack of information for informed consent etc.	We are expecting concrete feedback on the implementation from DGRSP and shall inform you in detail accordingly.	First of all – lack of experience. Threat level in Latvia is in low level. And radicalized offenders draw up a little number of prisoners. That's why in Latvia's context we need to speak how to get ready. There are many theories how to deal with threats but the real situation is different in each country. That's why there isn't one way or another that is the best. Next one – bureaucracy. There are so many regulations that must be taking into consideration, different kind of documents. And this is why information goes to the right institution far too late to make the best decisions. Lack of highly professionals. There goes a change of generation right now. That means new, inexperienced guards started to serve in prison department. Our goal here is to train them for future situation, including dynamic security	The federal structure of the German prison system and the 16 different ministries have their own interests and structures. Although the European and the national laws are binding for the countries the implementation of these laws is in the competence them. The Federal Ministry of Justice a brought schooling programme - with a focus on the judges - but as already written Bavaria and Baden-Württemberg did not participate in these programmes, so the dissemination of these possibilities is still low in this countries. On the other side the Administration of the prisons who can be seen as a key to a successful implementation has not yet been schooled in any country. This is a duty of the ministries of the countries who obviously don't see this issue a priority of their work.	A) It is very difficult to find data, because the directives are implemented by local prosecutors, and there is no platform to collect all the information to a central level. B) Although inmates are informed that they can choose to serve their penalty in their country of origin, there is a very small number of those who want to do that. C) It's a time consuming process. It takes so much time that by the time the procedure is finished, the convict is at the end of his sentence. D) Greek Law may have very strict penalties, but there are predictions favorable to the prisoner (for example with work and good behavior, a 15 years penalty means that one can be released after 5 years of imprisonment and having 9 years with work (work means for every day of work we count from 1 and 3/4 to 3 days of served penalty, according to the work), a life sentence means that one can be released after serving 15 years and having 4 years of wages benefits calculated (work)), so many inmates seem to prefer to serve their sentence in Greek prisons, and they don't consent to their transfer.

The EUG was organized in 5 different panels covering all the major topics of the two projects. During the event, the focus was on the three Framework Decisions 909/947/829. Prof Durnescu, moderator of the discussion, opened the floor with a presentation on the FDs contents. The presentation focused on:

- A comparative overview of the main characteristics of the FDs involve with a particular attention on FD 909;
- Show the state of implementation
- Presentation of one case study to show what can go wrong.

	FD 909/2008 on transferring custodial sentences	FD 947/2008 on transferring alternative to detention and probation decision	FD 829/2009 on alternatives to provisional detention
Aim and purpose	Enhance the social rehabilitation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- person's attachments</li> <li>- family, linguistic, cultural, social and economic links.</li> </ul>	Enhance social rehabilitation by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- preserving family, social, linguistic ties,</li> <li>- improving monitoring of compliance</li> <li>- prevent recidivism</li> <li>- protect the victim and the public</li> </ul>	Protection of the victim and the general public. Supervision of the people while awaiting trial - ensure the due course of justice. Enhancing the right to liberty and the presumption of innocence. Use of non-custodial measures for pre-trial. Equal treatment for non-residents
Where?	To the MS of nationality where he/she lives, or will be deported Another MS - upon request and consent of the MS	To the MS where the person is lawfully and ordinarily residing - if they returned or want to return Another MS - upon request and consent of the MS	To the MS where the person lawfully and ordinarily reside - <b>informed and consents</b> Other MS but only with consent of that MS.
Characteristics	The system of competent authorities. <b>Adaptation</b> - as close as possible (no nature or aggravating) Duration - to maximum but the nature the same.	The system of competent authorities Eleven types of probation measures - added more if ...	The system of competent authorities Recourse of the <b>central authority</b> Six supervision measures (obligatory - report, not to enter, remain in places etc.) Five other measures (may be prepared - treatment, money etc.)

Procedure	Certificate and judgment to the competent authority. EJN website. Procedure initiated by IS, ES or the sentenced person. The IS is not obliged. Consent required but exceptions when transfer to MS of nationality where he/she lives or where deported. Double criminality - 32	Certificate and the sentence EJN - <a href="http://www.ejn-crimjust.europa.eu/ejn/EJN_Home.aspx">http://www.ejn-crimjust.europa.eu/ejn/EJN_Home.aspx</a> Adaptation - nature and duration. ES - 60 days to decide Double criminality - 32.	Certificate + Decision on the supervision measures. Specify: length of time, renewal and the provisional length of time needed EJN ES - 20 days for decision + possible another 20 days - inform Adaptation - the nature in line with the national legislation for equivalent offence. Double criminality - 32
Law governing supervision	<b>IS takes all the subsequent decisions, including the conditional release.</b> <b>Work or other activities</b> deducted from the sentence. Both MS may - amnesty or pardon	<b>ES takes all subsequent decision except</b> alternative sentence if custody is not an option in case of breach. Transfer jurisdiction back	ES In case of continuation - IS may request to extend the monitoring by the ES. ES decides according to its own national law. <b>All subsequent decision taken by the IS -</b> renewal, modification, arrest warrant ES may adapt or refuse
Deadline of implementation	5 <sup>th</sup> of December 2011	6 <sup>th</sup> of December 2011	1 December 2012



This presentation is available on the Bitrex24 platform for partners to consult and it will be part of the training materials with a specific module dedicated on this topic.

Agenfor International organized a video interview with Prof Durnescu. In order to perform the task, Agenfor International elaborated a template with the structure of the interview, identifying the type of the information. The interview focused on the FDs and on their application.

We need to investigate the relation between the 3 FDs and the new legislation concerning radicalism in all its forms (radicalism and hate crimes, terrorism, foreign fighters). Under the concept 'radicalism' we intend people accused (convicted or awaiting a sentence) for terror-related crimes and/or inmates (prisoners, detainees and probationers) convicted, accused or awaiting a sentence for other non-related crimes but under observation for radical behaviours in the course of the execution of the sentence or while awaiting for a sentence.

**QUESTION1.A**

What is the level of implementation of the FDs [2006/909/JHA](#) (transfer of Prisoners), [2008/947/JHA](#) (Probation and Alternative Sanctions), [2009/829/JHA](#) (Alternative to Pre-Trial) in your country?  
(2 minutes answer)

**QUESTION1.B**

Please comment the following general questions concerning the implementation of the FDs:

- Who should pay the costs of the transfer operations (logistic and translation);
- Role of the person concerned in the transfer process, Article 6 Transfer of Prisoners, Article 5 Probation and Alternative Sanctions);
- Principle of mutual trust and adaptation of the sentences (Article 8 Transfer of Prisoners, Article 9 Probation and Alternative Sanctions);
- Subsequent decisions: differences in the execution of the sentence (Article 17 Transfer of Prisoners, Article 14 Probation and Alternative Sanctions)
- Obligation to accept a transfer, and grounds for refusal (Article 9 Transfer of Prisoners, Article 11 Probation and Alternative Sanctions)
- Time limits (Article 12 Transfer of Prisoners, Article 12 Probation and Alternative Sanctions)
- Impact of the recent ECJ Judgment in Joint Cases [Aranyosi and Căldăraru](#) (Article 3(4), Recital 13 of the FD/909/JHA)
- Link between Framework Decisions, particularly FD on European Arrest Warrant (EAW)
- Do you have a methodology to evaluate the mid and long term impact of the decisions concerning the application of the FDs on both prisoners and prisons, as well as judges and prosecutors.

(Max 7 minutes)

**QUESTION2.A**

Do you have a codified legal framework (or prison rules) for radicalism within prisons? Please specify what are the rules in relation to both, terror-related crimes and inmates under observation for radical profiling.  
(5 minutes answer)

**QUESTION2.B**

To which extent the application of the 3 FDs may contribute (if it contributes) to counter radical escalations? Brief explanation is required.

To which extent the lack of implementation of the 3 FDs may contribute (if it contributes) to escalate radical dynamics towards violence. Brief explanation is required.  
(2 minutes answer for both questions)

**QUESTION3**

Are you aware of cases of radical inmates (both categories) who benefitted from the FDs?  
(2 Minutes answer)

**QUESTION4**

Links between Framework Decisions and specific types of crimes (radicalisation, terrorism, hate crimes, etc.) in national legal contexts where 'radical behaviours' have different juridical connotations. There is a risk that the executing (administering) country might have a less generous system of early release or access to alternative measures for prisoners or probationers identified as 'radicals' than the issuing (sentencing) country: this could become an obstacle to transfers if the person concerned were to end up serving a longer sentence or having a different treatment in the EU country to which they are transferred than they would serve in the country where they were sentenced.

Please elaborate how the differences in the execution of the sentence (Article 17 Transfer of Prisoners, Article 14 Probation and Alternative Sanctions) for radical behaviours or crimes may be an obstacle for a full implementation of the directives.  
(5 minutes answer)

**QUESTION5**

How to solve the problems connected to the transfer of security data in case of specific crimes (radicalisation, terrorism, hate crimes, etc.) with different juridical connotations among the MSs and the necessity to transfer non-forensic non-judiciary information that may impact on the prisoners' treatment or the national security (such as personal data concerning radical behaviours/attitudes not included in the personal file of the prisoners and not representing a crime in the country where the prisoners were sentenced or accused)?  
(5 minutes answer)

**QUESTION6**

Are the different legal frameworks concerning 'radicalisation' applied at National level a reason for the obligation to accept a transfer, or a grounds for its refusal (Article 9 Transfer of Prisoners, Article 11 Probation and Alternative Sanctions)?  
(2 minutes answer)

**QUESTION7**

In case the issuing country collects non-judiciary data concerning radical profiling of prisoners and probationers to be transferred to executing countries where these data have a relevant impact on the sentence execution (early release, access to work and prison benefits or alternative measures, etc.), has the prisoner the right to access these information. Please elaborate around right to defence and data protection in relation to prisoners and probationers under observation for radical behaviours or convicted for specific crimes (hate crimes, foreign terrorist fighters, radicalism, etc.).  
(5 minutes answer)

This video material will be post-produced and available in the training platform.



During Panel II, of former radicals were invited to present their stories. The focus was put of the topic of grievances and exit strategy, with a strong interaction among presenters

and audience. People who accepted the invitations and contribute to the panel with their testimonies were:

- 1.Housam Najjair
- 3.Ali Manwar
- 4.Saverio Fontana
- 5.Omar Mulbocus

Agencfor International organized separate interviews with the following former. A document was elaborated in order to structure the interview.

## INTERVIEWS

The panelists will be interviewed in a separate room, one by one. It is required to have some background videos or photos illustrating their past experience, if possible. This material will be used to design the on-line training.

### QUESTION1:

*(2 minutes each)*

Is participation to any type of foreign armed conflicts always a crime and a threat for the EU security from your experience? Or crimes committed and enrolment in designated terror groups should be scrutinized to determine the risk?

### QUESTION1.B

*(1 minute each)*

Do you think that the decision concerning the arrest of returnee foreign fighters or the related preventive or punitive measures should be taken by police or political bodies or by judges as a result of an evidence-based investigation?

### QUESTION2:

*(5 minutes each)*

Is there a difference among different types of foreign fighters, foreign terrorist fighters or freedom volunteers? What determines such difference, if existent? Please make reference to your personal experience, mentioning also other people you meet during your past experience.

### QUESTION3.A:

*(4 minutes each)*

When you decided to follow your path, what have been the 4 main drivers or grievances, you remember? (ex: Identity crisis, family revolt, lack of freedom, desire of justice, romanticism and pleasure of adventure, psychological problems, turning point of life, etc)

### QUESTION3.B

*(3 minutes each)*

Why at that time you didn't consider Europe as the most appropriate theater where to address your grievances and decided to engage in third countries?

### QUESTION4:

*(3 minutes each)*

Why political reformism or engagement in European politics was not enough to address your perceived grievances at that time?

### QUESTION5:

*(3 minutes each)*

Who are the far and close foes for Europeans who decide to engage in extreme radical conflicts abroad? Do our policies in support of dictators, real or perceived injustices and extreme surveillance can contribute to switch the target from the far to the close foe? Or do you think that we need stronger man to counter the decadence?

### QUESTION6:

*(3 minutes each)*

Muslim foreign fighters are perceived more dangerous than Kurdish or Christian foreign fighters? Is this assumption correct and Why in your opinion?

### QUESTION7:

*(2 minutes each)*

You received training in the use of weapons or military training. How this influenced your life afterwards?

### QUESTION8:

*(5 minutes each)*

In Europe two mainstreaming approaches are emerging to counter risks connected to returnees: extreme security measures, as in the UK strategy, or combined approach security-welfare, as in the Aarhus model. What is working better and why, in your opinion and why? Please take reference to your specific case and experience.

### QUESTION9:

*(5 minutes each)*

What pull factors you remember, which mostly contributed to your decision to abandon the radical path?

### QUESTION10:

*(3 minutes each)*

In your experience was the war experience or radical involvement a push factor towards more engagement or a pull factor towards repentance and normalization?



Saverio Fontano



Manwar Ali



Sam Naijar



Omar Mulbocus

The fourth panel was lead by Younis Nannis, Lybian researcher and journalist, who gave a perspective on the situation in the country with a focus on organized crime, sociological aspects and evolution of the situation on the ground from a military and strategic point of view.

In particular he took into consideration the ISIS establishment in Tripolitania.

Francesca Stilla from the Italian Ministry of Justice closed the working session on January 11<sup>th</sup>.

Available on Bitrex24, in the *WP2/Slides showed during Padua Meeting folder*, partners will find:

- Presentation *"In Tripolitania"*, Younis Nannis,
- Presentation *Radicalization in Prison. Notes from Spain*, Florentino Gregoria Ruiz Yamuza
- *FD 909,947 AND 829*, Ioan Durnescu