



Ministry of
JUSTICE

National Offender
Management Service

Funding Innovation & Collaboration in Probation

Report

Cambridge, UK
March 2009

CONTENTS

Welcome Dinner and Setting the Scene <i>Leo Tigges, Secretary General, CEP</i>	3
International Funding, Innovation, and Collaboration – Why it matters <i>Ian Poree, Director of Commissioning and Operational Policy, NOMS, UK</i>	3
Words of Welcome <i>Mary Anne McFarlane, CEP Board Member and Chief Probation, Devon and Cornwall, UK</i>	4
International Funding: EU Funds; a needs and opportunities matrix <i>Steve Pitts, International and Business Development Manager, NOMS, UK</i>	4
Other donors, Integrated funding matrix: Matching needs and opportunities <i>Andrey Momchilov, International Manager, IGA Foundation, Bulgaria</i>	6
Understanding EU funding - Justice, Liberty and Security funding streams and priorities for work in Criminal Justice <i>Martine Parmantier, Programme Manager for Criminal Justice - JPEN, EU</i>	8
Coffee Time Activity	9
EU Funding from a national perspective <i>Ruben Laurijssens, Funding Advisor, Ministry of Justice, Netherlands</i>	9
Employing private and other sources of funding to support Development <i>Alison Hannah, Executive Director, Penal Reform International, UK</i>	11
<i>Thomas Lawson, Deputy Chief Executive, Prisoners Abroad, UK</i>	12
Capacity Building in Action – An experience of Russia <i>John Harding – Consultant in Developing Probation in Russia, UK</i>	13
Gala Conference Dinner, Gonville and Caius College <i>Phil Wheatley, Director General, NOMS, UK</i>	16
<i>Professor Friedrich Lösel, Director, Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, UK</i>	16
Wrap-up of the previous day <i>Mary Anne McFarlane, CEP Board Member and Chief Probation, Devon and Cornwall, UK</i>	17

Workshop 1	
European Justice and Crime Reduction (“JLS”) Funding	
<i>Ruben Laurijssens (Netherlands), Steve Pitts (UK), Jaume Martin Barbaran (Spain).</i>	
Facilitated by: <i>Mary Anne McFarlane and Leo Tigges</i>	17
Workshop 2	
Capacity Building	
<i>Kevin Barry (UK), Maria Razumovskaya (Russia)</i>	18
Workshop 3	
Municipalities, Embassies and Charitable funding	
<i>John Kwaks & Eric Staal (Netherlands), Andrey Momchilov (Bulgaria), Thomas Lawson (UK)</i>	19
Workshop 4	
EU non -JLS Funding Streams including Employability, Education and Culture	
<i>Linda Pizani-Williams (UK), Jürgen Hillmer (Germany)</i>	20
Financial Management of EU funded projects	
<i>Ruben Laurijssens, Funding Advisor, Ministry of Justice, Netherlands</i>	21
Accessing and Managing European Social Funds to improve Employability	
<i>Sibylle Batten, International and Business Development Unit, NOMS, UK</i>	22
Conclusion and discussion on how should CEP proceed with Funding / drawing up an agenda or framework for a work program and for co-ordinated application for funds	
<i>Leo Tigges, Secretary General, CEP</i>	24
The Matrix- revisited	
<i>Steve Pitts, International and Business Development Manager, NOMS, UK and Andrey Momchilov, International Manager, IGA Foundation, Bulgaria</i>	26
Closing of the Conference	27
Appendix A	28
Appendix B	29

Report compiled by:
 Jake Phillips
 PhD Candidate
 St Catharine’s College
 Institute of Criminology
 University of Cambridge

Welcome Dinner and Setting the Scene

Leo Tigges, Secretary General, CEP

Having been introduced by Mary Anne McFarlane, Leo Tigges welcomed all the delegates who had come from across Europe. Leo said that the variety of countries represented, and the backgrounds of those people, symbolised CEP's celebration of diversity. He then discussed CEP's vision which revolves around the fact that Probation Services work in the community and that CEP works towards human rights and the delivery of effective community sentences which are based on evidence and principles. Practitioners make this vision real and CEP works to interpret the vision of probation officers for their own societies. Leo said, therefore, that CEP is here to help through seminars, conferences and events of which this conference is one. This year's topics, Leo explained, include capacity building; electronic monitoring; the transfer of alternative sanctions and the training of probation officers. The conferences contribute towards the exchange of ideas. CEP's website is integral to this process as well as the recently published *Probation in Europe* book. Leo said that CEP also helps in terms of providing the Council of Europe with experts.

Leo said that probation is on the move in the three ways: i) the Council of Europe has a Penological Council which is looking at drawing up Europe wide probation rules ii) the EU currently prepares a Framework Decision on probation measures and alternative sanctions, which will improve the transferability of alternative sanctions across countries in Europe and iii) Brussels is showing interest in the Probation Service because it can make societies safer. We can only achieve this if we cooperate and this underpins this conference which has funding as its theme. Leo said that this was the first time that CEP had chosen this as a theme for one of its conferences and it stemmed from the conference in Glasgow which looked at the resettlement of offenders. Funding, like resettlement, is a complex and multi-faceted concept and at the conference in Glasgow it was realised that there was an imbalance between different countries. This conference was announced to build up probation services through training and capacity building for all countries as well as to look at how we expand through innovative projects and see funding as a resource to stimulate international cooperation.

Leo finished by saying that this conference was a golden opportunity to share experience, best practice and that it can also be used as a market place.

International Funding, Innovation, and Collaboration – Why it matters

Ian Poree, Director of Commissioning and Operational Policy, NOMS, UK

Ian started off by thanking CEP for the invitation to the conference and explained that it was his first CEP conference. He said that it was a privilege to support CEP in terms of funding streams, collaboration and sharing ideas and that the protection of the public is a shared outcome. Ian explained that the Probation Service and the Prison Service have merged in England and Wales and that we are just beginning to see the benefits of this. He said that there has been an injection of money into funding streams which aim to develop innovation. However, Ian said that we need to

make sure that innovation is turned into mainstream services because otherwise it remains as ‘just innovation’.

Ian then went on to talk about issues of resettlement and how we need to be able to measure standards. NOMS has been lucky enough to be able to spend time in Europe looking at other Probation Services and has realised that financial pressures amongst different Services are far from unique. Ian said that NOMS does not want to damage - through necessary forthcoming efficiency savings – any of the excellent work that has already been done, and that we need to continue working towards reducing reoffending - something that has been occurring in England and Wales for some time.

The question is, Ian argued, how do we continue to reduce reoffending during a period when demand for services won't be decreasing and money for providing the service is unlikely to increase.

Words of Welcome

Mary Anne McFarlane, CEP Board Member and Chief Probation, Devon and Cornwall, UK

The conference officially opened the following morning and Mary Anne McFarlane gave all those present a very warm welcome. Mary Anne explained her role in CEP as a board member and gave us an overview of her other roles as a Chief Probation Officer in Devon and Cornwall and also explained that she is currently on secondment in Turkey. Mary Anne also explained that she would be chair for the plenary sessions throughout the conference.

Mary Anne said a few words about the subject matter as she has direct experience in increasing funding in her own probation area. Mary Anne explained that funding should not be grabbed without consideration- we need to learn restraint and develop criteria to help with decisions on whether to engage with funding or an innovative project. Mary Anne also talked about how some Probation Services in England and Wales were already generating income through Unpaid Work and cited the example of America where there is no budget for Community Service. She said that a key aspect of gaining funding is to make sure that it is a win-win situation for both parties. Mary Anne also said we need to coordinate various projects and the only way we can do that, is by finding out what is happening elsewhere which is partly an aim of this conference.

International Funding: EU Funds; a needs and opportunities matrix

Steve Pitts, International and Business Development Manager, NOMS, UK

Steve started his presentation by taking the delegates on a journey through the different stages of engagement with funding. He said that some organisations and countries were in the plains, looking at the funding “mountains” in the distance, some were in the foothills and some, although not many, were approaching the summit. One aim of this conference, Steve said, was to get as many organisations moving

towards the summit as possible. Steve also noted some trends in collaboration with a move from twinning schemes to a partnership emphasis – or a move from bi-lateral work to multi-lateral work. This would involve the involvement of all three sectors- public, voluntary and private.

Steve then proposed some purposes and principles for funding endeavours. Purposes included: developing perspectives and practices, combining resources, supporting judicial aims, and staff development. Principles included: thinking about funding as a win-win situation for all involved, aiming for synergy, building collaborative capacity, and, where possible, looking for opportunities to improve cooperation across funding streams. He suggested these are principles rather than tips because he believes they are a pre-requisite of successful partnership.

Steve also took the delegates through a SWOT analysis which was completed by NOMS in which strengths of European international programmes were identified. These included innovation and attention to diversity. Equally, however, there were some weaknesses which could easily lead into opportunities. These included: raising awareness of funding streams, increasing confidence in engaging in those funding streams, mainstreaming promising innovation, and a more strategic approach to matching funding opportunity and need.

Steve said it was important to consider both need and opportunity, and that he would propose an approach which could bring both together. The goal would be a map or “matrix” of needs and funding: He then offered for consideration the approach to funding being developed by the new NOMS International Unit:

Nneeds: this revolves around a needs-analysis – offender and organisation focussed - so that fundraisers can target activities to the funding streams available taking needs into account.

Opportunities: this involves identifying all relevant funding streams available.

Method: this refers to the practical methodology and expertise involved in bidding for and managing projects, including ensuring approaches are inclusive of the whole organisation - in particular with close involvement of departments with responsibilities and expertise in the project focus areas.

Support: to submit winning bids and manage successful project implementation and finances, organisations and teams need to be well supported by staff with specialist bidding and management knowledge.

Although Steve’s use here of the acronym “NOMS” was “tongue in cheek” he believed the underlying approach was practical.

Steve also discussed some research which the UK Ministry of Justice is conducting into self-reported offender needs and advised the audience that we could usefully bear in mind the seven NOMS “pathways” which are critical in helping offenders to reduce their re-offending. These are: accommodation, education/training &

employment, health, drugs and alcohol, finance, families and attitudes/behaviour. These are supported by four underpinning themes: case management, diversity, risk/public protection, and partnership with other sectors.

Once we have identified the needs of offenders, Steve said that it is then possible to consider how they fit with European funding streams. Steve said that they have looked at funding from several European Directorates: Justice, Liberty and Security (JLS); Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities; Education and Culture; and Enlargement. All of these directorates can provide funding for work with offenders. Steve then introduced a funding matrix which matches need with funding streams (Appendix A).

Finally, Steve highlighted the example of two projects which have received EU funding: STARR and DOMICE. Both are part-funded by the DG JLS, are trans-national, address practice development and collaboration, and include the CEP, CEP members, and others as partners.

Questions and Comments

Mary Anne McFarlane suggested that it might be beneficial if delegates helped to build the matrix up over the duration of the conference.

Other donors, Integrated funding matrix: Matching needs and opportunities *Andrey Momchilov, International Manager, IGA Foundation, Bulgaria*

Andrey's presentation revolved around the concept of 'unconventional donors' by which he meant: municipalities, embassies, and private donors as opposed to European Union funding streams. Andrey acknowledged that he was not going to talk about international development agencies which were another group of 'unconventional donors' and provide good funding opportunities for professional work and said that he hoped this could be included at the next CEP conference on funding.

Municipalities

Andrey said that funding from municipalities stems from the decentralisation of municipal budgets, the process of which started in Bulgaria about 12 years ago. He said that the funding from this source can have a political element as local politicians vote on budgets annually. This means that priorities can change regularly so fundraisers need to be flexible. Andrey said that this kind of funding supports four key areas: accommodation, education and employment, at-risk children and public protection.

Embassies

It is impossible to say exactly what embassies might fund but it is fair to assume that the foreign policy of the nation which the embassy represents is transmitted through their funding policy. Embassies can usually, however, define their own local priorities and a main aim for funding is to increase visibility within the host country. Andrey said that different embassies have different styles so it is important to be flexible during

the application process and that funding amounts tend towards the small side- generally between €5,000 and €25,000. Decisions are taken locally- normally by the ambassador- so staying in touch can be very productive. Andrey stressed that co-funding is generally advisable, that it is important to remember that the aim of funding is to increase visibility and that embassies get a certain amount of credit for funding certain programmes.

Private Donors

Andrey said that this was the largest of the three groups of funders and gave some examples of organisations which have been working with the EU such as the Soros Foundation. The Soros Foundation, for example, is the largest private donor in the world and has been funding work in Bulgaria. Andrey said that it is important to remember that most of these organisations are driven by philanthropy, have a broad range of themes and have different styles.

Andrey then went on to adapt Steve's funding matrix by adding these unconventional donors to show we can increase the funds available to us. He said that we need to look at it as if it is a puzzle and we are trying to fill in the gaps. Andrey also said that fundraising is an attitude so we need more than just the matrix. We need to think about funding in terms of the 'chicken or the egg'- do we find a donor for our idea or find an idea for our donor? He also explained some developments within private funding: donor is not always a good word as donors will want something back; donors have become very active in setting out their goals when giving funds so we need to incorporate these goals into funding applications; and donors are trying to manage a bigger picture and the fundraiser needs to work out how they can fit in to that bigger picture.

Andrey then outlined some key behaviours to bear in mind when applying for funding:

- Be honest: admit your problems and say how they can be improved.
- Be open to partnerships both internal and external to the Probation Service.
- Be flexible: if you have a strategy, be prepared to amend it and remember that funding is generally a drop rather than a stream so you need to be prepared to look in other places for funding.
- Prioritise.
- Be effective: plan for maximum results on minimum funding.
- Transfer best practice: don't create a new project when a similar project from elsewhere will do just as well.
- Be creative.

Andrey finished off by saying that a committed fundraiser wouldn't see a 'chicken or an egg' but would instead ask for chicken soup and an omelette.

Questions and Comments

Mary Anne thanked Andrey for a challenging and entertaining talk which had already demonstrated how we can add to Steve's matrix from the previous presentation.

Understanding EU funding - Justice, Liberty and Security funding streams and priorities for work in Criminal Justice

Martine Parmantier, DG JLS, Criminal Justice Programme, Brussels

Martine's presentation aimed to give the conference an understanding of the Directorate General for Justice, Liberty and Security (DG JLS) and offered some tips on how to get the most out of the organisation. She explained that DG JLS comprises 6 different Directorates. She told that she is working in Directorate Justice (the Directorate 'E'), which is split into 4 groups and that she is based in E4- Financial Support. She advised that if someone had a request, then it was best to go to the top. Martine gave the conference information on the budget for 2009 and explained the hierarchy of norms in EC funding. This means that funding can only be provided if there is a basic act or legal basis and this provides a limit to each grant. Each Directorate produces an annual work programme which provides a political framework for budgetary and administrative implementation. The Commission has two tools for implementation- calls for proposals and calls for tenders.

Calls for Proposals

She explained that a call for proposals published in order to support proposals/actions intended to achieve an objective which forms part of an European Union policy, or the functioning of a body which pursues an aim of general European interest, or has an objective forming part of an European Union policy. The outcome of the call for proposals takes the form of a grant agreement and the grant may not finance the total costs of the action so it may result in a co-financing arrangement.

Calls for Tenders

Martine explained that the purpose of a call for tenders is to acquire a product, study or a service which the Commission needs for its own activities. The result of a successful bid is a contract where the Commission pays 100%.

Martine said that potential applicants should look out for the publication of the annual work programme as this gives information on what the commission will be funding that year so people can start preparing partnerships in advance of the publication of calls for proposals and tenders. She said that most people don't start early enough and so have to do all the work between the publication of the call for tender/proposal and the deadline which is normally after 6 weeks.

Martine then went on to explain the difference between the two grants that the Commission provides: operating grants and action grants. Operating grants cover the operating costs of project, whereas action grants are supposed to fund a particular activity. She also explained about monopolistic organisations which are guaranteed a certain amount of money each year. She also warned that there are advantages and disadvantages of this.

Finally, Martine went through the actual process of a grant application and some of the criteria which all projects must fit. The whole process can take 6 months from submission of application to the money being confirmed and awarded. She also explained that each project must be made up of at least 2 partners and have a European dimension. Countries which are outside the EU can be involved in an

application, as can international agencies, but they cannot lead on a project. The whole scheme is based on a co-financing principle with the Commission providing up to 70% of the cost of the project. Additionally, each bid must be for a minimum of €50,000. The Commission has target groups for 2009: judicial training; supporting victims of crime; e-justice; and the transfer of criminal records across Europe. The maximum duration of each project is 2 years. Martine advised all delegates to carefully read the application procedure which can be found in her presentation on the CEP website.

Questions and Comments

Kevin Barry, *Ministry of Justice International Directorate*, asked whether there would be a reduction in funding as has been seen in national budgets. Martine said that funding was fixed until 2013 and was unlikely to be reduced before then but this was not guaranteed. The current budget was drawn up before the credit crunch and the Commission will probably be faced with a budget reduction after 2013.

Peter Grundler asked for some clarification on operating grants and action grants. Martine said that, for example, action grants would fund a conference but operating grants might cover staff costs.

Leo Tigges asked a question about monopoly status. Martine explained that having monopoly status was good in that you know how much money you would get each year. On the other hand, you are ineligible from applying for general calls for tenders and proposals.

Coffee Time Activity

During the morning coffee break, delegates were asked to speak to someone who they hadn't yet spoken to and identify two needs of their organisation. These had to have something to do with funding and be related to the conference. Delegates were then asked to write these two points on a post-it note and stick it to a flip chart so that the conference could get an idea of what everybody's needs were.

EU Funding from a national perspective

Ruben Laurijssens, Funding Advisor, Ministry of Justice, Netherlands

Ruben began by saying that he planned to disprove some myths that are common in the area of EU funding:

- That it costs more than it is worth.
- That it is difficult.
- That there is no certainty.
- And, that there is not enough expertise or capacity to submit bids.

He then asked the question, 'Why do it?' in order to refute the myths laid out above:

- It's cheap: it is possible to get €1,000,000 for the equivalent of about 5-20 days work.
- There is the possibility to do more for less because there is no need to submit extra claims.
- It is easy- once you have done 10 applications it becomes easy. The adage practice makes perfect is, in this case, correct.
- It develops international networks which reflects the move towards Europeanisation and applying for these funds helps that process.

Ruben explained that the Netherlands had decided to go about funding in a more coherent way because there was a feeling that the country was putting more in to the EU than it was getting back. Therefore the national government played an important role in, conjunction with the increasing influence of the European dimension.

Ruben went on to explain that organisations should apply for funding once they have conducted a costs-benefits analysis, and once the organisation has found an international partner. Organisations should also wait until they have decided whether a particular funding stream will fit the strategic goals of the organisation. Ruben also discussed the fact that the Netherlands decided to apply for monopoly status- this made sure that there was no competition from other suppliers but he stressed that this was not necessarily a route that CEP should go down.

Finally, Ruben talked about the role of his team which has four tasks:

1. Inform and advise in using EU funding- this helps different departments understand what funding is available for their projects.
2. Assist in application process- the application process can involve a lot of work but has to be completed quickly so having a team to support this can be very useful for different departments.
3. Assist during implementation- this revolves mainly around the financial management of projects once they have been awarded funding. It is worth noting that applications can have a named person who is responsible for financial management and applicants can include this cost in the proposal.
4. Representation of the Netherlands in various committees of the Commission and networking to increase the visibility of the Netherlands as potential funding recipient.

Questions and Comments

Mary Anne commented on how having a funding infrastructure can really reap the benefits in terms of accessing funds and ensuring that successful projects are managed effectively.

Employing private and other sources of funding to support Development

Alison Hannah, Executive Director, Penal Reform International, UK

Alison used her presentation to show how Prison Reform International (PRI) had used funding to achieve results. Alison started by explaining that PRI had an international brief to promote penal reform based on three thematic priorities: reduce the unnecessary use of prison; implement human rights in prisons; and reflect the special needs that certain groups of prisoners have, for example, juveniles, women, and people with mental health issues or physical illness.

Alison then explained that the motivation for PRI applying for funding was twofold. The main priority is to meet PRI's mandate and help PRI work towards its thematic priorities. Secondly, PRI applies for funding because it helps identify successful programmes from elsewhere which can be implemented in a country they are working in. PRI also aims to achieve specific reforms which are in line with the donor's objectives, for example, promoting civil society, reducing the prison population, improving skills training in readiness for release, setting up a new probation service or capacity building in terms of staff training. PRI has undertaken projects such as promoting a Probation Service pilot in Georgia, working towards the reintegration of girls in Russia and setting up training for prisoners in the Ukraine.

Alison also discussed the range of donors which PRI has applied to for funding, many of which we had already heard about such as embassies, government donors, international development agencies, EU bodies and foundations. She also said that PRI received requests to be involved in consortia bids and highlighted the need to obtain match funding for many sources of funding.

Alison acknowledged that PRI was not always successful in obtaining funding and that they were learning by trial and error. Therefore, she had some tips which might be useful for other organisations:

- Make sure you plan ahead in terms of resources. For example, computers may break so initial proposals need to have enough money built into them to account for this kind of unexpected cost.
- There needs to be a legislative and procedural basis for reform so there is a need to negotiate with all parties that prepare legislation and a need for them to believe in the necessity for a project.
- You need to have professional support- all people who will be involved need to understand the need for a particular project, for example, ministries of justice, prison and/or probation staff, lawyers and judges.
- You need to make sure that there is popular support for a project and an awareness of a project's aims. For example, people need to understand that probation may well be more effective in terms of recidivism and is not a soft option.

- You will need a stable environment in which to work as well as sufficient resources and equipment.
- Sustainability is also a very important factor. Grants are often not repeated so organisations may have to pull out after some time due to lack of funding. This can then result in a project having no long-term impact, for example, if the culture of the host organisation or country hasn't changed.

Finally, Alison asked if it was worth it. The answer was an emphatic 'yes'. She argued that there is the opportunity through donor funding to make a big change to a country's criminal justice system. Governments also benefit through capacity building and international expertise and the resources available enable them to set projects up which otherwise would not be possible. Additionally, it removes a great deal of risk for state authorities in terms of long term funding.

Thomas Lawson, Deputy Chief Executive, Prisoners Abroad, UK

Thomas began by saying that fundraising is more than the sum of the bottom line- it is more than just money and can work to get people excited about certain projects. He said that, within Prisoners Abroad, fundraising is everyone's responsibility because they need both money and good people. He also said that it is important to have people working in organisations who have first hand knowledge of the issues that the organisation is working towards.

Prisoners Abroad works with British people who are in prison abroad- those who are held overseas whilst travelling, and expats who have committed a crime in their adopted country. He said that foreign nationals face more problems than domestic prisoners, including:

- More isolated than domestic prisoners.
- Difficulty communicating in a new language.
- Loss of contact with families and friends.
- Problems understanding rules and culture.
- Less likely to get work to earn money.
- May not know their rights.
- Less likely to access healthcare and education.

All this creates more work for probation staff and exacerbates barriers to resettlement. Additionally, some people have more extreme resettlement needs such as having no ID, accommodation or access to benefits.

Prisoners Abroad is limited by a lack of resources- the organisation gets 40% of its revenue from the government through the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, they also get money from foundations and trusts and NOMS provides money for returning prisoners. In addition to this, they conduct public fundraising, receive some money from legacies and have some rental income. Each year, the organisation has to raise two thirds of its income through fundraising. A significant barrier to raising money in this way is the stigma attached to offenders and crime which is a very political issue in the UK. This puts a straitjacket on innovation in the public sector but Thomas

argued that charities were still able to innovate. Therefore, innovative work through partnerships with charities is one way for the public sector to access money. For example, Prisoners Abroad is currently working with the Metropolitan Police in the area of child sex offending.

Thomas said that when you are thinking about approaching partners you need to bear two things in mind: are they financially healthy, and do they have sufficient capacity to work on extra projects. He also said that for partnerships to work, shared goals need to be decided upon and written down, there needs to be a lead organisation and you need to be clear about how success will be measured.

Finally, Thomas talked in more detail about overcoming the problem of stigma which can be a barrier to obtaining funds. He said we need to turn funding into a virtuous circle- by tackling stigma, we will build up more success. Thomas cited the example of people with HIV in the UK who in the 1980s were a very stigmatised group of people. Now, however, there is virtually no stigma attached to HIV and this is what we need to do with offenders.

Questions and Comments

Mary Anne thanked Alison and Thomas for the presentations. She said that it was excellent how they had managed to bring the offender into the room which is what this conference is all about.

Capacity Building in Action – An experience of Russia

John Harding – Consultant in Developing Probation in Russia, UK

John began by explaining that he had been working Russia for 20 months and gave some context to the work he does in Russia. This revolved around the fact that Russia has the second largest prison population in the world at over 900,000 inmates¹. Moreover, the prison population in Russia has increased inexorably over the last twenty years. A significant proportion of the prison population is made up of prisoners on pre-trial detention, about 250,000, and many of those people are very poorly defended- it is believed that evidential proof is often ignored by the courts and advocates don't press hard enough for it to be taken into account. 18% of pre-trial detainees are released at the point of sentence and so they are, in effect, needlessly being held on remand for up to 12 months. When people are released from prison there is no coherent resettlement policy and no one agency is charged with resettlement. Most prisoners are left to their own devices although some NGOs are active in this field. The European Court of Human Rights is being flooded by requests from Russian advocates on behalf of prisoners and the Council of Europe has responded by holding training sessions on HR issues for Russian judges and prosecutors.

¹ Behind USA although it is worth noting that China does not publish its prison population figures.

Russia *does* have Unpaid Work available and about 40,000 orders are made a year, roughly 1% of sentencing decisions. However the measure is very inconsistently administered. Russia is also going through the process of introducing electronic monitoring and John argued that if it is carried through *properly* and if the government has enough money (about which he was doubtful, following the collapse of the rouble and falling gas prices) it could reduce the pre-trial prison population by as much as 50,000 alleged offenders every year. John said that the trials for Electronic Monitoring are taking place in a penal colony. That apart, President Medvedev has put through a series of amendments to the criminal code through the Duma² that could lead to the declassification of some offences as imprisonable. He wants to strengthen the use and authority of alternative sanctions in line with what is happening in former Soviet bloc countries and the West. Notwithstanding his sincerity in these respects, new laws will only begin to bite if the judiciary and the prosecutors in Russia are prepared to make a profound shift in the current sentencing culture which leans towards the inevitability of prison.

John explained that he is one of 5 international experts who in turn rely on 11 local experts from NGOs and criminology experts to offer advice to Russia on policy, alternative sanctions, the management of staff and electronic monitoring. Even though Medvedev has been in support of reducing prison population one would think, therefore, that people would take notice. But there does not seem to be a sense of real political will. This is partly because the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Internal Security and Judges and Prosecutors operate in separate silos. Additionally, there is no history of judges and prosecutors being trained together to meet the challenge of new legislation so that measures are properly carried through.

John said that Russia needs to have a unified Criminal Justice Board made up of all the key departments both Judicial and executive as a collective way of managing legislative intentions and Governmental purposes. John said that when he speaks to some judges and prosecutors, they are cynical and have little trust in the legislation. However, he argued, community sanctions needs to be championed by the Judiciary and could make a profound difference in how Russia deals with offenders.

However, the newly formed Department of Alternative Sanctions (2005) has a thirst for new knowledge and wants to know about Risk Assessment and risk management measures plus a range of cognitive behavioural programmes practised in the West but they do not as yet have the resources to properly implement these programmes. The focus of the Tacis programme in Russia is on capacity building through training, research and seminars with local staff and study tours. John said that there has been some progress and the Russians were particularly keen to explore the potential of joining the CEP and understanding the challenge of the newly published draft Probation Rules from the Council of Europe. He reminded us that Russia is capable of far reaching change as in their decision to abolish capital punishment as a member of the Council of Europe in 1996.

² Russia's state parliament.

John finished by saying that the strengths in Russia are:

- Presidential support is strong and Medvedev does want to reduce the prison population.
- Russia is a member of the Council of Europe and is keen to improve compliance with ECHR and European Court on Human Rights.
- There is hope that Russia will join CEP.

John said that progress will be slow but the benefits for Russia will be great. New legislation in the Duma this summer will have a significant impact but this depends on the availability of money. Additionally, Probation Officers do want to improve their skills and are thirsty for knowledge, power and activity and Russians are beginning to wake up to the problems of an escalating penal culture.

On the other hand, there are some weaknesses to be aware of:

- Russia inherited a conservative tradition from Soviet era.
- Levels of incarceration are 5 times higher than other Western countries whereas crime has not risen greatly.
- There is a highly centralised administration which increases bureaucracy.
- The rouble is falling against other countries currencies which will limit the amount of money the government can invest in penal reform.
- The Department of Alternative Sanctions lacks the credibility and support that it needs from the public and the courts at this point in its history government.

Finally, John said that the most outstanding issue, which is more crucial than legislation, is the penal culture amongst sentencers: so we need to work out how to find ways of encouraging the desired shift in Russian sentencing culture which will eventually lead to the reduction in the size of the prison population.

Questions and Comments

Mary Anne asked how the funding works for this project. John said that complying with the funding is a very difficult task and requires quarterly reporting as well as regular visits from the Commission.

Maria Razumovskaya asked why a pilot of electronic monitoring was taking place, as it seems to be an expensive project which could provide the authorities with an automatic excuse to defer it due to expense. John replied by saying that it had come at the bequest of the Commission who wanted to pilot electronic monitoring and asked the Tacis team if they would be involved. The liaison with the Russian FSIN had been fruitful and there was now much enthusiasm for EM at Ministerial and local levels.

Gala Conference Dinner, Gonville and Caius College

Phil Wheatley, Director General, NOMS, UK

Phil Wheatley started by saying how pleased he was to be at the dinner and thanked the conference for inviting him. He explained that he had spent the day at the Institute of Criminology in Cambridge looking at issues to do with probation. Specifically, he had been looking at how to continue to make improvements to the Probation Service in England and Wales. Phil said that it is an exciting yet challenging time in probation at the moment. It is said that the economic pressures that most countries were facing may lead to an increase in crime although we don't know by how much and that, on the flip side, there is unlikely to be more money to work with a resultant increased numbers of offenders on probation. Phil argued that if we learn how to do the right things to reduce crime then we will protect the public. He said that we need to learn from the excellent work going on in the field of 'What Works', we need to learn from each other and we need to be doing the things that make the most sense. He finished off his speech by repeating his gratitude at being present at the dinner and concluded that, in the spirit of this conference, the more we can learn about how to access and make good use of funds that other donor organisations have available for crime reduction then the more likely we are to make countries and communities safer.

Professor Friedrich Lösel, Director, Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, UK

Professor Friedrich Lösel started off by saying that we need to make sure that we are in touch with practice- if this is not the case then research can have no impact and in this vein, he has been doing a review of a programme which works with people who have multiple personality disorders. He said that when he was working in probation in the 1980s rehabilitation was very low on the policy agenda but this has been reinvigorated by the 'What Works' agenda in recent years. He then said that there is evidence that there is a positive effect of new methods of working with people and that 'What Works' was driven by international cooperation and that now we have a relatively well-established knowledge of how to increase the impact on reoffending. However, he warned against the straight transfer of certain methods to different cultures and that we need to learn what effective measures can be successfully transferred.

Professor Friedrich Lösel said that the UK has a great tradition in systematic evaluation and that he hopes that the delegates will all contribute to this evidence base. He said that all Probation Services have the same aims and that we need to transfer knowledge especially when it comes to the theme of this conference about how to increase funding for innovative projects. He finished off by saying that we need to understand, for example, where the differences are and why we have those differences and this is never one-way process and wished all the delegates the very best in learning about EU funding for probation.

Wrap-up of the previous day

Mary Anne McFarlane, CEP Board Member and Chief Probation, Devon and Cornwall, UK

Mary Anne welcomed all delegates back and hoped that they all enjoyed the previous night's dinner. She said that this day, the final day of the conference, was the most important day and gave the delegates a reminder of what had already been discussed. Mary Anne said that she liked the idea of the matrix reminding us that we always need to think about needs and social exclusion rather than simply funding streams. She also reminded us of how useful a focussed team can be in terms of being successful for funds as discussed by Ruben.

Mary Anne then informed the conference that it was now time for feedback from the workshops which the conference had spent time on during the afternoon of the previous day.

Workshop 1

European Justice and Crime Reduction ("JLS") Funding

Ruben Laurijssens (Netherlands), Steve Pitts (UK), Jaume Martin Barbaran (Spain).

Facilitated by: Mary Anne McFarlane and Leo Tigges

Mary Anne gave feedback on this workshop which involved three very useful presentations from Steve, Ruben and Jaume. There were several points which were particularly useful. Mary Anne stressed the importance of networking and getting to know one's partners before any calls for proposals/tenders get published and before bids are submitted. She said that it is important to try and get some potential bids on the shelf so that you've done the initial important work which comes from the differences between cultures of different member states or candidate country before any calls are published. She said that language can be a very big problem and bidders need to decide on how this will be dealt with. Partners also need to decide on what web tools will be used so that there is no confusion. Mary Anne also said that although you don't always have to work with the same partner, if you do, then you will already have overcome some of these problems. She said that it was clear from the presentations that it is important to establish good working relationships early on.

Mary Anne also said that it is imperative to know the selection criteria and framework of different funding streams and that involving NGOs, public bodies and universities makes for a very important combination of partnerships for a bid. As an aside, Mary Anne asked if delegates thought that they had played enough attention to researcher's role over the last two days. Mary Anne also reported on the general subject of communication and how we share the lessons where communication hasn't worked and this led into a more detailed discussion of the problems faced by non-native English speakers. Mary Anne said that people believe that you are at a disadvantage if you don't speak English because most things on the Internet are in English, German or French. Therefore, English speakers need to be sensitive or certain countries can dominate. She also said that CEP needs to facilitate this.

Leo commented on how useful the exercises which were done as part of the workshop were. Steve Pitts facilitated the exercises which consisted of delegates attempting to score the bids for STARR and DOMICE based on the criteria set out in the funding stream rules. Leo said that it was interesting to see what congruence there was and what difference there was between the bids and the way different people marked them. Leo said that if people who were going to submit bids were able to consult those who have experience of submitting bids then we can turn the whole process into a learning process. The second exercise showed us how to structure an application and how using Ruben's logical framework approach can help you. This is a good way of thinking through one's application and it can prevent lots of problems which could otherwise arise.

Leo also thanked Jaume for his interesting presentation about the experiences in Catalonia. Jaume had said that his organisation had not been able to act as a lead partner in bids, not because of the size of his organisation, but because his organisation doesn't have the resources to have special civil servants to be occupied with the implementation and application of grants. However, Jaume said that being a partner rather than a lead partner can be very productive and effective and stressed that we need to use networks which are working on different areas of criminal justice to improve the work that we are doing and improve access to the funding available.

Workshop 2

Capacity Building

Kevin Barry (UK), Maria Razumovskaya (Russia)

Jill Shaw facilitated this workshop and began by giving delegates an outline of Maria Razumovskaya's presentation about her experience in Russia. Maria had given the group lots of tips about how to gain funds and shared with the group a very successful project about training Probation Officers in St Petersburg in which lots of materials have been produced. However, Maria has reported that they have been let down by one partner which has put future funding in jeopardy and this certainly showed how you need to rely and trust your partners.

Jill also informed us of Kevin Barry's presentation on Croatia explaining how they have made the best use of available funding by managing the process very efficiently. This meant, for example, that when Kevin went out as part of a 'twinning light' scheme Croatia had all the right people there ready to work with Kevin. This organisation really showed through the commitment and drive to take it forward of the members of staff involved. Kevin also shared with the group a *fiche* from another country, which was intending to do something similar but had failed at the first stage in putting their plan together because the organisation hadn't covered all bases in that they weren't honest, weren't professional and clearly weren't prepared.

Jill then said that three points that had really come out during the workshops were:

- The importance of planning. This was especially obvious in the Croatian example in which they had a plan from the outset and made sure that they used exactly the right funds at the right time to ensure maximum efficacy in terms of fund usage. For example, Croatia used embassies to fund the first

stage of their project which was a study trip to the UK to look at the Probation Service in England and Wales. This was a very relevant application of some of the funding streams we had already heard about during the conference.

- The importance of getting key players together. This was particularly visible in the case of Maria's project which had suffered a setback due to the actions of one partner. It was also discussed in the context of John Harding's speech in which he said that a big problem in Russia is actually getting staff from different agencies in one place.
- About the commitment that is needed on all sides. This also stemmed from Maria's experience as well as from the *fiche* shared by Kevin in which there was a clear lack of commitment to *really* succeed in the funding bid.

Workshop 3

Municipalities, Embassies and Charitable funding

John Kwaks & Eric Staal (Netherlands), Andrey Momchilov (Bulgaria), Thomas Lawson (UK)

This was, by all accounts, a small but intense and interesting session. There was a presentation on funding by municipalities in the Netherlands which stemmed from the Dutch government wanting to economise and cut aftercare from Probation Service. This was because ex prisoners are normal citizens so municipalities were considered to have a duty to take over this task. However, we heard that the Probation Service was not happy with this situation, and neither were the municipalities. The Probation Service decided to 're-conquer' this field and started approaching municipalities by saying that it could be improve safety in the community if they would involve the Probation Service which had the knowledge and experience of working with offenders. The Probation Service suggested that it could therefore act as caseworker for all the organisations in the municipalities which had taken on responsibility released prisoners. We heard about the difficulties in implementing this new way of working which included issues around legislation, tax and registration. However, it looks like in the Netherlands they have seized the opportunity and the Probation Service will benefit very much from this situation which will turn it from a cost cutting exercise into an asset for the Probation Service.

Thomas also gave a presentation at this workshop and introduced a checklist which will help people apply for funding, and undertake fundraising. He gave recommendations on how to format an application and advised the group on how best to put the bid together. He also introduced a checklist of how to be successful at fundraising:

- Identify
- Research
- Plan
- Involve
- Ask
- Close
- Thank
- Steward

Finally, Andrey gave the group a presentation and showed how, by being creative, you can attract a lot of attention. For example, IGA wanted to focus attention on the abhorrent condition of prisons in Bulgaria. However, this went against public opinion in which the belief that prisoners deserved what they got was prevalent. IGA, however, got permission to take photographs in prisons and created an exhibition. This had an impact of the views of the population.

Mary Anne commented that she was struck by culture change in the Netherlands and compared it to England and Wales which has been moving from an organisation which was in receipt of revenue funding to a situation which is more like being an NGO which has to go and market itself. This requires new skills but it is possible through utilising existing networks while retaining professional skills. This can be seen in action in the example from the Netherlands.

Workshop 4

EU non-JLS Funding Streams including Employability, Education and Culture

Linda Pizani-Williams (UK), Jürgen Hillmer (Germany)

Linda took the group through a whole range of funding streams, which hadn't previously been heard of by members of this workshop such as FP7 which is a research focussed stream. The workshop heard how we can incorporate funding for public health programmes into work done with drug users, for example. The workshop also heard about how there is a need to work with Ministries of Justice to work together in funding applications. Linda also discussed a funding stream called Life which can be useful for projects such as Unpaid Work.

Linda took the group through the pains and gains of funding. It was acknowledged that it is difficult and requires lots of preparatory work. Monitoring, financial risks, delays in approval (it can take longer than 9 months) were also discussed. Building partnerships at the pre-funding stage is also difficult because these costs are not paid for by anyone else. Another problem that occurs here is that sometimes agencies don't share budgets with each other but this means that you don't always know what you might get. Linda warned the workshop not to make assumptions about the value base of partners and also mentioned the difficulty of language. Linda advised that if it is at all possible partners should meet up to both work together because only using the telephone and email is a limited way of contact. Linda also said that one of the biggest mistakes made is not investing enough money into the administrative element of running a project once it is up and running.

Jürgen then introduced the concept of a 'community of practice' which focuses on resettlement, employment and training. Jürgen explained that there was talk about ESF funding when the Commission made a call for some work with offenders and ex-offenders and so Schleswig-Holstein applied, with other Länder and 10 other member states, to the Commission. Their proposal was a 'community of practice' which would be a learning network charged with looking at how to change the work done with offenders. This project will start on 1 April 2009 and they are still in the preparation stage so other States may still be able to join. It will be a network with 16 seminars and workshops hosted by the German government in 2010 or 2011. Jürgen informed us that some countries have signed up already and there was a discussion around

why some countries have signed up and others haven't- this has mainly been because of an inability to travel abroad for work purposes.

Financial Management of EU funded projects

Ruben Laurijssens, Funding Advisor, Ministry of Justice, Netherlands

Ruben started by stating that getting the money is only the first step in the fundraising business and that managing the process is the second step. He said that most of the horror stories are about the implementation of a project as opposed to the application process. He said that the financial management of projects aims to control and report on the implementation process of the project. Ruben stressed that it is important to know how different funding streams like their projects are to be managed.

Ruben said that quarterly reports are the normal way of managing projects and there are some basic rules which will make the whole process go smoothly. It is important to name a project leader and name a financial manager- in fact, many EU projects require you to name a financial manager and some larger projects may require a project secretary. He also said that a partnership agreement with an appendix in which you make detailed arrangements for financial management is crucial. Ruben explained that it is important to decide on reporting formats and partners need to make sure that when a project comes to an end all documents are comprehensively archived- this can be very important in case of an audit which the Commission can be very strict about.

Ruben said that the main tasks for financial management teams are to: draw up budgets; do breakdowns of costs; report to project leaders on what is coming up; and look back at what has happened. During these tasks the financial manager always needs to look at direct and indirect costs and make sure that everyone is clear about what is eligible, what is being paid for and how to record all costs accurately. For example:

- Staff costs: there are variations on how staff get paid depending on the funding stream and organisation and so it is important to make sure that people working on a project know when they are working on a particular project. A written declaration may be useful for this.
- Travel and subsistence allowances: often a receipt is not sufficient. For example, the Commission asks for boarding passes for the reimbursement of plane tickets.
- Equipment: always keep in mind depreciation. Many funds limit what you can buy and the more you buy the more you'll have to explain why you're buying it.
- Consumables and supplies.
- Conferences and seminars: the Commission is not very enthusiastic about conferences because they aren't very sustainable but as long as it is well organised, has follow up meetings, training, and aims to develop best practice they can be very useful. Therefore it is important to record the details of conferences to make sure that it is an eligible cost.
- Publications and dissemination: most projects do involve some kind of publication such as manuals or best practice guides. Projects must remember

that if something is published you will have to use visibility guidelines to make sure that people know who has been funding the project.

Other tips from Ruben included using monitoring to look back to the beginning of projects to see how some issues were resolved. He advised partnerships to combine knowledge with an expert pool, contact the European Commission for advice, look for training possibilities, and hire external staff to do the job if necessary. Finally, he said that you shouldn't reinvent the wheel- if you learn something, share it with colleagues and don't make other people learn it all over again.

Questions and Comments

Mary Anne thanked Ruben for a very interesting presentation and commented how project management, documentation and timing can be difficult because it is often the case that people go straight to the project before having a chance to work through some of the problems. Mary Anne strongly advised delegates to do some project management training because this will stop the little things causing problems in the future.

There was a comment about how it would be useful to be able to see someone else's bid if you are new to the application process. Ruben said that you could always try to find people who have submitted successful bids and ask to see their applications- not everyone will say yes but it is worth a go.

Kevin Barry asked if we could we put some successful bids on the CEP website to help new people? He also said that one of the issues for people involved in external rather than internal work is the interpretation of twinning manuals. He asked if Ruben had any comments to make on arbitrary responses to twinning manuals which come from the process being devolved to individual states so that the interpretation changes across countries. Ruben replied saying that people need to be flexible- it is not useful to fight it because they'll make the rules up anyway and that people are very cautious and can be over strict but we need to work with it.

Accessing and Managing European Social Funds to improve Employability *Sibylle Batten, International and Business Development Unit, NOMS, UK*

After a short introduction about how she ended up working for NOMS, Sibylle began by saying that the Probation Service is increasingly in a similar situation to NGOs because of budget cuts. She said that she will talk about NOMS and ESF and picked up on Steve's theme of a journey. Specifically, Sibylle said that she would be talking about NOMS becoming a co-financed organisation.

Initially, she gave us some context. Until 2006 England and Wales managed ESF funding differently to other member states because the money went to NOMS and then the applicant had to find match funding- this made it very difficult to monitor projects. Other member states had centrally arranged match funding which came from the EU to give to agencies in their home country and so NOMS decided to go down this route. Sibylle said that the process has been slow partly due to political

issues and also due to a lack of confidence in managing ESF projects. However, in Summer 2008, NOMS became aware that more money was available but there was nobody to spend it so they decided to 'step into the breach'.

One problem that they faced was that the ESF was split into regions but from NOMS perspectives this was difficult because offenders don't tend to stay in one area- especially those who are released from prisons. Fortunately, a deal was reached to implement ESF projects on a national level. Sibylle said that there has been a sea change and a recognition that our population (offenders) will find it hard to find jobs now so we need to make sure that they are as employable as possible so we were encouraged to apply for core financing status. This means that NOMS will be an accountable body for ESF and provide 50% of funding for ESF projects. This model is less risky for providers and involves less bureaucracy.

Sibylle then gave the conference some details on the numbers involved and some of the aims of the funding:

- £50 million ESF over 2 years: NOMS hasn't overstretched itself.
- Work with 25,000 people, 21% of whom are women.
- They have worked in prison and the community but want to focus the money on the community.
- They aim to *add value* rather than duplicate.

The funding also has specific target groups: prisoners serving at least 6 months of sentence, offenders on community orders, women offenders, and those with disabilities or substance and alcohol misuse.

Sibylle went on to discuss some of the delivery models such as introducing a link worker between custody and community in which there is good provision but a lack of transition between the two. They also want to support access to mainstream services because they know that offenders are bad at accessing mainstream service. NOMS also acknowledges that there is too much assessment and so is keen to have a system where transfer of data is embedded. Other examples include mentoring and peer mentoring, and increased work with employers themselves.

Certain risks were highlighted- they have to manage cash and match funding, evidence outcomes in line with audits and deliver activities in line with their profile. They also have the responsibility to make sure that providers do what their contract tells them to do. Sibylle explained how, in PSplus, they developed a risk management tool called CATS which monitors performance and case manages individuals. They want all sectors to have access to CATS- it will be web based and, as it can also act as an ESF project management tool, it is very useful in the management of projects.

Finally, Sibylle said that NOMS wanted a transparent process and has engaged with providers to see what they think needs to be delivered in order to identify gaps. She said that people came up with some very good ideas including a 'match making service' to link providers up, make sure that diversity is embedded in planning, spend

time on partnership building and have realistic time frames for delivery and these will all be incorporated into future ways of working.

Questions and Comments

Leo said that there is a huge amount of money available of which NOMS had to find 50%. He asked if NOMS already had that money or, if not, how they went about finding it. Sibylle replied that it was a challenge but that they had some large scale contracts which they could use and also that they are using some prison funding as match funding. She said that they went for large sums of money as it would be too difficult to manage if the amounts were small and so therefore they have managed to find match funding internally. The 50% match rule does not necessarily apply in all countries – in some countries the match requirement is much less.

Conclusion and discussion on how should CEP proceed with Funding / drawing up an agenda or framework for a work program and for co-ordinated application for funds

Leo Tigges, Secretary General, CEP

Leo said that he had studied the post-it notes from the previous day's coffee time activity. Leo began with some observations based on the number and content of the post-its. He said that there is obviously a real hunger for collaboration and innovation- and this really showed during the sessions of the previous day. He also said that there is a hunger for information on funding and this has been evident in the questions during the workshops. Leo had looked at about 30 post-its and had managed to fit them into the following themes:

- Partners and how to identify them: there were lots of post-its around partners. In particular people said that they wanted to start an innovative project but didn't know how to find partners.
- Funding:
 - Matrix development: the matrix is a very clear way of finding funding and the post-its reflected a desire to develop the matrix further.
 - People wanted to know which funds are available.
 - And, they also wanted to be able to learn from past applications.
- Research:
 - Funds for evaluation.
 - Prove effectiveness of probation.
 - Evaluation of innovative projects, e.g. peer mentoring.
- Special groups:
 - Minority background.
 - Learning difficulties.
 - Mental health problems.

Leo said that the number of academics present was reflected in the post-its and he made it clear that CEP is trying to strengthen relationships with academics. He reminded delegates that research institutions can join CEP. He also said that there is a working group at the European Society of Criminology which is conducting

research into non-custodial measures and this is led by Professor Fergus McNeill at Strathclyde University. There is also a move to change the VISTA journal into EuroVista in order to improve discussion between management, practice, and research. Researchers were also interested in what funds are in place for them because they want to improve effectiveness of probation work and evaluate specific projects such as mentoring schemes.

How do we proceed?

Leo said that it is important to have CEP as an organisation because it can play a facilitative role. However, members should remember that they should also act themselves. He said that we have heard that there are plenty of opportunities available but there are also risks. However, if you don't take the risks then you won't learn. Leo expects that members of CEP and delegates at this conference will be lead partners or partners in future projects and CEP is interested in being a partner.

CEP is prepared to use its website to disseminate information about successful projects such as STARR and DOMICE, publish presentations from this conference and send out a list of all delegates. CEP will also try to publish all relevant calls for proposals/tender. CEP also plans to have a members section on the website which will have a message board. This could be useful for the recruitment of partners. Leo said that he is happy to receive more suggestions for the website.

Finally, Leo asked some specific questions about what else CEP can do:

- Should CEP become lead partner?
- What grants should it apply for?
- What risks should CEP take?
- Should CEP apply for monopoly status?
- Do we need a specially focussed project officer and how can we finance that and cooperate with other networks?

In order to answer these questions, Leo proposed a small working group that will work on answering these questions. He said that we must try things out- otherwise we won't learn. He highlighted one project which definitely has a European dimension- the framework decision on the transfer of alternative sanctions and therefore suggested that the working group focus on this over the next 6 months.

Comments/questions

Steve Pitts suggested that CEP could help with improving dialogue with Directorate Generals in the Commission who are open to discussion. Leo said that he is happy for CEP to take on this role.

Barbara Wilamowska said that CEP should be involved in the process of coordinating the framework decision about probation because it has such a wealth of experience and knowledge. Jurgen Hillmer agreed with this sentiment saying that he could not imagine the framework decision being written without CEP involvement.

Another delegate also said that it was necessary for CEP to hire someone who takes care of European programmes. This could involve, for example, applying for two projects a year to promote activities in practice between all members in CEP. This would fit with the goals of CEP which are to advise on and promote best practice.

Martine Parmantier also discussed the probation framework decision and informed the conference that in Group E3 (Criminal Justice) of DG JLS there are people who are working on implementation and she advised CEP to talk to them.

Another delegate suggested using the proposals and priorities of CEP members to identify needs for funding. Leo agreed and gave some feedback from an exercise conducted at the end of last year in which CEP asked members what priorities they had for the coming period. He said that responses indicated that there is urgency about knowing what people want to achieve. He said that, on the basis of this exercise, they made a table of six priorities and sent it to Brussels. At the top of the table was the implementation of the Framework Decision and evidence based practice. He said that this is particularly important for those countries which do not have large groups of offenders and therefore cannot assess their programmes. A European Accreditation panel would also be useful for these countries. Members would also like to establish a framework on how to deal with providers of electronic monitoring and research into the role restorative justice can play in accommodating the need of victims and bringing about more safety in society. Leo said that there was no doubt that these priorities can be transformed into funding needs.

The Matrix - revisited

Steve Pitts, International and Business Development Manager, NOMS, UK and Andrey Momchilov, International Manager, IGA Foundation, Bulgaria

Steve presented a redrawn version of the matrix to the conference which was amended based on some of the sessions from the previous day. He said they were going to expand on this list of needs. Some new needs had already been identified:

- Electronic monitoring.
- Restorative justice.
- Expanding the diversity section.
- Organisational development which would take account of communication, training, partnerships, development of IT and management.

He said that the matrix began as a resettlement matrix but he thinks that it could be useful to continue a focus on resettlement as an aspect of case management.

Andrey said that we need to expand the funding streams section and that we might want to start prioritising certain ones. He said that the matrix will be added to the CEP website and will include more information about each funding stream as well as integrating it with other information on funding.

Closing of the Conference

Mary Anne closed the conference by thanking everybody for a very interesting and useful two days. She especially thanked those who were involved in the organisation of the conference and those who gave presentations and wished everyone a safe journey home.

Appendix A

A Needs-Opportunity Matrix

Need Funds	Employment Learning and Skills	Children & Families	Drugs & Alcohol	Attitudes, Thinking and Behaviour	Physical and Mental Health	Accommodation	Finance, Benefit and Debt	Case Management	Equal Ops and Diversity	Risk and Public protection	Voluntary and Community
ESF	X	x					X		X		x
LLP	X								X		x
JLS Drugs			X		x						x
JLS Criminal Justice								X		x	x
JLS Violence		X		X					X		x
JLS Crime Prevention	x	x		X		x				X	x
Health			X		X				x		x

X – obvious match

x – possible match

Appendix B

Needs-Opportunity Matrix: as amended by Andrey Momchilov

Need Funds	Employment Learning and Skills	Children & Families	Drugs & Alcohol	Attitudes, Thinking and Behaviour	Physical and Mental Health	Accommodation	Finance, Benefit and Debt	Case Management	Equal Ops and Diversity	Risk and Public protection	Voluntary and Community
ESF	X	x					X		X		x
LLP	X								X		x
JLS Drugs			X		x						x
JLS Criminal Justice								X		x	x
JLS Violence		X		X					X		x
JLS Crime Prevention	x	x		X		x				X	x
Health			X		X				x		x
Municipalities	X	X				X	X			X	
Embassies			x						x		
Private		X	X	X	x		X		X		X