



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL JUSTICE

Directorate A: Civil justice
Unit A.4: Programme management

JUST/2013/ACTION GRANTS

ANNEX 1

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION

Name of the Applicant organisation	Custodial Institutions Agency (DJI), the Netherlands
Project Title	Prisons of the future
Priority reference	E) Improving conditions relating to detention: detention – alternatives (actions or studies that focus on alternatives to imprisonment)

NOTICE

All personal data (such as names, addresses, CVs, etc.) mentioned in your application form will be processed in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2000 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data. Your replies to the questions in this form are necessary in order to assess your grant application and they will be processed solely for that purpose by the department responsible for the Union grant programme concerned. On request, you may be sent personal data to correct or complete it. For any questions relating to this data, please contact the Commission department to which the form must be returned. Beneficiaries may lodge a complaint against the processing of their personal data with the European Data Protection Supervisor at any time (Official Journal L 8, 12.1.2001).

PART 1 – GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT AND APPLICANT ORGANISATION

1.1. Summary of the project (*max 4000 characters*)

This should be identical to that contained in section 4.3 of the *Grant Application Form*.

Many countries are searching for alternatives to regular imprisonment, due to prison overcrowding or budget cuts. A current alternative to regular imprisonment is home detention, combined with electronic monitoring. Whereas imprisonment isolates offenders from society on almost all areas of life, home detention puts restrictions on a few areas of life. A continuum of alternatives to regular imprisonment can be distinguished, varying from very high security levels, where inmates are totally separated from society, to very low security levels where offenders function in the community.

Objectives of the project:

- **to get insight into alternatives to regular imprisonment in different countries**

From current scientific knowledge on prisons, variables can be derived, such as the formal regime, the social climate, criminality & offenders' characteristics, and outcomes.

Outcomes vary from offenders' changed behaviours, to offenders' adaptation to the institutional context, and systemic effects such as recidivism, cost reduction and restoration to victims. On these variables a comprehensive framework will be built to describe alternatives to imprisonment.

- **to assess cross-national alternatives to regular imprisonment**

Very few hard, evidence-based data are available on alternatives to regular imprisonment.

From the methodological perspective of realist evaluation, the project focuses on why intervention do (not) work in particular circumstances. Criteria are derived to assess alternatives and to define their working mechanisms.

- **to search the possibilities for implementing innovative prison options for the future**
- Innovative prison options for the future will be developed. Countries will share experiences and learn from each other how innovative prison options for the future can be implemented, taking into account the political and institutional context.**

The objectives will be attained on the basis of a participatory policy analysis methodology which combines scientific insights and subjective and tacit knowledge. During the interactively shaped process different perspectives and arguments are intertwined and a comprehensive policy framework is built.

Activities:

- **organising three working sessions with three representatives of each country; a practice-oriented scientist, an expert-professional from the prison system, and a policy maker.**

- **the first working session is oriented at drawing up national trends of penal policy in the last decade and alternatives that have been considered.**

- **the second working session selects a few best practices, such as an open, low security prison, and home detention with electronic monitoring, in order to assess them in depth on different criteria.**

- **the third working session focuses on exploring implementation problems that will be encountered by applying innovative prison options for the future and tackling these problems.**

- each working session will be prepared on the basis of input from external experts and national teams.
- Results are presented and debated during a concluding conference and in a final report.

Number and types of beneficiaries⁹⁹

Primary beneficiaries are the participants in the working sessions. Secondary target groups are scientists, policy makers and prison practitioners in different countries who benefit from the intertwinement of practice-based, scientific and policy arguments. Finally, victims, offenders and the general public in Europe will benefit from innovative prison options which take into account different interests.

Expected results:

- impression of a future landscape of prisons of the future
- common framework for analysing and assessing alternatives to regular imprisonment and insight into working mechanisms of alternatives
- a comprehensive policy frame that combines retribution, rehabilitation and restoration
- a toolkit of innovative prison options and possibilities of application

1.2. Definition of the problem and objectives of the project *(max 4000 characters)*

What are the problems and/or the current situation? Which are the needs that the project aims to address?

In relation to these problems, list the major objectives that the project should attain.

Provide the description of the target group(s) of your activities and explain why they were chosen.

In the last decade, the number of incarcerated prisoners hardly decreased, except in a few countries. In some countries prisons are overcrowding and national correctional or custodial institutions are facing budget cuts. Recently, renewed attention is given to alternatives to regular imprisonment, such as home detention combined with electronic monitoring. The objective of this project is to analyse and assess alternatives to regular imprisonment and to develop innovative prison options for the future.

Innovative prison options can be ordered along a continuum of incarceration and probation. Different options are possible, with gradual levels of supervision and punishment severity. However, implementing the same option in different countries will not have the same impact. The impact depends on the national criminal justice policy context. For example, home detention with electronic monitoring is shaped in accordance with the national policy frame and will also be assessed by means of this policy frame.

A recently emerged policy frame is 'new penology'. New penology focuses on reducing recidivism from a public protection perspective. According to this policy frame, offenders' recidivism should be prevented in accordance with the interests of victims and the public in general. Treatment and training are primarily means for risk management of offenders.

Another recent policy frame is 'renewed rehabilitation', which focuses on reintegration of offenders in society from a positive criminology perspective. The policy frame tries to address needs of offenders and supports them by focusing on strengths and protective factors instead of their risks and deficiencies.

In addition to the content of the policy frame, a difference can also be made between the formal or espoused policy frame, and the policy frame that is practically in use. The espoused policy frame may

differ from the policy frame-in-use due to an implementation gap between policy and practice. The objective of this project is to understand alternatives to regular imprisonment in their practical policy context.

Whereas 'evidence- and research- based policy' will be strived for, in practice, detention policy will be influenced by 'the fashion of the day'. Moreover, empirical evidence about outcomes of alternatives to regular imprisonment is hardly available. Even if valid evaluative data about alternatives are present, the data usually cannot explain why and how alternatives to regular imprisonment are effective in this specific context for these specific types of offenders. The 'working mechanisms' of the alternatives are not tangible. The objective of this project is to 'unravel' the alternatives to regular imprisonment and to understand why they may (not) work in these particular circumstances.

Current prison studies mostly focus only on the characteristics of individual offenders or solely on the characteristics of the institutional environment. The objective of this project is to search for the combined impact of offenders' characteristics as well as institutional characteristics and to develop a comprehensive framework that makes it possible to research alternatives to regular imprisonment from different perspectives.

The target groups of this project are policy makers, experts and prison professionals, and practice-oriented scientists. The project offers a cross-national framework for communicating the impact and outcome of alternatives to detention. It makes clear which innovative prison options for the future can be distinguished and could also be workable in different countries.

1.3. Relevance and justification (max 4000 characters)

Clearly outline how your project addresses the call priority against which you are applying. What is the project's added value in this priority area?

Describe briefly how the concept of the project was developed and what preparations for it have been made so far. Briefly refer to the current state of knowledge and explain how you will build on it.

If the project is the continuation of a previous activity or project, describe how the project is intended to build on the results of that project or activity.

Please explain any innovative aspects of the project.

Within the European area alternatives to detention have a long history. Some examples are community services, residential treatment, release on licence and aftercare. Detention is also combined with training and treatment programs in or out of prisons. The alternatives to detention can take place in different phases of penalization, such as during pre-trial, execution of the sentence, early release, and re-entry to society. This project focuses on the phase of execution.

Recently, new alternatives to regular imprisonment are (re)emerging, such as extramural detention. Developments in technology facilitate that offenders are less restricted or are supervised in innovative ways. Consequently, the difference between intramural prisons and extramural detention seems to disappear. Innovative prisons of the future will differ from the classical, high secure prisons, where offenders are fully isolated from society and highly dependent on staff. Prisons of the future may be more open to society and can offer offenders more possibilities for self-regulation and reintegration in society. Alternatives to regular imprisonment probably combine retribution, rehabilitation and restoration more effectively and more efficiently. Subsequently, conditions relating to detention can be

improved. Innovative prisons of the future can challenge the current European Prison Rules that are primarily shaped on the basis of regular imprisonment.

The renewed attention on alternatives to regular imprisonment is also visible in the European penal statistics (e.g., SPACE II) which pay attention to alternatives like home detention and electronic monitoring. This project looks 'behind' the statistics and tries to understand what kind of innovative prison options for the future can be distinguished, what their impact will be and how they fit with current policy frames.

The project is inspired by the Dutch effort to develop a realistic long term vision on future custodial and correctional institutions. In the Dutch vision a new landscape of facilities will emerge, with work-oriented facilities for executing long sentences in isolation of society, and resocialisation facilities for executing shorter sentences, closely connected to society. Currently, some real life experiments are executed in order to make the new Dutch landscape work in practice. The Dutch practice is also influenced by current short term developments such as budget cuts and the need to close current institutions.

The project builds on current available scientific knowledge about alternatives to regular imprisonment. From penal literature concerning imprisonment, four main categories of variables can be distinguished.

The first variable, formal regime, relates to the level of security, the kind of institutions, the restrictions of freedom and the number of available facilities for work, education, care and recreation.

The second variable, social climate, can be defined by the relationships between offenders, the relationship between offenders and staff, and the relationships between offenders and their social networks. Consequently, the social climate can be experienced by offenders as more or less safe or harsh. Offenders can also experience more or less freedom for self-regulation and may be more or less stressed, due to the social climate.

The third variable, offender characteristics, relates to the penal statistics on criminality, the amount of convictions and what offenders bring in to the prisons of the future, i.e., criminal propensity, criminal history, potential pathology and level of education or intelligence.

The fourth variable, outcomes, can be divided in offenders' behavioral changes, offenders' adjustment to internal prisoner rules, and systemic changes such as recidivism, costs and satisfying victims' needs.

Alternatives to regular imprisonment will be primarily related to one of more of these variables and it will be assessed how they may influence the other variables.

1.4. Expected results (max 4000 characters)

What are the expected results of the project? Explain who and how will benefit from these results. How will the final beneficiaries of the project profit from the project results?

How will these results contribute to achieving the objectives of the call priority against which you are applying?

The project results in:

- An impression of the landscape of prisons of the future.
- Mature alternatives to regular imprisonment, with insights into the working mechanisms of the alternatives.
- A more comprehensive policy frame for criminal justice policies regarding incarceration and rehabilitation.

- A common framework for comparing and assessing alternatives to regular imprisonment.
- A toolkit of innovative prison options for the future and the contexts in which they best can be applied.
- Intertwinement of arguments and thoughts of scientists, policy makers and prison professionals.
- Insights into possible and desirable adaptations of the European Prison Rules in accordance with innovative options for prisons of the future.

Beneficiaries can be ordered along different lines. Primary beneficiaries are the participants in the project who reflect upon current penal policy and can share and debate their ideas. Together they explicate implicit assumptions in penal policy. The attainable results will help non-participating colleagues in the field of penal policy to learn from practice-based experiences and trends in other countries in order to being able to reflect upon what is going on in their own countries. For the target groups of scientists, policy makers and prison professionals in general, they may view possibilities of intertwining arguments derived from the different worlds of practitioners, policy makers and scientists. Finally, victims, offenders and the general public will benefit from innovative options in which their interests are taken into account.

1.5. Methodology (max 4000 characters)

Outline the approach and methodology. Explain why this is the best approach to attain the objectives and the proposed results.

Explain the structure and complementarity of the workstreams.

Explain how the proposed activities represent a cost effective solution.

The project is primarily based upon a methodology for participatory policy analysis (Geurts & Joldersma, 2001, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 128, 300-310). According to this methodology, scientific insights and formal models should be combined with subject knowledge resources to improve communication about alternatives to regular imprisonment. Active participation of relevant actors enables to include subjective and tacit knowledge in addition to the objective, scientific knowledge derived from theories and empirical studies. The methodology tries to build theories-in-use for innovative prisons of the future, instead of relying on apparently espoused theories. The methodology distinguishes different kinds of structured debate to cooperatively clarify goals and explore options. An important tool is the 'language' or common framework which is used to understand each other.

Additionally, the project depends upon a realist evaluation approach as developed by Pawson & Tilley (http://www.communitymatters.com.au/RE_chapter.pdf). Realist evaluation tries to discover 'what works for whom in what circumstances and why'. Stakeholders are also included in the analysis. Alternatives to regular imprisonment are viewed as hypotheses about better conditions for detention. Alternatives are embedded in social systems and it is through the working of the system that any change in behaviors and social conditions are effected. Also externalities such as unanticipated events or political change will influence the outcomes. The realist evaluation tries to explain success and failures of interventions and define their working mechanisms.

Both methodologies assume that the application of innovative prison options for the future is dependent on the broader institutional and policy context. Different knowledge sources need to be combined for a robust knowledge management. Available quantitative and scientific data is

supplemented with subjective and tacit knowledge. This is also needed because valid empirical evidence of alternatives to regular imprisonment is hardly available.

The management and the substantial coordination of the project will be performed by a core team of the Dutch Custodial Institutions Agency. The core team will be assisted and advised by three scientific experts from different countries. Workstream 0 concerns the overall organization of the project and the common activities of the core team. Also activities with regard to the substantial coordination are included.

The project plan is shaped as a trajectory of participatory policy analysis with three subsequent working sessions. The core team starts the substantial kick off of the project by preparations for the first working session. Each working session will be prepared by an expertmeeting, a national meeting, and a paper or presentation of the national teams. The output from the first working session will function as input for the preparations of the next working session and vice versa. Each workstream focuses on a working session.

Workstream 1 gives a current overview of national trends in the penal policies in the participating countries and an inventory of alternatives to regular imprisonment which have been considered.

Workstream 2 relates to selecting best practices in a few countries, such as Bastoy in Norway, home detention with electronic monitoring in Belgium, and periodic detention, in order to assess them in depth on different criteria and to define their working mechanisms.

Workstream 3 explores innovative prison options for the future and tries to tackle implementation problems that will be encountered.

The workstreams are organized subsequently in time and build upon each others' intermediate results. The results are integrated in the concluding conference and the final report. Workstream 4 concerns the organization of the conference and focuses on communication and dissemination.

1.6. European dimension (max 2000 characters)

Explain the European dimension of the project and its added value at European level.

Explain how the project methodology and/or results are likely to be transferable at European level.

Alternatives to detention may influence the current statistics on the European level about length of incarceration as well as the number of offenders that are still imprisoned. The innovative prison options may also have an impact on the type of prisons that may emerge in the European landscape of penal facilities. New types of facilities can emerge, with different types of regimes and social climates. They can be based on different assumptions, such as earning privileges or payment of offenders for facilities. Consequently, prisons of the future may challenge the existing European Prisoner Rules. It can be needed to adjust the current European Prison Rules to types of extramural detention. Restrictions of freedom in extramural detention that are closely connected to society, can differ from conditions for incarceration in 'total institutions'.

At the European level penal data exchange between countries already exists. The University of Lausanne coordinates the annual research for the Council of Europe (Space I and Space II). The current statistics show that some countries have a low level of number of prisoners whereas in other countries relatively high levels of prisoners exist. Additionally, there are differences between the number of offenders per country. Also the current use of innovative alternatives to detention like home detention with electronic monitoring differs. The results of this project will make it possible to add qualitative information to the current statistics which can help to interpret the quantitative data

and to better understand the differences between European countries. It can also help European countries with prison overcrowding to learn from other countries which innovative prison options are more easy or more difficult to implement.

1.7. Timeline by workstream *(max 2000 characters)*

Provide in a clear manner the timing of the activities per Workstream. Indicate the most important milestones.

Overall time line:

- Month 1: Start of the project
- Month 1 to 4: Common framework, prepared by core team and external experts
- Month 3 to Month 5: Preparing input national teams for the first working session; a first draft of an overview of 5 pages about the national characteristics of the penal system, trends in penal policy in the last decade and alternatives to regular imprisonment that have been considered
- Month 6: Working Session 1 with presentations of the participants about trends in penal policy in their countries.
- Month 6: Evaluation report Working Session 1 preliminary list of alternatives
- Month 7: Supplementing preliminary list of alternatives by all participants
- Month 8-9: Preliminary working mechanism of alternatives by core team
- Month 9-11: Working mechanisms of national teams' alternatives
- Month 11: Videoconference with national teams in order to select three best practices for studying in depth
- Month 12-13: Description of the three best practices to be studied in depth
- Month 14: Working Session 2 with a working visit to one of the best practices
- Month 14: Evaluation report Working session 2: preliminary list of innovative prison options for the future
- Month 15: Refined toolkit innovative prison options by external experts and core team
- Month 16 – 18: Preparing overview innovative prison options per country by national teams (and second draft paper)
- Month 19: Working Session 3, focusing on implementation problems of innovative prison options and how to tackle them
- Month 20: Evaluation report Working Session 3: final toolkit of innovative prison options
- Month 23: Final conference
- Month 24: Final report

1.8. The partnership and the core project team *(max 4000 characters)*

Describe the partnership of organisations implementing the project and the project team (persons involved).

Explain how the partners were selected, and why is this partnership the best to attain the objectives of the project. Describe the value of the partnership, its strengths/weaknesses, the organisational arrangements between the partners and how you will ensure coordination between your organisation and the partners.

Introduce the core project team and list the cv's attached to the application of the key people working in the project (project manager, financial manager and the key experts).

The partnerships will ensure that the project is in the interest of many European countries and is not shaped in favour of the current practice in one particular country only. Additionally, the partnerships make it possible to disseminate and share information at the European level. In addition to that, the

involvement of the European Organisation of Prison and Correctional Services (EuroPris) in the project will provide for direct and broad access to experts from a wide range of European countries and will provide for the dissemination and sharing of information at the European level.

The co-beneficiary and associated partners were initially recruited from the already existing network of the International Roundtable for Correctional Excellence. The Roundtable is initiated by general directors of organizations of custodial and correctional institutions of Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Norway, Scotland, Sweden and the Netherlands. Also two non-European countries take part in the Roundtable, Canada and New Zealand. On a yearly base, the roundtable discusses national developments regarding penal policy. Connected to the Roundtable is a Research and Benchmarking Taskforce that produces data about the penal institutions in the participating countries. This resulted in co-beneficiary partnership of the northern West-European countries of Denmark, Finland and Sweden as well as from Belgium. Norway, as a non-member of the European Union, participates as an Associated Partner. All countries participating in this project are also members of EuroPris. These partners are of interest for the project, because they already implemented many alternatives to regular imprisonment and they hold a leading position in European innovative prison options for the future.

The participants from the involved countries are asked to compose a national team of three representatives; a practice-oriented scientist, an expert-professional from the prison system, and a policy maker. The core project team will support the partner organisations in the countries to perform the preparatory activities for the working sessions and the final report.

Also the European Organisation for Probation, CEP, participates as a co-beneficiary partner in the project. Due to their experience in other European projects as well as their experience with probation alternatives, they can support and enrich the knowledge base of the project. They also will compose a team of three representatives, especially from European countries which not already participate in the project.

EuroPris is also a co-beneficiary partner in the project. EuroPris brings together practitioners in the prisons' arena with the specific intention of promoting ethical and rights based imprisonment, exchanging information and providing expert assistance to support this agenda. Within this project EuroPris will be responsible for the identification of experts, establishing communication lines and dissemination of project progress and results. EuroPris will also play a key role in the organization of the final project conference.

The core project team consists of Jacqueline Kuyvenhoven (project director), Cisca Joldersma (project manager), Egon Heinen (financial manager), Joost de Looft (Researcher) and Koert Swierstra (senior adviser and secretary of the International Roundtable for Correctional Excellence). External experts that will advise and support the core team on substantial matters: are Alison Liebling from United Kingdom, Eric Maes from Belgium and Bas Vogelvang from the Netherlands. The management of workstreams will be done by the core team.

1.9. Monitoring of the project implementation; risks and measures to mitigate them (max 2000 characters)

Describe how will you ensure that the project is implemented as planned and what methods will you use to monitor its progress.

Describe possible risks and the activities that you plan to undertake to mitigate them.

The project progress is guaranteed through the subsequent working sessions that function as milestones on the road to the final products: the concluding conference and final report. The different working sessions are linked on the basis of a common framework which will be refined during the project. The common framework makes it easier to perform the tasks effectively and efficiently and to compare countries in a systematic way. The exact dates of the working sessions and the activities in the project plan will be set in an early stage to guarantee that all participants will be present and can take account of the deadlines. We will ensure that the core project team has regular contact with the teams per country so that difficulties and delays can be recognized as soon as possible. At the beginning of each month all participants will receive a progress report about the results so far as well as an overview of what is expected in the next weeks.

A possible risk is that, despite the commitment to the project, the national team per country cannot be easily fulfilled or the composition of the national teams changes during the project due to job changes of the national participants. These risks can be easily tackled with help of the current network contacts. Another risk is that the innovative options for prisons of the future are not experienced as valuable for some countries due to the practical difficulties they are facing with regard to the policy context and the fashions of the day. The project plan addresses this difficulties explicitly by the focus on practice-based and realistic options that take implementation difficulties into account and tries also to tackle them.

1.10. Evaluation of the results (max 2000 characters)

How will the actions be evaluated? Explain how you plan to organise feed-back mechanisms during and after the implementation of the activities (satisfaction surveys, evaluation forms, etc) and how you will use the feed-back received.

Explain which indicators you propose to use for the evaluation of the project results.

During the preparations for each working session the participants will be invited to bring in their wishes according to the session. At the end of each working session a debriefing and reflection will take place. During the reflections and debriefings attention will be paid to the steps that have to be taken for reaching the next milestone. The yearly meeting of the International Roundtable for Correctional Excellence will be informed about the progress. This meeting can also function as a moment of external reflection and suggestions for next steps to be taken.

The relevant indicators for the evaluation are: satisfaction of participants, added value to regular activities, added value for the communication within the country between scientists, experts-practitioners, and policy makers, new ideas heard with regard to innovative options for the prisons of the future, practical value of the exchanged information, and added value for the communication at the broader European level.

1.11. Dissemination strategy and communication tools (max 2000 characters)

Describe your dissemination strategy: How do you plan to disseminate information about the project, its activities and its results?

How will you reach your target group with the information and knowledge that you produce? Describe which communication tools will be used and explain how they will ensure effective dissemination of the project results.

Describe how your dissemination strategy will facilitate further use and transferability of the project results.

Information on the project progress and results will be available on the website of EuroPris. All the intermediate evaluation reports after the working sessions will be published on the website. Additionally, EuroPris will facilitate exchange of information between the project experts by means of creating a group on the internal and secure social networksite Yammer. A toolkit of innovative prison options for the future will be published and widely disseminated at the European level through the network and communication channels of EuroPris. Also, CEP will provide information about the project on their website. CEP's network and communication channels are also available for dissemination.

The project proposal as well as the products with regard to the subsequent milestones will usually be published as e-books or e-papers. The integrated results of the project will be presented on a 2-days conference for 75 participants. One of the keynote speakers will be the external expert Alison Liebling. During the conference the toolkit of innovative prison options will be presented. The project will also be disseminated by submitting abstracts to and giving presentations on international conferences in the field of criminal justice. The final report will be summarized in one or two articles to be published in international journals such as Punishment & Society, Prison Journal or European Journal of Criminology.

1.12. Sustainability of the project *(max 2000 characters)*

Are the project results likely to have a long-term impact and be sustainable? How? Do you foresee any follow-up after the end of the project? Please describe whether you will have sources of financing to continue developing your project after the end of the Commission's financial support.

The developed innovative options for prisons for the future will have long term impact, because the project focuses on the working mechanisms behind the alternatives to regular imprisonment. Especially the framework that is used to analyse, assess, and develop the options is sustainable, due to its basis in available scientific knowledge. The common framework will be refined on the basis of the findings during the project. The results of the project will be disseminated to existing European networks in the field of correctional and probation services. The publication of one or two articles will make the results available for the broader community. The results may also be useful for new ideas on European projects and programs.

1.13. Ethical issues related to the project *(max 2000 characters)*

Describe any ethical issues which you might come across during the implementation of your project and present your strategy to address them.

National differences in justice systems and processes will be respected and reflected positively, allowing countries to share good practice and experiences and to learn from one another.

PART 2 – DESCRIPTION OF WORKSTREAMS AND ACTIVITIES

- In Part 2 describe in detail the activities that you will undertake in order to achieve the objectives you described in Part 1 of this document. This section is divided into several Workstreams (WS), i.e.: set of activities leading to a specific output or deliverable that you wish to produce.
- Any project will have a minimum of two WSs: Workstream 0 with the management and coordination activities and Workstream 1 with outputs/deliverables related to the objective of your project. (This does not imply that a project with just a two WSs will score low). The division should be logical and guided by the different identifiable results of an activity. The application form contains boxes for projects with up to 5 Workstreams (including management and coordination). If you think your project has more than 5 WS please try to group them to be able to present them in the space provided.
Under each WS you should then enter an objective, list specific activities that you will undertake, list outputs and deliverables and finally enter costs of the WS.

WORKSTREAM 0 + WORKSTREAMS 1-5: PLEASE CONSULT THE INSTRUCTIONS AT THE END OF THIS TEMPLATE ON HOW TO FILL IN THE WORKSTREAM BOXES!

► Workstream 0 - Management and Coordination of the Project

I. Description of the work (activities)				
1 Turn project conditions into practice 2 Start up national teams per country; i.e. 1 professional, 1 practice-scientist, 1 policy maker 3 Literature research 4 Developing and refining Common Framework 5 Defining Chapter Outline 6 Monitoring that the working sessions build upon each others' results 7 Monitoring that agreements are followed up 8 Managing financial costs and monitoring financial conditions 9 Managing project progress and evaluations after each working session 10 Preparing the final report 11 Preparing one or two articles for journals (Punishment & Society, Prison Journal, of European Journal of Criminology)				
IIa. Output(s) of this workstream				
Output No.	Output (a)	Explanation (b)		
1	Kick off meeting	Conditions of the European Commission regarding the project, participation of project manager and financial manager		
2	Literature review	Developing Common Framework and Chapter Outline		
3	Expertmeeting (before working session 1) and expert advice	Discussing and refining Common Framework and follow-ups		
4	Coordination meetings (quarterly)	Information to be shared with network contacts; EuroPris, CEP and Secretary International Roundtable for Correctional Excellence		
5	Financial meetings (after each working session)	Core team and consequences for co-beneficiaries		
IIb. Deliverable(s) of this workstream				
Deliverable No.	Deliverable name/type (a)	Format (b)	Language (c)	Months of implementation (d)
1	Project plan	Overview planning	English	Month 1

2	Progress report	and activities 24 months, send to partners Via e-mail updates, at the beginning of the month to national teams	English	Starting at Month 1 and then each month
3	Definite composition national teams	Via e-mail, to project manager	English	Month 1
4	Chapter Outline	Via e-mail, to national teams	English	Month 2
5	Common Framework	Via e-mail to national teams	English	Month 4
6	Final report	Electronic, published on website	English	Month 24
7	2 Articles for journals	Printed/electronic version on website	English	Month 24

III. Distribution of activities to each partner in this work package:

Activity No.	Name of the activity	Partner
1	Turn project conditions into practice	Applicant (core team)
2	Start up national teams per country	Co-beneficiaries 1-5, Associate partner
3	Literature research	Applicant (core team)
4	Developing and refining Common Framework	Applicant (core team with external experts)
5	Defining Chapter Outline	Applicant (core team with external experts)
6	Monitoring follow up working sessions	Applicant
7	Monitoring follow up agreements	Applicant and co-beneficiaries 1-6
8	Managing financial costs and monitoring financial conditions	Applicant and co-beneficiaries 1-6
9	Managing project progress and preparing evaluations after each working session	Applicant (core team)
10	Preparing the final report	Applicant (core team)
11	Preparing one or two articles	Applicant (core team with external experts)

IV. Costs budgeted for the workstream:

Budget: 308.576 EUR

V. Timeline:

Month No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Mark with X	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

► Workstream 1: Title: Collection of current alternatives

Duration in months: 6

Leading partner: Applicant

I. Objective(s) of this workstream

➤ **Workstream 1:** Title: **Collection of current alternatives**

The objective of this working stream is to get short overviews of national penal systems, the trends in national penal policy in the last decade, and current alternatives to imprisonment. The current national alternatives are discussed interactively, resulting in a preliminary list of possible alternatives to imprisonment

II. Description of the work (activities)

- 1 Deskresearch and interviews
- 2 Describing national overview (5 pages)
- 3 Exchange national overviews and discussing alternatives
- 4 Evaluation outcomes first working session

III.a. Output(s) of this workstream

Output No.	Output (a)	Explanation (b)
1	National meeting(s)	In order to prepare the countries' national overviews
2	Preparing 1 slid with a summary of the overview	Which will also be used as input for the International Roundtable for Correctional Excellence
3	Working session 1	24 hours session, with core team, external experts and national teams and CEP with presentations and debate and discussion about alternatives

III.b. Deliverable(s) of this workstream

Deliverable No.	Deliverable name/type (a)	Format (b)	Language (c)	Target group (d)	Months of implementation (e)
1	1 slide per country	Power point by e-mail	English	International Roundtable	Month 3
2	First draft chapter on national overview	Electronic, by e-mail	English	All participants	Month 5
3	Presentation	Oral/power point presentation	English	All participants 1 st working session	Month 6
4	Evaluation 1: preliminary list of possible alternatives	Report, send by e-mail and published on website EuroPris	English	National teams, European Commission, prison professionals	Month 6

IV. Distribution of activities to each partner in this workstream

Activity No.	Name of the activity	Partner
1	Deskresearch, interviews, national meeting	National teams co-beneficiaries 1-5, associate partner + applicant
2	Describing first draft Chapter on national overview	National teams co-beneficiaries 1-5, associate partner + applicant
3	Exchange national overviews and discussing alternatives	Co-beneficiary countries 1-5, associate

➤ Workstream 1: Title: **Collection of current alternatives**

4	Evaluation outcomes (preliminary list of alternativest														partner + applicant Applicant (core team)									
IV. Costs budgeted for the workstream:															Budget: 14.674 EUR									
VI. Timeline																								
Month No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Mark with X	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

➤ Workstream 2: Title: **Assessing alternatives and exploring working mechanisms**

Duration in months: 8	Leading partner: applicant (core team)	
I. Objective(s) of this workstream		
The objective of the workstream 2 is supplementing the preliminary list of possible and desirable alternatives and selecting three best practices for studying in depth. Through assessment and comparing alternatives, innovative prison options will be developed.		
II. Description of the work (activities)		
1 Further elaborating on the alternatives to imprisonment which resulted from working session 1 2 Reflecting upon the common framework and developing criteria for assessment best practice 3 Distinguishing different categories of alternatives and defining their preliminary working mechanisms 4 Additional questions asked to national teams on (missing) best practices and their working mechanisms 5 Common selection of 3 best practices to be studied in depth and one of the 3 best practices for a working visit 6 Preparing background information on the 3 best practices to be studied in depth 7 Organising video conference 8 Organising working session 2 in combination with the working visit 9 Comparing alternatives and very first brainstorming on prison options for the future		
III.a. Output(s) of this workstream		
Output No.	Output (a)	Explanation (b)
1	Expertmeeting and expert advice	Reflect upon common framework, elaborating preliminary lists of alternatives, and developing criteria for assessment
2	National meeting	Elaborate working mechanisms national alternatives and answering questions on missing best practices
3	Videoconference	Discussing categories of alternatives and selecting 3 best practices to study in depth and one to visit
4	Working session 2	Debating the best practices, exploring working mechanisms and developing very first prison options for the future
III.b. Deliverable(s) of this workstream		

➤ **Workstream 2:** Title: **Assessing alternatives and exploring working mechanisms**

Deliverable No.	Deliverable name/type (a)	Format (b)	Language (c)	Target group (d)	Months of implementation (e)
1	Supplementation preliminary list of alternatives	by e-mail	English	All participants	Month 7
2	Preliminary working mechanisms of alternatives	paper, send by e-mail	English	All participants	Months 8-9
3	Elaborating on (missing) alternatives and their working mechanisms	by e-mail, to project manager	English	All participants	Months 9-11
4	Selection 3 best practices and criteria for assessment	by national teams during videoconference	English	All participants	Month 11
5	Descriptions of the 3 best practices	first draft of paper, send by e-mail	English	All participants	Months 12-13
6	Descriptions of alternatives and working mechanisms	2 nd draft of paper, after working session 2	English	All participants	Month 14
7	Evaluation 2: Preliminary toolbox of innovative prison options	report, send by e-mail and published on website EuroPris	English	National teams, European Commission, prison professionals	Month 14

IV. Distribution of activities to each partner in this workstream

Activity No.	Name of the activity	Partner
1	Elaborate alternatives to imprisonment which resulted from working session 1	Applicant (core team + external experts)
2	Reflection on common framework, and asking for corrections	Applicant (core teams + external experts)
3	Categories of alternatives/working mechanisms	Applicant (core team + external experts)
4	Elaboration working mechanisms alternatives	National teams co-beneficiaries 1-5 and associate partner + applicant
5	Participating video conference and selection 3 best practices	National teams co-beneficiaries 1-5 and associate partner and applicant
6	Preparing background information on 3 best practices	Applicant (core team) and case owner
7	Organising video conference	Applicant (core team)

➤ **Workstream 2:** Title: **Assessing alternatives and exploring working mechanisms**

8	Organising working session 2 and working visit	Applicant (core team) and case owner																						
9	Developing first draft toolkit innovative prison options for the future	Applicant (core team)																						
IV. Costs budgeted for the workstream:		Budget: 20.620 EUR																						
VI. Timeline																								
Month No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Mark with X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

➤ **Workstream 3:** Title: **Concrete prison options for the future**

Duration in months: 6		Leading partner: Applicant			
I. Objective(s) of this workstream					
To develop realistic and concrete prison options for the future on the basis of comparing alternatives to current national practice and searching for changes that can improve practice and tackle implementation difficulties.					
II. Description of the work (activities)					
1 Further exploring prison options for the future, building on the results of working session 2					
2 Exchange preliminary prison options for the future with International Roundtable for Correctional Excellence					
3 Comparing earlier identified alternatives and preliminary options with current practice in own countries					
4 Reconsidering current reality in own countries and how it can be improved					
5 Discussing realistic changes which could bring about improvement in the current prisons and are worth trying					
6 Exploring what needs to be done in order to implement the options					
7 Evaluation results by producing final toolkit prison options for the future					
III.a. Output(s) of this workstream					
Output No.	Output (a)	Explanation (b)			
1	Expert meeting and expert advice	Discussing first draft toolkit working session 2 and preparing input working session 3			
2	National meeting	Reconsidering current reality in the own country and how it can be improved			
3	Working session 3	Discussing realistic changes and concrete options that are worth trying and tackling implementation problems			
III.b. Deliverable(s) of this workstream					
Deliverable No.	Deliverable name/type (a)	Format (b)	Language (c)	Target group (d)	Months of implementation (e)
1	Refined toolkit of innovative prison options	send by e-mail	English	National teams co-beneficiaries and associate partners + applicant	Month 15
2	Second draft national chapter	paper, send by e-mail to project	English	All participants	Months 16-18

➤ **Workstream 3:** Title: **Concrete prison options for the future**

3	2 slides	manager powerpoint	English	International Roundtable for Correctional Excellence	Month 16
4	Evaluation 3: Final toolbox innovative prison options	paper, by e-mail and published on website Europris	English	National teams, European Commission, prison professionals	Month 20

IV. Distribution of activities to each partner in this workstream

Activity No.	Name of the activity	Partner
1	Further exploring on results 2 nd working session	Applicant (core team with external experts)
2	Input for exchange preliminary prison options with International Roundtable for Correctional Excellence	Co-beneficiaries, Associate partner and applicant
3	Comparing earlier identified alternatives with current practice	Co-beneficiaries + associate partner + applicant (national teams)
4	Reconsidering current reality and how it can be improved	Co-beneficiaries + associate partner + applicants (national teams)
5	Discussion realistic changes and debate innovative options	All participants working session 3
6	Exploring what needs to be done	All participants working session 3
7	Final toolkit innovative prison options	Applicant (core team and external experts)

IV. Costs budgeted for the workstream:

Budget: **14.683 EUR**

VI. Timeline

Month No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Mark with X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

➤ **Workstream 4:** Title: **Communication and organising concluding conference**

Duration in months: **24**

Leading partner: **Applicant**

I. Objective(s) of this workstream

To keep practitioners in the prisons' European area involved and disseminate results of the 3 working sessions to experts, scientists and policy makers in other European countries and to exchange and debate innovative prison options at the European level

II. Description of the work (activities)

➤ **Workstream 4:** Title: **Communication and organising concluding conference**

- 1 Creating on the EuroPris website a virtual location of the project
- 2 Creating a group on the networksite Yammer for project experts
- 3 Publishing and disseminating the toolkit of innovative prison options
- 4 To invite experts, scientists and policy makers on the European prisons' area from different countries to participate in the conference

III.a. Output(s) of this workstream

Output No.	Output (a)	Explanation (b)
1	Creating room at the EuroPris website for the project	in order to inform project experts about the project and the intermediate project results
2	Yammer group	To inform experts in the prisons' area about the project
3	Conference	Exchange integrated project results on the European level and debating and discussing innovative prison options for the future

III.b. Deliverable(s) of this workstream

Deliverable No.	Deliverable name/type (a)	Format (b)	Language (c)	Target group (d)	Months of implementation (e)
1	Toolkit of innovative prison options (leaflet)	Printed	English	Participants Conference and other professionals who are interested	Month 23

IV. Distribution of activities to each partner in this workstream

Activity No.	Name of the activity	Partner
1	creating room for the project on the EuroPris website f	EuroPris, beneficiary partner 6
2...	Creating Yammergroup	Europris, benefaiciary partner 6
3	disseminating toolkit of prison options	Europris, beneficiary partner 6
4	Organizing conference i	Europris, co beneficiary partner 6

IV. Costs budgeted for the workstream:

Budget: **97.796 EUR**

VI. Timeline

Month No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Mark with X	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

➤ Workstreams – How to fill in the form?

Workstream 0 - Management and Coordination of the Project

What is "Workstream 0" ?

Workstream 0 is intended for all activities related to the general management and coordination of the project (kick-off meetings, coordination, project monitoring and evaluation, financial management) and all the activities which are cross cutting and therefore difficult to assign just to one specific workstream. In such case, instead of splitting them across many workstreams please enter and describe them in workstream 0. For this reason it has a different layout where you do not have to enter objectives and duration. Nevertheless this workstream will have its **own deliverables** (ex. final report, work plan, evaluation report) and **outputs** (ex. meetings, minutes, agreements). This workstream has also a corresponding **budget** reference where you should enter all the costs necessary to implement activities of this workstream.

Workstreams 1 – 4.

➤ Workstream X: Title: Give a name to your WS and keep the same numbering you use in the detailed budget																											
Duration in months: ... X months												Leading partner: ... If there will be a partner leading this WS, please give its name. If it is the responsibility of the coordinator, write "Co-ordinator"															
I. Objective(s) of this workstream																											
Indicate the objectives of the activities under this WS.																											
II. Description of the work (activities)																											
Please present a concise overview of the work in this WS in terms of planned activities. Please be specific, give a short name for each activity and number them [the same activities will have to be reproduced in the section III.a. and III.b. and you will enter a detailed breakdown of costs related to those activities in the budget].																											
III. Outputs and deliverables																											
Outputs and deliverables are respectively intangible and tangible outcomes/results of your planned activities. Limit the number of outputs and deliverables and not include minor sub-items or internal working papers.																											
III.a. Output(s) of this workstream																											
Please list outputs produced under this workstream: e.g. conferences, seminars, trainings, training modules, events, knowledge, professionals trained.																											
(a) be specific as to the scope and level of ambition, therefore use a quantitative description where applicable, e.g.: X regional seminars organised with x participants each;																											
(b) Please add here additional information which would help the evaluator to understand the characteristics/scope/level of ambition of the output(s).																											
Output No.	Output (a)											Explanation (b)															
1															
2																											
...																											
III.b. Deliverable(s) of this workstream																											
Please list the deliverables produced under this WS : e.g. manuals, leaflets, websites, articles, training material packages, books,																											
(a) the type/name of deliverable should be self-explanatory																											
(b) the format could be: printed and/or electronic (downloadable), the approx. number of pages																											
(c) please specify each languages in which your deliverable will be available																											
(d) month in which the deliverables will be actually completed. Month 1 marks the start of the project, and all deadlines should be relative to this starting date																											
Deliverable No.	Deliverable name/type (a)											Format (b)				Language (c)				Target group (d)				Month of implementation (e)			
1			
2																											
...																											
IV. Distribution of activities to each partner in this workstream																											
Activity No.	Name of the activity																	Partner									
1									
2																											
...																											
IV. Costs budgeted for the workstream:																	Budget: ... EUR										
VI. Timeline																											
Month No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24			
Mark with X																											