

QON 1:

Mr WALLACE: Given that the number of people who are subject, or who have been subject, to CDOs and ESOs is very small, how many practitioners did you interview when you prepared your report?

**AIC Response:**

Page nine of the Australian Institute of Criminology report titled *Review of violent extremism risk assessment tools in Division 104 control orders and Division 105A post-sentence orders* reports the number of participants who fell into each group. This section states:

“Sixteen interviews were conducted for this review. Half the interview participants identified themselves as practitioners whose primary role was the implementation of risk assessment tools in a Structured Professional Judgement environment. Risk assessment for violent extremism comprised a significant proportion of their professional, day-to-day activity. Thirty eight percent of participants identified themselves as researchers; however, half this group had prior experience in designing or authoring a risk assessment tool relating to violent extremism. Thirteen percent of participants were professionals in policy implementation or management roles relating to violent extremism. Some practitioners also noted their involvement with policy implementation and management. There was considerable diversity of experience in the field of violent extremism risk assessment among interview participants.”

QON 2:

Mr JOSH WILSON: Apparently, two government agencies declined to participate in your review. Which agencies were they?

**AIC Response:**

1. NSW Crown Solicitor's Office
2. Australian Government Solicitor

QON 3:

Mr JOSH WILSON: I am trying to understand. The strongest point you are making is that this is a framework that guides professional judgement. The legislation calls for the application of expertise. If you have a framework that guides professional judgement, it begs the question: what is the basis for that person's professional judgement? I understand that the basis of someone's professional judgement may not be in what we would naturally consider a relevant field, like psychiatry or psychology, all those kinds of things; it might be something else. Nothing has been put to me to help me understand what else it could be. It is relevant if what we are being told is, 'Don't worry about the VERA-2R tool, it hasn't been validated and there is not much to show that it has fantastic predictive capacity', because all it is doing is helping a person who otherwise has some relevant substantial professional expertise to apply their judgement. I am just trying to understand who those people are and what is the basis of their expertise. But perhaps you can provide that on notice.

**AIC Response:**

Every practitioner interviewed in this research held formal qualifications and practiced as either a medical doctor or psychologist. These participants could be described as either a Clinical Psychologist, Forensic Psychologist, or a Psychiatrist.

QON 4:

Mr HILL: I don't know whether this is directly relevant to our conclusions, but could you take it on notice and give us some supplementary paragraphs. To oversimplify the range of violent extremists subject to terrorist convictions, there's religiously motivated violent extremism and ideologically motivated violent extremism. Is it possible to draw any conclusions about the likelihood of reoffending in one cohort versus another?

Dr Brown: When we are speaking about the likelihood of reoffending generally in this space, I think we just don't have the tools, at the moment, to do that. Regardless of the nature of the group we're talking about—

Mr HILL: Sorry; just to be clear: I don't mean the efficacy of a predictive tool. I mean simply an analysis of any reoffending data that you have.

Dr Brown: Of the extent of reoffending among groups?

Mr HILL: Yes. Maybe take it on notice. If there is nothing statistically valid or anything you can draw, that's perfectly fine.

Dr Brown: We'll take a look. We will take it on notice.

**AIC Response:**

Research literature emerging from other countries has found some demographic differences between individuals in these groups who commit acts of extremism, and possible differences in the onset of offending and trajectory toward extremism across their respective life courses (eg. Chermak & Gruenwald 2015). However, at present there is no reliable statistical analysis in the literature that reports the differences in likelihood of recidivism between these groups.

Chernak S & Gruenwald JA 2015. Laying a foundation for the criminological examination of right-wing, left-wing, and Al Qaeda-inspired extremism in the United States. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 27(1): 133-159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2014.975646>