



COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

# Official Committee Hansard

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION

**Migrant settlement outcomes**

WEDNESDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2017

CANBERRA

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

### **INTERNET**

Hansard transcripts of public hearings are made available on the internet when authorised by the committee.

To search the parliamentary database, go to:

**<http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au>**

## **JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION**

**Wednesday, 6 September 2017**

**Members in attendance:** Mr Drum, Mr Georganas, Ms Vamvakinou, Mr Vasta, Mr Wood.

### **Terms of Reference for the Inquiry:**

To inquire into and report on:

Migrant settlement outcomes with reference to:

- the mix, coordination and extent of settlement services available and the effectiveness of these services in promoting better settlement outcomes for migrants;
- national and international best practice strategies for improving migrant settlement outcomes and prospects;
- the importance of English language ability on a migrant's, or prospective migrant's, settlement outcome;
- whether current migration processes adequately assess a prospective migrant's settlement prospects; and
- any other related matter.

The Committee shall give particular consideration to social engagement of youth migrants, including involvement of youth migrants in anti-social behavior such as gang activity, and the adequacy of the Migration Act 1958 character test provisions as a means to address issues arising from this behaviour.

**WITNESSES**

**CARPAY, Mr Pablo, First Assistant Secretary, Countering Violent Extremism Centre,  
Attorney-General's Department..... 1**

**GRUNHARD, Mr Samuel, Assistant Secretary, Countering Violent Extremism Centre,  
Attorney-General's Department..... 1**

**CARPAY, Mr Pablo, First Assistant Secretary, Countering Violent Extremism Centre, Attorney-General's Department**

**GRUNHARD, Mr Samuel, Assistant Secretary, Countering Violent Extremism Centre, Attorney-General's Department**

**Committee met at 10:10**

**CHAIR (Mr Wood):** I now call on representatives of the Attorney General's Department to give evidence. Although the committee does not require you to give evidence under oath, I should advise you that this hearing is a legal proceeding of the parliament and therefore has the same standing as proceedings of the respective houses. The giving of false or misleading evidence is a serious matter and may be regarded as a contempt of parliament. The evidence given today will be recorded by Hansard and attracts parliamentary privilege. I now invite you to make a brief opening statement before we proceed to questions.

**Mr Carpay:** Thank you. The CVE Centre, or the Countering Violent Extremism Centre, is the lead policy agency for CVE within the Australian government. The CVE Centre provides oversight and coordination of the national CVE program. It focuses on building and maintaining nationwide CVE capabilities, leads on Australia's online CVE activities and supports best practice across all levels of government. The financial, emotional and social costs of crime are well documented. It makes sense to invest resources in preventing crime rather than only disrupting crimes that are imminent or investigating crimes after they have occurred. This is true whether we are talking about domestic violence, property crime or, in our case, violent extremism.

The aim of the Countering Violent Extremism Centre, therefore, is to reduce the risk of individuals becoming or remaining violent extremists and to address the social impacts of violent extremism. This work can only succeed if there is close and enduring collaboration with family members, friends, the community, religious leaders, frontline youth, social workers, academia and officials at all levels of government.

We know that there is no single cause of violent extremism. The process is unique to each individual, and is the result of a complex interplay between individual characteristics, external influences and social dynamics. In that context, therefore, we must have a range of programs. We have four strategic priorities for the work within the CVE Centre, the first of which is to protect Australians by addressing the factors and conditions that increase vulnerability to violent extremism within communities. The second is to challenge violent extremist ideologies, especially those that proliferate online. We increase awareness in our communities in a range of frontline officials in schools, police, health professionals and prison staff, to identify and support individuals at risk of radicalisation and violence, and then we divert Australians at risk of violent extremism through programs that support disengagement, rehabilitation and re-integration.

We focus on a couple of key areas within those four areas. We work to build community resilience. We have a Radicalisation Awareness Kit, which we distribute to a range of schools and other frontline workers in the community, and we conduct train-the-trainer sessions. People are trained in the use of those kits, and they can then roll them out to a further wider audience. We challenge ideologies and take down propaganda. Since 2014 we have seen terrorist groups utilise the internet and social media networks to spread their brand of violent extremist ideology. We are working to build a better understanding of how those ideologies and that propaganda affect Australians, and to reduce or counteract its appeal. We operate an analytical and research capacity within the centre, and we work with digital industry to remove material. For example, throughout the last financial year we identified a little over 3,000 items as meeting 'take-down' criteria—those criteria are set by the social media platforms, not by us—and 87 per cent of those items were removed through our referral by the hosting platforms.

AGD has become a trusted referee, so if we refer something, it gets actioned because AGD trusts us. In some instances, we can have material removed within minutes of it being discovered in the first place. We have engaged with a global internet forum to counter terrorism, which is an industry-led initiative—led by Facebook, Microsoft, Twitter and YouTube—to guide how digital industry can work together to curtail the spread of terrorism and violent extremist ideologies online.

We have early intervention and diversion programs. The programs aim to assist individuals to disengage from violent extremist ideologies or groups and reconnect with their community; we emphasise the reconnection with their community as being very important. The programs are delivered by jurisdictions and supported by the department, and involve developing individually tailored case management plans to reconnect people and provide a range of support, such as coaching, counselling, education and employment support.

It is important to talk about the potential relationship between mental health and radicalisation. Although no causal link has been established, events in Australia and overseas suggest that there are factors or vulnerabilities

that we need to better understand in relation to mental health and violent extremism. We are investigating this with ongoing research, and we have established a health expert advisory group to assist us in that process.

With the situation in Syria and in Iraq changing rapidly, some Australian foreign fighters and their families might seek to return to Australia as the conflicts there come to a broadly-based end. This is a complex and challenging issue. We work closely with jurisdictions and have established a policy framework that assists them and Australian authorities to carefully manage the return of foreign fighters and their families to Australia. When it comes to children exposed to the terrible effects of violent extremism, our efforts have a dual focus. First and foremost, we identify and mitigate any potential security risks, to protect our communities. After that, we seek to provide immediate ongoing welfare support for those children, particularly if they are very young.

In relation to the work we do in prisons, logically without intervention and rehabilitation, many offenders released from prison will remain at risk of re-offending. So we have a small but increasing number of terrorism offenders, and a small cohort of non-terrorism offenders, who may be vulnerable to radicalisation. We have trained over 3,000 prison staff nationwide to recognise and report indicators of radicalisation through the radicalisation and extremism awareness program.

In relation to our international efforts, this clearly is a global issue that requires us to work together with many other countries. It is in Australia's national interest to learn from and work with countries to shape and coordinate the global response and to maintain regional and global stability, and we work a lot with counterparts. Australia and Indonesia will shortly become the co-chairs of the Global Counterterrorism Forum CVE Working Group, a significant body that has been co-chaired recently by others. We are about to take on a two-years-plus CVE stream of work.

In closing, we will continue to work across governments, states and territories, and communities to strengthen Australia's resilience to radicalisation and assist individuals to disengage from violent extremist influences and beliefs by delivering evidence based best practice CVE programs.

**CHAIR:** Thank you. This inquiry is looking at settlement services. Initially we were focusing on migrant gang issues in Victoria; that has extended now to extremism. What percentage of extremists are Australian born compared to those who have migrated, having been born overseas? Are there any firmer figures on that?

**Mr Carpay:** The director-general of ASIO made some comment recently. I don't recall exactly what he said, but there is a general view that this is basically a homegrown issue. The people who are radicalising have been here for a considerable period; it is not imported. That lesson has been learned globally: people have been here for a long, long time, and have radicalised later in their lives. It is not an imported issue, if that makes sense.

**CHAIR:** Your programs trained more than 250 individuals this year. Were these 250 individuals trained to undertake programs to stop violent extremism or—we don't like the term 'deradicalisation'—is it like a mentoring program? How does it work?

**Mr Carpay:** We provide the ability for people in schools and other settings to recognise the early warning signs of somebody who may be radicalising. They may be, for example, disengaging from their normal peer network. They may be suddenly failing at school, which they have never failed before. They may have become isolated and spend a lot of time on the internet. We provide the training so that people can recognise some of those signs, and then pathways for them to seek assistance. I am very careful in saying 'seek assistance' because in many instances that may just be a conversation with a school counsellor about what is going on, and occasionally there may be nothing going on. But if there is something that is possibly of some concern then there is a range of avenues in relation to social workers or contacts—in the same way that if someone is engaging in drug-related behaviours, there are pathways for people to get support. It is the same with us. We create the awareness, the ability to understand and recognise the symptoms, and then pathways for people to get access, if required.

**CHAIR:** Say someone has identified someone who has extremist views. What is there to compel that person to undertake counselling or education?

**Mr Carpay:** In all circumstances the programs within Australia are voluntary; there is no compulsion. In many instances there is a lot of family pressure, for want of a better phrase. Mums and dads, brothers, sisters, peers and friends want someone to be functional and normal within society; therefore, some subtler social pressures are applied. But the programs are not compulsory at this stage. There is a benefit in someone willingly undertaking the program, because then they are in the right mindset for it. Most of the work we do through jurisdictions is about reconnecting people with society. If they are in a group that is focused on talking about ideology, we try to give them access to another group of people where they are not talking about that but where they still feel like they are in a peer group and have friends. We try to move them into a different social setting so they break the pattern, the cycle of behaviour they are in.

**CHAIR:** When it comes to people who are displaying extremist views, is that on the decrease or increase?

**Mr Carpay:** It's an interesting question. The numbers remain relatively small; it is not that common. It is sometimes difficult to work out whether the person is just looking at material out of interest versus being deeply committed to it. I do not have a sense of whether it is increasing or decreasing. I can tell you that there are intervention programs across Australia and they are fairly busy.

**CHAIR:** Are you able to provide the committee with numbers?

**Mr Carpay:** I would rather take that as—

**CHAIR:** We may go in camera at the end—

**Mr Carpay:** Yes, because when you get into smaller jurisdictions the numbers get quite small, and we then run the risk of inadvertently identifying people. It's not dozens; it's more than that, but it's not hundreds and hundreds, if that makes sense.

**CHAIR:** It is great having a National Security Hotline. A number of years ago, under the former Prime Minister, I had an event in my electorate with the Afghani community. Five parents came up to see me, saying, 'My son has been radicalised'—their words. We ended up running a program. Are mums and dads concerned about using the hotline; is that what you find? If a family member is very worried about someone's behaviour, is there a reluctance to use that hotline?

**Mr Carpay:** I guess the observation I'd make is that that is one avenue but there is now actually more of a community-oriented line in Victoria and there is also now in New South Wales a line which is called Step Together, which actually has the ability for people to ring. It is not the National Security Hotline and it actually has trained social workers at the other end. What we have done is skill up those social workers to understand radicalisation and the concepts within it. But that is much more a subtle approach and it is saying, 'I am concerned. I want to ring but I don't want to make it look like what it is'.

**CHAIR:** What is the program in Victoria? How is it run?

**Mr Carpay:** It is actually run by one of the Islamic societies down there. The name escapes me. I am thinking about the call line. Apologies. We will come back to it.

**CHAIR:** That is something I have been told internationally. We had a delegation overseas and they very much have a community line similar to that. One of the things they were saying was that you must have people, whether it be youth workers or counsellors, who have an Islamic background. Is that the case with these? He is talking to—

**Mr Carpay:** In the New South Wales context it is very experienced social workers. We simply train them to understand the engagement.

**CHAIR:** They are not specifically of Islamic background?

**Mr Carpay:** No. Some may well be because it is an existing line. So some of them may well be but it is not part of the design.

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** This is a settlement inquiry. We are looking at settlement services and where there might be areas of improvement. The settlement services are all about helping people engage in the broader community. I don't know when we got to counterterrorism but we did get to a stage where we were looking at the South Sudanese gang members in particular. And from there it appeared that there might be a gap or an absence of response in the Australian-born children of refugees or migrants or those that have come here very young, especially young men, and whether the settlement services were responding or could be extended to respond to assisting them through those areas of conflict, cultural conflict, and all those things that actually make young people in particular vulnerable to all sorts of other things.

In that space—and I want to stay in that space—I am trying to see what you are doing and whether where we have started from might and could meet, and whether the meeting is productive or whether it is counterproductive. That's my interest. So the question I want to ask you is: what, if any, are the differences between perhaps the South Sudanese young people that we initially started looking at in terms of their antisocial behaviour—what is the difference between those subjects; we'll just call them subjects for now—and the ones that you deal with from other communities whose tendencies may not be just to run around in people's homes but to conduct other activity which is of harm to the broader community? Are there similarities? Are there any differences? What are the approaches and where we meet, a settlement, and where you come in? That is the area I am interested in.

**Mr Carpay:** I guess we would characterise what we do as a crime prevention strategy, if that makes sense. Therefore, there are a whole range of crimes that can actually be committed. A lot of that occurs because people

are not connected with their local environments and their society et cetera. I guess the way I characterise what we do is that we are more of a safety net. We try and catch people who have fallen through and are perhaps further progressed where they are exhibiting signs and concerns. And that is perhaps, therefore, trying to actually educate schools and other environments so that they would recognise those signs and then provide a pathway or access to support and services. So we are really not in the settlement space per se but there are similarities in terms of the reasons why people may not feel connected and therefore disengage and pursue a range of paths.

One of the comments I would probably make is with ISIS and al Qaeda there is an awful lot of propaganda. If people are feeling disenchanted with the local environment, in the sense of grievance, al Qaeda and ISIS are actually providing a solution by saying, 'Join us and you've got a pathway forward.' I don't know whether that applies in the other community you mentioned. But I think that is one of the differences in relation to specific propaganda trying to tempt people down a pathway versus a scenario in which people are disaffected and act out, if that makes sense.

**Ms VAMVAKINOU:** It does in a way. I know what you are dealing with. And it is an issue of our times, and maybe one day it won't be an issue anymore. And yes, you have a very specific role at the end of the line, as opposed to that middle ground that we are trying to carve out as a settlement services umbrella rather than a countering violent extremism umbrella. I feel that sometimes the two are not totally exclusive to each other but one doesn't necessarily assist the other either, and it can be counterproductive.

I am looking for some advice or thoughts from you in terms of where we could go before they end up in your jurisdiction, and what programs are either working or not working. I know you are running the school programs. Are they effective? Do you call them settlement services programs? You don't, because we don't have that space yet. Is it worth pursuing that space to make it a bit easier? That's really what I am interested in knowing from you, who have been doing this for quite a while.

**Mr Carpay:** And again I guess the settlement services are really more of a DSS matter. We do work—

**Ms VAMVAKINOU:** I know they are. But here we are: you're AG and we're social cohesion. How are we working together and are we succeeding in working together? Can we work together, really?

**Mr Grunhard:** Perhaps the purpose of the international intervention program that Mr Carpay outlined in his opening statement is precisely to identify those people who have already progressed, as you are saying, beyond a point of concern, but potentially to refer them back and to feed them back into those other services that are already on foot. So those broader social services that are already underway are precisely designed to address some of the upstream factors that we know do increase the risk of a whole range of—

**Ms VAMVAKINOU:** What are some of those services that you refer back to? What are some of those? They will be the mainstream services that deal with mental health issues and drug addiction in particular.

**Mr Grunhard:** Mental health issues, drug addiction, for example. But there are services that are established under the intervention framework that are peer-to-peer mentoring networks, possibly employment support networks. The purpose of the intervention program that we operate is primarily to identify those who are at risk but then also to identify which services best to connect them to in their particular circumstances. So it is an individualised case management approach to ensure that they receive the support they need to re-engage with society. In a sense, most of our work involves identification and referral back to some of those services. In some cases there is a requirement for more niche services, and we have done some work, capacity building, in that area but—

**Ms VAMVAKINOU:** What are some of those niche areas or niche services?

**Mr Grunhard:** There are youth programs that are run in various locations, for example, that would seek to have people properly trained in how to deal with someone who has been referred in, because they are already showing signs of a potential towards a path of radicalisation and, therefore, able to tailor their existing services to deal with some, in the particular case. But certainly it is true the broader social services policies that Australia runs are designed absolutely to deal with those upstream factors that will contribute to a whole range of different criminal behaviour, including possible involvement in—

**Ms VAMVAKINOU:** Your mentoring program and the job connect, which are two very important programs, how are they working? You refer to that. Do you keep an eye on whether you are having success with those referrals? Are they working? Are they actually doing what they are perhaps designed to be doing, and are you having outcomes so that you could say, 'Right, we are doing really well here in this referral and it is worth developing more and working on'?

**Mr Carpay:** Yes. And again, the numbers are quite small. But we do know that there are individual success stories where people have been going down a pathway and they have re-engaged with their families and their

peers et cetera, et cetera. And often that is because they are individuals. It is all individual based but there are definitely success stories out there. But again numbers are quite small, thankfully. But we are getting some individual success stories across Australia.

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** Just on another matter, just to finish my questioning, obviously you have experience in this area. This was Mr Georganas's question. He had to leave. I promised I would ask. He was interested in knowing would you be able to articulate maybe not a profile but certainly what is it that drives young people to end up where you are having to deal with them? Do you have a profile? I think we could probably guess some of it. You probably talked about it already. I don't want a facts sheet. But in your experience—that's what he was interested in.

**Mr Carpay:** I think that's what we indicated. There is no single pathway. But I can tell you a couple of things. We are talking about people who have a positive engagement in their community. But at some point they start to not feel as comfortable and start looking for answers. And then if they start looking for answers, for example, online they might find a group that says, 'Yes, we can solve all these problems for you.' We talk about people then being in a sceptical mind frame and looking for answers. And what can happen is that they can find themselves in what we call an echo chamber. All of the answers that they are getting are: 'If only you follow this path we'll solve all of your problems for you. You will get a sense of belonging'—which often people are looking for—'Your grievances can be addressed.'

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** Yes, a sense of identity.

**Mr Carpay:** 'You can take direct action.' A sense of identity. So that's it broadly. And then, of course, for some people, if they continue to be in a framework where that is not challenged and there are no messages sort of saying, 'Yes, but that isn't actually the case,' or, 'That's not true,' or, 'It's more complicated than that,' then they can continue down that path. So really what we try and do, again, is get to the point where we try and give people some clarity, that it is not a solution to become violent because that doesn't actually solve your problem, and that there are other ways to belong in Australia and to get a sense of purpose and a sense of engagement. Hence, if we can get someone access to a mentoring or a coaching program that enables them to get a job, then they can see that they can succeed here rather than having to go down a pathway of violence, for example, to get a sense of belonging, a sense of purpose. And some individuals, at least, are actually looking for, I guess, redemption because maybe their life has not been great and they've done some things that they are not proud of, and someone says, 'All will be forgiven if only you go down this pathway.' And that's a lot of what propaganda tells us.

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** And this on religious redemption?

**Mr Carpay:** Yes, and personal redemption as well, in that sense of forgiveness.

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** Through religion?

**Mr Carpay:** So even though there is no single profile, there are some common elements where we talk about things like some push-and-pull factors. A sense of grievance, an injustice, a lack of opportunity to search for meaning, social isolation are all some of the push factors; and the pull factors are really about a sense of belonging, status, reputation, a sense of purpose, an ideological call to action and some direct incentives on occasions.

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** So the character test and the deportation, which is used as an instrument of basically removing people that are involved in violent crime or even extremism, can you reflect on that as an option for dealing with some of these issues? One of the committee's terms was to look at the character test—and to go back to the terms of reference—

**CHAIR:** Meaning if someone is on a visa and they are an extremist, relating I suppose to inclination, especially those ones trying to convert young people to go down the wrong path, I think that would be—

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** Yes, or wanting to be actively involved in harming the community in a way that they can't be redeemed or whatever, I am assuming. They are the extremities, being in gaol for 12 months for more.

**CHAIR:** This is probably going to end up in government policy. It is a bit hard to answer too.

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** Yes.

**Mr Carpay:** I guess so. My observation would be: indeed it is a matter of government policy. I guess what we do is we deal with the realities of the framework within which we operate. So we will continue to provide services for people who are identified and who are in need, and that is what we do and that's where we focus our efforts.

**Mr Grunhard:** And if I could just add, it's probably true that most of the people who fall within those sorts of tests are probably already further progressed. In a sense our work has probably already not succeeded in catching them at an early stage—

**CHAIR:** So early intervention?

**Mr Grunhard:** by the time they have reached that point where they would satisfy the efforts.

**Mr DRUM:** We often hear that it is the Islamic leaders that play a huge role in alerting authorities, that some young Johnny has gone off the rails and started muttering some rubbish, and that helps Australian authorities to stop these events becoming a reality. We are torn between making that mainstream knowledge public and not making it public. I think if we made that mainstream knowledge available we would obviously do a lot better job at having people really understand that we've got some fantastic Islamic leaders out there that are actually helping us, and it would mean that small part of the community that says, 'We've got too many Islamic people in this country,' maybe would realise that we are actually being helped dramatically by the bulk in the main. That's on one side.

But the other side is: if we make that mainstream knowledge public then maybe the radicals might not share—are you with me?—and they might go into a further area of seclusion when they are starting to mutter different ideologies and, therefore, we might not get that support or that assistance that we are currently getting. How do you see that conundrum?

**Mr Carpay:** The way we try and do things is to try and find as many pathways for support as we can. We don't look at it from the point of view of only getting information and referrals from one sector or another, whether it is leaders of faith in certain areas or not, because we have programs for schools and social workers. We try and provide a very wide coverage, so that in some ways it doesn't matter how it comes to one's attention. It could be the parent, it could be the local imam or it could be the guy sitting next to another guy at school who says, 'I watched a beheading video yesterday.' He goes and talks to the school principal and says, 'I'm a bit worried.' Our process and approach is very much to have as wide a safety net blanket as we can out there.

**Mr DRUM:** It would seem that after events or near events, when we do the analysis of the individuals, the term 'loner' nearly always comes forward. We don't tend to see the young chap who is the star basketballer, the star soccer player or the star musician in the local school. We tend not to see these people that are integrated that seem to be taking this path. Is that fair or is that not fair?

**Mr Carpay:** There are always exceptions. Certainly, there are some individuals who I understand were actually quite well-connected and in fact may have possibly been quite well-connected and stayed connected, so that it wasn't obvious what was going on, if that makes sense.

**Mr DRUM:** Yes.

**Mr Carpay:** But we do talk about the fact that people disengaging from their usual networks is one sign, in the same way that some people disengaging from their networks is a sign that they've got other concerns going on, and they may be turning to drugs, crime et cetera. It is really about those early indicators. With someone who says, 'I'm spending a lot of time watching propaganda videos,' clearly there is concern. The fact that they haven't turned up to a basketball game is probably not the matter. But when they don't turn up for a basketball game, they don't see their friends and they barely attend school, you start to say, 'Something is going on here.' What it is then needs to be looked at. It is rarely in relation to our space, but if it is, again, we would provide support.

**Mr DRUM:** With the work that you are doing with the CVE, is there anything that is unique about Australia that would mean we can't look overseas to see the world's best model? If Australia is very similar, where would you be directing us to look at world's best practice?

**Mr Carpay:** We have engaged extensively, particularly with our Five Eyes partners—Australia, the UK, New Zealand, USA and the United Kingdom. We work quite closely with those countries. We also work with academia in terms of their thoughts and their research. The UK has a very well-established CVE program. Some elements of that are quite similar to what we do in terms of intervention programs and trying to find ways for people to be able to refer themselves or refer others for support. So we do a lot of work across the world, and we would say that what we are doing is comparable to most of those major nations and their approaches.

There are some unique elements within Australia, because, geography being what it is here, you get certain large cities versus rural and there are some different elements. The population size is different. The pathways for people coming here have been different. There's a whole range of different factors. But with the approaches broadly around sharing information so that people know what the early signs are, and pathways for referral for service, there is really a broad common model.

**CHAIR:** Dr Aly?

**Dr ALY:** Thank you, Chair, and committee members for allowing me to attend today. I am not a member of the committee, but obviously it is an area that interests me. I want to ask about training and capacity. I am familiar

with the indicators of radicalisation model. It is very individualised. It is very much about the individual. I'd be grateful if you could talk also about, apart from that model that is used predominantly as a basis for a lot of training—training of social workers, training of teachers et cetera—what other forms of training or capacity building are out there to look at not so much the individual factors but the family, social and broader environmental factors. Where is the capacity to deal with those within the programs that you are doing?

**Mr Carpay:** What we do is that, as much as we talk about individuals, we always consider them in their social setting, if that makes sense. In the context of an individual, sometimes they've got immediate family and friends. So we do look at people in a societal construct rather than just as an individual, because you have to. Our processes are more focused on individuals rather than collective work at this stage.

**Mr Grunhard:** Connecting back to Mr Drum's question, there is a great deal of international work, as you would be aware, going on in other countries, both similar and very different to ours. Absolutely nobody has all the answers, including us, so we are very keen to exchange work. We also fund some research work ourselves here in Australia.

Looking at some of the factors you are referring to, such as the extent to which the broader social environment contributes to those factors, and the extent to which gender, ethnicity and various other factors contribute at a broader societal level, we are funding research, but we also share a lot of that research information with partners overseas, including in our region. It is certainly true that nobody has all the answers, and we think we need to exchange stories of success, and also stories of failures, to improve our programs.

**Dr ALY:** I should preface this question by saying I have worked with a lot of individuals and in each case I have seen a breakdown of family relationships. Is it fair to say that currently that focus on individuals does not provide services or training for the social workers around working with the family?

**Mr Carpay:** No. In fact, when someone is in an intervention program, it very much does take account of their family setting. The ability to actually fund services for those family members is probably something I would need to check as to exactly how that works. But it does very much take into account the family setting, because one of the things that often is important is the family support network, to get the person on the right path again. Certainly, when an individual is in an intervention program, it is very much about them in their social setting; otherwise you just run the risk that they remain an individual and isolated, when in fact it is re-engagement and connection that we are trying to achieve.

**Dr ALY:** In this area that we are talking about trends change very quickly. Are you aware of any current research that looks at crime and antisocial behaviour as a pathway to violent extremism and individuals with high-trait aggression that may act out first through crime and antisocial behaviour, and then move into violent extremism—attracted not by any ideology but by the violence component, so that violence becomes a bigger pull factor than ideology?

**Mr Carpay:** I might make one quick comment and then throw it over to Mr Grunhard. There certainly has been some media commentary in relation to the number of people who have committed terrorist acts who have engaged in domestic violence acts at some point in their lives. There is certainly some media commentary that has tried to construct a story. In terms of research that we have done, I will hand over to Mr Grunhard.

**Mr Grunhard:** As you would be aware, given your background, Dr Aly, if you ask international academia a question you'll get many different answers.

**Dr ALY:** Yes; at least five!

**Mr Grunhard:** At least five. There is certainly some research that suggests that a criminal tendency or a tendency towards violence is actually the primary driver for some individuals. It is different for different individuals. Some of the research that suggests which indicators you need to look at in designing programs like ours suggests that that criminal tendency or that violence tendency may be the most important for some individuals.

It is certainly something that we are looking at. The difficulty is that there are as many different models as there are individuals who end up engaging in this sort of path. Certainly, for some, that is one of the drivers; absolutely.

**Mr GEORGANAS:** My question is very similar to Anne's as well. There are certain factors that identify people that are at risk. At that point there is some intervention. Are there any programs or has any research been done on, prior to that point, preventing people from getting to that point where they become at risk? There could be what you call hotspots around the place, where the risks are higher if you are in a particular—I don't want to use the word 'demographic'—area. Therefore, what programs are there for people generally that are in that area

before they get to that risky point? In other words, is there something that prevents them from taking on the isolation, maybe feeling a bit like an outsider at school, at high schools in different—

**Mr Carpay:** This is a bit in the space around some of those push and pull factors. Some of those push factors are things like a sense of injustice or grievance and a lack of opportunities.

**Mr GEORGANAS:** You may have discussed that while I was out.

**Mr Carpay:** Yes. It's fairly well understood that those are some of the factors that can contribute to someone going down a pathway. I might illustrate one of the things we have been working on recently, which is a slightly more collective approach. We have been working with a number of people from NGOs—non-government organisations—with some private sector, with some people from the community, and in fact across faiths, to work up a model where we might be able to find, in a given locale, what the needs are in that locale. What are the issues that exist in that location? What are the services that already exist, and what are the services that might actually assist in solving some of those broader issues at an earlier stage? It is about trying to do it in a way that involves the private sector, because this is a societal problem, and the private sector, when things happen, is deeply impacted as well. How could it work so that government might provide some seed funding but not have to fund it ongoing, because maybe the private sector can contribute?

We've been doing some work in that space in a particular locale with a group of people, and trying to design what we are calling a public-private partnership. The aim is to try and find a way to assess need, assess what services are available, engender new services, and then fund it on an ongoing basis, with perhaps government kicking off with seed funding but not funding ongoing.

**Mr GEORGANAS:** Something that I have been thinking about—there may not be any research on this—is other groups that have settled in Australia over periods of time, and to look at those groups to see what sort of isolation existed and who felt it, and what the outbreaks were from that, compared to what is happening today, where there is an international network that people can hook into, which makes it very difficult. It would be interesting to look at different groups that settled at different periods of time, from the thirties, forties, fifties and sixties, and what was happening with them. I suppose we didn't have as many programs as we have today, but there were issues. I remember the front-page stories in Adelaide, for example, targeting a complete ethnic group about something. It would be interesting to see if this has any resemblance to any of what was taking place, but with a different outcome today.

**CHAIR:** Maybe over time things change. Other communities have had their problems over the years.

**Mr GEORGANAS:** Yes, that's right.

**Mr Carpay:** It goes back to the discussion earlier about how research suggested that, with poor social cohesion outcomes, crime is one of the potential consequences. To some extent, some academics and some practitioners are seeing the present difficulties we are having with the extremist violence as simply a crime type, which is why we view all of our work as fundamentally a crime prevention program, similar to what would have been done in past decades, as you say.

**Mr GEORGANAS:** For example, organised crime back in the seventies and eighties.

**Mr Carpay:** Indeed. Some of the extremist groups that promote violence have very strong similarities with organised crime groups in the way they operate and the way they promote violence.

**CHAIR:** With the delegation over to the UK, one thing that the counterterrorism police informed us about was that, when it came to youth gang violence, there were ever-stronger connections to the extremists. The extremists were now working with these youth gangs or migrants. Are we experiencing the same thing here, or is that something that you don't have knowledge of?

**Mr Carpay:** My sense is it's more of a UK thing.

**CHAIR:** The UK seems to have its own level—

**Mr Carpay:** Yes. That's just based on—

**Ms VAMVAKINOU:** So does Los Angeles.

**Mr Carpay:** academia and other bits and pieces. I am not telling you anything that I know deeply from another direction. It is based on academia. It seems to be more of a UK thing. It's not as prevalent in Australia.

**CHAIR:** One thing which has become quite clear—and correct me if I am wrong—is that there is a group, whether it is coming through schools or parents or friends or whoever, which is showing signs of extremism and is moving from the community to the community support programs which you talk about. It's voluntary. We had a

situation in Victoria with Numan Haider, who was going around a shopping centre in Dandenong with the ISIS flag and was very unresponsive to police. How do we deal with that person?

**Mr Carpay:** I guess in our world what happens is that if they don't engage in our programs then at some point they will probably come to the attention of police or authorities, and then it becomes more of a law enforcement, police intervention situation.

**CHAIR:** I suppose this is the issue that the inquiry has been looking at—and the Victoria Police counterterrorism unit has spoken to me about this—in relation to community protection intervention orders. Could you have something similar to a family violence order? This could be where a person is standing outside a mosque and has previously been expelled but is trying to capture and influence young people as they go in. Could you have what they call a community protection order? They go before the court and the magistrate issues a directive that the person can no longer hang outside the mosque or hang around with these other radicalised people or try to influence others, and the person must go and seek some mentoring or counselling. Is this something we have looked at or is this purely a state issue?

**Mr Carpay:** The police have community liaison teams. They may reach out and engage with the person as an early approach to say, 'Look, you are concerning.' Maybe there would be some contact with friends or family to see if they can influence the person. But, ultimately, if they are not influenced and they continue down a path then they will continue, increasingly, I guess, to get on the radar of law enforcement authorities.

**CHAIR:** Are you able to comment on that type of community protection? I know in the UK they are looking at doing something similar. They had the awful attack at the Borough Market where some people were on their watchlist. The public said, 'Why didn't you go and arrest them?' and they said, 'What for? They're extremists, but we can't do anything to stop them.'

**Mr Grunhard:** They hadn't broken any laws prior to that.

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** I guess what the chair is saying is that you could have a situation where we have identified someone, but we can't mandate them to participate in programs. At that point you can no longer be involved with them; is that correct? I am just trying to work out where there is a gap and who fills that gap.

**Mr Carpay:** With the intervention programs we will probably stay connected with the person. We will still reach out periodically and check in with them. We say, 'We know you don't want to get on a program, but how about we have a coffee and see how things are going?' That does occur.

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** But if they were put on some sort of order, as the chair describes, who would be overseeing intervention to ensure that maybe some work could be done in that period while they are on it? Being on an order could actually make you more hostile and more aggressive, so you're more of a danger, potentially. You are, for all intents and purposes, being watched for the protection of the community. How do you fill that space and what do you do at that point?

**Mr Grunhard:** You are right. At present no such order exists, not least because a lot of the advice is that mandatory involvement, as you say, can be quite counterproductive in some cases and certainly won't necessarily lead to the right outcomes for a person engaging and then changing their behaviour.

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** But it meets the needs of the community in saying, 'Hang on a minute'—

**Mr Grunhard:** Yes. It is something that has been discussed in different jurisdictions. At present there is no such order in existence.

**CHAIR:** I will take up that point. You are saying there is a person there who is showing extremist tendencies which you can't control, so the best solution is to do nothing and let them go? To me, that's not a solution at all. That's dangerous, because you are waiting for them as a ticking time bomb to go off.

**Mr Grunhard:** Certainly, law enforcement would continue to have a very close eye on that person. As Mr Carpay said, the intervention coordinators would continue to try to engage both with the person and—

**CHAIR:** So someone else.

**Mr Grunhard:** the people around them.

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** So you continue to try and help them?

**Mr Grunhard:** Indeed. You certainly wouldn't leave it alone.

**CHAIR:** You wouldn't refer that person to ASIO or the police and say, 'You need to watch this person'?

**Mr Grunhard:** They would certainly be on the radar of those sorts of agencies.

**CHAIR:** We spoke about prisons. I was advised a number of years ago that Barwon Prison had a number of convicted terrorists who had then converted over to the Mongols motorcycle club. We heard again,

internationally, that prison is an absolute breeding ground, especially for young people. They may not be showing extremist views, but they walk into the prison and basically get told, 'You'll come and join our extremist gang or else.' Do we have specific programs in place or ways to stop that occurring?

**Mr Carpay:** A couple of quick observations. Certainly, there are some individuals in prison who will elect, because of some food advantages, to declare themselves as Muslim, for example. The fact that someone says they are a Muslim doesn't mean that they have converted and have radicalised. That is a real instance that occurs. More broadly, as I said in the opening remarks, we have trained about 3,000 prison staff now to look at the early signs of radicalisation and, again, to have people walking around in the prison environment who can recognise those early indicators and then connect them back in. I think it is 3,000 now across the country.

**CHAIR:** I congratulate you on the training. But the issue is when a young guy walks in and is told, 'You come over here.' How do we stop that? Richard Reid, the shoe bomber, converted in, I think, a Manchester prison.

**Mr Grunhard:** Certainly, the purpose of the training is to first identify the cohort. After that point, of course, all jurisdictions have in place programs, some of which we have funded the development of at the Commonwealth level, to ensure that there are then management programs to deal with those prisoners—as there would be for being involved in any kind of criminal activity or organised activity within the prison environment. New South Wales and Victoria, in particular, have very specific disengagement programs in place to deal with violent extremist offenders, or those who are in for minor offences but have been picked up through those programs and seem to be showing tendencies towards—

**Mr Carpay:** Victoria has the Community Integration Support Program, or the CISP, which is very much a model around intervention support and then trying to get the person to a state where, when they return to society outside of the prison environment, they are well adjusted and fully functional.

**CHAIR:** We looked at the issue of the young Sudanese. The evidence given to us was around lack of education, lack of job prospects, lack of family and disengagement. One of the things we heard from Les Twentyman, a social worker in Victoria, was that they had a program in the western suburbs where, when young South Sudanese went into the police station, they had youth workers there to try to grab them when they came out to help and mentor them to get out of the situation they were in. I think this is something that the deputy chair mentioned before. Is there really not that much difference between a young person who may get involved in a gang and a young person who is getting involved in extremism and, therefore, can we use the same measure of mentoring? The UK has a program in place with law enforcement. I forget the name of it, but basically they walk out of the interview with the police and are intercepted and told, 'We're going to offer you all this support to try to get you out of there.' First of all, would you find the similarity and, secondly, is that—

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** The mentoring program is run by previous gang members. Clearly, they have got skin in the game in this area and they actually convert to mentoring.

**Mr Carpay:** I think those sorts of programs and approaches that reduce those push factor vulnerabilities are all very good. If they don't have any of those underlying push factors then the pull factors don't have the same kind of effect. If you can deal with that then that is a good outcome.

**Mr GEORGANAS:** The distinction between the risk factors and identification and mental illness—obviously a lot of it is borderline, from what I read and see.

**Mr Carpay:** The research has indicated that—

**Mr GEORGANAS:** How do you deal with those people?

**Mr Carpay:** there isn't a causal connection between mental health—

**Mr GEORGANAS:** Sorry?

**Mr Carpay:** There is not a causal connection between mental health and violent extremism per se. But there is more research to be done. There is a CVE subcommittee under the Australia-New Zealand Counter-Terrorism Committee. We have a mental health and lone actors working group where we are trying to explore this issue much more deeply. They are looking at what we describe as 'fixated persons'. There are people who are fixated on an issue. They may not be ideologically driven, but they may be issues focused and issues based. We are actually doing some work there.

We have established, as I think I said at the outset, a health expert advisory group with whom we are working to work through this. Some of the things we are trying to do there, for example, include working to better understand the connections. Also, if someone is in contact with a psychiatrist or a mental health service provider and, again, they can become aware of the signs of radicalisation then it is another pathway for people to be

referred back in. There is a working group looking at this issue at the moment. But there is no clear mental health and violent extremism connection, although individual vulnerabilities—

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** It is not a given, but the connection is there; in some cases people can presumably—

**CHAIR:** The deputy chair and I were talking about this, and Dr Aly has spoken to me about it before. In the UK and the US they were very much using former gang members to go in and get younger gang members out of gangs. This was the FBI and the LAPD strongly endorsing that program. In the UK it was Home Affairs and Scotland Yard. Do we have any programs in place where people who have been regarded as extremists but have basically seen the errors of their ways are being used as mentors? Do we have any specific programs like that or individuals you are using?

**Mr Carpay:** It is a really complicated space because you are still trying to manage risk. I am not aware of programs that exist at the moment that use that. It is something to consider. In the Australian context we have a number of people who are still overseas. If they were to return then clearly there would be law—

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** We haven't successfully—

**Mr Carpay:** Prosecution issues would be the first focus, let alone what might—

**CHAIR:** I am not necessarily saying a terrorist who has been convicted. I am saying a person—

**Mr Carpay:** Someone who overstepped the mark.

**CHAIR:** Yes, someone who has been stopped from getting to that next level.

**Mr Grunhard:** It is a challenging space. There has been some success in Australia with a former extreme right-wing violent nationalist helping to—

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** Who actually mentored back.

**Mr Carpay:** Certainly, there is some work by those people explaining why they went down the path, how it was not right and what it actually did to them, rather than for them. It is more informal, if that makes sense. It is not a structured, logical, signed program. I think there are some people out there in communities whom we are probably not aware of who can say, 'I was heading down this path and I didn't. You ought to have a chat with me about it.'

**CHAIR:** With regard to gangs and saying, 'You give me 20 youth workers and I'll start addressing the gang problem,' we have also heard a similar comment from the Islamic community: 'We need Islamic youth workers.' How would a group apply for federal funding for youth workers? Under these programs here, what would you be potentially looking at, or would that be a specific individual case? I am pretty sure that, at the end of the day, the committee will make a recommendation on this.

**Mr Carpay:** In the CVE Centre we had a one-off grants program. We don't have an ongoing regular grants program. The grants program, using seed funding, was there to create some new services, capacities and capabilities that weren't there prior to that. There isn't a logical, immediate mechanism to come to us and say, 'We need more social workers in areas X, Y and Z.' It's something where I know DSS have just had a \$65 million grants round close. You can imagine that, in a broader social cohesion space, that's the kind of area where that might go.

**CHAIR:** So it would be more DHS looking at it?

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** That's you and DHS meeting at some point and working out where one starts and one ends?

**Mr Grunhard:** We do work very closely with them. That is a very large funding facility that has just closed again and would certainly have capacity under its umbrella to deal with some of those services.

**CHAIR:** Do extremism and family violence go hand in hand?

**Mr Carpay:** There has been some press reporting about domestic violence in connection with terrorist offenders, mainly in the overseas and UK contexts. I have not seen research on it, but it has now piqued people's interest.

**CHAIR:** If a migrant group wanted to apply for funding, they wouldn't be looking at AG's; they would be looking more at DHS—correct?

**Mr Carpay:** Yes, or state services—state funding facilities.

**CHAIR:** We have had a number of incidents around my electorate—people being arrested and planned attacks—you name it. The deputy chair has had the same thing. As members of parliament, how do we get access to these programs? In my belief, it would be good for the department to make direct contact with members, in my

electorate and others, who obviously have issues and say, 'These are the programs'. I speak to my schools, and they wouldn't be aware of these programs at all.

**Mr Carpay:** We can take that on board.

**CHAIR:** Obviously the work has been done.

**Mr Carpay:** We have information kits, for example, that are not as well distributed as they might have been in the past. On the Attorney-General Department's website there is a 'Living Safer Together' place where you can go, which contains information and background resources. We can have a chat about what more we could do.

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** You don't have any direct contact with us, as members of parliament who service these communities and who know quite a bit about those communities. We would have views about some of the programs and their efficiency, or whatever. That is what Jason is probably saying. Is it an opportunity to make it more effective and more tailored to the community if you deal with those who work in the community, even at our level? We have a broader understanding of the communities and the individuals.

**Mr Grunhard:** We can certainly look at that.

**CHAIR:** You could take it on notice. It is obvious that work has been done there. Rather than me going to a community event and people saying, 'I need your help; what are you doing?' it would be better if I were able to say, 'We have a social media campaign, in case you need assistance'.

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** Or you could refer back.

**CHAIR:** Or refer back.

**Mr Grunhard:** I can take that on notice. I would have a guess that the community liaison teams of the state police in every area have a heavy involvement in the intervention. They connect directly with all these services.

**Ms VAMVAKINO:** Yes, they do—some better than others.

**CHAIR:** Groups have come to me to ask what is available.

**Mr Grunhard:** We are happy to do that.

**CHAIR:** Thank you. I appreciate you coming here today.

**Mr Carpay:** It's a pleasure.

**CHAIR:** It has been very informative. If the committee has any further questions, they will be put to you in writing. You will be sent a copy of the transcript of your evidence, and you will have an opportunity to request corrections to transcriptional errors. Thank you very much for your attendance and participation today.

*Resolved that these proceedings be published.*

**Committee adjourned at 11:14**