

REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT  
5TH WORLD CONFERENCE OF  
THE INTERNATIONAL  
ASSOCIATION OF REFUGEE  
LAW JUDGES, WELLINGTON  
23 OCTOBER 2002

*Geoffrey Care\**

This will be my last Report. I want to revisit the vision of the Association, for the benefit of those who may read of it here for the first time to give a short description of it, and to explain some of the methods which we have adopted, in the seven years we have been operating, to realise that vision.

It is a temptation to address future programmes. It is a temptation I shall resist: The members with their new President, Executive and Council must decide for themselves which of the aims of the Association should receive the most attention given how deep our pocket is. There are times to surge ahead and times to pause and reflect a little. What I shall do however is take a critical look at the climate in which we operate and will in my view continue to operate in the foreseeable future.

The vision, which the Association has, is to achieve a consistent and coherent application of international norms in the realm of asylum and refugee matters. It is committed to promoting a world-wide understanding of refugee law principles: Encourage countries and courts and tribunals to adopt the best practices - not just minimum standards on a local stage - in the determination process and in appeals

---

\* President of the IARLJ.

from earlier decisions and do what it can to ensure that all claims to refugee status or analogous protection are governed by the Rule of Law.

The Association is a voluntary and non-profit-making organisation of some 450 judges and quasi-decision-makers and academics from over 70 countries who have joined together in a global network to provide a forum which can assist and support those who are called upon to interpret issues of refugee and asylum law and procedure.

Our members come from half the countries that have signed the 1951 Refugee Convention and from at least two-thirds of the signatories to the 1969 OAU Convention Governing the specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa.

In Annex II I have set out what the Association has done since it first gathered in London in November 1995 - the events held since we last met in Bern in October 2000 are set out in more detail than the earlier ones which are there for ease of reference.

We have been listed as a consultant body to the OAU and the EC and the Council of Europe and other international organisations and NGOs regularly consult us as an Association or our individual members. Frequently we are asked to participate in colloquia and at conferences by speaking or preparing papers or simply supplying advice in various parts of the world.

In particular we were invited to, and were able to, contribute through our members to the UNHCR Global Consultations. These Consultations aimed at strengthening the 1951 Convention, providing better protection within broader migration movements share burdens and responsibilities handle security-related concerns more effectively and redouble durable solutions. Our ability to make such a contribution was in large measure made more effective by the studies carried out in the Working Group system hitherto co-ordinated with much enthusiasm and effort by Hugo Storey.

In Africa the long-term co-operation between the UNHCR and the OAU on the 1969 Convention led, in November 2000 to a Round Table of Regional Judges from the Great Lakes and the Horn at which I gave the keynote speech.<sup>1</sup> This followed a joint meeting of Government and Non Government Technical Experts at Conakry. Of the 25 practical recommendations one related to a Comprehensive Implementation Plan which called on both UNHCR and OAU to "study the

---

1 See Report on "The Role of Judiciary and Refugee Protection".

manner in which judicial and administrative systems function ...in relation to refugees" (Action 12). Judges, including some of our members, participated and IARLJ was specifically mentioned. Both Sam Ibok OAU Director of Political Affairs and Koluide Doherty UNHCR Director Africa Bureau at the time saw this as a start to a new process. It has not been followed up. This is to be regretted. That initiative for real progress toward reducing reasons to fly a country; assisting countries adopt harmonised and effective procedures and developing the jurisprudence world-wide was lost.

We cannot set up such meetings ourselves; we can only be the catalyst when given the opportunity. With respect it is up to the OAU and UNHCR to continue to provide such opportunities. That is one of the practical improvements to be made in an effective teamwork between us and in the spirit of our Memorandum of Understanding.

So far the Association has held five world conferences including this one: The first in 1995 in the UK, two on the continent of Europe (in the West), and one in North America. There are proposals on the table for the next conference to be held in Africa.

The Working Groups are the research engine of an association such as ours. They provide the ongoing contacts between conferences; they enable any number of brains to be brought to focus on topical issues and they are as it were the cement which binds the members together over long periods of absence. I refer to this aspect of our work again later, but Jim Simeon has set it all out with admirable clarity and I hope he will forgive me for putting what he has to say in Annex 1 to this Report.

A Workshop Manual was prepared in Ottawa and has now served as a basis for helping over 300 judges and others toward a better understanding of the Convention and its application to decisions mainly, though not exclusively on review. Those who have attended these courses are judges from all parts of Europe, some from The Philippines; some in Africa Asia and Latin America. Another will be held in January in Cairo for some 60 Judges and others from most countries in the Middle East.

We are presently updating the Manual and with a deeper insight from having heard of the problems facing our colleagues elsewhere will be able to make it even more effective. We will add a section on the OAU Convention. We are hoping this will be ready in the New Year and we have sought funding to pay for

its production and translation. The current edition has been already been translated into Arabic.

I think that the Manual can be a relatively cheap course -which we can readily take on the road to all tribunals and judges in any country whether at basic or advanced level - a viable alternative to much expensive local training - and one which would bring true harmonisation closer and in a far more durable and globally acceptable form than any directives made by regional bodies.

But having listed an impressive number of events we have been unable to make a real impact in those parts of the world where conflicts begin, flight is first planned and the majority of refugees are warehoused. In Addis we agreed, but as I said the opportunity then to take it further with the workshop system perhaps was lost.

Such countries are in many cases the very countries also in which the judges need the moral support, the resources that we are in a good position to make available and the knowledge and expertise acquired by judges in other parts of the world - had we the financial means and the manpower to do so.

Even in countries in which we have a strong presence the basic principles for which we stand are being questioned and even, often very obliquely, eroded. I do not speak of policy but simply of fulfilling international obligations: In both letter and spirit. Accelerated procedures; illusory rights and foreshortened periods within which to make claims are, as Courtney Mireille O'Connor of Washington observed, frequently focussed on ways to speed up rejection and we must be ever watchful for this. A Canadian judge said recently

My vague general impression is that governments with a geographic base are weakening in the face of global commerce and domestic political leaders are drawing strength from the lack of a combined judicial voice with the result being an increasing tendency in "the civilised world" for the manipulation of judicial decisions being attempted.

However I have encountered much support by the governments of many countries for what we are doing, even if politicians still see the judiciary as an unelected opposition - and this even after centuries of struggle to establish a democratic form of government in which some form of separation of powers is recognised as the best road to progress. Simon Bolivar saw the future clearly when he warned that it is one thing to win democracy but a far harder battle to keep it.

It is thus not only in countries where tyrants rule that the judiciary are 'lonely long distance runners' requiring courage as well as wisdom. In the countries which we like to think of as established democracies constant vigilance as well as courage is called for. A gullible and often ill - informed public are used as tools to attack the judiciary. Complacency and a false sense of security - the "it can't happen here" syndrome - are the first enemies: Well it can happen here, can it not?

Judges in those areas of the world most at risk know only too well how to value the IARLJ's existence. The gap, in which we all say that the judiciary stands between the people and the executive, varies from a yawning chasm to a concealed pit - but what lies at the bottom is ultimately the same today as it has always been. Both Professor Duguid and Judge Albie Sachs reiterated this very point not so long ago in South Africa and the sequel from events in Zimbabwe is yet to unfold.

To underscore my point may I refer you to the International Commission of Jurists' website (<http://www.icj.org>). They evaluate the state of the law and its practice in relation to the independence of judges and lawyers in 47 countries. It catalogues today 315 judges who have suffered reprisals for carrying out their professional duties. Of these 38 have been killed, 5 have disappeared, 44 have been prosecuted, and some 23 have been attacked, 67 threatened verbally and 109 professionally obstructed or sanctioned.

It is however not enough always to look outside ourselves to complain at the erosion of rights. Frequently it is our own lack of vigilance and complacency where the rot starts. Every time we cut a corner to get a case finished more quickly, every time we allow justice to be compromised or sacrificed to speed the production line syndrome, where overlisting can be a serious inroad into both independence and that anxious scrutiny of Lord Bridge of Harwich spoke in the House of Lords in *Musisi* in 1987;<sup>2</sup> every time we fail to denounce "floodgates" thinking - we open the door a little wider to someone's rights being respected somewhere a little less.

Of course we read the newspapers and hear the views of those around us. The media are however frequently a willing tool used to attack the judiciary distort the facts and encourage politicians to blame their own errors on the judges - but the hordes of Genghis Khan or Attila the Hun are still nightmares from the past and will only jump out of the history books if we let them. A Canadian Judge of

---

2 Reported in [1987] Imm AR 250.

Armenian ancestry recently told me of the horror of the slaughter of the Armenian races in Turkey. That was 90 years ago. Kosovo less than three and omnipresent is the situation in the Great Lakes or Indonesia. They have a reality in those same countries where the IARLJ could help most. The Balkans, Africa, on the Indian Subcontinent in South East Asia, in the Middle East, South America China – anywhere where the numbers are large or the host is poor and unstable. The threat to stability of the host there is not just a party political worry about votes - it is the very survival on a shaky stage of law and order.

I repeat, in the long run we can make more a lasting contribution than all the international institutions to avert these horrors. We can make sure our states abide by their obligations - indeed if the judges will not stand up who will?

I am not blind to how we ourselves sometimes can contribute to government frustration. There are undoubted delays in our systems, which could be avoided by more effective and less long-drawn out review procedures. Individually we can often minimise causes for complaint in this area and where we can we should do so. The IARLJ has had a working party functioning to look deeply into this issue for over six years. We have produced two publications and several chapters in books<sup>3</sup> on this topic but the most comprehensive review so far, started when Jacek Chlebny chaired this Working Party has been taking place since Bern in a Working Group under the chairmanship of Michael Creppy, Chief Immigration Judge in the US. He will tell you I am sure how his efforts are frustrated by the inability to reach the very people he needs to reach. We simply do not have the resources.

We can often give help in a low key cheap but most effective way as consultants assisting with the determination processes in countries such as Moldova. I think that what was done in the Republic of South Africa last year was valuable but whether it was the best use of resources and money still awaits evaluation. But at least I think the Association and the consultants themselves were greatly appreciated.

All I have said has been said many times before and it applies to the judiciary as a whole everywhere. But at this time that part of the judiciary concerned with the fulfillment of the obligations undertaken by the original signatories 50 years ago are the most vulnerable to attack.

---

3 *Asylum Practice and Procedure Country by Country Handbook*; UK Asylum Law in its European Context Chapter 3.

Let me analyse some specific ways in which the IARLJ can and does assist; some I have already mentioned:

- (1) We can encourage an understanding of refugee law principles in the context of international human rights.
- (2) We can share our knowledge and expertise in both law and practice.
- (3) We can man watchtowers to keep the jurisprudence under constant review.

*Encouraging understanding*

We need every member to be an ambassador in this respect. We have held a seminar on terrorism, another on complementary protection and yet another on other aspects of human rights standards in persecution. We have acted as consultants in other countries.

We are offered and often can accept opportunities offered to participate in regional and international forums in many countries in western and Eastern Europe, on the Indian sub-continent in the Middle East and Far East.

*Sharing knowledge*

The Workshop Manual on Refugee Law is an excellent tool. I am happy to note that the International Bar Association is following suit with what they call a *Training Manual for Judges and Lawyers*. Apart from the basic courses we have held many of you will by now have attended Professor James Hathaway's Advanced Course this week.

The Iustitiae Programme, which followed an earlier and successful Asylum Judges Support Programme (both funded by UNHCR and the EU) brings together judges from all the countries aspiring immediately to join the EU to exchange knowledge and experience of this area of jurisprudence. The IARLJ is in partnership with Judges and Judges Associations in the Netherlands, Germany, Austria and Belgium, Sweden, Finland and France, all of whom supply their expertise free - but the funds must come from the institutions we assist. This was the impetus to the creation of the European Chapter of the IARLJ last year. Now under the Convenorship of Judge Jacek Chlebny of Poland.

Regional Chapters are I am sure valuable but they are there to monitor and help with more localised issues and are subordinate to the Association.

Efforts are being made to co-ordinate and improve the quality of background material and its accessibility, especially in countries with little access to this crucial part of any worthwhile decision. We have agreed with EIN for access to their database to be free to a number of countries at least to start with and I chair a committee of Eurasyllum (comprising a number of well known academics and other members) a body concerned with the collection and evaluation of data.

#### *Jurisprudence*

There are six ongoing Working Groups. I want more people to participate; more people to see they have the ability to make a contribution globally to the issues which we face daily. Your executive has budgeted for money to be made available to these groups to pay for telephone (or video) conferences to assist with their deliberations.

Such is the benefit of this part of our work to the global development of refugee related law that I would urge the next Council to make it a priority to persuade their countries to set aside both the time and the funds to enable the workshops to function more effectively. Canada has done this and their reports confirm it. The USA would I think have been able to do more had it not been for the tragedy they suffered on 11 September 2001.

On this I wish here and now to repeat the Association's sentiments of sympathy and most importantly respect, which we all have for the American people for how they have conducted themselves on that day and since.

We have tried to co-operate with James Hathaway on his database of 8 major countries producing reasoned decisions on refugee law marshal correspondents in as many other countries as possible to provide a broader base to the jurisprudence. I started a pilot scheme with Sweden, Poland, Uganda and India.

Progress in this, as in most fields is hampered in several ways. The lack of funds is an obvious impediment, but it is the areas in which the funds are required which raise the other obstacles. Clearly if we had the money to have a fulltime secretariat and suitably qualified Director/Secretary the planning organising and follow-up would make it easier for busy judges to make their contributions. But even with this I think there needs to be close liaison with other Institutions such as National Judges Associations, the Commonwealth Magistrates and Judges Association, the International Bar Association, The Commonwealth Secretariat and so on and above all we need a structured planning with UNHCR. We have contacts with the UN and the UNDP but it must be to the UNHCR that we look primarily.

The co-operative opportunities created by Regional Chapters is another way forward, and this has been manifested in the European Chapter. I look at the other Regional Chapter – the first one between two countries – that of Australia and New Zealand. Many may be despondent – after all events in Australia seem to have led to the situation where only very few have been able to attend this Conference.

I said earlier that one of our restrictions is a lack of manpower. But there is a wealth of experience among adjudicators in Australia and judges who have made significant contributions to the development of the jurisprudence. It does not go away though and we can harness it. But we need the money and the vision and support of some of our supporting institutions to help.

I think this is well illustrated by Paul Whites' consultancy (out of a personal commitment) in South Africa, along with others from NZ and the UK last year and his present detachment in Afghanistan. I hope he will report on his experiences on his return. He represents the storehouse of expertise on which we can draw world-wide for help, when perhaps such services are (temporarily I hope) not required at home.

On a one-to-one basis what some members of the Immigration Appellate Authority have been doing in Moldova for several years is a small example.

It is in the realm of organising teams of judges to help in appeals and bodies in such ways and advising on effective procedures that the OAU and EU could do much more. I do not much like committees but a small one on this with representation from UNHCR, UNDP, UNO, UNHRC and IARLJ meeting once a quarter could make sure we know where we are needed and who is available.

Turning to money. Your executive has prepared budgets for the next three years within the funds we have. But those funds are not enough to enable your executive, each one a judge up to his or her eyes in day to day work and pressure, to keep the Association moving forward.

We are therefore presently looking at additional funding from two aspects. Firstly Project Funding. By this we mean trying to identify funders for specific projects which we want to engage for the development of an effective Association.

Such projects fall into two categories. Those which are central to our aims keep the Association moving forward. They will tend to be ones which bring together the maximum number of our members. Activities which make

membership attractive and worthwhile in a very basic sense. And then there are the projects which will broaden the reach of the Association for the benefit those coming new to this jurisdiction or involve aspects of development in this jurisdiction.

Secondly is funding of the Association as a whole. Between a membership of 500 as it is now and 3000 which I think is the maximum we can ever reasonably expect in this jurisdiction a realistic aim could be about 750 members. If we try to maintain a membership fee at the present level, eschew self-financing conferences and give courses based on the Workshop Manual free — making allowances for inflation — this gives us an income of around from \$25,000 (if every member paid up on time). To assist payment we are hoping to implement a credit card payment facility this coming year.

But even with that number of members we would still need at least \$200,000 to run the administration effectively without overloading the judges. To have enough in hand simply to be able to have enough in hand to carry on our projects — Conferences, seminars, research with the working groups and training the dissemination of material and so on without having to wait for the funds — which may or may not come in - we need \$1,000,000.

I must confess that I would like to see a substantially larger amount which we could invest to produce an income which frees us completely from any outside influences and enables us to reach all our members and for our members to access whatever information which we are able to make available for them. For this we certainly will have to create a charitable trust.

We have not only budgeted over the next three years but we have put up specific and targeted budgets to UNHCR, Council of Europe, Ford Foundation, the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the Lord Chancellor's Department and others.

#### *Membership*

Unless we can offer potential members something tangible and useful to their work they will not join or if they do they will not make any active input. They need to be able to gather information, they need to meet others, they need to attend meetings and conference seminars and they need to be involved. In short they must feel they are wanted and belong to a body which helps them in their very onerous job.

As said earlier we formed a European Chapter of the IARLJ to deal with specifically local issues and to assist in holding regional events, which are accessible to members in the region. So far we have no members from Portugal, Spain or Italy. I hope that will be remedied at the European Congress of Jurists in Lisbon to which we have been invited to participate and to which judges from the area have also been invited with a view to having a meeting.

The same went for the Australia NZ Region and I had hoped that they would reach out to other countries in the region such as Japan, China, Malaysia, Singapore and Indonesia and we would have seen one or two Chinese judges this time - there are contacts in place but the time in the end was too short to make arrangements.

The need and desire to establish an African Chapter, or several Regional African Chapters, is being explored. Communications there are the most immediate problem. No Region has any funds of its own and many members do not have ready access to working emails. One of the greatest services which would benefit not only the judges and their courts as well as the decisions themselves would be a reliable means of communication available directly to our members and through them to their colleagues - and others. The central body is the only route through which such a project could be run. When you see the somewhat startling figures I mention in fund raising they were with such a vision in mind. It is not in my view appropriate for a region to seek separate funds for its running. I believe that it is the intention of the few delegates from Africa here at this Conference to get such a Regional Chapter up and running to help realise the aim to have the next Conference in Africa.

At the moment we divide fee structure into above and below a country's GNP - with low fees for countries, where incomes are lower relatively than in many other countries and hard currency is not easy to come by either to pay the fee or attend a conference. I would like to suggest that the incoming executive be mandated to review this fee structure. Those of us in the wealthier countries may view a subsidisation of our less fortunate colleagues by paying a somewhat higher fee is more satisfying and a more effective and also more acceptable to everyone. It would certainly in my view make funding our association more attractive to donors to see we are doing what we can to fund ourselves.

Once again I take great pleasure in recording our gratitude to the Netherlands for its generosity in funding our secretariat and allowing us the use of personnel. You may have noticed new names there. Liesbeth van de Meeberg, who used to be Sebastiaan de Groot's Secretary gives every morning to the business of the

Association and seems to manage a full day's work. We are very grateful to her industry, and cheerfulness.

Then there is Eva Kuipéri. She is legally trained and works the rest of her time with the Asylum and Immigration Division of the Court in The Hague. She came with the Iustitia Project but is able to assist with many aspects of our work. UNHCR has generously agreed to fund her to stay with us for an extra six months and we are trying to persuade it and/or some other donor to extend that facility indefinitely and on a full time basis week.

I now come to the nostalgia! It is just 10 years ago that a discussion in Glasgow provided the springboard for what is now the IARLJ. It became a reality because the then Lord President Lord Hope, Lord Kenneth Cameron, Lords Justice John Laws and Stephen Sedley, Hugo Storey, the late and much missed Shun Chetty, Walter Stoeckli, Nurjehan Mawani Joachim Henkel, Sebastiaan de Groot, Michael Creppy, Allan Mackey, Gaëtan de Moffarts, Jacek Chlebny and his President Professor Hauser, Roger Errera, Johan Fischerstrom and others from Norway and Italy and elsewhere were thinking along the same lines. We had visionaries in UNHCR like Rick Towle and indeed Victor Callender who contributed so much to the success of the first Conference and silent support from Lord Mackay, the then Lord Chancellor in UK. We were soon joined by others.

There is much goodwill elsewhere in higher Courts in Canada, the UK, India, Australia, Poland and the Netherlands and New Zealand at least. We need to draw from this well of wisdom and support. We need to encourage the fainthearted and convert the doubtful to our confidence that there is nothing but positive assistance to be drawn from IARLJ – but as usual you get out what you put in – with interest I think.

I hand over to Allan Mackey, in his own home, confident that under his guidance the Association will extend its influence and consolidate its foundations. I, like others who are to take a back seat, give our unquestioned support to you all. Thank you for your friendship your wisdom and comradeship. I value all of it and shall do always.

---

### *ANNEX 1*

#### ***IARLJ INTER-CONFERENCE WORKING PARTIES PROCESS***

The IARLJ has defined itself in the following way:

The Association is an independent body of individual judges whose aims are broadly to encourage standardisation of practice procedure and interpretation of refugee law and practice throughout the world.

The Inter-Conference Working Parties process, first established at the second IARLJ Conference in Nijmegen in January 1997, has as its objective to assist in the development of a coherent body of international refugee jurisprudence.

Clearly, this Inter-Conference Working Parties process is central to the very purpose of the Association. Indeed, the Constitution of the Association requires that we commit ourselves to promoting "within the judiciary and quasi-judicial decision makers world-wide a common understanding of refugee law principles and to encourage the use of fair practices and procedures to determine refugee law issues." (IARLJ Constitution, Part 1: Objects of the Association, Section 2(1)).

The Constitution also calls upon its members "to promote or undertake research initiatives, publications, and projects that further the attainment of the objects of the Association." (Section 2(5)). The Inter-Conference Working Parties process has been one of the principal vehicles for promoting these central objectives of the Association.

There are currently six active Inter-Conference Working Parties:

- Membership in a Particular Social Group, Rapporteur, Lory Rosenberg (USA);
- Non-State Agents of Persecution, Rapporteur, Roland Bruin (The Netherlands);
- Asylum Procedures, Rapporteur, Michael Creppy (USA);
- Internal Flight Alternative, Rapporteur, Kim Rosser (Australia);
- Human Rights Nexus, Rapporteur, James C Simeon (Canada);
- Vulnerable Categories, Rapporteur, Edward Grant (USA).

They are examining a number of critically important issues of refugee law within their specific issue area. Each Working Party has prepared an in-depth report that has been included in the delegate Conference materials. I am sure that you will find this material extremely valuable. I should like to encourage all of you to read and to consider the contribution of each of the Working Parties for the Conference. I should also like to encourage you to consider engaging actively in the debates and discussion that is ongoing in each of the Working Parties.

An active and energised Inter-Conference Working Party process is absolutely essential to the purpose and objects of our Association, and I encourage all members to participate actively in the Working Party of their choice. All of us have the ability to make a contribution globally to the issues that we face in the hearing rooms on a daily basis.

To this end, the IARLJ Executive has budgeted monies to be made available to the Inter-Conference Working Parties process to ensure that their vitally important work on behalf of the Association gets completed from one Conference to the next.

I should also like to give my special thanks to Dr Hugo Storey, the Co-ordinator of the Inter-Conference Working Party process, for his outstanding efforts in directing and supervising the work of our Working Parties since their inception. Without his determined and visionary efforts the Working Parties would not have made the outstanding contribution that they have over the years.

---

**ANNEX 2**

**LIST OF PROJECTS**

Conferences

*World*

London November/December 1995, 53 delegates from 21 countries

Nijmegen January 1997, 69 delegates from 18 countries

Ottawa October 1998, 169 delegates from 70 countries

Bern October 2000, 200 delegates from 71 countries

*Regional*

Asylum Judges Support Programme (meetings in Slovakia in 1999 and Austria)

Iustitiae met in Dublin in March 2002

South Africa June 2001 "*The Convention at 50 - The Way Ahead*"

Professional Development (Training Workshops)

*Individual*

Many of us have attended training and other seminars and conferences over 8 years in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Estonia November 2001 which was a joint effort Denmark Switzerland involving 50 judges and others from CIS and Baltic States, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, New Delhi, Calcutta, Cairo, Anaheim and Washington. Edinburgh and Capetown in co-operation with the Commonwealth Judges and Magistrates Association.

*Group*

The Philippines

Dublin in March 2002 under the Iustitiae Programme when a small Conference was also held

Netherlands with the Council of Immigration judges and the Immigration Appeal Tribunal

Kampala April 2000

Tanzania November 2001

And also at each of the Conferences in Ottawa and Bern, and now New Zealand, Workshops were held which drew in all some 200 judges and others. At each of these a new dimension has been added - Training For Trainers in Bern and an advanced course in Auckland.

Seminars and Colloquia

Human Rights Paradigm London 2000

Complementary Protection London 2001

Terrorism 2002. In co-operation with UNHCR and the Immigration Law Practitioners Association

*Working Groups*

There are 5 as follows

Human Rights Nexus - James Simeon

Asylum Procedures - Michael Creppy

Membership of a Particular Social Group - Lory Rosenberg

Non-State Agents of Persecution - Roland Bruin

Internal Flight Alternative - Kim Rosser

Vulnerable Categories - Edward Grant

Research

This was carried out for the Country by Country Handbook funded by Rowntrees Charitable Trust, the Law Department of Napier University, Edinburgh and UNHCR

*Publications*

Country by Country Handbook Conference Books: London, Nijmegen and Ottawa and Bern.

The main papers from Bern were published in the Georgetown University Law Review.

Website activity

This has been totally revamped this year and is run from Haarlem by Liesbeth

Executive Meetings

These have been held regularly roughly every quarter and the venue rotates generally between Netherlands, Belgium, France, Switzerland and London

Council Liaison

This is presently only possible by email, fax or post.

