



Newsletter

International Criminal Law Network
The Hague

August 2006

New project assistant.....	3
ICLN news and events.....	3
Vacancy notice for international lawyer in Iraq.....	4
Wanted: writers of book reviews.....	4
News from U.S. Commission on America's prisons.....	5
Human rights competition in France.....	6
ICLN events: 2 nd Annual Hague Programme Debate.....	6
ICLN events: ICLN Annual Reception.....	9
Contact information ICLN.....	10
Institutional member: Jongbloed Legal Bookstore.....	11
Editorial.....	12

Word of Welcome

Dear Member,

On June 7th ICLN organised the Second Annual Hague Programme Debate together with the European Commission, Eurojust, the European Council, Europol, the Austrian and Finnish presidencies of the EU and the Dutch ministries of Justice and of the Interior & Kingdom Relations. Participants from 21 countries gathered in The Hague to discuss the progress of The Hague Programme and the pre-results of the Scoreboard. This Programme concerns European police and judicial cooperation in the field of freedom, security and justice. In this newsletter you can find the main conclusions drawn from the interactive debate. In case you are wondering why this event has not been announced beforehand; the reason for this is that the debate was only open to national representatives and EU staff in the field of Justice, Freedom & Security, police & judicial practitioners and academics in the European Law and cooperation field. ICLN's partners co-decided on the composition of the invitation list.

For our annual conference we have chosen to discuss "Structuring International Investigation and Prosecution". The 5th annual conference will take place in the World Forum Convention Centre in The Hague. You can read more about the backgrounds and program on page three of this newsletter.

Furthermore, ICLN organises its fall lecture on October 4th in The Hague. Please check the website for the topic and the location of the lecture and reception.



M. Wladimiroff
President

New project assistant

Irene Koomans (1980)

I was born in Amsterdam and grew up in Lelystad. Hereafter I went north, to Groningen, to study International and European Law. I have been active in student and student union life and for one year I co-organised (full time) the introduction week for first year students. After having completed my study I would like to remain active in the international law field. Therefore I am pleased to do an internship with ICLN, where I can gain experience with the practical side of international law. My main task is developing the annual conference which will take place December 14th and 15th 2006.



ICLN Fifth Annual Conference, The Hague 14-15 December

Structuring International Investigation & Prosecution

Coordination of police & judicial cooperation in criminal matters

ICLN each year organises an annual conference on a current issue. This year we have chosen to discuss the importance of mutual legal assistance and other forms of international cooperation in criminal matters. ICLN's annual conference covers two days with plenary presentations by renowned speakers on the first day and thematic break-out sessions with plenty of time for questions and discussion on the second.

The conference program has been developed in conjunction with the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the European Judicial Network, Iber Red, the Ibero-American Association of Prosecutors, Eurojust, Europol and the International Association of Prosecutors

Currently the following speakers have confirmed their participation: Karl Wycoff, Max Peter Ratzel, Michael Kennedy, Helmut Satzger, Guy Stessens, Francois Falletti, Marko Magdic, Nasser Amin, Ana Gallego and Gerard Strijards. Professor Strijards will prepare a case study on 'Cooperation and coordination in a Counter-terrorism case'; the case study will take place on the second day of the conference.

A conference brochure will be sent to you in October. For updates on the program and speakers, please check our website.

[The conference takes place in The Hague on December 14th and 15th 2006](#)

[Please mark the date in your agenda, we hope to be able to welcome you to ICLN's fifth Annual Conference](#)

Vacancy notice (advertisement)

IRAQ

A fascinating opportunity has arisen in Baghdad, Iraq for the urgent recruitment of two international lawyers with experience assembling complex international law cases. Experience before an international criminal tribunal such as the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia or the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda would be particularly relevant.

The successful candidates would be part of the legal team of Two Rivers Consultants (TRC), working on the Iraqi High Tribunal, which is responsible for trying Saddam Hussein and other members of the former Iraqi regime.

TRC is a consultancy firm, established in Baghdad in 2003.

Pay and benefits will be extremely good and the work will be demanding and very interesting. The premises are in a secure location.

Send applications with CV to Glenda Butts on mail@recruitmentiraq.com

Wanted: writers of a book review

The Journal for International Law of Peace and Armed Conflict is looking for persons interested in writing book reviews. Book reviews must be about 5 pages long (Courier New, 1,5 space, 12 font). The deadline is 8 January 2007.

- Chandler: From Kosovo to Kabul and Beyond
- MacQueen: Peacekeeping and the International System
- Alvarez: International Organizations as Law-Makers
- Caplan: International Governance of War-Torn Territories
- Clapham: Human Rights Obligations of Non-State Actors
- Trechsel: Human Rights in Criminal Proceedings

We are also looking for reviewers of the books published in our series on international law. The reviews will be published in various German and Austrian journals. We would need:

- two reviews in German "Peterke, Der völkerrechtliche Sonderstatus der Internationalen Föderation der Rotkreuz- und Rothalbmondgesellschaften"
- two reviews in English "Fischer/Quénivet, Post-Conflict Reconstruction: Nation- and/or State Building"
- one review in English "Buchwald, Der Fall Tadic vor dem Internationalen Jugoslawientribunal im Lichte der Entscheidung der Berufungskammer vom 2. Oktober 1995"
- one review in English "Dijkzeul, Between Force and Mercy: Military Action and Humanitarian Aid"
- one review in German "Fischer/Quénivet, Post-Conflict Reconstruction: Nation- and/or State Building"

If you are interested in writing a book review or if you require more information please contact Ms. Noelle Quénivet: noelle.quenivet@rub.de

**U.S. COMMISSION OUTLINES CRUCIAL REFORMS TO PREVENT VIOLENCE AND ABUSE
IN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES**

Report Connects Problems Inside Prisons and Jails to Public Safety and Public Health

Ever since seeing photos from Abu Ghraib Prison in Iraq and hearing accusations that the U.S. had exported abusive correctional practices abroad, people around the world have been wondering what really happens inside U.S. prisons and jails.

After a year-long inquiry, the Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prisons has answers. The diverse panel of 20 is headed by former U.S. Attorney General Nicholas de B. Katzenbach and former Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit John J. Gibbons and includes several other high-profile members, including former FBI Director William S. Sessions and noted violence expert Dr. James Gilligan.

In [Confronting Confinement](#) the Commission concludes that serious problems exist but also identifies promising practices and strong leadership in some facilities that contradict the notion that violence and abuse are inevitable features of life behind bars in the United States. Recent violence inside prisons in Venezuela and also in Brazil, where the violence spread into the neighbourhoods of São Paulo, and the continuing health care crisis in Russia's prisons demonstrate that running safe and healthy correctional facilities that also promote public safety is challenge in many countries. The report offers insights of use to prison reformers internationally.

The Commission's report is the first review of conditions in U.S. prisons and jails in three decades and comes at a time when there is increasing interest among both conservatives and liberals in real reform. The release of the report on June 8 was timed to coincide with a hearing by the U.S. Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Corrections and Rehabilitation focused specifically on the Commission's findings and recommendations.

The report outlines the most serious problems in U.S. jails and prisons, how to solve those problems, and why the public is at risk unless states, localities, and the federal government change their approach to incarceration. As the report states, "What happens in prisons and jails does not stay inside prisons and jails."

Among 30 practical reforms, the Commission recommends:

- Reduce violence behind bars and promote public safety by re-investing in rehabilitative programming for prisoners.
 - End the crowded conditions in many facilities that fuel violence.
 - Change the culture of confinement in ways proven to protect prisoners and officers.
- Stop the spread of infectious diseases and unnecessary suffering by using federal government funds to help pay for medical care in prisons and jails, and by ending the practice of requiring prisoners to pay for health care.
- Protect prisoners and the public by reducing the use of high-security segregation, and by ending the practice of releasing prisoners directly from these units to the streets.
- Shed light on life behind bars by making independent oversight of jails and prisons the norm in the United States as it is throughout most of Europe and in other parts of the world.

The 20 members of the Commission include Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, those who run correctional systems and those who litigate on behalf of prisoners, scholars, and individuals with a long history of public service and deep experience in the administration of justice. Beginning in March 2005, the Commission held four public hearings in cities around the country, visited jails and prisons, consulted with current and former corrections officials and a wide range of experts working outside the profession, and conducted a thorough review of available research and data.

To read a summary of the Commission's findings and recommendations and a brief Q&A about the report, or to access the complete report, go to www.prisoncommission.org/report

International Human Rights Competition

Sign on now

<http://www.memorial-caen.fr/portail/concours>

The International Human Rights Competition is:

- Pleas in defence of the victims of cruel and degrading treatment across the continents, such as genocide, torture, slavery, death penalties, antipersonnel mines, arbitrary detention, abuse of power and freedom of expression issues;
- Over 1000 candidates and especially the 170 competition finalists, who have already come to plead their case in the Caen Memorial;
- An audience of 2000 people who attend the final each year;
- An official jury of internationally renowned figures including representatives of the UN, former political detainees, leading intellectuals and artists from around the world, such as Leïla Aslaoui, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, Abdou Diouf, Barbara Hendricks, Hauwa Ibrahim, Thierry Lhermitte, Abraham Serfaty and Mario Stasi;
- A committee follows up certain selected individual cases. Examples of satisfying outcomes of causes exposed in the Caen Memorial include the release of the American Michael Pardue in 2001, the case of Rami the schoolgirl from Niger, a victim of arranged marriage, in 2002, the acquittal of Amina Lawal in 2003, and the recent liberation of Raoul Rivero. Since 2003, regular actions have been organized in order to liberate Ingrid Bétancourt.

PARTICIPATE AND MAKE YOUR VOICE HEARD

- **Advance the cause of human rights** worldwide by denouncing violations. The competition, a rallying call and high profile media event, often represents victims' last hope and the very last chance for intolerable situations to be exposed.
- **Speak your mind in a unique setting.** The Caen Memorial is a unique forum for debate and discussion about peace and the threat of conflict.
- **Join with like-minded professionals** from around the world, united in their conception of the defence of fundamental liberties. The Competition brings together individuals and organisations actively engaged in support for victims of Human Rights abuse.

Complementary information, rules of procedure and entry form are available on

<http://www.memorial-caen.fr/portail/concours>

Event: Conclusions 2nd Annual Hague Programme Debate

The first working group dealt with the Hague Programme and internal security, operational and policy consequences for national and European practitioners. The review of the implementation of the Hague Programme was seen to provide the opportunity for taking stock of the relevance of the Hague Programme, and of efficiency in its implementation. Among the difficulties that were seen to have been encountered were the different political agendas and ambitions of successive Presidencies, the rather wide scope and diversity of the Action Plan, the overly complex nature of the instruments from the point of view of practitioners, the possibility that some questions may have been improperly formulated (for example, also petty crime has an impact on the community and on individuals), and the question of how far we can go in preventing terrorism (e.g. in the case of suicide bombings.)

One key problem was seen to be a lack of awareness of the contents of the Hague Programme. This could be seen in the lack of an internal dimension and in the lack of political will. Responses to this lack were seen to include the provision of better information, awareness raising, and the provision of external and internal training.

Among suggestions that were identified for improving efficiency were improving the input provided by practitioners as well as input that reflects actual experience on the ground. Stock should be taken of best practices. For example the Police Chiefs Task Force could contribute to this. It was also suggested that a more horizontal approach could be taken to cooperation, This would require better identification of the role and responsibility of each actor, better definition of the role of the Organized Crime Threat Assessment, and improved information exchange between law enforcement and judicial authorities.

The working group that dealt with the principle of mutual recognition sought to provide an overview of how far we have progressed with this principle, and how far we can go. It was noted that a number of decisions on mutual recognition had already been taken, and more are pending. Mutual recognition has a prominent place in the Hague Programme, and it has clearly acquired a substantial role in practice.

However, it was noted that the ideal of mutual recognition – automatic recognition of the decisions taken by the judicial authorities of another Member State - is still far from reality. In practice, a number of grounds for refusal exist. Among these is the absence of double criminality, an issue that is a frequent subject of debate. The current approach of having a list of key offences in respect of which the absence of double criminality can be invoked, was seen to be workable, although some suggested that the absence of double criminality as grounds for refusal should be completely eliminated. On the other hand, it was pointed out that double criminality is not often cited in practice, even though it has an important symbolic value for some Member States.

It was also noted that the Hague Programme identifies the importance of mutual trust. This can be facilitated in many ways. Among the best ways was seen to be the successful application of mutual recognition instruments. The legislative and administrative authorities were seen to need time to absorb instruments; it was argued that the time period for implementation should not be overly short. It was also argued that mutual recognition should be balanced with approximation of criminal procedure. The conclusion was drawn by a participant that the success of mutual recognition stands or falls with the political will to enforce decisions that could have turned out differently if national law were to be applied. It may very well be difficult to muster this political will, as has been shown by the negotiation of the proposal on procedural rights.

The working group on evaluation and assessment began with a discussion of the intention of the Commission to submit a "Scoreboard Plus," a document that would look not only at the record for approval of instruments at the EU level, but also at their implementation on the national level. Several difficulties were noted in implementation, difficulties that could better be assessed through the development of an effective evaluation mechanism. Some of these difficulties have to do with the decision-making process at the EU level, while others were related to national implementation.

At EU level, there was seen to be a need for a political debate on the substance of proposals. Regret was expressed that a political debate was usually absent from the beginning of the discussion on proposals. For example, had there been such a political debate at the outset of the discussion on the proposal regarding the transfer of prisoners, some of the subsequent difficulties might have been avoided. A second difficulty encountered at the EU level was seen to be the lack of coordination between Council formations that meet in Brussels (working groups, the Article 36 Committee, Coreper and the Council itself) and the national level. For example, papers containing the most recent proposals arrive late. One of the results of the difficulties was seen to be a lowering of the quality of legislation, a search for the "least common denominator." It was suggested that some of these difficulties could be avoided if a shift could be made from unanimity votes to a qualified majority vote.

On the national level, a variety of difficulties or inhibiting factors were identified in the implementation of EU instruments. Several of these had been encountered in respect of implementation of the framework decision on the EU arrest warrant. There has, however, been little systematic debate within the Council on these difficulties, much less on how they can be overcome. Several participants suggested that the decision-making process on the EU level itself has to be improved, for example by taking political decisions

already at the outset of the process, so that the political decision-makers are committed to the instrument in question.

The political decision-makers should also be given the opportunity to study the assessed impact of the proposals. It was also suggested that national Parliaments should be more closely involved already in the decision-making process; in this respect, there were considerable differences in the practice in the different Member States. It was noted, for example, that systematic reports are provided to the Dutch Parliament every three months on first and third pillar instruments.

The fourth working group dealt with improvement of the decision-making process. It was noted that this topic had been touched upon also by the third working group. In the fourth working group, attention was paid to the possibility of invoking article 42 TEU (the passerelle option), but also to other ways to improve decision-making.

Regarding the passerelle option, it was noted that several questions had to be addressed, such as what actions could be transferred, how the border-line should be determined between the first and the third pillars as well as within either the first or the third pillar, what instrument could be used (primarily, regulations or directives), what voting procedure should be applied (qualified majority voting, unanimity or something else), whether or not an "emergency brake" would be needed, how would the European Parliament or national parliaments be involved, would there be the possibility of requesting preliminary rulings from the European Court of Justice, what would happen to the special position of Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom, who would be responsible for the external dimension of justice and home affairs, and to what extent would the passerelle option have to be ratified by national Parliaments.

It was also noted that various technical questions had to be dealt with when considering the improvement of decision-making. Along these are the questions of finances, and of the possible future role of the Article 36 Committee. Several participants emphasized that these questions had to be dealt with, as they saw that there would otherwise be the danger of enhanced cooperation or other solutions which may in themselves open up difficulties.

It was noted that the review of the implementation of the Hague Programme contained three basic elements: the development of an improved evaluation mechanism in order to better measure progress in implementation; the identification of priority areas in which more work is needed; and the improvement of the decision-making process.

It was suggested that there was wide agreement on the need to develop the evaluation mechanism, although obviously its structure had to be agreed, and the financial and personnel resources needed for its use had to be secured.

The Tampere and Hague Programme priorities had received high political affirmation, and there was wide agreement among the participants that no attempt should be made to open the Programmes, or to identify new priorities. What was important was to identify those few priorities where more work was needed, and to identify exactly what work should be undertaken, when and by whom.

It was also considered highly important to improve decision-making on home and justice affairs. The Debate had contributed to greater understanding among the participants as to what options exist in this respect. It was agreed that what the passerelle option involves in practice should be more closely identified, so that the debate could be more informed. At the same time, also other, more technical ways to improve decision-making should be explored.

**'The Importance of International Legal Cooperation
for the US and the EU'**

On this topic, we were honoured to hear the comments of:

Mark Richard,
U.S. Counsellor for Criminal Justice Matters assigned to the US Mission to the European Union
&
Luigi Soreca,
Head of Strategic Policy Unit, DG Justice, Freedom and Security, European Commission

Mr. Richard puts forward that he wants to discuss the obstacles and challenges in the months ahead. The US is extremely dependent on international cooperation and 'we cannot address international crime realistically without working together. There is a need for reliable, predictable useful information that is usable in court. Therefore information sharing with regard to intelligence, judicial information and police information (border security) is indispensable.'

The American focus concerns working on a bilateral basis, this is called the 'first line'. Crime problems, level of integrity and working systems can be comprehended best in a bilateral way. On a bilateral basis the US creates tailor-made agreements to counter crime, and this is not possible when working multi-lateral. On a multi-lateral basis consensus can only be achieved by ambiguity and vagueness. An example hereof is the UN Convention on Drugs that has many signatories but much less implementations.

The JHA field is a success story for cooperation between the US and EU according to Mark Richard, this is however not to suggest that all problems are surmounted. Data protection is the most difficult area in cooperation. The US has based its opinion on past lessons. The US wants to eliminate gaps in information sharing, Mr. Richard: 'to connect the dots and see the big picture'. The utilisation of information beyond the use it was originally collected for is difficult for the EU. Currently the biggest problem is the Personal Name Records (PNR) ruling by the ECJ (May 30th). Another obstacle is the prosecution of suspects of terrorism because of a lack of (classified) information sharing (consistent with the rights of the defendant).

Mark Richard: 'Let's find a process in which prosecutors and judges can make inquiries to (classified) information'. At the moment prosecutors prefer to dismiss a case rather than sharing information. In this way one ends up with public reproaches and finger pointing. 'We have yet to find a regularised predictable way to consult each other' according to Mr. Richard. 'We do not have much choice, we have a new reality at hand and we have to develop new methods of consulting and cooperation'.

According to Luigi Soreca the EU and the US have a high level of mutual understanding of each others legal systems, open borders, new technologies etc... Mr. Soreca wants to discuss new challenges and threats to European security and the external dimension of the area of freedom, security and justice.

After 9/11 mutual arrangements between the EU and US were established. They concern arrangements with regard to border control, information sharing and security and immigration policy. Also, a high level EU-US working group on border control was created. It is very important, according to Luigi Soreca, to find common ground and to keep discussing obstacles, priorities and cooperation together. The EU has to ensure that the current framework, Europol and Eurojust, will dedicate itself to counter-terrorism. This would truly add value. Secondly, as Mr. Soreca emphasises, consultation and cooperation are very important to eliminate terrorist attacks. A network of security has to be built up. Furthermore it is of the utmost concern to drive a wedge between terrorists and the public they claim to defend, this takes away the terrorist's legitimacy and power base. Terrorism can be defeated.

Question: All cooperation looks fine, and one is inclined to be positive about EU-US cooperation after the overview given by Mr. Richard and Mr. Soreca. However, what about the deep rupture between the EU and US with regard to Guantanamo, CIA camps, Abu Graib and the ICC, doesn't this render all other cooperation meaningless? Mark Richard: 'I do acknowledge the existence of such a difference of opinion but I do not think that it makes it impossible to cooperate all together. Luigi Soreca: 'Differences in the institutional framework do exist but in the field of Justice and Home Affairs it is important to agree or find a compromise approach, especially on data protection between the EU and US.'

Contact Information ICLN

If you have any questions regarding the topics named in the newsletter or other questions regarding the International Criminal Law Network, please feel free to contact Maartje Jansen and/or Irene Koomans at:

International Criminal Law Network

Koninginnegracht 22
2514 AB Den Haag
info@icln.net
tel. +31 (70) 362 6579
fax. +31 (70) 362 9768



JUST PUBLISHED AND DIRECT AVAILABLE FROM
JONGBLOED LEGAL BOOKSELLERS

SCHABAS, WILLIAM A.

THE UN INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIBUNALS; THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA, RWANDA AND SIERRA LEONE

A guide to the law that applies in the three international criminal tribunals, for the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda and Sierra Leone, set up by the United Nations during the period 1993 to 2002, this is the first book to attempt to analyse and present such materials in a comprehensive manner. - Provides readers with a single source, systematically organised and properly indexed, for answers to questions about the law of the three international criminal tribunals - While there is a wealth of periodical literature on specific aspects of the activities of these tribunals, this is the first comprehensive monograph to be published on the subject in more than a decade.

Cambridge 2006, 800 pages, € 64,45

SCHOMBURG, LAGODNY, GLESS, HACKNER

INTERNATIONALE RECHTSHILFE IN STRAFSACHEN; INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN CRIMINALMATTERS

Kommentar zum Gesetz über die internationale Rechtshilfe in Strafsachen (IRG) sowie Erläuterungen zu den wichtigsten Europäischen Rechtshilfeübereinkommen (Europarat, EU, Schengen) mit Auszügen aus weiteren wichtigen Rechtsquellen sowie Rechtshilfetabellen und den wichtigsten Texten auch in englischer Sprache

Muenchen, 2006, 2400 pages, € 262,88

ALLEN, TIM

TRIAL JUSTICE; THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT AND THE LORD'S RESISTANCE ARMY

The International Criminal Court (ICC) has run into serious problems with its first big case - the situation in northern Uganda. Joseph Kony's Lord's Resistance Army has abducted thousands, many of them children, and has systematically tortured, raped, maimed and killed its victims. Nevertheless, the ICC has confronted outright hostility from a wide range of groups, including traditional leaders, the churches and non-governmental organizations. Even the Ugandan government has expressed serious reservations. This book argues that much of the antipathy to the ICC is based upon ignorance and misconception. Drawing on field research in Uganda, it shows that victims are much more interested in punitive justice than has been suggested, and that the ICC has made resolution of the war more likely.

London/New York, 230 pages, € 21,11

I would like to order:

- _____ ex. THE UN INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIBUNALS
_____ ex. INTERNATIONALE RECHTSHILFE IN STRAFSACHEN
_____ ex. TRIAL JUSTICE; THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT AND THE LORD'S RESISTANCE ARMY

Name: _____

Address: _____

Postal code: _____ City/Town: _____

Telephone: _____ (business/private*) Fax: _____

E-mail: _____ (business/private*)

Date: _____ Signature: _____

If your order through our website www.jongbloed.nl has a value of € 20,00 or more you do not pay for shipping within The Netherlands. If you order by telefax or any other way we charge you € 5,00 shipping costs within The Netherlands. For outside The Netherlands we always charge the actual costs. If you use this form please send it to: Jongbloed Juridische Boekhandel, Noordeinde 39, 2514 GC Den Haag, or fax it to: 070-345 58 70,

Prices include 6% VAT/BTW (and excl. shipping costs) and may vary due to changes by the publisher or exchange rate.

*** Please mark your choice with a circle**

Interpol issues first ICC Red Notices

On the first of June, Interpol issued for the very first time Red Notices after a request of the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court was made. The ICC-Red Notices concerned five commanders of the Lords Resistance Army who are named in ICC arrest warrants. They are wanted for trial for multiple counts of crimes against humanity and war crimes in Northern Uganda.

Red Notices are not international arrest warrants. They seek the arrest or provisional arrest of a wanted person with a view to extradition based on an arrest warrant. However, it is the closest instrument to an international arrest warrant in use today; many member states consider a Red Notice a valid request for provisional arrest. This is particularly true if the requesting country and requested country have a bilateral or multilateral extradition treaty or convention in force with each other. It is even more so if the treaty or convention allows for the use of Interpol channels to forward such requests.

The Red Notice is the best known of Interpol's six colour-coded notices, the others being Blue, Black, Green, Orange and Yellow, which serve to alert police of fugitives, suspected terrorists, dangerous criminals, missing persons or weapons threats. The notices help Interpol in one of its most important functions: to help the member states' law enforcement agencies communicate with each other about crime-related information. The notices are circulated among the 184 members in all four of its official languages; English, French, Spanish and Arabic.

With regard to the Red Notice, a distinction is drawn between two types: the first type is based on an arrest warrant and is issued for a person wanted for prosecution. The second type is based on a court decision for a person wanted to serve a sentence. The ICC, the International Criminal Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, the United Nations Mission in Kosovo and the Special Court for Sierra Leone are the only non-national governmental bodies to which Interpol has granted permission to request the issue of Red Notices. Interpol and the ICC also signed a co-operation agreement in 2005 which also provides the ICC with access to the organization's global police communications system.

The notice contains identification information about the subject person such as physical description, photographs and fingerprints if available, occupation, languages spoken and identity documents. The notice may also contain judicial information such as offence with which the person is charged, references to the relevant laws under which the charge is made or conviction was obtained, the maximum penalty that has been or can be imposed, the references of the arrest or of the sentence imposed by the court, and details of the countries from which the requesting country will seek the fugitive's extradition.

It should be noted that Interpol has the authority to refuse to issue a Red Notice when it is not satisfied that the notice contains all the information needed to formulate a valid request for a provisional arrest. Additionally, a Red Notice may not be issued if Interpol concludes that the request is based on activity of a political, military, religious or racial character.

In cases where an arrest is made based on a Red Notice, it is carried out by the national police in Interpol member countries. Interpol cannot demand that any member country arrest the subject of a Red Notice.

The ICC-Red Notices are a step forward in the cooperation between the ICC and Interpol. They include a request to arrest and detain the individuals if found, pending surrender to the ICC. However, as always, the person should be considered innocent until proven guilty.

The Hague, July 26th 2006
Irene Koomans