



Non c'è Pace Senza Giustizia
No Peace Without Justice



**JUSTICE
RAPID
RESPONSE**



JUSTICE RAPID RESPONSE CERTIFICATION WORKSHOP

11-14 September 2009



**HELD AT THE OFFICE OF NO PEACE WITHOUT JUSTICE
BRUSSELS, BELGIUM**

- WORKSHOP REPORT -

The JRR Interim Secretariat is run by No Peace Without Justice.
The JRR Certification Course is run with the financial assistance of



Government of Finland



Government of Canada



European Union

REPORT FROM THE FIRST JRR CERTIFICATION WORKSHOP

1. Background and Mandate

The JRR Certification Workshop was jointly organised by JRR Coordinating Group members No Peace Without Justice (NPWJ – Interim JRR Secretariat) and the Institute for International Criminal Investigations (IICI), with the financial support of the European Commission and the Governments of Canada and Finland. The workshop was hosted by NPWJ from 11-14 September 2009 in the offices of NPWJ in central Brussels.

The idea of holding a short ‘Certification Workshop’ emerged from observations made during the JRR Pilot Training Course (PTC) in May 2009, the report of which recommended that “the range of expertise represented on the JRR roster can be greatly expanded in a very short time-frame and at minimal expense by seeking experts who are already fully trained for international criminal justice-related deployment, and instead of a full course, providing them with short, JRR specific training. These experts could receive an estimated two-day workshop on how to apply their training to JRR situations and could be added to the JRR roster so that it is fully operational as soon as it is established”.¹ The PTC report, including this recommendation, was shared with the Coordinating Group and Policy Group, after which NPWJ and IICI proceeded to implement its recommendations by organising the Certification Workshop.

The JRR Certification Workshop was therefore designed to meet two objectives: (1) to certify another group of experts to the JRR roster by providing experts who are already fully trained for international criminal justice-related deployment with training on how to apply their expertise to JRR situations; and (2) to test the short-course format with a view to applying it to future short certification courses. Each of these objectives was successfully met.

Sixteen additional experts have now received standardised training on how to apply their pre-existing training and expertise in international criminal justice-related deployments to JRR situations and have now been certified to the JRR roster.

The certification workshop presented participants with a hypothetical case of a JRR deployment, in which serious crimes under international law have reportedly been committed in the course of a conflict in a fictional country named ‘Bomo’. A United Nations peacekeeping mission has been established in Bomo, the human rights component of which has received widespread reports of continuing human rights violations and violations of international humanitarian law. The UN High Commissioner for Human Rights decides to establish a fact-finding mission and, as time is of the essence, she approaches JRR with a request to put a team in the field in Bomo for this purpose. The Security Council, seeing that such a fact-finding mission may be a useful way to express its concern with the parties in Bomo, as well as to obtain information required to make future decisions should the situation not improve, requests the Secretary General to have DPKO and UNABOM support the JRR mission logistically. After short consultations among the JRR Coordinating and Policy Groups, a lead State steps forward to arrange for the JRR deployment. The request seeks a full-fledged JRR mission, whose final report will be provided to the High Commissioner for Human Rights; the UN Secretary-General; and subsequently to the Security Council. The purpose of the mission is to gather information for possible future action by the international community. Substantively, therefore, the mission is considered to be more than an initial screening mission, but less than a comprehensive evidence gathering exercise such as would be required in the final stages of preparation for a judicial process.

On the basis of the hypothetical case, participants worked in teams to determine the information and evidence they would gather and to develop an initial plan for the mission, including an investigative plan. In addition to the practical exercises, the workshop provided briefings on

¹ See the *JRR Pilot Training Course Report: Assessment and Lessons Learnt from the JRR Pilot Training Course*, available at http://www.justicerapidresponse.org/jrr_PTC_Berlin_May09.htm

some of the most crucial practical aspects of deployment for international criminal investigations, such as risk management and field safety and security.

Through debriefings with the participants, presenters and observers, the format and curriculum of the certification workshop were deemed to be suitable to the workshop's objective of providing the participants with a level of familiarity with the JRR mechanism and the kinds of situations into which it might deploy. Evaluation forms filled out by participants also provided useful feedback that will allow future workshops to be even more focused and beneficial. It was generally agreed that the format, curriculum and method of organising the workshop could be easily replicated in the future.

At the conclusion of the workshop, all participants were certified as experts on the JRR roster. These participants now join the first group of experts certified at the Pilot Training Course in May 2009, constituting a total roster of 34 experts who could be deployed in the event that a request were received. As did the JRR Pilot Training Course, this workshop served to create synergy between the participants, who may find themselves working together on a JRR team in the future. It also provided an opportunity for participants, presenters and observers to provide feedback on the workshop content and format, which are summarised in this report and will help to improve future JRR training and certification workshops.

2. Workshop Summary

2.1. Participation

The JRR Certification Workshop was attended by 16 participants sent by their State or institution, all of whom were experts in various aspects of criminal investigations and international criminal law, and the majority of whom had previously completed the IICI International Investigator Course.²

Given that those people who have completed the IICI course can be considered fully trained for international criminal justice-related deployment, they were invited to attend the certification workshop in order to understand how to apply their training to JRR situations. The final group of 16 participants came from the following institutions: the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission (2 people); the Human Rights Centre Memorial; Moscow (1); the Institute for International Criminal Investigations (1); the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (3); the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (2); the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (1); the School of Forensic and Investigative Sciences; University of Central Lancashire (1); the Special Court for Sierra Leone (3); the Swedish Prosecution Authority (1); and the University of Leeds (1). They represented a variety of fields of expertise: forensics (1), human rights (3), investigations (6), prosecutions (3) and witness support (3).

Exactly half of the group were male and half female and several geographical regions were represented.³ A full list of participants, observers and presenters can be found in Annex II.

Two Observers also attended the workshop, one from the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission and one from the Sierra Leone Institute for International Law.

² The IICI International Investigator Course covers four topic areas considered essential to provide investigation professionals with the additional skills required to conduct international criminal investigations. The four course topics, International Humanitarian Law; Military Organisations, Weapons, Operations and Modern Warfare; Evidence; and Investigation Skills, are broken down into nineteen separate modules taught through distance learning and a two-week residential course, which involves participation in a range of seminars and competency based exercises, <http://www.iici.info/docs/iici-syllabus.pdf>

³ Three from Canada and North America, 5 from Europe, 5 from Africa, 2 from Asia and 1 from Russia.

2.2. Presenters

The presenters for the JRR Certification Workshop were identified by IICI and NPWJ in consultation with Canada as the Chair of JRR and, with one exception, had all taken part as trainers in the PTC. They each focussed on different aspects of JRR, the hypothetical JRR deployment case, including information and evidence gathering; mission planning; risk management and field safety and security. They came from IICI, the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia and NPWJ. One of IICI's Board Members also gave a presentation on his recent experience as a member of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission in Gaza, describing the investigative methodology used by the Mission.

2.3. Training Program

The content and format of the JRR Certification Workshop curriculum was developed by IICI, NPWJ and Canada as the JRR Chair (see Annex 1).

Session 1, part 1: Concept and evolution of JRR

After lunch, a welcoming address and introductions, the workshop began with an introduction to the 'Concept and evolution of JRR', given by Canada as the JRR Chair. The session provided an overview of JRR and its development; its basic structure; and its purpose. As in the PTC, this introductory session looked at the rapid development of international criminal justice in the last decade and the challenges still faced, one of which is the need for the identification, collection and preservation of information that might otherwise be at risk of being lost. JRR is meant to address this challenge and to help take advantage of the political will that often exists during or immediately after a conflict to allow the international community to collect information and take steps towards ensuring justice. The specific functions most likely to be carried out by the JRR mechanism include: pattern of violence investigation; forensic mapping; documentary evidence investigation; visual image collection; identification of potential witnesses; identification of massacre sites; and development of recommendations as to future justice measures. An updated version of the JRR FAQ and the Executive Summary of the JRR Feasibility Study were distributed to all participants.

Session 1, part 2: Deployment

This session explained how JRR deployment will work in practice, including how the Guidelines for Cooperation and Deployment apply and the three possible Deployment Scenarios developed during the JRR Coordinating Group meeting in Wakefield, Canada in February 2009. It also highlighted the value-added of the JRR mechanism, in that it provides professional expertise to collect, assess and preserve information in conflict or post-conflict situations where there are no professional experts already on the ground. Deploying a JRR team ensures significantly reduced response times for the provision of assistance in information and evidence gathering that is both impartial and meets international standards. Impartiality is further guaranteed by the fact that JRR is deployed with the participation of a broad group of States. JRR can also contribute to stopping violations since the knowledge that the violations are being investigated can deter potential perpetrators. The discussion following Session 1 focused on several practical aspects of a JRR deployment, such as who would provide the equipment, interpreters, etc. for the team; how the interviewing of witnesses would be carried out in practice, including the level of detail needed in interviews; and the storage and future use of evidence collected. Some questions also looked at the overall function of JRR, including the independence of the investigation in the case of a State referral and on the role of experts on the roster.

Session 2, part 1: Perspectives from the field: Darfur

This session illustrated the experience of this non-JRR investigative mission to Darfur, looking at the history of the region and its most recent conflict and the UN response that led to the establishment of the independent commission of inquiry, which was tasked with the following

mandate: a) investigate violations; b) determine if genocide had been committed; c) identify perpetrators; and d) suggest means to ensure that those responsible are held accountable. The presentation described the challenges faced by the inquiry team, including the short time and human resources available. It also described the three stages of the inquiry: a) analysis; b) intelligence and information collection; and c) databases; and the diversified methodology applied to the mission, which featured interviews by commissioners with government officials and eminent persons in Sudan; field investigation by a multi-disciplinary investigation team, review by the mission secretariat of submissions and reports from a large variety of sources; witnesses interviews; crime scene examinations; and analysis of the structure of the armed forces, the role of intelligence agencies, the chain of command and the links between soldiers, militias, rebel groups and the reservist army. At the end of the mission, the inquiry provided the following findings: a) mass violations and human rights violations occurred in Darfur; b) these violations were committed both by the government and the rebels; c) the government and the military led indiscriminate attacks; and d) the elements required to demonstrate that the governmental violations constituted genocide could not be established. The presentation emphasised the importance of investigative teams in difficult circumstances such as this remaining flexible and evaluating, on an ongoing basis, the most crucial priorities in order to fulfil their mandate.

Session 2, part 2: Perspectives from the field: Gaza

This session illustrated the experience of this non-JRR investigative mission to Gaza, looking at the background to the most recent phase of the conflict and the establishment of the fact-finding mission by the UN Human Rights Council. The mandate of the mission was to investigate all violations of international human rights law and international humanitarian law that might have been committed from 27 December 2008 to 18 January 2009. The presentation discussed only the investigative methodology of the mission since the findings had not yet been released at the time of the certification workshop. The mission began by reviewing publicly-available information on the events it had been mandated to investigate; then gathered independent expert views on various aspects of the events in question. The mission continued to seek expert opinions throughout its investigations, especially from NGOs. It also gathered information by interviewing witnesses to and victims of the events under investigation and by visiting the sites of such events. The Fact Finding Mission placed great importance on openness, holding public hearings in Gaza, Amman and Geneva. Discussion after this session focussed on questions of how a JRR team should manage situations where parties to the conflict under investigation are uncooperative; how JRR missions can ensure that they remain independent in politically-charged situations; and how to maintain balance when cooperation is uneven from different parties.

Session 3: Review of previous day

This short session consolidated the discussions of the previous day, through a review and question-answer session. Discussion focused on how language competencies would be covered for JRR missions and the ways in which JRR teams would interact with interpreters. Another aspect of the discussion addressed the situation where a State requested JRR intervention but did not have the resources to cover the cost of the investigation. It was clarified that in this case, States and institutions who agree to participate in the mission and are in a position to do so would also agree to contribute funding to the mission, whether by providing personnel, logistical support or direct funding, depending on what is required.

Session 4: Hypothetical case: investigation of crimes under international law and evidence gathering

This session was designed to ensure that all participants have a common understanding of what they will be expected to do in relation to information gathering when deployed in the context of a JRR mission. The presentation focused on the common and specific elements of crimes under international law (war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide); and the elements of individual criminal responsibility (both direct responsibility and command responsibility). It was recommended that JRR missions, which are likely to be overwhelmed by potential crimes and avenues to pursue and gather information, should focus on asking key questions to assess the category of crimes to which various incidents might belong. JRR teams should approach

information gathering in three phases: a) which crimes may have taken place; b) which category of crimes they could belong to; and c) which group could have been responsible.

Session 5: Group work on information identification, collection and preservation

During this session, participants were provided with a hypothetical case regarding serious violations of international law which occurred during a fictional conflict. The participants broke into three groups and, based on the hypothetical case, developed answers to a list of questions regarding information gathering, in order to: identify the specific violations; choose the category of crimes that may have been committed; identify alleged perpetrators or perpetrator groups; and decide how the group would organise themselves to conduct the mission.

Session 6: Presentation of results of the practical exercise and feedback

In this session, teams presented their work and received feedback on those presentations. Each group presented its work through four separate exercises, which looked at identifying specific violations; the categorisation of crimes; the identification of possible perpetrators and their modes of liability; and the division of labour among investigative teams. Each group presented very comprehensive responses to the exercises and received feedback that filled certain gaps and situated the exercise firmly within the context of a JRR mission. In the final exercise, the groups began the process of planning the hypothetical JRR mission by dividing the work of their team in the manner they considered most appropriate to the situation. One group divided itself by type of crime; one group divided itself geographically to cover different parts of the region; and one group divided itself according to activities to be undertaken in the field.

Session 7: Risk management

In this session, risk management principles and safety and security practices were reviewed, in order to ensure a baseline understanding among potential members of a JRR team. The session provided a mode of defining threat, vulnerability and risk as part of risk analysis and management. The presentation outlined a process of identifying and specifying possible events, their frequency and impact in order to take appropriate steps to mitigate potential risks. The importance of modifying and re-assessing the analysis according to the context and newly emerging elements was also emphasised. Minimum Operating Security Standards (MOSS) was also discussed as a set of standards JRR would need to comply with if working under the aegis of a United Nations mission. The participants completed an exercise in Threat/Vulnerability/Risk Assessment and mitigating factors for different possible threats (e.g. kidnap, roadside bombs, land-mines).

Session 8: Risk Management: safety and security

The session followed from Session 7, aiming to enhance knowledge among participants regarding security issues, in particular security planning. The session outlined the different aspects of a security plan including: the pre-deployment preparation (clear understanding of division of tasks, the purpose of the mission, the country situation, potential threats, the medical situation, required equipment and insurance); travel plans (pick up on arrival, public transport, local laws and checkpoint procedures); driving and road traffic accidents (road conditions, vehicle power, speed limits and the use of main roads where possible); briefing and security debriefing (whole team being fully informed on the situation, up-to-date information, individual specific tasks and communication procedures to follow); procedures and rehearsals (use of existing procedures adjusted and updated where necessary); communications (ensuring the procurement, availability and condition of equipment); personal security (reducing the risk of harassment and assault, especially in the streets and at night; wearing appropriate clothing); building security (importance of having water, mobile phone and emergency medical procedures); and preventing kidnapping (walking in groups, avoiding routine, lock the doors and be alert).

Session 9: Risk Management: safety and security (part 2)

Following from session 8, this session aimed to raise awareness among participants regarding security issues related to weapons and arms in conflict and post-conflict situations. The presentation outlined the principal weapons that mission members may find in conflict and

post-conflict areas. The presenter discussed the dangers of white phosphorus and landmines and discussed the importance of a high level of mine-awareness among JRR teams, especially those deploying to areas where landmines were known to have been used. The presentation concluded with several concrete suggestions, including avoiding secondary routes or picking up unfamiliar objects and ensuring the team and its members have up-to-date information at all times.

Session 10, part 1: Investigation plans

The session drew out general principles of investigations planning, including the sources of evidence, investigative avenues and possible legal theories. The presentation outlined the elements of good investigative planning, making reference to the hypothetical conflict situation given in the hypothetical case study. The elements include: the event or events to be investigated; a present understanding of these events (what you know, available information, gaps in the information you have); sources of evidence and information (where the current information comes from, whether it is valid, what kind of sources could cover the gaps); possible legal theories (linking the subject to the event); the people whose conduct is to be investigated (biographical data, current whereabouts); investigative avenues (potential additional information); and conducting the investigation (staff, witnesses interviews, documentation collection, document authentication, crime scenes). The session emphasised the importance of a flexible plan that, when necessary, can be reassessed and revised.

Session 10, part 2: Mission planning

This purpose of this session was to develop a common baseline understanding of the elements of a mission plan, including situation, mission, execution, administration and logistics, communications and command and security. A mission was defined as a field operation carried out by investigation staff outside of their duty station and discussed the different aspects of a mission, including the need for prior planning, emphasis on the security of all persons involved, acquiring general information on the situation, a background summary of the operation and information on the staff deployed. The presenter discussed the importance of the clarity of the mission, with common understanding of who, what, when, where and why, as well as of the goals of the mission. The plan should also include a clear description of the execution, formed by three sub paragraphs: general outline; group tasks; and coordinating instructions. The plan should also have an administration and logistics section, which would include transportation; interpreters; equipment; final arrangements; accommodation; visas and documentation; and local requirements. A mission diary should be compiled daily with all relevant events. At the end of the mission, the Team Leader is responsible for compiling and submitting a mission report (an internal document for JRR that looks at the operations of the mission, as distinct from the external mission report which will include the mission's findings and recommendations).

Session 11: Group work on mission planning

In this session, participants were again divided into three groups and were required to write a mission plan. At the completion of each group's presentation of its mission plan, the presenters had the opportunity to comment on those plans. The mission plans were generally of a very high standard, reflecting the depth of experience among the workshop participants. The presenters identified some areas where the groups had overlooked certain details, while acknowledging the very short period of time given to developing the plans.

Session 12: Workshop Review, question and answer

This session was designed to consolidate information discussed in the previous sessions, to ensure all participants had gained a common understanding of the different issues discussed and would be ready to deploy in the context of a JRR mission. In addition, the discussion included an evaluation and feedback from participants regarding the workshop and their impressions of JRR. Questions from participants included: who decides to go on the mission; what is role of the employers of mission members in the decision to deploy; who chooses the destination of the mission; what the minimum number of experts is to form a team; and what composition of different experts would be needed to form a team.

Further comments from participants addressed the content of the workshop with a view to improving future workshops. One comment in particular suggested that the workshop should focus to a greater degree on the structure and modalities of the JRR mechanism, given that the Certification Workshop is designed principally to educate participants on how to apply their existing expertise in a JRR context. Greater detail on JRR was felt to be necessary in order for roster members to understand fully the framework in which they would be deploying. It was also suggested that JRR should consider developing more comprehensive guidelines for team members, addressing such issues as internal reporting lines; role and expectations of the Team Leader and other team members; and other operational procedures. This would give roster members more clarity on what to expect in the field, who they would report to and who would ultimately be responsible for the safety and security of the team and the integrity of the investigation. Another comment focused on the hypothetical case, suggesting that more practical information on the fictional situation would have made the exercises more beneficial, such as maps and other geographical details and information on the type of JRR team to be deployed (range of competencies, etc).

3. Assessment and Recommendations

The workshop achieved its main objective of certifying a second group of experts to the JRR roster, bringing to 34 the total number of experts now available for deployment if requested. The other objective of the Certification Workshop was to validate the short workshop format and receive feedback for future workshops. This objective was also achieved as most participants gave the workshop strongly positive evaluations, with some making useful suggestions to strengthen future courses and JRR as a whole.

In response to participants' comments, it was agreed that future workshops should focus to a greater degree on the structure and modalities of the JRR mechanism and that workshop materials should provide participants with as much detail as possible. Now that JRR is approaching its operational phase, it was also agreed that much of the information contained in the JRR Feasibility Study should be drawn out and presented as a set of guidelines for all involved in the mechanism, including roster members. Finally, future short workshops will adopt the suggestion that more information on the hypothetical case be provided in order to improve the effectiveness of the exercises based on the information.

The workshop resulted in two other positive outcomes. First, it enhanced JRR's relationships with institutions that might provide additional experts for the roster in the future. Having successfully certified a number of their experts to the roster, JRR can approach the focal points in each of the participating institutions with future calls for nominations. Second, the workshop provided an opportunity for the JRR Chair and Secretariat to engage in discussions regarding the future development of JRR and to take advantage of the presence of the workshop presenters to develop plans for future training courses and certification workshops. During these discussions, the next steps were identified, including development of a structure that would facilitate a more effective working relationship between the Chair and the Secretariat resulting in more efficient management of JRR; the development of the infrastructure for the roster; and a tentative Plan of Action for the coming 12 months including the assignment of tasks (see Annex III). The Interim JRR Secretariat (NPWJ) has begun implementing the Plan of Action by briefing members of the COJUR-ICC at their meeting on 16 September 2009, encouraging all EU Member States to engage actively in JRR.

Recommendations:

- The JRR Chair and Interim Secretariat will engage in intensified outreach, briefings and correspondence with States and institutions with a potential role to play in JRR
- The Interim JRR Secretariat will revise the Call for Nominations, identifying gaps in the expertise currently represented on the JRR Roster and encouraging States and institutions to nominate particularly experts in those fields. The Call for Nominations will also include a profile for candidates to be nominated, to assist States in nominating individuals with the expertise most useful for the JRR roster and for deployment.
- The Interim JRR Secretariat and the Institute for International Criminal Investigations (IICI), in consultation with the German Centre for Peace Operations (ZIF) and the Swedish Folke Bernadotte Academy (FBA) will identify training institutions that may be in a position to implement JRR training courses and certification workshops. Once the programs have been revised (by the Interim JRR Secretariat), those institutions will be contacted to assess their capacity and willingness to hold JRR training courses and certification workshops. This process will also involve identifying other presenters who could be “back-up” presenters, in the event that the presenters who have participated in JRR courses and workshops to date are not available.
- The Interim JRR Secretariat will update and circulate the JRR FAQ and make arrangements for it to be translated.
- A Coordinating Group Meeting will be held directly before the opening of the Assembly of State Parties in the Hague on 17 November 2009.
- A Policy Group Meeting will be held on the margins of the ASP in the Hague on 18 November 2009 (TBC). A new Call for Nominations for full training courses in 2010 will be launched at the Policy Group Meeting.
- During 2010, two further Certification Workshops and two further full Training Courses will be held, aiming to increase significantly the number of experts on the JRR roster. The two full Training Courses will be held in the Middle East (with Qatar as a possible location) and in South America (with Colombia, Argentina, Guatemala and Peru as possible locations) in order to facilitate the participation of experts from those regions.

Annex I: WORKSHOP PROGRAM

**JRR CERTIFICATION
11-14 SEPTEMBER 2009**

*Rue du Pépin, 54
Brussels, B-1000 Belgium*

Friday, 11 September 2009

13h00: Arrival

13h00-15h00: Lunch and orientation at NPWJ offices

Lunch at venue; by the end of this session, all participants will have introduced themselves, including the most relevant parts of their background and experiences.

15h00-16h00: Concept and evolution of JRR

This session will focus on what JRR is, how it developed, who is supporting it and what the basic structure of JRR is, including the roles of the Chair, Secretariat and Policy and Coordinating Groups. The purpose of the session is to familiarise participants with the background of JRR, also to put them in a position to be able to explain what JRR is to their sending State or institution and/or to third parties.

16h00-17h15: JRR Deployment

This session will run through how JRR deployment would work in practice, including how the guidelines for deployment and cooperation apply to possible requests, focusing on the three possible scenarios examined by the Coordinating Group in February 2009. The purpose of this session is to familiarise participants with how various types of deployments will work from the initial request through to the final report.

17h15-17h30: Coffee break

17h30-18h30: JRR Deployment: Hypothetical Case

This session will consist of an initial discussion of a hypothetical JRR deployment case which will be used as a basis for the rest of the workshop. The purpose of this session is to familiarise participants with the hypothetical case, apply what has been discussed earlier in the afternoon to the specific situation given in the case, and begin thinking about how it might play out in practice.

18h30-20h00: Perspectives from the Field: Darfur and Gaza

This session, (which might spill over to dinner), will discuss the experiences of recent (non-JRR) investigative missions in Darfur and in Gaza. The purpose of this session is to introduce issues of mission planning and implementation for JRR from a practical perspective, on the basis of experiences in Darfur and Gaza.

20h00: Dinner

Saturday, 12 September 2009

09h00 - 09h30: Coffee and cookies available at the office

09h30-10h00: Review of Previous Day

This short session is designed to consolidate the discussions of the previous day, through a review and question-answer session.

10h00-11h15: Hypothetical Case: Information gathering

This session will discuss the kinds of possible information that experts will be expected to gather and how they might go about gathering it. This will cover the 6Ws (who, what, when, where, why and how); the 4Cs (consistency, clarity, correctness and completeness); PEACE (preparation, engagement, acquisition, closure and evaluation); classification and reliability of sources (primary, secondary and tertiary, including open sources); and safety and security of information, including issues of consent. The purpose of this session is to ensure all participants have a common understanding of what they will be expected to do in relation to information gathering, including information they will be expected not to gather, and the standards they will be expected to employ.

11h15-11h30: Coffee break

11h30-13h30: Group Session: Information Identification, Collection and Preservation

During this session, participants will break into three groups and, based on the hypothetical case, develop answers to the following questions:

- 1 What information would be relevant and why?
- 2 How will they prioritise which information they will seek to collect?
- 3 What are the potential sources of information?
- 4 How will they collect information?
- 5 How will they assess, store and secure information?

13h30-14h30: Lunch at venue (in groups)

Participants will be expected to prepare (within their groups) for the presentation of the results of the practical exercise undertaken just before lunch.

14h30-15h30: Presentation of results of practical exercise

Each group will have 15-20 minutes to present the answers to the questions they have discussed before lunch.

15h30-16h45: Feedback on practical exercise

Feedback session on the presentation, by facilitators and by other participants.

16h45-17h00: Coffee break

17h00 -19h00: Mission Planning

This session will draw out general principles of mission planning, including: mandate, information to be collected; situation overview; team make-up; deployment strategy; and reporting. The purpose of this session is to develop a common baseline understanding of the basic elements of a mission plan.

20h00: Dinner

Sunday, 13 September 2009

09h00 - 09h30: Coffee and cookies available at the office

09h30-10h00: Review of Previous Day

This short session is designed to consolidate the discussions of the previous day on Information Identification Collection and Preservation and Mission Planning.

10h00-11h15: Risk Management

The session will review risk management principles, as well as cover basic safety and security for JRR team members and for all other persons with whom JRR teams come into contact in the course of a mission. The purpose of the session is to ensure a baseline understanding of risk

management principles as well as safety and security practices and how to address them pre-, during and post-mission.

11h15-11h30: Coffee break

11h30-13h00: Risk Management

Previous session continued.

13h00-14h00: Lunch at NPWJ offices (in groups)

Participants will break into three groups and have lunch together with their group to begin preparing a mission plan for the hypothetical case.

14h30-16h30: Mission Planning; Practical exercise (in Groups)

Participants will continue working on their mission plans for the hypothetical case.

16h30-17h15: Coffee break

17h15-18h15: Presentation of results of practical exercise

Each group will have 15-20 minutes to present and justify their mission plan.

18h15-19h45: Feedback on practical exercise

During this session, feedback will be given on the presentations made in the previous session.

Monday, 14 September 2009

08h30 - 09h00: Coffee and cookies available at the office

09h00-11h00: Workshop review

This session will consolidate the information discussed over the previous three days. The purpose of this session is to ensure all participants have a common understanding of the different issues discussed and would be ready to deploy in the context of a JRR mission.

11h00-11h15: Coffee break

11h15-13h00: Evaluation and Feedback

This session is to obtain feedback from participants regarding the workshop and their impressions about JRR.

13h00: Lunch

Departure of participants

Annex II: PARTICIPANT LIST

JRR Certification Workshop, 11-14 September, 2009

Participants	
Avetisyan, Grigor	Human Rights Centre Memorial, Moscow
Bernard, Joseph Kaberia	Kenya National Commission on Human Rights
Coulouris, Anna	Institute for International Criminal Investigations
Forde, Anthony	University of Leeds
Graham, Alistair	International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia
Hägkvist, Ewamari	Swedish Prosecution Authority
Hashimi, Mohammad Homayon	Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission
Hussey, Blair	Special Court for Sierra Leone
Hussey, Stephanie	Special Court for Sierra Leone
Kagabo, Aisha	International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda
Kamau, Evelyn Wanja	International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda
Muzigo-Morrison, Rosette	International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda
Saffa, Joseph	Special Court for Sierra Leone
Simmons, Tall	School of Forensic and Investigative Sciences, University of Central Lancashire
Vassou, Yota	International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia
Zafar, Syed Musa	Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission

Observers	
Kanu, Ambassador Alieu I.	Sierra Leone Institute for International Law
Mazoori, Dallas	Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission

Presenters	
Name	Organisation / Affiliation
Figa-Talamanca, Niccolo'	No Peace Without Justice
Marcus, Maxine	International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia
Nugent, William	EU Border Assistance Mission - Rafah
Ralston, John	Institute for International Criminal Investigations
Smith, Alison	NPWJ/JRR Secretariat
Travers, Desmond	Institute for International Criminal Investigations
Vamos-Goldman, Andras	Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Canada/JRR Chair

NPWJ / JRR Secretariat	
Barbone, Greta	NPWJ
Chiaranello, Roberta	NPWJ/JRR Secretariat
Gibb, Michael	NPWJ
Gibbons, Niamh	NPWJ/JRR Secretariat
Marchisio, Sabrina	NPWJ/JRR Secretariat
Pomatto, Valentina	NPWJ/JRR Secretariat

Annex III: PLAN OF ACTION

2009

September 2009

- Outreach and briefing meetings and correspondence, with a focus on Europe and New York (NPWJ and Canada)
- Development of JRR Management (NPWJ and Canada)

October 2009

- Outreach and briefing meetings and correspondence, with a focus on New York (NPWJ and Canada)
- Revision of call for nominations, including the identification of gaps of expertise on the JRR Roster and the development of a profile for candidates to be nominated, to ensure appropriate nominations from November 2009 (NPWJ)
- Identification of training institutions who may be in a position to implement JRR Training and Certification workshops, under the direction of the Chair and the Interim JRR Secretariat (NPWJ with IICI)
- Updating and circulation of FAQ, including translations (NPWJ)
- Update of Focal Points in JRR Participants (NPWJ)
- Revision of the training programs, including possible identification of other presenters who could be “back-up” presenters (NPWJ)
- Planning for training courses for 2010 (NPWJ)

November 2009

- Outreach and briefing meetings and correspondence, with a focus on Europe (Canada and NPWJ)
- Coordinating Group Meeting – 17 November 2009
- Policy Group Meeting, also to launch the call for nominations for full training courses in 2010 – 18 November 2009 (TBC)

2010

- 5-8 February 2010 – Certification workshop, NPWJ Offices in Brussels
- March 2010 – Coordinating Group Meeting, also to select participants for May
- May 2010, full training course in Qatar, to be reported on as part of an overall JRR briefing at the ICC Review Conference in Kampala
- July 2010, Certification workshop, NPWJ Offices in Brussels
- September 2010 – Coordinating Group Meeting, also to select participants for October (TBC)
- October 2010 – full training course in Latin America, location TBD (possibilities include Colombia, Argentina, Guatemala and Peru)
- November 2010 – Policy and Coordinating Group meetings