

# United Nations Roundtable Forum in Korea on Alternatives to Detention

Disclaimer: The views expressed in this paper are those of the author only.



Writer, third from right, at UN Forum in Seoul with delegates from UNCHR Geneva, Republic of Korea, Japan, Hong Kong, Peoples Republic of China, New Zealand, Australia.

The writer was invited as New Zealand civil society representative to a roundtable forum on alternatives to detention in Seoul, Korea in late April, 2010. The forum, organised by UNHCR, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea, brought together senior government officials from Korea, Japan, Hong Kong, China, Australia and New Zealand and delegates from civil society to consider the immediately current issues of detention of asylum seekers and humanitarian alternatives.

Representatives of the six participating countries in the region first shared their own policies and practices, and there was ample opportunity for knowledge exchange, and discussion on humanitarian principles. The Forum was convened by Janice L. Marshall, Deputy Director, Policy and Law within the Division of International Protection at UNHCR headquarters, Geneva.

The roundtable included, among others, senior representatives from IOM (International Organisation for Migration), June Lee, Chief of Mission; Anton Camen, Beijing, East Asian Director of the International Committee of the Red Cross, Homanyoun Alizadeh, Regional Representative of OHCHR, Grant Mitchell, Director of the International Detention Coalition, and reps from the Asia Pacific Refugee Rights Network, Dong-Hyeon Seok, Commissioner of Korean Immigration, Hyon Cho, Minister for Multilateral and Global Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, politicians and officials from Korea, Japan, and Hong Kong as well as a number of researchers from La Trobe University in Melbourne and Osaka University in Japan.

### **Purpose and Focus**

The Roundtable Forum was organised by UNHCR and the ROC Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the purpose of bringing together the six Pacific countries to discuss the current situation in relation to irregular migration, asylum and border control in the context of detention policy and humanitarian practice. Representatives of the participating countries first gave presentations on their own laws, policy and practice, and shared something about issues presently facing them and how their governments and civil society agencies are addressing them. The purpose of the Forum was to educate about international best practice in relation to detention issues, to consider alternatives to detention, and to influence action in future policy and practice. The Roundtable did seem to adopt a positive approach to change and tangible action, rather than just talk.

### **Interest in the Balance Between Government and Civil Society**

One of the most interesting aspects of the interchange between the representatives of civil society was an understanding of the relationship to government. Many of the representatives from both quarters were interested in how the two can work together in balance. There was considerable interest in the balance between civil society or human rights advocate/service agencies in the questions to representatives from Australia and New Zealand.

It was explained that in maturing democracies, the main aim is to achieve a balance in which people working in both government and civil society have their respective jobs to do and have their roles to play. They may well not always agree with each other (and indeed if they are always agreeing something is probably wrong). It is the role of government to control borders, and to implement and enforce laws. It is the role of civil society to uphold and advance human rights, to monitor and hold accountable government policy and practice in relation to that.

It was explained that is not necessary for civil society to either be in position of being subservient or 'kowtowing' to government, nor to be in angry or emotive oppositional relationship. In a democracy, government and civil society usually have similar laudable goals, but different roles to play in achieving them. It is the role of civil society to advocate for human rights, to protect the vulnerable and to positively influence government policy and practice. The best way to achieve that is through a collegial relationship of mutual respect.

### **Why Governments Detain Asylum Seekers and Intending Irregular Migrants**

It is certainly true that control of its own borders is a key test of the sovereignty of a country. Questions about identity and security concerns are certainly valid and accepted reasons for detention or restriction of movement of a person in an irregular arrival situation. Beyond the small number of such genuine cases, political pressures come into play and politicians particularly cannot be seen to

**'losing control' of borders or flows of migrants into a country, as opposition parties will seize upon this as seen recently across the Tasman. But detention should be the rare exception for a host of reasons related to its adverse impacts:**

***1. Brief Summary of Current Research into the Impacts of Involuntary Detention:***

*Summary*

Adults

Dudley (2003) estimates that the rates of suicidal behaviours among men and women in Australian detention centres are approximately 41 and 26 times the national average, respectively. Furthermore, male refugee claimants in detention have rates of suicidal behaviour that are 1.8 times higher male prison rates (Dudley, 2003). Steel et al. (2004) assessed parents and children who had been held in Australian immigration detention centres for approximately two years. All of the individuals met diagnostic criteria for at least 1 current psychiatric disorder; 26 disorders were identified among 14 adults, and 52 disorders were identified among 20 children.

Mares and Jureidini (2004) confirmed these high levels of psychological distress among adults and children in detention and noted that there was very little support and few interventions provided in those settings. The detention setting places many obstacles in the way of clinicians servicing detainees and making significant improvements in such an impoverished environment is improbable. Refugees' experiences of immigration detention have offered compelling evidence that detention has impeded efforts to address their mental health needs.

Studies examining the experiences of refugee claimants have also shown high rates of trauma, PTSD, and depression among this subgroup (Silove, 2002). One study, in which 51% of the sample had experienced torture, showed that, similar to other studies with refugees, combined PTSD and DD was associated with considerable psychosocial disability (Silove et al., 2006). A host of other factors, including a number of policy-related variables like conflict with immigration officials, obstacles to employment and delays in processing of the refugee's application, were associated with psychiatric distress (Silove, Sinnerbrink et al., 1999).

Children

Particular emphasis has been placed on the psychological vulnerabilities of child refugee claimants who have been held in immigration detention. Thomas and Lau (2002) conducted an extensive review of local and international research into the mental health status of children and adolescents who were refugees or were detained in the course of claiming refugee status. Thomas and Lau concluded that symptoms of post-traumatic stress are common amongst child and adolescent refugees.

Although symptoms vary across age groups, in preschoolers, they are generally manifested in very high anxiety, social withdrawal and regressive behaviours. In school-aged children, symptoms can include flashbacks, exaggerated startle responses, poor concentration, sleep disturbance, complaints of physical discomfort and conduct problems. In adolescents, symptoms may include acting out, aggressive behaviours, delinquency, nightmares, trauma and guilt over one's own survival (Thomas & Lau, 2002, p. 3).

The Australian Psychological Society's submission (Allan, Davidson, Tyson, Schweitzer, & Starr, 2008) to the National Inquiry into Children in Immigration Detention reached a similar set of conclusions. The submission maintained that holding young people in immigration detention is a negative socialisation experience, accentuates developmental risks, threatens the bonds between children and significant caregivers, limits educational opportunities. In addition, the detention experience has traumatic psychological impacts, reduces the potential to recover from pre-migration trauma, and exacerbates the impacts of other traumas.

Source:

Murray, K., Davidson, and D., Schweitzer, R., 2008. Psychological Wellbeing of Refugees Settling in Australia, Assessment and Intervention; Guidelines for Psychologists: (pages 13-21), Australian Psychological Society, Melbourne,

## 2. *Current Research Related to Prevalence Rates for the Risks of Absconding*

Secondly, there is also international research showing that high security detention is quite unnecessary in most cases, and that there are generally very low rates of absconding. Governmental concerns about possible absconding is the tacit justification used for detaining arrivals until their refugee status claims can be determined. The following references below are from a key global international comparative study (Field, 2006) relating to relative absconding rates between countries. Best practice implications and recommendations are contained within the Legal and Protection Policy Research Series and may be accessed @:

<http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/search?page=search&docid=4474140a2&query>

Excerpts from Field (2006) relative to absconding rates:

No unauthorised asylum seeker released on a bridging visa in Australia in a two year period failed to meet their reporting obligations to DIMIA. [21] Similarly, an INS experiment in the US of 640 detainees released into the community had a 95% compliance rate on release. [22] In Sweden, there has proven to be a high level of compliance and voluntary repatriation in negative decisions with very few asylum seekers absconding under case managed supervision. A system of release into the community, after initial health and security checks, has brought significant reduction in the use of taxpayers' money and in public outcry. Sweden now has the lowest levels of illegal immigrants in detention in Europe, with research showing that resettled refugees integrate quickly into the community with no increase in levels of welfare dependency or crime. [23]

Field (2006) also briefly cites the New Zealand experience in the paper:

“In New Zealand, an innovative approach to collective accommodation and directed residence has been taken at the Mangere Accommodation Centre. This centre holds asylum seekers under orders of detention but it does so alongside housing quota refugees (those resettled from overseas via UNHCR). 85% of asylum seekers detained in New Zealand in the first year of New Zealand’s new detention powers have been sent to Mangere. The only differences in the control of those detained and non-detained are: detainees must request permission to leave the centre during the day, as opposed to notifying the management of an intended absence, and detainees may not stay away overnight while the quota refugees may. To date, permission for day release into the community has never been denied and only 5% of residents are supervised during day release. Nonetheless, for those detained, any breaches in the centre’s rules may be punishable by transfer to remand prison. **Only one of 159 asylum seekers ‘detained’ in Mangere since September 2001 (to 2006) has absconded and nobody has yet needed to be transferred to remand prison.** The environment of the centre, where specialised staff treat detainees and refugees alike with dignity and respect, is cited as a factor in its successful record. In part, this must also be attributed to New Zealand’s relatively high recognition rates and the fact that the Mangere detainees receive prioritised processing, so stay at Mangere is usually for around six weeks and a prelude to permanent integration. Onward movement out of New Zealand is neither geographically feasible nor desired by asylum seekers.”

## **Country Reports and Observations**

### **Australia**

#### ***Focus on the Current Asylum Detention Crisis***

**There was considerable attention and debate around the current crisis in Australia where increasing numbers of asylum seekers, often involved with people smugglers, are arriving by boat and being placed in detention centres such as on Christmas Island. Many of these men women and children are from Afghanistan, Sri Lanka and Iraq, and have been victims of human trafficking, arriving in Australian and Indonesian territorial waters in bad condition and in unsafe vessels.**

**Australia was ably represented by Andrew Bleeze, Deputy Secretary for Programme Integrity and Risk Compliance Branch of the Department of Immigration and Citizenship, and by Paris Aristotle and Joseph Swarz of Victorian Foundation in Melbourne.**

**The sheer numbers of asylum seekers arriving by sea in current events has led to abrupt and major changes of policy and direction in relation to asylum issues by the Rudd Government. The legality of the recent policy announcement (in relation to the 1951 Convention and subsequent protocols) was discussed. At present, the Australian government has suspended processing of Sri Lankan and Afghan refugee claims in the new arrival waves. This move may have more public relations strategy than substance in the sense that it is not unusual for countries to temporarily suspend or delay claim processing when faced with overwhelming numbers. The Australian government has crucially *not* suggested in any way that it will not process asylum claims, simply that there is a temporary moratorium on claims of new boat arrivals from those two countries.**

**Representatives of civil society, however, voiced very strong views that the change of policy and direction related to asylum by the current government is very disappointing and a cause for great concern. Secondly, the reopening of detention centres run by the former Howard government is of concern, but particularly the present conditions on Christmas Island and the impact on detainees. Paris Aristotle of Victorian Foundation has recently visited Christmas Island and returned with heightened most serious concerns about conditions there. Governments everywhere are sensitive to issues around irregular migration, and political pressure around having to be seen to be in control. There was a wry suggestion was floated that it might not be a good idea to seek asylum anywhere in an election year.**

**At the same time, Australia shared the benefit of its most considerable humanitarian and quota refugee initiatives and innovative and leading service delivery programmes in Victoria, New South Wales and a number of other states.**

Australia also shared interesting information its innovative special category visas and asylum claimant identification, benefits, and case management and counselling services.

### New Zealand

As unfortunately there was no representation from Wellington, Jane Mulryan, Deputy Head of Mission for the Embassy in Seoul kindly stepped into the breach and presented a brief power point presentation regarding our laws, policies and practice. She acknowledged her lack of background in the area, but offered to refer any specific queries to DOL. Importantly, Jane's presentation touched on the implementation of the new Immigration Act, 2009. It was observed that the new Act allows for a tiered system which includes a greater ability to use reporting conditions instead of secure detention.

Her presentation noted that the majority of asylum seekers in NZ are not detained at any stage. A few AS are held in correctional facilities because: individual failed refugee status and is assessed as liable to abscond; criminality risk; identity issues; and rarely, (perceived) security risk. Essentially, our NZ system operates on a sliding continuum of four options: detention in prison, limited detention or restricted movement at the Mangere Accommodation Centre, Conditional Community Release; or Unrestricted Release. The presentation stated that people claiming refugee status are usually issued work permits for the time it takes to decide their status claim.

Under the new 2009 Act, a person liable for monitoring or detention has reporting requirements and could be subject to initial arrest up to 96 hours by Police or pursuant to warrant up to 28 days with release on condition by the Courts.

**Access to Legal Aid: As of 1 November, 2010 Legal Aid will become available for asylum seekers in NZ challenging their detention in a Court under the new Act.**

The presentation then went into the 2008 report of the UN Chief Inspector Crimes and Torture Act on New Zealand. New Zealand got a good report card. No evidence was found that AS had been subjected to torture, or cruel treatment; AS were being well cared for in a good standard of cleanliness at the Mangere Centre; AS were provided with comprehensive information about rights and entitlements.

#### **Why is Detention used in at all in some countries?**

**To address broader issues such as:**

- **Deterring future asylum seekers/irregular migrants**
- **Providing a sense of control over territorial borders**
- **Responding to political pressure and concerns of the public**
- **In rare cases addressing identity or genuine security issues**

**NZ: Detention in Prison: the Statistics**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Detained MAC</b>	<b>Detained Prison</b>	<b>Total Detained</b>
2004-05	62	14	76
2005-06	58	12	70
2006-07	34	4	38
2007-08	18	8	26
2008-09	16	6	22
2009-10	11	6	17

**Writer's Comments:**

**Comparatively, New Zealand is a leading country which endeavours to consistently apply fair, just, and humanitarian principles in asylum issues but.... there is always opportunity for further improvement. Specifically, the Refugee Council of New Zealand would like to see the detention of the few asylum seekers in prison environments eliminated completely in favour of a small secure facility in the community.**

**Our Government has plans in that direction, and the writer fully supports that and hopes it will be accelerated. Because of our remote geographic location, New Zealand has not had to contend with the large numbers of 'boat people' as currently being experienced in northern Australian waters. Anyone who has ever sailed the Tasman, can attest to the fact that it presents a formidable natural barrier. But many of these people are so desperate to escape the dangers and conditions in their home countries, they risk their lives to seek any safe haven.**

**Interdiction at transit airports and the prevention of genuine asylum claimants from reaching safe haven or even filing a claim in New Zealand is another key issue of serious growing concern that was raised at the Forum and with UNHCR. There needs to be independent research into the effects of interdiction in relation to likely genuine asylum claims under international law.**

## **Republic of Korea**

The genuine commitment of the Republic of Korea to humanitarian principles and its efforts in relation to asylum claimants and refugees was both impressive and heartening to the outside observer.

Tae-ik Cho, Director of Human Rights and Social Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, was co-chair of the Roundtable and there were many senior government officials, academics and observers present. Korea is a (1992) signatory to the 1951 Convention and 1967 Protocols. Only in May 2009 was the Nationality and Refugee Division established. Korea has established a Refugee Reception Centre. Many of the refugees the ROK has accepted and accommodated have escaped from North Korea. Annual asylum claims peaked at 717 in 2007, and main countries of origin are Nepal, China, Myanmar Burma, Sri Lanka, Nigeria, DR Congo, Nigeria, Ethiopia and Iran.

Asylum seekers receive information and counselling, and only a few are held in secure detention if they are believed to be involved in criminal activity. Regarding detention, appeals may be made on 14 days notice and there is review by the Refugee Recognition Committee. Final appeal is to the Minister of Justice. Convention refugees are given residence visas, social integration allowance, national basic living security allowance, national health insurance and counselling.

The Korean Government is committed to the establishment of a new Refugee Reception Centre in 2012 (please take note Kiwis) with livelihood assistance for asylum seekers and social integration and counselling/case management for convention refugees. There is strong and growing independent civil society presence on the scene and it is influential.

There was a certain amount of understandable tension on the streets in relation to the recent sinking of the Cheonan naval ship and the tragic deaths of the 46 men aboard. There was a sense of combined grief, anger and worry for what that could mean for the future pervading for many people during the time of the event.

The enlightened and humanitarian recent aims and practices of the Republic of Korea in relation to asylum seekers and refugees and as a gracious host for the Forum deserves to be recognised by the other participants.

## **Hong Kong SAR (Special Administrative Region)**

The activity and issues around irregular migration and asylum claims in Hong was of considerable interest, as was the humanitarian approach and commitment of its government and civil society. Chow Wing Hang, Principal Secretary, Security Bureau, led a large government delegation, and Adrielle Panares, Director of the International Social Services, represented civil society.

Hong Kong has a small geographic size and one of the world's most densely packed populations (6,480 per sq km), relative prosperity and easy access by land, sea and air. Its border control issues are formidable. The number of refugee claims in 2006 exceeded 2,481 but only 55 cases resulting in status recognition that year. By the end of 2009, there were 3,286 outstanding claim cases pending. There are special issues in relation to coping with 1,980 claims from Pakistan and 1,170 from India. Bangladesh, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Nepal and Philippines constitute the next descending source countries.

One of the most interesting new trends reported was in the exceptionally high number of claims related to torture. Interestingly, over 90% of torture claimants did not lodge them until over one year after arrival in Hong Kong, reportedly after an arrest for an offence or negative immigration decision. Persons subject to removal are not entitled to remain or work in Hong Kong. Those in detainment (473) had been convicted or were being tried for serious crimes. There is the right to complain through various channels including JP's, Ombudsman. A guarantor, cash surety or self-surety may be required. Another curious fact: asylum seeker claimants are not lawfully employable, but equally there is no criminal offence for taking up employment illegally.

In Hong Kong there is an impartial assessment of torture risk upon deportation return consisting of a 2-tier administrative process subject to judicial review. Legal assistance is means tested. The aims of the Hong Kong system are to provide a fair and sustainable system of protection and assistance for those genuinely in need and promptly remove those without a substantiated claim. Their objective is to prevent Hong Kong from becoming a magnet for economic migrants and unduly burden the community, given its porous borders.

For those awaiting claims, there are none in detainment except for criminal offences, and no requirement to work. There are generous in-kind, housing, food, clothing, medical, and practical support for asylum claimants, as well as a spectrum of assessment, case management and counselling services delivered by ISS (International Social Service) through generous and comprehensive ongoing funding support from the Government of Hong Kong SAR.

Direct links between RASNZ and ISS Hong Kong have been established for collaborative exchange of resources, expertise and experience as a result of the Forum.

### Peoples Republic of China

The PRC had several official observers present at the Roundtable. Their purpose appeared to be possibly to listen and passively observe or monitor what the officials and civil society reps from Hong Kong had to say. The PRC did not present anything about its asylum policies or practices, which is possibly not surprising, given that China is frequently itself a source country of asylum claimants around the world.

## Japan

The Japan delegation was headed Kaji Taguchi of the Refugee and Immigration Bureau of the Ministry of Justice and included a number of government officials and some politicians. Civil society was well represented by the lawyers network, and Soo Jin Hyung of the Japan Association for Refugees.

Japan has taken a high-tech approach to border control and requires mandatory digital photography and electronic fingerprinting immediately upon arrival at the border for all entrants including visitors or migrants.

Japan had 1,599 asylum claims in 2008 and 1,388 in 2009. The major source countries are Myanmar Burma (40%), Sri Lanka (17%), with the remaining Turkey, India, Pakistan and others.

There were only 57 asylum seekers granted convention refugee status in 2008, but 360 granted visas on the basis of humanitarian grounds. There were 72 persons permitted 'provisional stay in 2009.

There were 476 persons in 2009 for whom deportation orders were executed. Persons who applied for refugee status more than 6 months after landing in Japan were apparently less successful. Deportation procedures are performed under physical detention, and no exception is allowed for applicants related to recognition of refugee status.

Most notably, Japan has in very recent times, set in motion the process of accepting a very small number (30) quota refugees from Myanmar Burma. A delegation visited RASNZ and other agencies at the MRRC in 2008 in observing New Zealand's policies and long practices in quota refugee resettlement. Civil society reps suggested that the government had taken virtually full control of this process, there was much fanfare and PR around it, and that there was quite a bit of what is known as 'cherry picking' regarding the quota composition selection process of the Burmese accepted. Nevertheless, Japan is clearly inching forward at its own evolutionary pace and in response to changing conditions.

It would be fair to say that there was quite a bit of disparity between the perspectives of those from government and civil society. Off the record, there was the impression given that asylum seekers and irregular intending migrants are treated rather harshly and not particularly welcomed. Arrivals from Africa were reported to be particularly discriminated against in comparison to those from Asia or other areas. Representatives of civil society more or less presented a portrait of a very wealthy and somewhat xenophobic society taking tentative steps toward a more humanitarian approach in relation to migration issues generally and refugee and asylum matters particularly.

## **Best Practice and Other Countries**

Reports from NGO's such as the International Detention Coalition and Amnesty International suggest that the asylum situation in the USA and human rights generally have improved considerably under the first year of the Obama administration following major setbacks under eight years of the Bush regime. At the same time, some innovative leading edge pilot programmes such as the Vera Institute of Justice Project supported by the Soros Foundation had been initiated. Canada continues to offer outstanding examples of innovative and enlightened humanitarian public policy and practices in relation to asylum, refugees and multiculturalism, with a range of initiatives in the provinces.

Leading best practice examples of AVR and other alternative initiatives were reported particularly from Belgium and Sweden. Sweden particularly was noted for receiving, maintaining, managing and integrating large numbers of asylum seekers in humanitarian practices without detaining them. Sweden has been seen as a leader in asylum practice and in alternatives to detention which have resulted in positive outcomes.

## **New Initiatives in Promising, Practical Alternatives to Detention**

### **Assisted Voluntary Return (AVR)**

One of the most promising and practical alternatives presented at the Forum was an initiative in some pilot project countries called Assisted Voluntary Return (AVR). AVR aims at orderly, humane and cost-effective return of unauthorised entry migrants who are unable to remain in a host country who wish to voluntarily return to their countries of origin.

Case management, pre-departure, transportation and some post-arrival assistance is provided to unsuccessful asylum seekers, irregular migrants, overstayers, or other persons in similar circumstances. The assistance typically provides information, referral, arrangement of travel to the home country and limited support towards reinsertion. AVR assistance may also include targeting particular groups, information and counselling to potential voluntary returnees, medical assistance, reception, and longer term preparation for reintegration in countries of origin. AVR programmes are particularly effective in situations where the voluntary return option is part of a multi-pronged approach to migration management.

Politicians and government officials in pilot countries are reported to particularly favour AVR because of its reported effectiveness and reductions to cost. Human rights advocates are reported to favour AVR because it avoids the traumatic experiences for all concerned associated with forced deportation, and the risks of unprepared return.

The writer intends to discuss with RCNZ and government the possible prospects for a small AVR pilot in New Zealand. An expert on AVR, June Lee with IOM has indicated a willingness to travel to New Zealand to transfer knowledge and to assist in the design of any possible initiatives.

## **Summative Observations**

The human rights community generally views detention as an impediment to the right to seek asylum. Many also object to jailing asylum seekers on the simple humanitarian grounds that many asylum seekers are survivors of torture and other trauma, for whom detention – particularly in harsh correctional facilities designed for and populated by criminals – is particularly oppressive.

This is the fourth UN forum the writer has participated in. It was worthwhile not only because of the exchanges which took place, but because of the practical information, ideas and actions which may result beyond the dialogue.

### **Key findings reported:**

(Acknowledgment and thanks to Robyn Sampson, La Trobe University)

**Asylum Seekers and Irregular Migrants are better able to comply with requirements if they can meet their basic needs while in the community. Good case management is also most surely essential.**

**Asylum Seekers and Irregular Migrants very rarely abscond while awaiting the outcome of a status claim or visa application while in the destination country if they are humanely treated and provided with basic living assistance, and case management support.**

**Detention should be the last resort in line with international best practice standards**

**Asylum Seekers and Irregular Migrants are more likely to accept and comply with a negative refugee status decision outcome if they believe:**

- ✓ **They have been through a fair status determination process**
- ✓ **They have been informed, supported and properly case managed through the process**
- ✓ **They have explored all options to legally remain**
- ✓ **They are prepared and assisted for voluntary return to their country of origin**

**Ongoing dialogue and exchange, particularly between RASNZ and counterparts in Hong Kong and Japan, will continue and advance further over the next two years with sharing of mutual skills, knowledge and experiences. The writer also intends to explore the feasibility of possibly trialling a small pilot AVR project through discussions with Government and in collaboration with IOM.**

**Enclosed via separate PDF are the Detention Standards Brief from the International Detention Coalition. These standards provide a concise checklist against which policy and monitoring may be based and tested.**

**The writer wishes to thank UNHCR and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Korea for the invitation and opportunity to participate.**

**G.E. Poole  
Auckland  
May, 2010**

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.  
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.  
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.