

International Courts & Tribunals Interest Group Newsletter

Introductory Note

ICTIG is hard at work planning events for the next few months. These include a two-day virtual conference, scheduled for December 16-17, called "International Law Without International Courts." The conference will address, on a practical and theoretical level, the positive contributions that international courts and tribunals make to the development of international law, but also the ways that international law develops and could develop further in their absence. We hope that you will join us for this exciting event. More information will be distributed and made available from the [ICTIG webpage](#) closer to the event.

ICTIG is also planning its annual works-in-progress event for this winter. Stay tuned for the call for papers for that event.

We hope you enjoy this edition of the quarterly ICTIG newsletter. The newsletter provides a great forum for short summaries of recent cases and other legal developments, as well as for publicizing conferences, recent publications, and professional news. Please use this letter as a resource and consider making a submission for our next newsletter.

-David Bigge & Freya Baetens, Co-Chairs

Developments at International Courts & Tribunals

Kosovo Specialist Chambers Begins Trial Against Salih Mustafa

The Kosovo Specialist Chambers began its first-ever trial, against Salih Mustafa, on September 15. The defendant, a former unit commander for the Kosovo Liberation Army in the late 1990s, is charged with four counts of war crimes for alleged arbitrary detention, cruel treatment, torture, and murder, which allegedly occurred in Kosovo in April 1999. The Kosovo Specialist Chambers and its prosecutorial unit, the Special Prosecutor's Office, were established in 2015 to prosecute crimes against humanity, war crimes, and other crimes under Kosovo law committed in Kosovo and its surrounding areas during the Kosovo War at the turn of the century.

Judge Fatimata Sanou Touré Appointed to IRMCT

On August 13, the Secretary-General of the United Nations appointed Judge Fatimata Sanou Touré of Burkina Faso to the roster of the Judges of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals (IRMCT). Judge Touré is a senior member of the national judiciary in Burkina Faso and has served as the Chamber President at the Court of Ouagadougou since October 2015. The IRMCT maintains a roster of 25 independent judges. Judge Touré will succeed Judge Gberdao Gustave Kam, who

—continued on page 2

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

Developments at International Courts & Tribunals

1

New Publications

2

Notable Judgments & Decisions

2

Opportunities

8

.....

International Courts & Tribunals Interest Group

CO-CHAIRS

David Bigge
Freya Baetens

EDITORS

Sara Ochs
Lisa Reinsberg

Views contained in this publication are those of the authors in their personal capacity. The American Society of International Law and this Interest Group do not generally take positions on substantive issues, including those addressed in this periodical.



Developments at International Courts & Tribunals —continued from page 1

passed away in February 2021, and will serve the remainder of Judge Kam's term, which runs until June 30, 2022.

Special Tribunal for Lebanon Limits Proceedings Amid Funding Shortfall

Despite undergoing a significant budgetary crisis, the Special Tribunal for Lebanon (STL) has scheduled an appeals hearing to take place from October 4-8 in the case of *Prosecutor v. Merhi and Oneissi*. In June, following a report from the STL registrar that exhaustion of the Tribunal's available funds was "imminent," the STL's Trial Chamber II cancelled the commencement of a second trial. The precise future of the STL remains unclear, with certain scholars deeming the Tribunal to be functioning on "life support."

ITLOS Celebrates 25th Anniversary

As the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea began resuming in-person activities, it held a small ceremony to commemorate the Tribunal's twenty-fifth anniversary on October 1. The in-person ceremony, which was held at its seat in Hamburg, Germany, coincided with the online release of a short film and an updated version of the Tribunal's *Digest of Jurisprudence*. ITLOS President Albert Hoffmann described plans for the anniversary, as well as other developments, in the Tribunal's September newsletter. ■

New Publications

Books

We are proud to share that ICTIG members have recently published the following books:

- John D. Ciorciari, *Sovereignty Sharing in Fragile States* (Stanford University Press 2021)
- G. Matteo Vaccaro-Incisa, *China's Treaty Policy and Practice in International Investment Law and Arbitration: A Comparative and Analytical Study* (Brill 2021).

Articles, Essays, & Book Reviews

ICTIG members have recently published articles and essays including the following:

- Sara L. Ochs, *Propaganda Warfare on the International Criminal Court*, 42 Mich. J. Int'l L. 581 (2021).

Notable Judgments & Decisions

ECOWAS Court of Justice Holds Nigeria Responsible for Failure to Investigate Service-woman's Rape

Lisa Reinsberg, International Justice Resource Center

In a judgment adopted on April 30 and published online in August, the Community Court of Justice of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) held that Nigeria had violated its human rights obligations in connection with the 2011 rape of a Nigerian Air Force (NAF) member. *Aircraftwoman Beauty Igbozie Uzezi v. Nigeria* is among the Court's most significant judgments on gender-based violence to date. The Court concluded Nigeria had violated the applicant's rights to dignity, health, liberty, and work in view of a superior officer's assault of the applicant, the consequences on her physical and mental health, her arbitrary detention by superior officers, and her unlawful oral dismissal from the NAF in 2015.

—continued on page 3



Notable Judgments & Decisions —continued from page 2

With reference to international jurisprudence, the ECOWAS Court confirmed that rape may constitute torture. The Court also concluded that rape may violate an individual's right to dignity. Based on the applicant's medical records, the Court determined she had been raped, but in the absence of eyewitness testimony or a "matching semen sample," the Court stated it could not conclude that the alleged perpetrator was the person responsible.

Nonetheless, the Court recognized the State's due diligence obligations to prevent sexual violence and its international responsibility for the actions of its agents, concluding that Nigeria violated the applicant's dignity through its failure to investigate despite the assault being documented by NAF hospitals. Separately, on the basis of the location of the rape, the Court concluded that it could "only be perpetrated by a NAF official," meaning the State was also directly responsible for violating the applicant's right to respect for her dignity.

While the applicant alleged other officers repeatedly beat her to intimidate her, the Court found her evidence lacking; it did not discuss whether the State had an obligation to investigate, or whether the applicant had reported the beatings. However, the Court concluded Nigeria had violated the applicant's right to liberty because the State did not deny she had been detained on base by superior officers, yet failed to prove any lawful justification. The Court awarded the applicant \$200,000 in damages.

Inter-American Court Issues Advisory Opinion on Trade Union Rights

Lucía Solano, Legal Adviser, Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations in New York

On May 5, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights issued an Advisory Opinion on the rights to freedom to organize, collective bargaining, and strike, and their relation to other rights, with a gender perspective, as per a request from the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. The Court highlighted that: 1) trade union freedoms must be guaranteed for public and private employees; 2) such freedoms include the right to form and join the organizations considered suitable, the right to adequate workplace protection from all direct or indirect coercion aimed at undermining the exercise of trade union freedom, and the

right to conduct trade union activities; 3) the right of collective bargaining constitutes an essential component of trade union freedom; 4) the right to strike is one of the fundamental rights of workers; 5) protection of trade union freedom plays an important social role in maintaining and improving the working conditions and lives of workers, and therefore, makes the realization of other human rights possible; 6) there is no question that conduct that could be considered discriminatory with regard to women's exercise of their trade union rights is expressly prohibited and States should move toward true equality between men and women in the exercise of trade union rights; and 7) States should adopt legislative and other measures that center human beings—not principally or exclusively markets—and that address the challenges and opportunities arising from the digital transformation of work, including work on digital platforms. The full text of the Advisory Opinion can be found [here](#) and the official summary [here](#) (in Spanish).

Inter-American Court Advises States That Unlimited Reelection Terms Contradict Convention

Lucía Solano, Legal Adviser, Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations in New York

On June 7, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights issued an advisory opinion in response to a question submitted by Colombia on unlimited presidential reelection in the context of the Inter-American human rights system. The Court found that: 1) the principles of representative democracy include the obligation to prevent a person from remaining in power and to guarantee rotation and the separation of powers; 2) unlimited presidential reelection is not an autonomous human right; 3) the ban on this practice is both justified and supported by the rule of law; and 4) a lack of limits on presidential reelection weakens opposition parties and political movements and impacts the independence and separation of powers. Unlimited reelections were judged, thus, as violations to the principles of a representative democracy, and therefore, to the obligations established in the American Convention on Human Rights and the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The full text of the Advisory Opinion can be found [here](#) and the official summary [here](#) (both only in Spanish).

—continued on page 4

Notable Judgments & Decisions —continued from page 3

IRMCT Convicts Jovica Stanišić and Franko Simatović

Sara L. Ochs, University of Louisville Brandeis School of Law

On June 30, the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals' (IRMCT) Trial Chamber issued a **judgment** convicting Jovica Stanišić and Franko Simatović of aiding and abetting the crime of murder as a war crime and crime against humanity, and the crimes of deportation, forcible transfer, and persecution as crimes against humanity. The Trial Chamber sentenced both defendants to 12 years' imprisonment.

Mr. Stanišić served as the Chief of the State Security Service of the Serbian Ministry of Interior, and Mr. Simatović served as a senior intelligence officer for the State Security Service during the war in Bosnia in the 1990s. The Trial Chamber concluded that Stanišić and Simatović participated in a joint criminal enterprise (JCE) with the objective of forcibly and permanently removing non-Serbs from large areas of Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina between April 1991 and December 1995.

Both defendants were indicted in 2003 and then initially tried before the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) Trial Chamber I between 2009 and 2013. The Trial Chamber acquitted both defendants on all counts due to the prosecution's failure to provide sufficient evidence of intent to further a criminal purpose of a JCE. In December 2015, the ICTY Appeals Chamber quashed the acquittals, finding that the Trial Chamber misapplied the law relevant to JCE liability, and ordered that the defendants be retried on all counts. The defendants were then tried before the IRMCT between 2017 and January 2021.

The case against Stanišić and Simatović is the longest running Yugoslavian war crimes trial before the UN. The defense teams for both **Stanišić** and **Simatović** filed their notice of appeal of the judgment on September 6.

ICC Pre-Trial Chamber confirms charges against Abd-Al-Rahman 'Ali Kushayb'

Sara L. Ochs, University of Louisville Brandeis School of Law

Following the defendant's initial appearance before the ICC, on July 9, the ICC's Pre-Trial Chamber II issued a decision unanimously confirming all charges brought by the Prosecutor against Ali Muhammad Ali Abd-Al-Rahman (also known as "Ali Kushayb"). The Pre-Trial Chamber specifically determined that there exist substantial grounds to believe that the defendant is responsible for 31 counts of war crimes and crimes against humanity allegedly committed in Darfur, Sudan.

The Prosecutor alleges that between August 2003 and April 2004, Mr. Abd-Al-Rahman served as a senior leader of the Militia/Janjaweed in the Wadi Salih and Mukjar Localities of Darfur. The confirmed charges allege that during this time, Mr. Abd-Al-Rahman engaged in various crimes including intentionally directing attacks against the civilian population as a war crime; murder as a crime against humanity and as a war crime; rape as a crime against humanity and as a war crime; and persecution as a crime against humanity, among others.

The ICC's Trial Chamber I has scheduled the opening of the trial against Mr. Abd-Al-Rahman to begin on April 5, 2022.

African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights Issues Advisory Opinion on Right to Vote in a Pandemic

Massimo Lando, Assistant Professor, City University of Hong Kong

On July 16, the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights gave an **advisory opinion** concerning voting rights in elections held during a public health emergency, such as the COVID-19 pandemic. The opinion was requested by the Pan African Lawyers Union, an organization based in Tanzania. The opinion stemmed from measures implemented by African States during the COVID-19 pandemic, including limitations on freedoms of movement and assembly, which were argued to constrain the running of democratic elections.

—continued on page 5



Notable Judgments & Decisions —continued from page 4

As it found that it had jurisdiction to give the opinion requested and that the request was admissible, the Court addressed the merits of the request. First, the Court found that States were free to decide whether to hold elections in a pandemic, in consultation with other political actors and representatives of civil society. Second, the Court found that States that decide to hold elections during a pandemic must implement measures to ensure that individual voting rights are not exercised to the detriment of collective security, morality and common interest; such measures must be passed by legislation, be proportionate and not undermine other essential rights. Third, the Court set out some specific criteria for States postponing elections: “postponement must be made in application of a general law, must aim at the legitimate purpose, be proportionate to the intended purpose and must not undermine the essential content of rights.”

This advisory opinion seems notable for its support for the right of political participation even in the face of the issues caused by the COVID-19 global pandemic that has constrained living conditions for nearly two years. Apparently, the Court was concerned with the possibility that the pandemic could become a “precedent” based on which future elections may be called off because of purported public health emergencies. The Court’s opinion should counsel States against taking advantage of such future opportunities.

CJEU Holds Energy Charter Treaty’s Investor-State Arbitration Clause Cannot Apply to Intra-EU Investment Disputes

Lisa Reinsberg, International Justice Resource Center

On September 2, the Grand Chamber of the Court of Justice of the European Union issued its judgment in *Republic of Moldova v. Komstroy LLC*. The decision is notable for its conclusion that the arbitration provision in Article 26 of the Energy Charter Treaty (ECT) is not applicable to disputes between an European Union Member State and an investor of another EU Member State. While this case did not involve an intra-EU dispute, the CJEU decided the issue of the ECT’s applicability in order to identify which disputes may be submitted to arbitration under the ECT. The CJEU determined that the ECT is an “act of EU law” because the EU is a party to the treaty and, as such, uniform interpretation of the ECT is “clearly in the interest of the European Union.”

Building on its 2018 decision in *Slovak Republic v. Achmea B.V.*, the Court emphasized the importance of clarity and consistency in EU law and found it inappropriate that ECT tribunals, as non-EU bodies, could be authorized to interpret and apply EU law without their decisions being reviewed by the court of an EU Member State or with the benefit of a preliminary ruling from the CJEU. Because “the exercise of the European Union’s competence in international matters cannot extend to permitting, in an international agreement, a provision according to which a dispute between an investor of one Member State and another Member State concerning EU law may be removed from the judicial system of the European Union such that the full effectiveness of that law is not guaranteed,” the CJEU concluded that the ECT’s arbitration provision “must be interpreted as not being applicable to disputes between a Member State and an investor of another Member State concerning an investment made by the latter in the first Member State.”

ICC Pre-Trial Chamber Grants Prosecutor’s Request to Open Investigation into the Philippines

Stuart Ford, University of Illinois Chicago School of Law

On September 14, Pre-Trial Chamber I of the International Criminal Court (ICC) granted the Prosecutor’s request to open an investigation into potential violations of international criminal law committed in the Philippines as part of that country’s “war on drugs.” As part of its request, the Office of the Prosecutor presented evidence that between 12,000 and 30,000 civilians had been killed either by official security forces or by so-called “vigilantes” operating in conjunction with the official security forces. While the Philippine government has argued that most of the deaths caused by security forces were the result of legitimate self-defense by security forces, the Prosecutor presented evidence that many of the deaths were not justified. The Prosecutor also presented evidence that many of the “vigilantes” responsible for killings were either themselves police officers or were private actors working in conjunction with and paid by the police. The Court also received information from more than 200 victims’ representatives, who represented more than 2,000 victims and their families.

—continued on page 6



Notable Judgments & Decisions —continued from page 5

After reviewing the evidence presented by the Prosecutor and the victims' representatives, the Pre-Trial Chamber concluded that there was a reasonable basis to believe that crimes within the ICC's jurisdiction had occurred in the Philippines between 2016 and 2019. While the Prosecutor's request focused largely on the crime of murder as a crime against humanity, the Court noted that both the Prosecutor and the victims' representatives described acts that could constitute other crimes against humanity, including inhumane treatment, torture, unlawful imprisonment, and enforced disappearances. Consequently, the Court gave the Prosecutor leave to investigate any violations of the Rome Statute, not just murder.

The ICC's Prosecutor will now open a formal investigation of the situation in the Philippines, which may lead to individuals being charged and tried for violations of international criminal law. The Philippines withdrew from the ICC effective March 2019, and while that prevents the court from investigating crimes committed after that date, it does not deprive the Court of jurisdiction over crimes committed while the Philippines was an ICC member.

ICSID Tribunal Reaffirms Jurisdiction over Investments in Outer Space

Laura Yvonne Zielinski, Holland & Knight (Mexico City)*

On September 15, the tribunal issued its award in the arbitration proceeding opposing Eutelsat S.A. and the Government of the United Mexican States (ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/17/2). The award remains confidential and the underlying facts as well as the tribunal's reasoning behind the decision to reject all of Eutelsat's claims on the merits cannot be discussed.

It is noteworthy, however, that this is the third time that an investment tribunal has upheld jurisdiction over an investment "in space" (the first two being: *CC/Devas (Mauritius) Ltd., Devas Employees Mauritius Private Limited and Telecom Devas Mauritius Limited v. India*, PCA Case No. 2013-09, and *Deutsche Telekom v. India*, PCA Case No. 2014-10).

The tribunal's jurisdiction *ratione materiae* was not in dispute between the parties but the tribunal nonetheless clarified that Eutelsat's right to occupy specific Mexican geostationary

orbital positions and to exploit their associated frequency bands fell within the definition of investment of the France-Mexico bilateral investment treaty. Like in *Devas v. India* and *Deutsche Telekom v. India*, it was irrelevant that the dispute was related to space activities, as in all three cases, the investments at issue were constituted of conventional property rights in the form of concession agreements and licenses.

While other aspects of space arbitration might require further discussion, the *Eutelsat* decision confirms that international space law, by providing states with the rights and obligations to assign frequencies and orbital positions and authorize launches of space objects from their territory, seems to offer the connection needed between an activity in space and a national territory on Earth that is required for international investment protections to apply.

**The author was part of the team having represented Eutelsat in the arbitration proceedings and therefore has access to the award.*

European Court of Human Rights Finds Russia Responsible for Litvinenko Assassination

Lisa Reinsberg, International Justice Resource Center

On September 21, the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) delivered its judgment in the case of *Carter v. Russia*, in which it found Russia internationally responsible for the 2006 polonium poisoning of Russian dissident Aleksandr Litvinenko in the United Kingdom. The application by Litvinenko's wife, Maria Anna Carter, alleged that Andrey Lugovoy and Dmitriy Kovtun fatally poisoned Litvinenko at the direction or with the acquiescence of Russian authorities, who also failed to conduct an effective investigation into his death.

Russia did not produce the files requested by the Court, prompting the ECtHR to find the State in violation of its obligations under Article 38 of the European Convention on Human Rights. Russia also unsuccessfully contested the admissibility of evidence from the UK's inquiry into the assassination, which had concluded that Lugovoy and Kovtun were responsible.

Russia challenged the ECtHR's jurisdiction *ratione loci*, arguing that the assassination had taken place outside Russian territory and without its involvement. With reference to

—continued on page 7



Notable Judgments & Decisions —continued from page 6

international standards including Article 8 of the Draft Articles on the Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts, the ECtHR disagreed, concluding that the case involved Russia's substantive and procedural obligations under Article 2 (right to life). Substantively, the Court specified that, if proven, the State's involvement in a targeted human rights violation via the "exercise of physical power and control over [Litvinenko's] life in a situation of proximate targeting" would give rise to the extraterritorial application of the Convention. Procedurally, the ECtHR concluded that Russia had created a jurisdictional link and incurred obligations when it initiated its own investigation and, separately, when it retained "exclusive jurisdiction" over the suspects it refused to extradite and to whom it granted immunity.

On the merits, the Court found Russia was responsible for Litvinenko's death, relying on the UK inquiry's findings, because the means and motives of the killing, along with Lugovoy and Kovtun's relationship with -- and treatment by -- the State supported the conclusion that the two men acted at the State's direction. Because Russia failed to carry out an effective investigation, it also violated the procedural limb of Article 2.

CJEU General Court Annuls Trade Agreements in Western Sahara for Lack of Local Consent

Chad Farrell

The Court of Justice of the European Union issued two judgments on September 29 annulling trade agreements between the EU and Morocco on the basis that they lacked the consent of the people of Western Sahara.

The two trade agreements at issue expanded the scope of existing agricultural and fisheries arrangements between the EU and Morocco to products originating in the territory of (or waters adjacent to) Western Sahara, a contested region administered by Morocco. The Front Polisario, a group advocating for the independence of Western Sahara from Morocco, filed applications with the Court in 2019, arguing that by approving the two agreements without the consent of the people of Western Sahara, the Council of the European Union infringed the EU's obligations under international and EU law.

The Court first determined that the Front Polisario had standing to bring the proceedings, holding that it had legal personality under international law and that it is recognized internationally as a representative of the people of Western Sahara in the process of self-determination of that territory. The Court held that effective judicial protection requires that the Front Polisario be regarded as having the capacity to bring an action to defend the right of the people of Western Sahara to self-determination. The Court further found that the Front Polisario had a legal interest in bringing proceedings, as the agreements at issue applied expressly to Western Sahara or the adjacent waters, concerned the people of that territory, and required the consent of its people.

On the merits, the Court recalled that in an earlier case (*Council v. Front Polisario*, Judgment of December 21, 2016) it had determined that the EU had an obligation to respect the separate and distinct status of Western Sahara and to secure the consent of its people in the event it implemented certain agreements between the EU and Morocco in that region. The Court found that the trade agreements at issue were not intended to confer rights on the people of Western Sahara, but to impose obligations on them, and that prior consent was therefore required. It found that in view of the legal definitions of "people" and "consent" in international law, the consultations conducted by EU institutions with the people of Western Sahara prior to concluding the agreements did not amount to an expression of consent. The Court thus annulled the agreements, but decided that the agreements would be terminated over a certain period of time to ensure that the EU respects its international commitments.

The judgments are *Front Polisario v. Council*, case no. T-279/19 and *Front Polisario v. Council*, joined cases T-344/19 and T-356/19.

African Court Again Finds Violations in Tanzania's Criminal Justice System

Lisa Reinsberg, International Justice Resource Center

In a judgment delivered on September 30, the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights (AfCHPR) reiterated its understanding that the mandatory imposition of the

—continued on page 8



Notable Judgments & Decisions —continued from page 7

death penalty for murder convictions violates the right to life under the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights. The Court's [summary of *Amini Juma v. Tanzania*](#) outlines the parties' arguments and the Court's conclusions; the full judgment should be available in the Court's [case database](#) soon.

With regard to admissibility, the Court emphasized that it retained personal jurisdiction because the application was presented before the entry into effect of Tanzania's withdrawal from the Court's jurisdiction over individual complaints. The Court rejected the State's four preliminary objections, including that the application should be dismissed for "insulting or disparaging language" (the applicant stated that "the Justices of the Court of Appeal failed to inject common sense"). The Court held that the applicant's 4.5-year delay in presenting his claim before the

AfCHPR was "reasonable" given his lack of representation, incarceration, limited movement, and "limited access to information."

On the merits, the Court held that the five-year delay between the applicant's detention on remand and his conviction violated his right to be tried within a reasonable time. While the Court found the applicant's other due process allegations to be unconvincing, it did confirm that the mandatory imposition of the death penalty violates the right to life. The AfCHPR also held that hanging, as a method of execution, violates the prohibition on torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment. Based on the summary, it appears that the Court did not consider the mandatory imposition of the death penalty to be a due process violation, in contrast with its prior [conclusion in *Ally Rajabu and Others v. Tanzania*](#). ■

Opportunities

Awards, Grants & Prizes

ASIL WILIG Prominent Women in International Law Award

The Women in International Law Interest Group (WILIG) invites nominations for the Prominent Woman in International Law Award. The award honors those who have advanced women, gender, and women's rights in international law. The deadline is October 15, and additional details along with the submission form can be accessed [here](#).

SIEL-Hart Prize in International Economic Law

The SIEL-Hart Prize is awarded every two years to an outstanding unpublished manuscript by an early career scholar in the field of International Economic Law and is sponsored by the Society of International Economic Law and Hart Publishing. The manuscript can be a doctoral thesis or an original, book-length piece of scholarship and can focus on any field of, or perspective on, International Economic Law. The winner of the SIEL-Hart Prize will receive a contract for publication within the Hart series Studies in International Trade and Investment Law; a £250 Hart book voucher; a SIEL bursary of up to £750 to cover travel and accommodation expenses to, and waiver of the

registration fee for, the next SIEL Global Conference. Entries for the 2022 edition of the Prize will be accepted through December 1. Additional information can be found in the [call for papers](#).

2022 Lieber Society Lieber Writing Prize

The American Society of International Law's Lieber Society on the Law of Armed Conflict awards the Lieber Prize to the authors of publications that the judges consider to be outstanding in the field of law and armed conflict. Both monographs and articles (including chapters in books of essays) are eligible for consideration — the prize is awarded to the best submission in each of these two categories. Submissions, including a letter or message of nomination, must be received by January 7, 2022. Further instructions are included in the [call for papers](#).

Conferences, Webinars & Programs

International Criminal Law before Domestic Courts: October 14-16

The University of Vienna and the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute of Fundamental and Human Rights have orga-

—continued on page 9



Opportunities —continued from page 8

nized a hybrid conference on the topic of “International Criminal Law before Domestic Courts.” The conference will take place in Vienna and livestreamed on October 14 through 16. Register and see program details on the [conference webpage](#).

Nuremberg Forum: October 15-16

The International Nuremberg Principles Academy will host its annual Nuremberg Forum, virtually, on October 15 and 16. This year’s theme is “The Fight Against Impunity Since 1950: Living up to the Nuremberg Principles?” For additional details and to register, visit the [forum webpage](#).

International Law Weekend 2021: October 28-30

The American Branch of the International Law Association (ABILA) will host International Law Weekend (ILW) 2021 on October 28 to 30, virtually. This year’s theme is “Reinvesting in International Law.” For program information and to register, visit the [ILW 2021 site](#).

Implementation and Impact of the African Court on Human and Peoples’ Rights’ Decisions: November 1-3

The African Court on Human and Peoples’ Rights has announced an International Conference on the Implementation and Impact of the Court’s Decisions, to be held from November 1 to 3. Additional details are likely to be posted on the [AfCHPR website](#).

Conference on United Nations War Crimes Commission: November 19

Maynooth University Law Department and the Centre for International Studies and Diplomacy at the SOAS University of London will hold a joint online conference on the United Nations War Crimes Commission, which supported prosecution of international crimes committed during World War II. Further details, including registration information will be made available on the [Conference webpage](#).

Women’s Voices in the International Judiciary: December 6

The Graduate Institute of Geneva will host a public lecture in its series “Women’s Voices in the International Judiciary,” part of a larger project focused on diversity on the international bench. Additional information will be posted on the Graduate Institute of Geneva’s [website](#).

International Law Without International Courts: December 16-17

The International Courts and Tribunals Interest Group of the American Society of International Law will host a virtual conference on “International Law Without International Courts: Looking to History and Considering the Future,” on December 16 and 17. Registration details will be available from the [ICTIG webpage](#).

Calls for Papers

Cambridge International Law Journal

The Editorial Board of the Cambridge International Law Journal invites submissions for Volume 11 (issues to be published in June and December 2022). The deadline is October 24, and further information can be found in the [call for papers](#).

2022 Global Corporate Governance Colloquium

The Global Corporate Governance Colloquia (GCGC) is a global initiative to bring together research in law, economics, and finance relating to corporate governance at a yearly conference held at 12 universities in the Americas, Asia and Europe. The eighth annual GCGC Conference will be hosted by University of Oxford on June 3-4, 2022. The Conference Committee is inviting researchers to submit recent papers, or extended abstracts on corporate governance. The deadline for submissions is October 29, and further instructions are included in the [call for papers](#).

Conference on Transnational Dispute Resolution in an Increasingly Digitized World

The call for abstracts for the “Transnational Dispute Resolution in an Increasingly Digitalized World” conference is now open through December 1. This online conference will be hosted by the Center for the Future of Dispute Resolution at Ghent University on March 24, 2022. See the [call for abstracts](#) for additional details.

Intergovernmental Organisations In-House Counsel Journal

The Association of Lawyers in Intergovernmental Finance and Development Organisations (ALIFDO) is accepting original submissions for the *Intergovernmental Organisations In-House Counsel Journal*. Abstracts are due by January 30, 2022, with accepted articles due by May 30. Articles may

—continued on page 10



Opportunities —continued from page 9

address any topic relevant to the work of organizations where ALIFDO has members, including the Asian Development Bank, World Bank, and International Monetary Fund, among others. See the [call for submissions](#) for additional details.

Job Postings & Other Opportunities

Legal Officer (P3), International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals

The International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals seeks a legal officer (P3) to be based in the Hague. See the [posting](#) for details and to apply. The application deadline is October 9.

Lawyer (Iceland), European Court of Human Rights

The Registry of the European Court of Human Rights seeks a lawyer qualified in Iceland. See the [posting](#) for additional details. The deadline for applications is October 11.

Associate Legal Officer (P2), UN Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea

The United Nations Office of Legal Affairs is accepting applications for an associate legal officer position within the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, to be based in New York. See the [posting](#) for details and to apply. The application deadline is October 13.

Associate Legal Officer (P2), International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals

The Office of the Registrar of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals is seeking an Associate Legal Officer, to be based in Arusha. See the [posting](#) for details and to apply. The application deadline is October 19.

Legal Officer (P3), International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals

The Office of the Registrar of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals seeks applicants for a Legal Officer based in Arusha. See the [posting](#) for details and to apply. The application deadline is October 20.

We invite submissions to the newsletter on an ongoing basis, and encourage members to contribute case summaries, news items, publications, relevant announcements and opportunities, and their own professional news for inclusion in the next issue. For summaries and news items, please limit submissions to 300 words or fewer and indicate how you would like to be credited. All submissions may be sent via email with the subject "ICTIG newsletter submission" to Sara Ochs (sara.ochs@louisville.edu) and Lisa Reinsberg (lisa@ijrcenter.org).

Associate Legal Officer (P2), International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals

The Office of the Registrar, Judicial Records Unit, seeks applicants for a Legal Officer based in Arusha. See the [posting](#) for details and to apply. The application deadline is October 28.

Fellowship, Berlin Potsdam Research Group

The Berlin Potsdam Research Group "The International Rule of Law - Rise or Decline?" seeks applicants for a fellowship to begin on or after January 1, 2022. The position is for 12 months and may be extended up to an additional year. Applicants should hold a doctorate in international law, international relations, or political philosophy and propose projects related to the Group's research. Applicants are not expected to speak German and applicants from outside Europe are particularly encouraged to apply. See the [posting](#) for additional details. The application deadline is October 29.

Lawyers, Court of Justice of the European Union

The Court of Justice of the European Union seeks lawyers to join its roster for periodic, temporary openings within the Research and Documentation service. The Court seeks lawyers familiar with the laws and languages of its various Member States. See the [vacancies](#) page for details. Applications are accepted on a rolling basis and will be retained for 12 months. ■