Submission from the Norwegian NGO-Forum for Human Rights regarding the Universal Periodic review of Norway, scheduled for December 2009

The Norwegian NGO-Forum for Human Rights welcomes the opportunity to submit these views on behalf of the following organisations (in alphabetical order):

Antirasistisk Senter
FIAN Norway
Human Rights House Foundation
International Commission of Jurists Norway
Norwegian Bar Association, Human Rights Committee
Norwegian Helsinki Committee
Norwegian Organisation for Asylum Seekers
Norwegian Peoples Aid
Norwegian Psychological Association
Norwegian Refugee Council
Norwegian Tibet Committee
Norwegian Youth Council
Save the Children Norway

Submitted to the
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
uprsubmissions@ohchr.org , 20 April 2009.

Some of our organisations have taken part in an information meeting on UPR hosted by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. We are ready to participate in a national consultation process, both in preparation for the report of Norway and especially in the follow-up phase. We have co-ordinated our preparations of this report with other Norwegian NGOs as well as with the Norwegian Centre for Human Rights.

This document reflects some recent activities and concerns of our organisations within the framework of maximum 10 pages, and is not exhaustive of human rights issues in Norway deserving attention.

I. Background and Framework

A. Scope of international obligations

Ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture

Norway has not yet ratified the Optional Protocol that it signed 23 September 2003. According to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the ratification process is ongoing. We recommend that Norway ratify the OPCAT as soon as possible. The setting up of a national preventive mechanism as required by OPCAT is the crucial new element. That body must act with independence, integrity, a public profile, and according to a mandate that gives room for taking effective and appropriate action to address protection issues within all areas the body deems relevant under the Convention. We recommend that to ensure the independence, integrity and credibility of the body to be established, both the process of its design, and the method of appointment of its members, should be open to non-state actors, including Human Rights organisations and other stakeholders.

Signature and Ratification of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

The ICESCR-OP was adopted by consensus in the UN General Assembly on December 10th 2008. The protocol establishes an international complaints procedure for violations of economic, social and cultural rights as established by the ICESCR. Norway's position on the OP changed drastically during the drafting period. In 2008 the government took a surprising turn, abandoning its previous support of a comprehensive OP. Currently the government expresses reluctance to sign the OP. Still, we strongly recommend that Norway sign and ratify the Optional Protocol as soon as possible, and in any event explain the change of position.

Ratification of the UN Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights and Dignity of persons with Disabilities

The UN General Assembly adopted the convention in December 2006. Norway has been actively involved in the process leading up to this important convention, covering the rights of persons with psychological as well as physical disabilities, including the right of non-discrimination. Norway signed the Convention in March 2008, promising that ratification would follow soon. We are aware that the work is ongoing, and that certain measures need to be in place before ratification. Based on the importance of this convention, Norway's contribution to the process as well as political promises, we strongly recommend that the convention be ratified as soon as possible.

B. Constitutional and legislative Framework

Incorporation of CEDAW and CERD through the Human Rights Act

The Human Rights Act of 1999 incorporates the European Convention of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and these treaties statutory precedence over other Norwegian legislation. The Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and the Convention on the Elimination on all forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD) are also incorporated, but unlike

the conventions mentioned in the Human Rights Act with a formal status not higher than other legislation. As long as the CEDAW and the CERD are not included in the Human Rights Act Norway could be believed to attach less importance to these two core conventions than to other human rights instruments. We recommend that these conventions be included in the Human Rights Act as soon as possible. An initiative might be on the way with regard to CEDAW, which would leave CERD as the only core international human rights instrument not included in the Human Rights Act. The government has not given reasons to the public why this should be Norwegian policy, although it is a most likely outcome at the time of writing, which will be most unfortunate.

C. Institutional and human rights structure

Comprehensive long-term National Plan of Action

The 1993 World Conference on Human Rights recommended that all governments produce a national plan for the implementation of their human rights obligations. Norway produced a comprehensive Plan of Action for Human Rights (Stortingsmelding 21), specifying action to be taken until 2005, but did not make it a permanent element of its human rights framework, as new plans were not enacted once that period had expired. The promotion and protection of human rights requires systematic, co-ordinated and continuous work and we recommend that Norway adopt a long-term comprehensive Plan of Action for Human Rights with a five years cycle. The planning process should be guided by a transparent, inclusive and participatory approach and the plan should be based on baseline studies. Evaluations should provide the foundation for new cycles of the process. We are convinced that a Plan of Action for Human Rights would contribute positively to shared ownership, cooperation, effectiveness and transparency in the joint efforts to promote and protect human rights in Norway.

Policy co-ordination to provide system-wide impetus for human rights implementation

Norway subscribes to the principle of mainstreaming in the implementation of human rights. It is certainly true that the implementation of human rights must involve many different sectors and needs to be taken into account in the policies of many ministries, other state bodies, as well as counties and municipalities in Norway, which is the rationale behind mainstreaming. However, for all these state actors, agencies and levels to effectively protect, promote and respect human rights, they need to be reminded of their obligations and prompted to take action, and their efforts needs to be coordinated. These functions are at best taken care of in a fragmented manner within the present set-up, as neither the Government nor the Parliament structures have one body that gives attention to these matters on an overall basis, which particularly gives cause for concern due to the fact that the expired National Plan of Action for Human Rights has not been replaced by similar policy guidance and co-ordination instruments.

We recommend that Norway establish a strong national high-level structure to act as an overall focal point with a mandate and capacity to provide leadership in the implementation of human rights obligations, and to provide comprehensive, system-wide policy co-ordination and impetus. If Norway again develops a Plan of Action for Human Rights, such a structure should play a key role to ensure the implementation of the plan.

D. Policy measures

Effective follow-up of the recommendations of international monitoring mechanisms

The National Plan of Action on human rights of 1999 presupposed effective follow-up of the

recommendations from international monitoring mechanisms as one of the most important measures to strengthen human rights in Norway. However, a proper system for this is still not in place. Presently, new recommendations from UN human rights treaty bodies are discussed at meetings between different ministries and representatives from civil society. These meetings do not produce decisions and it is not clear how they relate to other possible governmental action. In addition, recommendations are disseminated without sufficient guidelines that could enable follow-up by the various authorities.

For the effective follow-up of recommendations we recommend that Norway establish procedures to ensure systematic identification of the nature and specific content of each recommendation and the creation of strategies to fulfil them. The strategies and concrete objectives should be made in the form of written official statements; furthermore, they should be based on a broad and consultative process including governmental bodies at national, regional and local levels and stakeholders from civil society. The management of such processes should be one of the key roles of a high-level structure for human rights co-ordination.

II. Promotion and protection of human rights on the ground

A. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

Requests for interim measures from UN bodies

A recurring issue in the legal-political debate in Norway is which formal weight recommendations and requests from UN bodies, acting in individual cases, should be given in domestic law. A prominent example is provided by the so-called Dar case, in which the UNCAT requested interim measures preventing the *refoulement* of a Pakistani citizen until the Committee had considered his case. Norway requested a separate admission decision, and then deported Mr. Dar to Pakistan without awaiting that decision. In its subsequent decision on whether the deportation violated international law, the Norwegian Supreme Court stated in an *obiter dictum* that CAT was not incorporated in national law and that no customary international rule existed to support the existence of a legal requirement to adhere to such requests. We recommend that Norway introduce legislative changes to bring domestic law in line with international requirements, similar to statutory regulations of the subject in Sweden.

B. Implementation of international human rights obligations

1. Non-discrimination and equality

Racism

Norway has taken a number of important steps to improve the legal framework against racism and racial discrimination and its implementation. Some steps towards better monitoring have been taken. However, causes of concern include that for young people of immigrant background there is an unemployment rate twice that of their age group total, as well as a disproportionately high drop-out rate from secondary education. The rate of homelessness is six times higher among persons of immigrant background than in the population as a whole.[1] Racial discrimination is reported to be a central cause of these differences. However, its exact role remains to be more clearly established and monitored. We recommend to generate data on actual manifestations of racial discrimination and on the position of minority groups in practical life, that could help identify patterns of direct and indirect racial discrimination, to

take measures to improve the participation of persons of immigrant background, especially young people, in the labour market; and to undertake a comprehensive set of measures to tackle racial discrimination in the field of housing.

2. Right to life, liberty and security of the person

Juvenile justice

According to a 2008 survey conducted by the Human Rights Committee of the Norwegian Bar Association, the treatment of juvenile prisoners is an issue of major concern. Some juveniles are placed hundreds of kilometres away from their families, and some are placed in a cell 23 hours a day for weeks as well as sharing a cell with an adult. In general, there is a large information deficit regarding juvenile prisoners. Norway has made a reservation to ICCPR art 10, para 2 (b) and para 3 with regard to separation of juvenile and adult offenders. In regard to the CRC, the Government has argued that the number of juvenile prisoners is so small that it is in the child's best interest not to be separated from adult inmates. However, the report from the Bar Association demonstrates that Norwegian practice is not in the best interest of the child. The Ombudsman for children has also expressed serious concern about the treatment of juvenile prisoners. We recommend that Norway increases efforts to secure the human rights of juveniles in detention and as a minimum ensure minors separate prison cells and regular contact with their family.

Pre-trial detention

According to Norwegian regulations, persons held on remand shall have regular prison accommodation available within 48 hours of being apprehended. Prior to this, such persons are held in isolation in police cells. Practicing lawyers regularly report of violations of this rule. In 2007, the UNCAT recommended that detailed statistics be compiled regarding the length of pre-trial detention in police cells within one year. Without such statistics it is not clear how shortcomings can be discovered and then addressed by responsible authorities. We recommend that the Government produce statistics on the use of pre trial detention in police cells, and that routines for monitoring and upholding the 48-hour rule are improved.

Mentally ill in prisons

The European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) has expressed concern, both in 1993 and 2005, regarding detention of mentally ill individuals serving penal sentences in Norwegian prisons. There is a wide gap between the conditions prisons can handle adequately and conditions required for proper health care under hospitalization. A new complaint about inmates with severe mental illnesses has recently been submitted to the CPT by Amnesty International Norway and the Norwegian Helsinki Committee. We recommend that Norway ensure that prisoners suffering from a mental illness are transferred when necessary to an appropriate hospital establishment.

Deprivation of liberty in mental health care

Norwegian mental health legislation authorizes administrative deprivation of liberty based on "serious mental disorder" combined with the additional alternative requirements "need for care and treatment" or "danger to self or others".[2] The vast majority of involuntary hospitalizations in Norwegian psychiatry, 68 % in 2006[3], is based on the ground "need for treatment". Further, statistics indicate that Norway has a high incidence of involuntary admissions compared to other European countries. There are major, and unexplainable,

regional variations in the use of involuntary hospitalisations in Norway[4], which could indicate arbitrariness related to the practice and/or legislation. Underreporting of involuntary hospitalisations has been revealed, and possibly as many as one fourth of the incidents of deprivation of liberty are registered as voluntary admissions.[5] We recommend that Norway undertake measures to ensure that involuntary hospitalisations are used only in accordance with international human rights obligations and amend the mode of registration so that all incidents of involuntary hospitalisations are registered as such.

Coercive means in psychiatric institutions

An independent report commission by the State, recently released shows that the over-all use of coercive means in psychiatric institutions increased in the period 2001 – 2007[6]. The use of restraints increased more than 20 %, and the use of seclusion increased 202 % in that period. Electro Convulsive Treatment (ECT) can also be administered without informed consent. The legislation requires such consent, but the practice is nevertheless accepted. It is purportedly justified by the "principle of necessity". We are not aware of any official statistics on the extent of forced ECT (nor ECT administered with informed consent). We recommend that Norway minimise the use of force in psychiatric institutions and produce statistics on the use of ECT. We furthermore strongly recommend that the government looks more closely into the use of forced medication in Norwegian psychiatric wards, and establishes a system for monitoring and controlling these practices.

Transportation from the home to psychiatric institutions by police

In 2005 CPT pointed out that uniformed police officers transporting persons from their homes to psychiatric establishments, routinely hand cuff and ankle cuff such persons; that this practice criminalizes and stigmatizes the patients and should cease forthwith.[7] Despite improvements, such practices are still used in a too large extent in Norway. We recommend that Norway introduce legislation that regulate and minimize the use of police and restraints, such as hand cuffs and ankle cuffs, for the transportation of patients to psychiatric establishments. In general adequately trained health personnel should be used for this purpose, and only in exceptional cases uniformed police.

Protecting victims of trafficking in human beings

In 2005, the Norwegian government introduced an action plan to counteract trafficking in human beings. The state granted those willing to witness during a police investigation a reflection period before being deported. However, this amendment has led to few new cases. In addition, victims of trafficking are seldom given a thorough consideration of risk of return. Of particular concern is the use of the Dublin II-regulation, where victims of trafficking are returned to first country of entry into the EU without investigating claims of being forced to apply for asylum. We recommend strengthening of the legal assistance offered to victims of trafficking; that stable, long-term residence permits should be afforded to victims of trafficking who break out of their situation; and that the state carefully consider the risk of being reintroduced to forced prostitution before returning victims of trafficking who testify that they have been forced to apply for asylum, to a Dublin II-country.

3. Administration of justice and the rule of law

Investigation of acts committed by members of the police and prosecuting authority

In 2005 the government launched a new and formally independent institution in charge of investigating acts committed by members of the police and prosecuting authority. However, the integrity of the unit has been questioned as a number of its members have been recruited

directly from the police. The unit has been criticized due to the very low number of cases that result in any form of reaction. An assessment of the unit was initiated by the Government in 2008, and a report is expected within 12.05.2009. We recommend that the de facto independence is ensured for the special unit in charge of investigating cases of alleged police and prosecutorial misconduct and abuse, and the recruitment of officers reconsidered.

Public Legal Aid

Public legal aid in civil cases is as a main rule offered only within a limited area of legal issues, and only when the gross income of the applicant or his or her family falls below a set maximum. Both requirements have been widely criticized; the material requirement as it excludes a number of human rights related legal issues and as such impedes access to court and undermines the principle of subsidiarity; and the income requirement as it is artificially low in light of the high level of income and expenses in Norway. We recommend that public legal aid is made available to a wider proportion of the Norwegian population, by adjusting the maximum income requirement in accordance with the average level of income and that public legal aid is made available in all cases relating to credible allegations of human rights violations.

5. Right to privacy, marriage and family life

Data surveillance as a means to counter terrorism and other crimes

The political debate in Norway regarding police methods, in particular with regard to counter-terrorism, indicates a tendency towards a lesser degree of respect for the private sphere of individuals. The possible implementation of the European Union Data Retention Directive, despite its uncertain standing under the EEA-agreement (that is the overall framework agreement regulating legal relations between Norway and the EU), is one example of this development. The consequence in Norway of the Swedish FRA Act, which authorizes en masse surveillance of Norwegian telecommunication passing through Sweden, is another.[8] Similarly, authorizing the use of software which may read information from computers not linked to any network (e.g. information stored on a personal computer, but not shared between computers) or the contents of information from computers linked to a network before the content in question is in fact sent/communicated into that network, is currently under consideration for inclusion in the Criminal Procedure Act .[9] These developments, at their respective stages, indicate that increased attention to the right to privacy as guaranteed in ICCPR Article 17, freedom of thought and ultimately the right to freedom of expression, is warranted with respect to the situation in Norway. We recommend that all legislative processes and white papers concerning the use of surveillance in countering criminality is based on thorough considerations of the right to privacy, including private communication and, thus, ultimately, freedom of expression. Further, we recommend that Norway take diplomatic measures to ensure the right to privacy and freedom of speech of its citizens with regards to the Swedish FRA Act.

7. Right to social security and to adequate standard of living

Housing

In 2005, there were 5500 people without residence in Norway. Housing prices are generally determined by market forces, which negatively affect economically weaker groups, such as those outside the labour market, the first time established, single parents, single adults, refugees and immigrants. We believe that the international human right to adequate housing should be implemented by spelling out more clearly in statutory law that Municipalities are

obliged to provide adequate housing to all citizens. Social house construction schemes should be used as instruments to that end.

Minimum income

Norway has a generally well developed social welfare state, but there are tendencies that benefits to an increasing degree are linked to connection with the labour market, and towards poverty starting to be a heritage from parents to their children. Municipalities have in principle a duty to provide necessary subsistence to individuals and families in need, however there are no national minimum standards for such support, which has a consequence that the support given commonly is inadequate, not predictable and not given on an equal basis. We strongly recommend the introduction of a right to a minimum income for those who are dependent on social welfare. The amount should be on an adequate level, such as what the State Institute for Consumer Research (SIFO) has already calculated as necessary for a decent life in Norway.

9. Minorities and indigenous peoples

Travellers

The travellers in Norway have in the 20th century been victims of extensive and systematic violations of human rights. As a vulnerable minority group, the travellers were exposed to an assimilation policy with a final aim to completely eradicate their culture and language. The Norwegian government has expressed official apologies to the travellers, but we recommend that in addition the protection against discrimination of the travellers as a group should be strengthened. The Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud should establish a high-profile project that addresses the travellers' situation. This could be done in cooperation with the Parliamentary Ombudsman and the Ombudsman for children. Additionally, language training in Romani, the Travellers own language, should be offered to children of Traveller origin in public schools.

10. Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers

Asylum: Being able to submit an application

Norway is part of the Schengen co-operation on asylum and migration with the European Union. In recent years Schengen countries and the European Union has increasingly focused its asylum and migration policies on combating irregular entries and deferring responsibility for individuals at risk of persecution. Visa requirements for nationals from refugee producing areas are generally very strict, while air carriers are heavily sanctioned for carrying undocumented passengers. As a result, individuals at risk of persecution end up taking life-threatening risks in desperate attempts to reach protection in Europe, those who can afford it at the mercy of smugglers of human beings or other criminals. We recommend that Norway ensure that the right to seek asylum is fulfilled by adopting measures to ensure that people in need of international protection are not denied access to its territory.

Respecting international refugee law

In the Schengen-area co-operation the Dublin II regulation, has been made to ensure that only one country within the area makes a decision on an application for asylum. Under the Dublin II regulation Norway has returned asylum applicants to the first country of entry without dealing with the merits of the application, even to Greece, whose asylum procedures clearly do not provide the legal security foreseen in international refugee law, with the ultimate risk

of *refoulement*. NGO-reporting has lead to a temporary halt in such returns to Greece, but the government has since publicly defended such returns and have instructed a recommencement. We recommend that Norway practice the Dublin II regulation in a manner that ensures that refugees are not returned to other European countries if their legal safety is not guaranteed and that the practice of the Dublin II must be in full compliance with the 1951 Refugee Convention.

The so called "13 point plan to reduce the number of asylum seekers not in need of protection"

In September 2008, the Norwegian government presented thirteen changes in the immigration law and regulations, aimed at reducing the number of unfounded asylum applications. Several of these draft changes, including points 2, 5 and 6 of the plan, have been subject to severe critique on the part of human rights NGOs for being problematic with regard to obligations under international refugee law[10] and other human rights law. Point 2 introduces conflict with the internal flight alternative requirements of safety, accessibility and reasonableness, by requiring strong humanitarian reasons in addition to these. Point 5 restricted further accesses to family reunification and family establishment in some cases, which is problematic in relation to the right to family life, ICCPR article 17 first section. According to point 6, minor asylum seekers above the age of 16 arriving in Norway without caretakers may be given restricted residence permits which may not be renewed upon reaching the age of 18, which is in conflict with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child article 3 (1). Points 5 and 6 are both disproportionate compared to their legitimate aim.

We recommend that Norway reconsider these legislative changes, and ensure that international human rights and refugee law obligations are respected.

"Unreturnable" rejected asylum applicants

Due to the impossibility of or risks involved in returning to their country of origin, an unknown, yet significant number of people remain indefinitely in Norway after their applications for permission to stay have been rejected. For as long as the legal status of this category remains unresolved, they are left without access to social benefits and health services, and cannot further their education or enter the labour market legally. Their entire lives are put on hold. For some, this has been the situation for up to a decade. We recommend that Norway give priority to establishing a clear legal status for this category, and make resources available for their individual cases to be resolved.

Systematic Registration and documentation of torture against asylum seekers: Implementation of the Istanbul Protocol

The Istanbul Protocol, or *Manual on Effective Investigation and Documentation of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment* is the first set of international guidelines for documentation of torture and its consequences. The Protocol became a United Nations official document in 1999. It is emphasized in the UN torture convention that to train professionals to detect, document and treat signs and consequences of torture is a State Party obligation. The manual is an important tool in this context. The importance of actively including the manual in the asylum procedure is argued both by Human Rights organizations and UN treaty bodies. Norway does not on a regular basis assess signs of torture in asylum seekers who report that they have been subject to torture prior to arrival in Norway. Therefore important information is missed that could strengthen their application for asylum; form a basis for necessary treatment; and provide information for

possible criminal cases against their perpetrators. It is our recommendation, in order to fulfil obligations under international law that the Istanbul Protocol is included as a default procedure in all asylum cases where torture is reported. This includes the organization of sufficient and available competence in the area, including documentation of torture, mental and physical, and treatment as needed.

Legal guardians for unaccompanied minor asylum seekers

Norway provides unaccompanied minor asylum seekers with legal guardians meant to act in the interest of the children and safeguard their rights. However, there is great variation in terms of both recruitment and training (often none) of legal guardians, resulting in arbitrary differences in representation. Frequent moves and change of legal guardians make the situation for the older children especially unpredictable and difficult. UN CRC has repeatedly called for improved supervision of children living in reception centres. The many gaps are well known, and some temporary measures are in place, but Norway has stated that the issue will be dealt with systemically as part of a new foreigners' law expected in 2010. We recommend that identified shortcomings be dealt with as a matter of priority in the interim, inter alia, that funds be allocated for training, payment, translation services and monitoring of all legal guardians. We recommend that Norway implement the new law and the permanent national scheme as soon as possible.

The care situation for unaccompanied minor asylum seekers

With a statute amendment, the Child Welfare Services took over the legal care for unaccompanied minor asylum seekers under 15 years of age as of December 2007. The responsibility for those between 15 and 18 years of age remained with the immigration authorities. The Child Welfare Services Act has general provisions covering all other groups of children and needs, except unaccompanied minor asylum seekers, who are covered by a separate chapter. We believe the difference in treatment amounts to discrimination and recommend that the statute be amended to place the responsibility for all unaccompanied minor asylum seekers up to the age of 18 with the Child Welfare Services under the general provisions of the law.

V. Capacity building and technical assistance

Training of professional groups in human rights ethics and obligations

Norway lacks an overall plan for education and training in human rights law and human rights teaching. We recommend that such a plan be developed as a matter of priority, to cover implementation, teaching methods, content, clear objectives as well as evaluation. Such a plan should cover training of students at all levels, including at universities, primary and secondary schools and professionals in different sectors. The requirements of systematic training of teachers and trainers, development of curricula and text books should also be addressed. We emphasise the particular need for targeted human rights training programs, including monitoring and evaluation of such programs, for professionals in settings where persons made vulnerable are under professional care, such as persons deprived of their liberty in hospitals or in prisons, refugees, asylum seekers, persons with disabilities, persons exposed to severe trauma and the elderly, and others.

[1] ECRi's fourth report on Norway, published 24. February 2009.

[2] Mental Health Act 1999 § 3-3 first section no. 3

[3] Pedersen, P (L) et al (2007): Samdata sektorrapport for det psykiske helsevernet 2006. SINTEF-rapport nr 2/07.

[4] Helsetilsynet (2006) "Bruk av tvang i psykisk helsevern." Rapport nr. 4-2006.

[5] SINTEF Health. Bjørngaard, J.H. and Hatling, T. Involuntary placement in the mental health system in the period 2001-2003. Report STF78 A055001, 2005.

[6] SINTEF Health. Bremnes, R., Hatling, T. and Bjørngaard, J. H. Use of coercive means in the mental health system for 2001, 2003, 2005 and 2007. Report A8231, November 2008.

[7] Preliminary observations made by the delegation of European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) which visited Norway from 3 to 10 October 2005. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2005.

[8] See third party intervention of the Norwegian section of International Commission of Jurists in ECHR case 35252/08 Centrum for Rättvisa v Sweden, available at http://www.icj.org/news.php3?id_article=4454&lang=en

[9] The panel of experts which considers changes in the current legislation which regulates means and methods of police investigations, "Metodekontrollutvalget", is to produce a white paper on the matter before July 1 2009. The panel is organized under the Ministry of Justice.

[10] Handbook on Procedures and Criteria for Determining Refugee Status under the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees, HCR/IP/4/Eng/REV.1 Reedited, Geneva, January 1992, UNHCR 1979**;** Guidelines on international protection; "Internal Flight or Relocation Alternative" within the Context of Article 1 A (2) of the 1951 Convention and/or 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees, 23 July 2003"