

RWANDA TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE MECHANISMS: STUDY TOUR (11-15 JULY 2011)

➤ Introduction

From 10th – 15th July, 2011, Together Against Impunity in the Great Lakes Region (TAI/GLR) – Rwanda, organized a study tour in Rwanda on Transitional Justice mechanisms adopted after the 1994 genocide. This study tour was aimed at clarifying the complex nature of re-building a society after genocide. It was comprised of two components: literature study and a study tour. Participants were encouraged to choose different topics of their interest, topics like; political freedom, its general meaning in different parts of the world, in post-conflict states in general and Rwanda in particular; reconciliation, justice, security, the criminalisation of hate speech, genocide ideology and denial, Gacaca as semi-traditional justice mechanism, nation building, International Criminal Justice and Universal Jurisdiction in Africa and Rwanda in particular etc. We (organizers) assumed that based upon the literature study participants will understand the subject of the study tour, thus helping them in formulation of questions to be answered during the study tour and roundtable discussions. As a result, participants would enter Rwanda with some knowledge on those issues in the form of questions instead of opinions.

➤ Organizational structure

The study tour involved different stakeholders in Rwanda and visiting different places like genocide memorial sites, the Unity and Reconciliation Commission, an Ex-combatant demobilization and reintegration Solidarity Camp, the National Commission for the fight Against Genocide, poverty eradication initiatives, the forum for political parties, talking to survivors and victims of genocide and their organisations, perpetrators of genocide who confessed and are currently doing community service work, the National University of Rwanda (NUR) Butare and Kigali Campuses, Faculty of Law of the Independent Institute of Lay Adventist of Kigali (French acronym INILAK), The Institute of Research and Dialogue for Peace (French acronym IRDP). In roundtable discussions we included government officials, civil society and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) to discuss the following topics;

- 1) The history of the 1994 Genocide against Tutsi, conservation of memory and post genocide Rwanda, “ethnic” social cohesion:
 - Prof Dr. François MASABO, Historian at the National University of Rwanda – Butare.
 - Jean Paul MUGIRENEZA, Researcher, *l’institut de recherche et de dialogue pour la paix*, IRDP (Institute of Research and dialogue for Peace)

- 2) International Criminal Law and Universal Jurisdiction:
 - Mr. Roland AMOUSSOUGA, Chief of External Relation and Strategic Planning Section and ICTR Spokesperson
 - Dr Emmanuel UGIRASHEBUYA, Dean of the Faculty of Law, National University of Rwanda

- Prof Charles JALLOH, Assistant Professor of International criminal Law, University of Pittsburg school of Law, USA.
 - Justice Prof. Samuel RUGEGE, Vice President of the Supreme Court, Republic of Rwanda.
- 3) Gacaca and fair trial rights:
- Mr. Denis BIKESHA, Director of training, mobilization and sensitization, the National Service of Gacaca Courts
 - Huges MUKENDI, coordinator access to justice project, *Avocats sans Frontière* Kigali (ASF).
 - Ms Usta KAITESI, Deputy Dean for postgraduate research and consultancy and a lecturer at the faculty of Law, National University of Rwanda, a visiting lecturer at the institute for legal practice and development (ILPD) in Rwanda.
- 4) Reconciliation as a Government Process:
- Edmond BAMPORIKI, producer of the movie “the long coat”.
 - Dr. Jean Baptiste HABYARIMANA, Executive Secretary, National Unity and Reconciliation Commission.
 - Prof. Dr. Jean Pierre DUSINGIZEMUNGU, President of IBUKA (An Umbrella Association of Genocide Survivors and associations).
- 5) A) Democratization and conflict resolution as one of components of national building.
B) Genocide Ideology and hate speech versus freedom of expression and freedom of political association:
- Mr. Alphonse NKUSI, Researcher, Rwanda Governance Advisory Council (RGAC)
 - Mr. Tom NADIHIRO, Independent journalist and Researcher and a former commissioner of Rwanda commission of Human Rights.
 - Mr. Alphonse MUNYENTWARI, Governor of the Southern Province.
- 6) Multi-Sectorial intervention in Reconstruction of Rwanda, international community and development partners, Policing , Investigation genocide related crimes and prosecution and the role of the army (RDF): Présenté par :
- Mr. Jean Bosco SIBOYINTORE, The Acting head of the Genocide Fugitive Tracking Unit (GFTU), National Public Prosecution Authority (NPPA), Rwanda.
 - CSP Elisha Kabera, Director, International Cooperation, Rwanda National Police.
 - Brigadier General Dr. Richard RUTATINA, Chief of Military Intelligence, Rwanda Defence Force (RDF).
 - Frieda NICOLAI, the Royal Netherlands Embassy.
- 7) The role of film in the conservation of memory:
- Screened a documentary ‘*ISETA: behind the roadblocks*’ Film Producer, Eric KABERA, was the Guest speaker.

8) Demobilization and Reintegration of Ex-Combatants:

- Mr. Jean SAYINZOGA, Chairman, Rwanda Demobilization and Reintegration commission (RDRC).

➤ **Evaluation**

For the benefit of similar future programs, we evaluated the success of the study tour to identify areas of future improvements and recommendations. The general response was that the program was a success, to some exceeding their expectations. Below is the summary of remarks from respondents (participants).

GENERAL QUESTIONS REGARDING THE PROGRAMME				
Board and lodging		Excellent	Okay	Could be better
Rooms		3	8	1
Meals		8	4	
Service		8	4	
Internet		4	7	1
<i>Do you have any suggestions?</i>	<p>Organisers:</p> <p>The choice for hotel Le Printemps was made in order to make board and lodging as Rwandan as possible, and as affordable as possible, without too much compromising on quality. No big and expensive international hotel where one only meets other foreigners, leaving afterwards the question: “in which town was I?”</p> <p>Participants:</p> <p>The overall impression of board and lodging is good. Friendly people, acceptable price/quality, better than staying in a high budget hotel mostly visited by foreigners, easy going.</p> <p>Shower curtains were missing, contrary to insects. In one case when someone fell ill, the conditions of the hotel turned out to be rather poor (which is in particular a moment that you want them to be excellent).</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>In principle therefore the choice for the kind of hotel was a good one, and will remain, though maybe more near the centre of town.</p>			
Programme in General		Excellent, leave it in the programme	Okay, neutral	Remove from the programme
Memorials (Nyamata; Ntarama; Gisozi; Murambi; Heroes; Belgian Soldiers)		12		
Visits to towns, universities, poverty eradication project, Village Sina Gerard		10	2	
Commission National de Lutte contre la Génocide; Forum for Political Parties		6	6	

Transport	11	1	
<p><i>Do you have any suggestions?</i></p>	<p>Organisers:</p> <p>The purpose of the organisers was to show as many aspects of Rwandan society as possible, linked to the genocide and its aftermath. Not only legal issues, but also common life, discussions etc. The choice has been made for a full day 24/7 programme: for many participants this would be the only time in their life to visit Rwanda and speak with Rwandans, so this should be used to the utmost.</p> <p>Participants:</p> <p>In general the mix of talks and tours, the great variety of activities, was appreciated.</p> <p>It was good to see something of ‘ordinary’ Rwanda life (maybe even more possible). The memorials were considered as highly impressive, and boosted discussion and debate between participants. All taken together it added to understanding Rwanda better.</p> <p>In general, however, it is also observed that the programme was sometimes a bit overloaded, with too little time for reflection. On the other hand many participants had wished to experience some other things, including the ICTR in Arusha, more ‘ordinary’ life, which would make it necessary to extend the tour to ten days. Others again say that the fact that the programme was very full added to the general excitement, hearing so many things in a short time; digestion and reflection comes later.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>The great variety of activities, talks, tours, has shown to be a good one and will certainly be maintained.</p> <p>The question of how many activities keeps debatable. Travel time to other parts of the country takes a lot of time, and should be considered to be time of reflection also. At least participants should be very well informed about the idea behind the programme.</p>		
<p>Preparation of the Conference</p>	<p>Very satisfied</p>	<p>Okay, neutral</p>	<p>Could be better</p>
<p>Access to information</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>3</p>	
<p>Timely response to questions about the conference, Rwanda etc</p>	<p>11</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p><i>Do you have any suggestions?</i></p>	<p>Organisers:</p> <p>The draft paper to be prepared before the tour was meant to let participants focus on what exactly they would like to gain from the tour, in particular in terms of questions, not opinions or answers. The idea was to have participants write a full paper after the tour, integrating experiences gained.</p> <p>Participants:</p> <p>The purpose of the paper we had to prepare was not entirely clear to everybody beforehand.</p> <p>You made us write a paper which I did with grinding teeth because it costed me a lot of time, But I am so glad you made us do it. It forced everyone to be well-prepared ad informed, and it created topics to talk about among group members. So keep this</p>		

	<p>mandatory!</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>The draft paper was effective in the sense that it made participants actively think beforehand what they expected from the visit, what questions to ask. It did get no follow up however. Further thoughts should be spend on how better to use this, for instance by dividing beforehand themes to participants, who start a specific theme with a presentation on what in their opinion are crucial questions, after which panellists can present and discussion can take off.</p> <p>An interesting suggestion was made to start a facebook group from the start so people can get to know each other a little better, and to distribute short bio's of the speakers and the panellists.</p>		
Conference Themes and Speakers in General	Very done	well Okay	Major improvements possible
Themes in general	11	1	
Selection of speakers in general	4	7	2
<p><i>Do you have any suggestions?</i></p>	<p>Organisers:</p> <p>As in the international debate about Rwanda the (not always constructive) criticism dominates, the choice has been made to show in particular the other side of the discussion – that is: the Rwandan side – a little bit more than the international well-known debate.</p> <p>Participants were briefed at the start that everything can be asked, that there are (hardly) no taboos, as long as questions are raised in a polite and constructive manner.</p> <p>Participants:</p> <p>The selection of themes was excellent and covered a wide array of themes all relevant to contemporary Rwanda.</p> <p>However, some more diversity of speakers, more opinions, more critical voices are desired, including NGOs, ‘ordinary’ Rwandans.</p> <p>Also, it is suggested to use more variety in the design of presentations and discussions: smaller groups, fewer panellists, less formal setting. And leaving more room for discussion, interaction.</p> <p>Moreover, panellists/presenters should more in detail be briefed on the character of the group/participants, what has been discussed already (to avoid repetition), and should be better managed in terms of time. Not all chairs succeeded in managing time and discussion.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>More variety of speakers should be introduced, if possible Rwandans (not outsiders). The debate in Rwanda should be more reflected in the panels and discussions, rather than only focusing on the official story.</p> <p>In order to get more time for discussion/interaction, the panellists have to be briefed carefully beforehand; the chairs of panels should be very strict in terms of time.</p>		

	The briefing of participants regarding politeness and taboos turned out to be very important. Where questions were made in a polite and constructive manner the discussion was much more open than when some hostility could be discerned. This is an important point of monitoring for the organisers throughout the entire programme.		
SPECIFIC QUESTIONS REGARDING THE PROGRAMME			
Monday	Excellent, leave it in the programme	Okay, neutral	Remove from the programme
Visit TIG camp	8	3	
Presentations IRDP-Kigali (video and presentation on social cohesion)	7	5	
<i>Do you have any suggestions?</i>	<p>The visit to the TIG camp was found very interesting by most of the participants and will be maintained, if possible with more opportunity for small group interaction between participants and TIG-istes.</p> <p>The video with IRDP was found very interesting, but the two presentations afterwards were too less focused and left too little time for discussion.</p>		
Tuesday	Excellent, leave it in the programme	Okay, neutral	Remove from the programme
Roundtable UNR/KIST Kigali: Universal jurisdiction	9	2	
Roundtable INILAK-Kigali: Gacaca and Fair Trial Rights	6	4	
Roundtable Reconciliation as a Government Guided Process	4	6	1
<i>Do you have any suggestions?</i>	<p>As the best were considered the meetings with mixed national/international speakers, in particular the morning session on universal jurisdiction.</p> <p>It was very much appreciated that speakers were invited for lunch which allowed for an informal setting.</p> <p>The afternoon session was an example of a lack of good chairpersonship, with speakers not respecting their timeslots, and speakers not all willing to discuss.</p> <p>The fact that some presentations were in French and had to be (not professionally) translated did not always contribute to the speed of presentations and often left therefore too little time for discussion/interaction.</p>		
Wednesday	Excellent, leave it in the programme	Okay, neutral	Remove from the programme
Roundtable Butare: democratization, genocide ideology and hate speech	5	5	
<i>Do you have any suggestions?</i>	<p>This session was very much appreciated by some (the best of the week), less by others.</p> <p>It is suggested that it would have been better to discuss this topic in smaller groups; with more diverse speakers (too much the official rhetoric now).</p>		

	The suggestion is made to introduce a tour through university, most relevant faculties, with presentations by students.		
Thursday	Excellent, leave it in the programme	Okay, neutral	Remove from the programme
Roundtable UNR/KIST: justice and security as requirement for peace and reconciliation	10	2	
Movie (Roadblock) and roundtable	10	2	
<i>Do you have any suggestions?</i>	<p>The panellists in the afternoon were seen as very challenging. Resulting in a very open discussion.</p> <p>Filmmaker very interesting; completely different background</p>		
Friday	Excellent, leave it in the programme	Okay, neutral	Remove from the programme
Demobilisation of ex-combatants in Ingando solidarity camp	12		
<i>Do you have any suggestions?</i>	<p>This was by everybody considered as a very impressive part of the study visit and well organised. Good interaction with the ex-combatants who were remarkably open.</p> <p>Suggestions are made to include a tour through the camp (cooking, living etc), and the possibility of mall informal discussions.</p>		
GENERAL			
<i>Do you have any other suggestions in general that you could not mention before?</i>	<p>Almost all participants made some general comments on top of those made already above. We prefer to include in this evaluation the extensive remarks of one of the participants, experienced in organising and participating in similar study tour, as it in fact summarizes most of the remarks by the other participants.</p> <p>“In general the whole study visit is very well organised and extraordinarily interesting and fascinating. A lot of that has been said already during and directly after the visit. In fact it even exceeded my expectations in terms of relevance for my wish to get a good, deep and general picture of the situation in Rwanda and to compare it with my experiences on the Balkans. Before the trip I hoped and expected that apart from the juridical focus of the study visit there would be enough place for other aspects of the situation in Rwanda. And it did.”</p> <p>“In relation to this I also experienced it to be very worthwhile that the group was divers and combined several professional disciplines. Unless the focus on the legal discourse, participants had quite a different background in terms of experience and professional status. Also the fact that part of the participants had no legal background at all contributed in a few situations to different discussions and exchange of knowledge that otherwise would not have happened. (...). This helps to avoid tunnel view and come with unorthodox innovative solutions and practices. So to my idea the mixed composition of the group may have contributed to the success.”</p> <p>“A very subjective and personal remark perhaps is the fact that it was a very nice group</p>		

with inspiring people. I don't know if it is a coincidence or the result of your selection of participants. We might take that for granted now but not all study visits are that lucky. Point is that one or two people in the group that don't fit or have difficulties to behave properly or get stressed easily might spoil it for the whole group. (...) For future study visits it could be an idea to meet once or twice in the Netherlands as part of the selection procedure. I know it's not always possible and it's never a guarantee but I have good experiences with this (...)."

"It comes to mind that during the study visit spontaneously a social media tool like Facebook was used by almost everyone. It had an added value even after the official programme in terms of connection and knowing what everyone was doing and thinking. Also LinkedIn was used for networking purposes afterwards. A tool like Facebook – or perhaps another more professional social medium like Ning – could have an added value to the study visit also being used in the preparation, to share documents, pictures, video's, to exchange views, experiences etc."

"In general I have to give you compliments for your time management. Because it's extremely hard to have such a study visit organised and have everyone respect deadlines, be in time at places etc. And personally I liked the fact that the program was very full and intense. (...) The intensity of the program was ideal for those 5-6 days."

"About the roundtable sessions and the selection of speakers in general I have a few suggestions and thoughts. They are based on my own professional experience organising seminars, debates, conferences and study visits for both Dutch as international participants."

"The roundtable sessions might win in effectiveness if there is more interaction and participation from the participants and the speakers speak less. Of course this is not always possible and sometimes one simply need an expert to speak and give a lecture about the subject. Special if a speaker is talented and has great narrative skills. But in general it might be better to have speakers speak shorter. Because in general participants loose attention after a while. I always remember what people answer after you ask them 'How was the conference and what was most worthwhile?' Quite often people will answer 'the conference itself was not so much new but talking and meeting people in the lobby was very useful'. Those parts of the program of conferences during the breaks where people can exchange ideas, opinions and experiences are usually considered as very valuable. So that's what I always try to integrate interaction in the official program by using subgroups in which people discuss the issue for example for 20 -30 minutes. This method could be used also in some of the roundtables."

"To my experience it also helps to force speakers to make their story short because most of the time less is better. I know it's sometimes extremely hard to limit the amount of time people have in particular when they are important people in high positions. (...) On the other hand I had so many positive results (...) with cutting back the time of speakers/experts and introducing methods of interaction that I'm convinced it would improve the roundtables. In general participants have much more energy and enthusiasm after such a session then during events in which they mostly listen."

"Another method of introducing interaction from participants is to have every member of the group prepare one or more items to give a presentation about. That they should have prepared already back home. During the start of the trip I thought you were going to do that and I understand that it was to hard to realise. But to my idea it would be very worthwhile a next time especially when weeks before the trip people choose what subject they want to take care of. (...)"

"With a few of the speakers I had the idea and feeling they felt 'attacked' in discussions about the present situation in Rwanda and the policy of the government. Because of

	critical questions being asked by the participants. I can understand this feeling of speakers because of the critics in international media and ngo's and their idea of not being understood properly. But in the same time the speakers should expect that during a study trip with academics and journalist the discourse might be critical. Not to be negative but to understand the situation and to learn. So it might help that speakers are made aware about the fact that critical questions doesn't mean a negative attitude. In the same time we saw that we as participants learned to start questions with a lot of compliments."
--	---

➤ **Short background (Bios) of Participants**

1. Charles C. Jalloh

Charles C. Jalloh is an Assistant Professor of Law at the University of Pittsburgh School of Law, U.S.A., where he specializes in Criminal Law, International Criminal Law, International Human Rights Law and Public International Law. Professor Jalloh's recent scholarship centers on questions of jurisdiction and selectivity in international criminal law, including in particular, the tense relationship between Africa and the International Criminal Court. His publications include several book chapters and articles in leading journals such as African Journal of International and Comparative Law, American Journal of International Law, Criminal Law Forum, Fletcher Forum of World Affairs, International Criminal Law Review and Michigan Journal of International Law. In 2007, he edited the legal texts of the Sierra Leone Tribunal for Martinus Nijhoff and is currently under contract for a four-part jurisprudence series with the same publisher.

2. Christa Grootveld

Is pursuing her LLM (accent criminal law) at Tilburg University, the Netherlands, writing her thesis about sexual violence and the ICTY and ICTR, and planning a 2nd LLM in International and European Public Law, accent on International and Human Rights Law.

3. Cora Westerink

Graduated at the academy of arts in painting and photography in 1990. Graduated in 2002 at Tilburg University, Faculty of arts, General Literary studies, major: Culture and Literature (with distinction). Between 2002 and 2004 she participated in Theory Seminars at Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis (ASCA), University of Amsterdam. Ever since she is studying how people identify themselves, all over the world, by making artworks and/or poems, or arts and crafts.

4. David de Boer

Is pursuing his LLM International and European Public law (Human Rights track) at Tilburg University, the Netherlands.

5. *David Kamanzi,*

LL.M Student at Handong Global University (HGU), Korea.

6. *Edwin Mermans*

Works for the provincial government of Noord-Brabant (the Netherlands) mainly focusing on exchange of experience and knowledge between regions on a European level, in which his core business is to organize exchange in conferences, study visits, description of best practices and the use of social media to facilitate debates between experts and policy makers. Worked as a journalist with interests and experiences in social and political issues. After international experiences - among others during the conflict in former Yugoslavia - eight years focusing on ethnic and cultural diversity, integration, participation and anti-discrimination in the Netherlands.

7. *Hassane Madigouh*

Magistrat, Juge au Tribunal de Grande Instance Hors Classe de Niamey, NIGER, Spécialement chargé des affaires civiles, commerciales et coutumières de la commune Niamey 3, apres deux ans 1er Substitut du Procureur de la République près le Tribunal de Grande Instance Hors Classe de Niamey.

8. *James Nyayo*

An international development and humanitarian aid manager with eight years of field experience working mainly with Catholic based charities in conflict and post-conflict contexts in Angola, Uganda and Sudan. A holder of an MSc in Humanitarian Programme Management from The Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (UK) and now conducting a PhD research on State Sovereignty and International Criminal Justice in Africa at the Irish Centre of Human Rights (National University of Ireland-Galway). BSc in Sociology, University of Zimbabwe.

9. *Lia Gieling*

Is an art historian from the Netherlands living in Butare (Rwanda). Doing research into the contribution of artists in the great lakes, healing and reconciliation and the way how they express this in their work and performance.

10. *Maarten Van Munster*

Lecturer at The Hague University of Applied Sciences, in the areas of politics and law (human rights, international criminal law, development policy and EU law). Previously worked at a law faculty in Mozambique, where he experienced some of the post civil war society and the (lack of) mechanisms to deal with atrocities committed during the war, including quasi-legal mechanisms such as community courts and their contribution to the justice system.

11. Mirjam Vossen

Is a journalist and researcher with a master in international development. She writes about development cooperation, microfinance and microjustice. Teaches and gives workshops about development cooperation, and wrote a number of books about development cooperation.

12. Niek Vollebergh

Is pursuing his LLM at Tilburg University, the Netherlands. Studies at the University of Pretoria (SA) with the main focus on Legal problems on HIV/AIDS and the African Human Rights system, and doing voluntary work at the Township primary school Mamelodi (SA).

13. Ralf Bodelier

Is a freelance journalist, moderator, author and researcher. He holds a BA in History and an MA in Theology. He lectured for years Fontys University of Applied Sciences and published books on Auschwitz, Africa and Development Aid. Next spring he intends to defend his PhD thesis '*The Price of Cosmopolitanism*'.

14. Roberta Arnold

Studied law and joined the Swiss armed forces, for which she worked as a legad (IHL) and as a policy adviser on arms control later. Currently incorporated in the Swiss Military Justice as an investigation magistrate (as a militian). Joined the Federal Attorney General's office, int. legal assistance division, competent for cases concerning war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide. Does research on command responsibility and on the material scope of application of the war crimes provisions.

15. Stefanie Heinrich

Hold a law degree (LLM) from the University of Freiburg, Germany, and an MA in European Criminology from the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium. She qualified as a German lawyer. She joined the Office of the Federal Examining Magistrates of Switzerland as a legal officer in July 2009; she now works in the Department for state protection and crimes against humanity, war crimes and genocide as a legal officer. A PhD student at the Irish Centre for Human Rights, NUI Galway, pursuing a case study with research focus on Timor-Leste, bringing together victimology and transitional justice. It focuses on post-conflict Timor-Leste, the peace building and truth-seeking efforts, prosecution and punishment (Special Panels) and the local traditional restorative justice mechanism (the Community Reconciliation Processes).

16. Suzanne Hoeksema

Holds an LLM International Relations, specialization Peace and Conflict Studies, Uppsala University, Sweden, and an LLM Holocaust and Genocide Studies, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands, including six months of research in Rwanda. She currently works as a junior researcher at the Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies in Amsterdam, in charge of mapping the emerging field of transitional justice research.

➤ Short background (Bios) of Organisers

1. *Alphonse Muleefu*

Alphonse Muleefu is a PhD researcher at INTERVICT, Tilburg University. Holds a Law Degree (LLB) from the National University of Rwanda and LLM in International and European Public Law from Tilburg University, The Netherlands. He has participated in short courses on Transitional Justice, International Criminal law and International Criminal Investigations. He worked as a research student and legal researcher at the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and as a Legal intern at the International Criminal Court (ICC). In Rwanda he worked as a Legal Officer in the National Service of Gacaca Courts and is a Founder of Together Against Impunity in the Great Lakes Region (TAI/GLR).

2. *Roelof Haveman*

Roelof H. Haveman (LLM, Erasmus University Rotterdam, 1983) is an independent consultant in the field of rule of law. From June 2010 until March 2011 he worked as a Field Programme Manager for IDLO/International Law Development Organization in Juba, South Sudan, supporting the judiciary of southern Sudan and the Ministry of Legal Affairs in developing training programmes and institutes. Since its start early 2008 until May 2010 he was the Vice Rector in charge of Academic Affairs and Research of the ILPD/*Institute of Legal Practice and Development* in Rwanda. He lived and worked in Rwanda as from 2005, initially for the Dutch Center for International Legal Cooperation (CILC), supporting the law faculties of the *Université Nationale du Rwanda* (UNR, Butare) and the *Université Libre de Kigali* (ULK, Kigali) in strengthening their academic and managerial capacity and quality. In addition, in 2007-2008 Roelof Haveman provided technical assistance in organisational reform for the Law Development Centre in Uganda. Since its establishment in 2002 and until 2005, Roelof Haveman was the programme-director of the *Grotius Centre for International Legal Studies* at Leiden University's Campus in The Hague. Until the summer of 2005 he has been an associate professor of (international) criminal law and criminal procedure at Leiden University and fellow of the E.M. Meijers Institute of Legal Studies of the Faculty of Law, Leiden University, the Netherlands. In 1998 he defended his PhD-dissertation on the „Conditions for Criminalizing Trafficking in Women“ (in Dutch) at Utrecht University, the Netherlands. Over the past 20 years he published many articles and a number of books on gender-related crimes, trafficking in persons and prostitution, the principle of legality (e.g in the context of customary – *adat* – criminal law in modern Indonesia). His scholarship currently concentrates on all kinds of issues related to international criminal law, covering such topics as Rwandan *gacaca*, prosecutorial discretion, gender crimes, legality, fair trial, supranational criminology and victimology, comparative criminal law and the sui generis character of the supranational penal system. He is the editor in chief of the series: *Supranational Criminal Law, Capita Selecta*, Intersentia, Antwerp.

3. *Usta Kaitesi*

Usta Kaitesi is the Deputy Dean for postgraduate research and consultancy and a lecturer at the Faculty of Law National University of Rwanda, a visiting lecturer at the Institute of Legal Practice and Development (ILPD) in Rwanda. She is also an Advocate with the Kigali Bar Association. She holds a bachelors' degree in Law (LLB) from the National University of Rwanda, Masters of Laws (LLM) from the University of Ottawa-Canada and is writing her PhD at the Netherlands Institute of Human Rights (SIM) - University of Utrecht - The

Netherlands; analyzing the legacy of dealing with genocide gender and sexual crimes before the ICTR and Rwanda Domestic Courts. Usta Kaitesi is a member of different human rights related organizations including HAKI-Africa (An Association of University teachers of Human Rights in the Great Lakes region) and Together Against Impunity. She has presented lectures at different international and national conferences especially in relation to gender based violence, she is a member of the International Advisory Board for Mukomeze, a charitable organization in the Netherlands that supports women victims of sexual violence endured during the genocide in Rwanda and a Board member of the National University of Rwanda Legal Aid Clinic. Previously, she was the head of public Law department at the NUR faculty of Law and a deputy head of the NUR faculty of Law's Legal Aid Clinic.

➤ **Acknowledgment**

We (organizers) – Alphonse Muleefu, Roelof Haveman and Usta Kaitesi – wish to thank the following persons (individually and collectively) for their contribution to the study tour.

Our special thanks goes to:

- ✓ Dr. Anne-Marie de Brouwer, Associate professor, Department of Criminal Law Tilburg University.
- ✓ Emeritus Professor, Luc Huyse, K.U.Leuven
- ✓ Prof. Dr. Rianne Letschert, Deputy Director, INTERVICT, Tilburg University.
- ✓ Prof. Dr. Stephan Parmentier, K.U.Leuven.
- ✓ Tilburg Law School, Tilburg University.
- ✓ The Royal Netherlands Embassy in Kigali Rwanda.
- ✓ The Office of Registry, International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR).

Without giving names again, we are grateful for the valuable collaboration we received from different Institutions and individuals, speakers and field study guides in Rwanda. Their support was an immense contribution.

And, finally (last but not least), we are grateful for having worked with such a wonderful group of participants. Your curiosity, interest, enthusiasm and open mindedness contributed largely to the success of the programme and we are all happy for everyone's individual contribution.

THANK YOU ALL.