



Inter-American Human Rights Network

The Inter-American Human Rights System: The Law and Politics of Institutional Change

9-10 October 2015
Institute of the Americas
University College London

Leverhulme Inter-American Human Rights Network WORKSHOP SUMMARY

This document provides a summary of the second workshop of the Inter-American Human Rights Network, held between 9th and 10th October at [University College London's Institute of the Americas](#).¹ The workshop focused on key themes related to the law and politics of institutional change within the Inter-American Human Rights System (IAHRS). The summary below is not intended as an exhaustive record of the discussions, but rather as a concise presentation of the key findings and main areas of debate as they developed during the workshop.

Session 1: The Politics of Institutional Change

Presentations in this session examined the institutional change the IAHRS has undergone, and the broader regional order in which this has been embedded. The session examined the extent to which the system's development has been a story of progress over time, with only minor reversals in recent years, or whether the system has entered into a period of possibly irreversible decline. Discussions included consideration of the broader context of global shifts and the potential impact of extra-regional developments on human rights norms and sovereignty.

Luis Reque vs. Augusto Pinochet: The Changing Fate of the Inter-American Human Rights System in the 1970s

Patrick William Kelly (University of Wisconsin-Madison) argued that violence in Latin America in the 1970s indelibly shaped the tone and tenor of human rights politics. In particular, he cited the Chilean coup as having fundamentally changed the rights landscape at both the regional and global levels. This was, in large part, a result of the visit by a large number of international organisations and human rights groups to Chile in the aftermath of the coup. Surprisingly, Pinochet let in a number of such organisations to Chile during this period, apparently thinking that he would be able to persuade them that his actions were justified. The Commission played a key role here. In 1974 Luis Reque, then Executive Secretary of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR), decided to intervene in Chile at a time when nobody thought of the Commission as undertaking this type of

1 See the Annex to this report for the participant biographies.

activity. The Commission produced reports on the abuses and allegations it documented during its visit and the Chilean government subsequently responded with detailed reports refuting the numerous accusations. This marked the beginning of the era of 'human rights propaganda'. Reque's visit to Chile represented a key turning point for the Commission and showed what the IAHR could do. The question remains as to why these actions had such an impact and what factors had prevented the IAHR from having much impact before this stage. It is also important to reflect on why it was that violence in Chile attracted this degree of international attention while other sorts (e.g. endemic contemporary violence in Mexico and Central America) have not.

South American Interpretations of Human Rights – The UNASUR in the context of the Inter-American Human Rights System

Anne Hoffman (German Institute of Global and Area Studies) outlined her view that the rise of sub-national mechanisms in the Americas contains an implicit challenge to the IAHR. Such organisations may have aims which are counter to those of the IAHR, or have mechanisms which overlap with or duplicate the efforts of the IAHR. UNASUR, in particular, seeks to strengthen the identity and sovereignty of South American nations and has sought to mainstream human rights normativity into all areas of public policy in Latin America (in a similar way to efforts to mainstream gender). UNASUR's proponents have advanced a number of explicit criticisms of the IAHR. These include claims that: 1) it is mainly a Washington centric organisation, which is not based on Latin American legal theories and traditions; 2) the system does not deal with issues of security and inequality (which UNASUR sees as the fundamental problems of contemporary Latin America); and 3) it is an outdated system as it mainly focuses on how to deal with rights abuses of the past, instead of focusing on the challenges of today.

Inter-American Human Rights Commission and Non-Jurisdictional States: Impasse or Cooperation?

Isabela Garbin (Federal University of Uberlândia) presented preliminary research which aims to examine political aspects of institutional change within the IAHR by examining the behaviour of 'non-jurisdictional states' (i.e. those that have not accepted the jurisdiction of the IACtHR). These, Dr Garbin argued, represent an interesting case study for the institutional development of the IAHR as they are less committed to the advance of the system. Indeed, they represent an active obstacle to the system's universalisation. Non-jurisdictional states include about a third of OAS states and are extremely diverse (they include the US, Canada, Cuba and a number of Caribbean states). Future research will need to focus on the actions and influence of these states during two previous periods of change/crisis within the IAHR: 1969-79 and 2011-13. This will be used to assess what impact these states had on the system's development.

Silence, Failures and Omissions: The IACHR and the Brazilian Military Regime

Bruno Broti Bernardi (Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados) argued that human rights violations committed by the Brazilian military regime were the first serious test of the Commission. These were the first time that the system was confronted with gross and mass human rights violations committed by an authoritarian regime. In contrast with its actions in Chile, in Brazil the Commission failed to provide much in the way of adequate defence to the Brazilian population in the 1970s. A total of 33 cases were submitted to IACHR between 1970 and 1980 but very few had an impact; most were archived or never mentioned after submission. The Brazilian military regime, especially via Brazilian Commissioner Carlos Alberto Dunshee de Abranches, pressured the OAS Secretary General and other states to prevent movement of cases through system. Brazil also used

other techniques to delay case progress, including engaging in protracted correspondence, which the Commission lacked the resources to deal with effectively. Moreover, within the OAS itself, the IACHR was largely ignored by the General Assembly, Secretary General and Permanent Council, up until 1976. The omissions and neglect of Brazil by the Commission during this period has had a long-term effect on transnational mobilisation in the country. It is still cited by Brazilian human rights activists today as a reason for not engaging with the system.

Comments:

- *Role of individuals.* Presentations show that the role of individual officials, especially Commissioners – and their levels of commitment, drive and initiative – is very important. In Chile, Reque was able to drive the system to work against the abuses of the regime and achieve impact, whereas in Brazil officials effectively hindered the progress of cases against the regime.
- *Civil society actions.* Officials within the system did not operate in a vacuum, however. Chilean civil society was highly active at both the domestic and international level (especially in Washington) in the aftermath of the coup, which proved helpful in bringing international attention to the issue. This was less true in the Brazilian case. Mobilisation on this scale only came much later, particularly in relation to the Belo Monte case.
- *Legitimacy issues.* The origin of the reluctance of some policy makers to deal with the IACHR is in part a result of a perception that the body was originally mainly created by the US to deal with the revolution in Cuba. OAS faces legitimacy challenges and this affects the Commission's actions as it is institutionally embedded within the OAS framework. This continues to affect implementation – criticisms of IAHRs by members of UNASUR, for example, may further complicate efforts to implement reforms and policies, which whose implementation would have bolstered the IAHRs.

Session 2: Patterns of Normative and Legal Change

The IAHRs has emerged, from its roots as a quasi-judicial entity with an ill-defined mandate to promote respect for human rights, as a legal regime formally empowering individuals and groups to bring suit to challenge the human rights performances of regional states. This session discussed two strands of change over time: 1) the normative expansion of the system and 2) the institutional and procedural changes through which the depth and breadth of the system's activities have increased.

Beyond the Constitutionality of the Brazilian Amnesty Law: Crimes against Humanity as a Case Study to Understand Supremo Tribunal Federal Behaviour and Struggles of Civil Society

Caroline de Lima e Silva (University of Copenhagen) examined the ascendancy of courts as political entities in Brazil using the concept of crimes against humanity and their relation to the Brazilian Amnesty Law. Her presentation focused on the current struggles of civil society and prosecutors to reassure and guarantee non-repetition measures through litigation tactics in the Supreme Federal Tribunal. In examining relevant STF decisions, she found that 99% of these cited article 1 of the American Convention on Human Rights and 51% cited article 2. In total, 55 of cases before the court relate to crimes against humanity; approximately one third of its whole caseload.

Guarantees of Non-Repetition in the Jurisprudence of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights

Diana Guarnizo (University of Essex) explained how the concept of guarantees of non-repetition in the IAHR is based upon article 63.1 of the ACHR (on reparations). There have been several important stages in the development of reparations guidelines within the IAHR. In the period 1987-1998 the system was producing its early jurisprudence on reparations; from 1998 to 2001 the Court tried to go beyond individual harm and focus on the law itself. Between 2001 and 2008 the Court determined in several cases (mainly regarding indigenous groups) that reparations should go to an entire community (e.g. building hospitals), rather than just to individuals alone. From 2008 remedial measures and guarantees of non-repetition have been consolidated, with orders for: funds to be assigned or particular institutions involved in the analysis of a specific problem; human rights training programmes to be carried out; databases to be created to establish the number of cases of forced disappearances etc. That said, in the majority of cases the Court still takes a largely conservative stance, asking for reparations to be paid, but without providing sufficient clarity over how this should happen or exactly to whom. Reparations have remained a source of political tension as various states continue to try to reduce the scope of Court action.

Beyond Article 2: Real Impacts of Legislative Changes Ordered by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights

Carina Calabria (University of Manchester) discussed some categories of reparations awarded by the IACtHR, with a focus on guarantees of non-repetition. Her research has entailed the analysis of around 200 IACtHR cases to try to understand the reasons provided by the Court for granting specific forms of reparations, for instance, the obligation to execute a legislative change. While it was anticipated that most of these reasons would be based on Article 2 violations (American Convention), in reality only about a third of relevant reparations cases were. There was full compliance in an even smaller proportion of the 64 cases in which the Court ordered a legislative change as form of reparation. Although just a few cases were declared fully complied, some impacts of these rulings are indisputable. That said, compliance alone is not a sufficient measure to understand impact. For example, the court ruling on the Brazilian amnesty law said this should be overturned, but did not include a specific provision to this end. Thus, the state can technically be in compliance with the ruling, whilst still retaining the amnesty legislation. Conversely, the Surinamese cases of *Moriwana* and *Saramaka* had a significant amount of impact, without full compliance being achieved.

Comments:

- *Conception of Impact.* Reparations and guarantees of repetition provide only a partial view of the impact of the system. Often one of the main motivations for CSOs to take cases to the international level is to raise the profile of the issue and bring greater pressure to bear on authorities to address it. They also almost exclusively litigate cases which they think will bring about broader changes in the rights environment; e.g. to change a particular law or practice. This 'naming and shaming' effect is an important impact of the system that goes beyond the conception of impact as mere compliance with rulings.

Session 2 (cont'd): Patterns of Normative and Legal Change

Revisiting the Velásquez Rodríguez Ethos: Contestation, Deference and Backlash in the IAHRs

Jorge Contesse, (Rutgers School of Law-Newark) reported that when the system first became active in the 1980s it had a very top-down approach. The IAHRs was then dealing with authoritarian regimes and failing states, while it was deemed to be a 'morally superior' entity able to tell these illegitimate states how to deal with their rights failings. This method of working constitutes the 'Velásquez Rodríguez ethos'. Today, the political and rights environment has changed, with the system now mainly dealing with democratic regimes. While these still continue to commit abuses any violations are of a different scale and type than in the earlier period. In this context, the top-down approach of the IAHRs is no longer as appropriate as it once was and a maximalist Court is not always the way to achieve maximum impact. For example, in its decisions on Uruguay, the Court should not have been so quick to rule against popular backing (via referendums) for the continued application of amnesty legislation. The democratic government in Uruguay is categorically different from Fujimori's Peru or Pinochet's Chile; the Court should bear this in mind and give greater consideration and better explanation for its decisions regarding Uruguay's amnesty legislation. It is problematic for the Court just to assume that it knows better, based on jurisprudence developed in the context of autocratic regimes. If it continues to do so it may provoke further backlashes which could undermine the system over the long-term. To ensure the continued strengthening of the IAHRs it may be better to reassess the relationship of the IAHRs with states, and perhaps also to examine the possibility of applying a margin of appreciation in particular instances.

The Principle of Complementarity and Reparations in the Jurisprudence of the Inter-American Court

Clara Sandoval-Villalba (University of Essex) highlighted the different decisions taken by the Court regarding the applicability (or otherwise) of domestic reparations mechanisms. Generally speaking, litigators in cases before the IAHRs have argued that national or local reparations programmes are inadequate or ineffectual, while governments have defended them. The Court has ruled in different ways on the matter, depending on the local political context. Broadly speaking, these have been to: 1) refuse to defer to local mechanisms; 2) to partially defer to them (with dialogue) and; 3) to completely defer. In the *Chitay Nech* decision of 2010, victims argued that Guatemala's domestic reparations programme should not be used as the basis for compensation. The Court agreed and awarded reparations in accordance with its own guidelines (i.e. without reference to the Guatemalan programme). Decisions on cases in Colombia and Chile, by contrast, recommended that domestic reparation programmes should be used, as these countries were considered to be more democratic, and their reparations mechanisms better designed. The *Operation Genesis* ruling, for example, largely allowed the Colombian state to deal with reparations in accordance with its own criteria (albeit with instructions to prioritise victims in this specific case, with implementation theoretically monitored by the Court). In the *García Lucero* case from Chile, the Court felt it did not have legal authority to *order* reparations in the case and instead opted just to 'exhort' the state to do so. The outcome of these three different rulings was similarly varied. Guatemala ignored the IACtHR ruling, saying it would not honour the compensation ordered by the international body as its domestic programme was adequate. The outcome was better in the Chilean case, in that the state ultimately acceded to the Court's request for payments to be made to *García Lucero*. The result in Colombia was less positive for victims, who essentially had to return to using the domestic reparations mechanisms. At the same time, neither is it desirable for the Court to provoke a reaction like that of Guatemala.

The Conventionality Control and Challenges within the Venezuelan National System

Francisco Alfonso (University of Essex) described how the principle of 'conventionality control' in the IAHRs was first mentioned in a dissenting opinion in 2003, but that it was not until 2006 that the Court officially recognised the concept in the case of *Almonacid Arellano vs Chile* (paragraph 124). As Nestor Pedro Sagues explains, the European system provides precedent for conventionality control in the IAHRs (the broad principles are the same, although the concept is not referred to as such). In the *Cabrera Garcia and Montiel* case (2010), the Court explained how the doctrine of conventionality control has been interpreted in other countries. The exercise of control applies not just to the Convention but to the whole *corpus iuris interamericano*. In other words, national law needs to be interpreted in accordance with international standards. Some difficulties remain in practice as the bodies that should apply this control are also those that have the capacity to violate human rights.

Comments:

- *Consistency of decisions.* Part of the reason that states have been able to produce legal arguments to support their objections to IAHRs intervention in, say, the area of reparations is that they have found inconsistencies across decisions that they can use for their own ends. Sometimes decisions in particular cases are issued with a view to other matters. For example, in the Guatemala case discussed in this panel (Chitay Nech), the Government based its argument on a dissenting opinion that had previously been issued in a case on El Salvador (the Mozote Case), which stated that partial amnesties could be applied in certain contexts of transition from armed conflict. It is widely felt that this separate opinion was written primarily with the Colombian peace process in mind and its invocation by Guatemala, a country where the context is completely different, is problematic.
- *Managing the backlash.* To avoid further backlash it was suggested by some that the System might need to be a bit more careful about the circumstances in which it issues interim measures. It was the issuance of a precautionary measure over Belo Monte that galvanised the reform process that has weakened the system. Separately, the system leaves itself vulnerable to provoking further backlash and allegations of bias due to its selectivity of cases. It is not at all clear how cases from some countries (e.g. Venezuela) can progress from petition to the Court in two years, while complaints from other countries may take up to 10 years to do the same.
- *The Margin of Appreciation.* Diverse views were expressed as to the appropriateness of applying a margin of appreciation in the IAHRs. In the European context the margin of appreciation was created because of the large volume of cases brought before the European system; it was created to solve a structural problem of the system. But it creates its own issues with regards to how and where it is applied, which can give rise to additional concerns over the legitimacy of the system. Interchange between the inter-American and European systems on this matter would be useful.

Roundtable discussion: Best Practices for the IAHRs in a Changing Human Rights Environment²

Threats to the IAHRs, which came to the fore with the recent reform process, have not since disappeared entirely. The system, its mechanisms and institutions face constant threats and efforts to undermine their scope and efficacy. Individual judges and commissioners can have a large impact on the system, which means that selection and appointment procedures will continue to be highly significant for the future of the IAHRs.

We need to continually ask how the system can have the maximum amount of impact in the region, but this does not necessarily mean being maximalist. This requires continual evolution of the system's processes and procedures. For example, procedures for monitoring compliance with judges have changed from written monitoring only (up to 2007), later to private hearings for victims and finally public hearings. Public hearings have, in some cases, been an effective means of additional pressure to push compliance with judgements e.g. in Costa Rica.

An interesting recent model for the system to explore further was that of sending a delegation of experts to Mexico to investigate the events in Ayotzinapa. This was a positive advance in that it meant the system could have an impact in real time, rather than having to wait for the culmination of litigation by victims several years later. If the system is interested in increasing real time impact, it should also examine the example of CICIG in Guatemala, which has played an important role in ousting corrupt elements from the very highest level of the political system.

Taking on new areas will, of course, mean that fewer resources are available for existing activities. This could be an issue given the large backlog of cases at the Commission (around 8,000 cases as of 2014). The delay in registering petitions is particularly problematic. CSO interaction with the system presents opportunities for advocacy and impact at a series of key milestones during the process. However, this cannot begin if cases are not even registered. Exploring new avenues for action, or expanding the work of existing rapporteurships etc, would likely have the effect of delaying case processing further by switching limited resources out of such activity.

The IAHRs has made a contribution to tackling some of the shared problems that the region faces (inequality, violence and highly centralised power). The system has played an important role in spreading human rights values and in promoting new dynamics between social actors. Part of the reason that it has been able to do so was because of the earlier emergence of democratic constitutions in Latin America that contained open clauses, enabling greater interaction between domestic law and international human rights law. Strengthened CSOs have played an important role in this process and in the struggle for rights and justice. The IAHRs has, with the cooperation of CSOs, gradually built up its legitimacy as an important and effective instrument for the protection of human rights.

That said, CSOs often do not perceive interaction with the system as a unique or stand-alone means of securing results. Rather, this is often just one element of an advocacy strategy which draws on different means of pressuring for change at both the domestic and international level. The role of

2 There were four speakers on this policy roundtable, including Oscar Parra-Vera, former senior legal officer at the IACtHR and currently MSc candidate at the University of Oxford. The summary of the discussions in this session in particular does not necessarily reflect the views of all workshop participants.

the system was crucial, for example, in bringing about reparations and justice in Argentina. Yet that justice would not have come without a human rights movement that fought for it for over 30 years.

The IAHR is gradually empowering itself by means of interactions which permit the strengthening of human rights in a multi-level system. The building of a Latin American *Ius Constitutionale Commune* faces three central challenges: 1) fomenting a legal culture that draws inspiration from new legal paradigms and from the emergence of a new Public Law; 2) strengthening the inter-American human rights protection system and 3) advancing the protection of human rights, democracy and the Rule of Law in the region.

In terms of limitations on the system's evolution, the IAHR has developed around a conceptualisation of states as the main violators of human rights, but there are other actors which contribute to / perpetrate abuses which are not covered by the IAHR institutional framework. In particular, the behaviour of corporations has fallen outside the scope of institutional action. Similarly, it has been difficult to advance on the subject of economic, social and cultural rights. This is, in part, because donors like the US and Europe are mainly interested in funding civil and political rights work.

Session 3: Institutional Change and Human Rights Impact

In this session, workshop participants reflected upon the ways in which processes of institutional change are related to the relative impact of the IAHR on domestic human rights outcomes. This included discussion of a range of questions concerning the institutional effectiveness of the IAHR and the prospects for institutional strengthening: to what extent have the institutional changes that the IAHR has undergone enabled it to affect positive domestic human rights change; are the institutional resources at the system's disposal deployed where the need is the greatest (however conceived); and by, and/or on the behalf of, those groups and individuals most in need (however conceived)?

One Step Forward, Two Steps Back? Domestic Courts under Scrutiny: The Crucial Impact of National Courts in Latin America on the Inter-American Human Rights System

Stefanie Lemke (Utrecht University) argued that judicial independence is a very important pre-condition for ensuring human rights protection. Her paper explored the different degrees of judicial autonomy that currently exist in a sample of Latin American countries (Venezuela, Ecuador, Bolivia, Paraguay, Costa Rica and Uruguay). The intention was to analyse how judicial systems in Latin America contribute to the protection of human rights and to social change in the region. Several countries in Latin America – notably, Venezuela, Ecuador and Bolivia – now advocate a policy of non-interference in their internal affairs and do not accept international involvement in their domestic matters. However, at the same time, judges in these countries face serious challenge to their independence from the executive. Impeachment procedures, short-term assignments and physical threats have become common practice for judges issuing dissenting opinions in these states. As a result of the politicisation of judiciaries, judges do not respond adequately to increases in violence in these countries. It therefore seems that countries with politicised judiciaries appear less likely to implement changes required to protect human rights.

The Impact of Institutional Change at the Commission on the Allegations Made by Victims of the Chilean and Argentinian Dictatorships and its Resolutions

Karina Fernandez (University of Essex) discussed the role of the Commission in dealing with dictatorships in Chile and Argentina. She outlined how scholars often report that the Commission played a significant role during the dictatorship, but that its influence was not always felt at the time by those directly involved in the domestic human rights movement. Broadly speaking, there were four different stages of action by the Commission in Chile. The period 1973-78 predominately involved monitoring activities, which did not fully respond to victims' needs. At this stage, many victims were not familiar with the IAHR and its procedures, and the main users tended to be the political elite and international organisations. The Commission's action in response to petitions was fairly limited; most cases were closed as soon as a response was received from the state. Between 1978 and 1990, petitions increased, with the main area of action focused on tackling impunity. The Commission changed its procedures so that state responses did not just lead to the closure of cases, but rather were incorporated into the Commission's reports. From 1990 to 1998, the Commission prioritised friendly settlements, and truth and justice issues. From 1998, NGOs begin to reduce their involvement in petitions dealing with past crimes as these were not deemed likely to gain media interest or lead to structural changes. As a result, victims themselves have had to become the main petitioners for such issues.

The Inter-American Human Rights Court's Approach to Reparations: a Colombian Case-Inspired Reflection on the Nature, Origins and Implications of Recent Tendencies

Geneviève Lessard (University of Ottawa) discussed the Court's rulings on reparations in cases related to Colombia. The decision in the Operation Genesis case (2013) – in which the Court deferred reparations to the newly adopted Law of Victims – was a great victory for the Colombian state and a loss for CSO petitioners. After having progressed through the IAHR, victims were ultimately sent back to the same domestic administrative reparation mechanisms which apply to all Colombians who are victims of the armed-conflict. This trend was already perceptible in recent decisions since 2010 (Cepeda Vargas Case in 2010 and, most importantly, the Santo Domingo Case in 2012), where the Court seemed to grant increasing credibility to contentious administrative justice (*contencioso administrativo*) when dealing with reparations. This could have an effect on future decisions as to whether to take such cases to the system. The Colombian state takes hearings before the IAHR Court seriously – or at least appears to – and the country has not challenged the system diplomatically. Part of the idea of this is to enable the state to ask the system to grant greater leeway with rights issues, on the basis that the government is already trying to resolve such problems. The Court seems to have accepted this rationale, which departs from the approach it had developed in the 2000s, which consisted of recognising national efforts, whilst always determining *motu proprio* inter-American standards for reparations. Such rulings have led Colombian organisations to fear that the strength of the Court's supervision over reparations be reduced in the coming years. Court decisions to defer to local mechanisms of reparation mean that this body has substituted what it had come to consider its responsibility to evaluate reparations against inter-American standards, for a duty to encourage States when efforts are made at the domestic level. This questions the future capacity of the Court to effectively induce guarantees of non-repetition.

Comments:

- *Judicial Independence.* An independent judiciary does not always and necessarily lead to greater human rights protections. In Colombia, for example, the judiciary is a strictly

independent branch of the state in that the executive or legislative is not able to remove judicial appointees. That said, some of those holding the most senior legal posts in the country have been heavily criticised and do not, in their rulings, tend to uphold human rights. However, because this body is so independent there is now no way to sanction these officials.

- *Evolving challenges.* Generally speaking, observers of the system are trained to deal with 'bad states'; those that engaged in obvious violations of human rights and made no real attempt to comply with international legal instruments. However, today the rights environment has changed and states are much more sophisticated in their approach to external scrutiny. These represent a new challenge in that these states frame all their actions in accordance with international law, but are still falling far short of what they are supposed to be doing.

Session 3 (cont'd): Institutional Change and Human Rights Impact

Mobilizing Women's Human Rights in the IACHR: Impacts of the Belém do Pará Convention on Transnational Legal Mobilization

Cecília MacDowell Santos (University of San Francisco) discussed how the Belém do Pará Convention created normative change and change in the broader sphere of transnational mobilisation. Mobilisation over women's rights issues began in earnest in the 1990s, with the approval of Belem do Para (1994) representing an important achievement. There were several types of impacts from this: material and direct (ratification of the convention, creation of other norms); material and indirect (the new norm was subsequently used as the basis of litigation) and; symbolic and indirect (it led to improved legal consciousness and produced changes in how abuse survivors viewed themselves). There was an "impact cascade" as one type of impact leads to another. Indeed, the convention has shaped legal mobilisation, but was itself a result of mobilisation of organisations to create an instrument of this type. The ultimate adoption of the norm produced new efforts for legal reform on issues including criminal violence against women and femicide. In the process, litigants are learning from each other, and victims have become activists. Sometimes the interests of these various groups converge, but at times there are also conflicts.

Assessing the impact of the IAHRs on Legal and Public Policy Standards in Brazil

Heloisa Camara's (Universidade Federal do Paraná) presentation examined the relationship between the impact of provisional measures at the individual and collective level. In the case of Brazil it is interesting to note that provisional measures are applied repeatedly in the same instances, without ever crystallising into something more long-term and structural to addresses the underlying issues. (For example, there have been some 31 instances in which the system has issued provisional measures to protect inmates at the Urso Branco prison.) Part of the reason why this happens is that some of those benefiting from these measures face threats from military and police officials in regions where there are complex power relationships between actors. Urgent measures will not resolve this or provide long-term protection to those under threat. Part of the problem is also public attitudes to the issue. A recent survey of public opinion in Brazil revealed that 50% accepted the practice of torture in some situations. Without consolidated popular respect for human rights it is difficult to bring about structural improvements to the situation of those vulnerable to abuses, such as prisoners.

Institutional Complexity and Compliance in the Inter-American Human Rights System

Cristiane Carneiro (Universidade de São Paulo: presenting author) and **Simone Wegmann** (University of Geneva) are researching into the impact that greater institutional complexity within the IAHRs may have on states' compliance with treaty content. To examine this issue they will use, as a case study, the incidence of torture and its relation to increased institutional complexity. Although the creation and development of the international human rights regime is the result of an agreement among states, compliance with the regime is often motivated by different dynamics. A vast literature in the field of human rights has analysed the influence of treaty ratification on human rights protection. This research will use a statistical analysis to evaluate whether greater institutional complexity leads to higher or lower levels of compliance; and whether ratification of the Inter-American Convention Against Torture is associated with higher or lower levels of such abuses.

Comments:

- *UN vs IAHRs.* Brazilian NGOs and transnational organisations see the UN as a way of drawing attention to particular issues. When NGOs decide to take the case to the IAHRs it is to obtain a definite judicial decision, while the UN is used to shame the country before the eyes of the world. Though the UN does not have a court, levels of compliance with its decisions tend to be higher than those before the IAHRs.
- *Progress is Not Linear.* Though there was an “impact cascade” in the Maria da Penha case, the rights improvement did not improve with each year that passed. After the implementation of the law the impact was detained by a series of rulings by Brazilian Courts which effectively declared the law to be unconstitutional. The Supreme Court eventually ruled to uphold the Maria da Penha law, but progress was not linear in this area.

PARTICIPANT BIOS

Francisco Alfonzo - University of Essex, UK

A Venezuelan lawyer with three years' professional experience in Human Rights litigation. Currently finishing an LLM in International Human Rights Law in the University of Essex (UK). Has also completed a Masters in Constitutional Law in Venezuela (Universidad Católica Andrés Bello, Caracas).

Carlos Alza Barco - Pontifical Catholic University of Peru

Carlos Alza Barco has served as Director of the School of Government and Public Policy at the Pontifical Catholic University of Peru (PUCP) since October 2014. He holds an MSc in regulation from the London School of Economics and studied law at PUCP. Between 2011 and 2014 he coordinated the Public Policy and Management programme within PUCP's School of Government. Previously, he worked within the Office of the Peruvian Human Rights Ombudsman where he held various senior positions. He has published widely on public policy issues and has worked as a consultant to a number of different national and international bodies, including UNICEF, GTZ and the International Labour Organisation.

Dr Sandra Borda – Universidad de los Andes, Colombia

Sandra Borda is an associate professor of Political Science and International Relations at Los Andes University (Bogota, Colombia). She has a PhD in Political Science from the University of Minnesota, an MA in Political Science from the University of Wisconsin, and an MA in International Relations from the University of Chicago. She has taught various classes on IR theories, Social Sciences Research Methods, Global Governance, Colombian and US Foreign Policy, and International Organizations. Her research agenda includes US foreign policy (she is currently the chair of the Center for American Studies), the internationalization of civil conflicts, regional integration, Colombia's foreign policy, human rights, and international relations. She has been a visiting scholar at the ITAM (Mexico City), the Munk Center for International Studies at the University of Toronto and, the International Relations Department at the University of Groningen (Netherlands). Sandra was also a member of the Mission on Foreign Policy, a group of seven experts convened by the Colombian government with the purpose of formulating recommendations for its future foreign policy.

Dr Bruno Boti Bernardi – Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados, Brazil

Bruno Boti Bernardi holds a BA degree in International Relations from the University of Sao Paulo and a Master's degree and Ph.D. in Political Science from the same university. He has conducted extensive fieldwork research in Mexico (2008, 2014), Peru (2012), Colombia (2012) and Brazil (2014) as grantee of the Sao Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP). His research interests lie in human rights policies in Latin America, with focus on the Inter-American Human Rights System, transitional justice, international norms, judiciary branch, transnational NGOs and compliance with human rights standards. Currently, he has been working as IR Professor at the Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados (UFGD).

Dr Clara Burbano Herrera – Ghent University, Belgium

Clara Burbano-Herrera, PhD (Ghent University), LLM (Universidad Carlos III de Madrid), Postgraduate Degree in Constitutional Law (Universidad Nacional de Colombia), Law Degree (Universidad de los Andes), is a Fulbright Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the François-Xavier Bagnoud Center for Health and Human Rights (Harvard University) and a Postdoctoral Research Fellow of the Research Foundation Flanders at the Human Rights Centre of Ghent University, where she also teaches

Human Rights in Developing Countries. She is executive editor of the Inter-American & European Human Rights Journal, author of *Provisional Measures in the Case Law of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights* (Intersentia, 2012), and *Las Medidas Provisionales en Caso de Vida o Muerte* (Editorial Porrúa, 2013), co-author of *Procederen voor het Europees Hof voor de Rechten van de Mens* (The Procedure before the European Court of Human Rights - Intersentia, 2011). Currently, she is conducting research on the prevention of human rights violations in the Inter-American and in the African System of Human Rights, with a specific focus on the right to health.

Carina Calabria - University of Manchester, UK

Carina Calabria is a PhD candidate at University of Manchester and member of the project “The Sociology of the Transnational Constitution”, headed by Chris Thornhill and funded by the European Research Council. She holds degrees in Social Communication (Universidade Federal de Pernambuco/UFPE) and International Relations (Faculdade Integrada do Recife/FIR) and a LLM, with a focus on Constitutional and International Law (Universidade de Brasília/UnB). She was one of the 8 chosen tutors of the “Concurso do Sistema de Direitos Humanos”, organized by the Brazilian Ministry of Human Rights in 2013 and conducted a Professional Visit to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights from January to May of 2015. She is currently investigating the efficacy of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights in cases related to amnesty, indigenous rights and prison systems.

Heloisa Camara - Universidade Federal do Paraná, Brazil / Kings College London

Heloisa Fernandes Câmara holds a Law degree from the Federal University of Paraná (Universidade Federal do Paraná - UFPR) in Curitiba, Brazil. She received her Master of Laws in Public Law from the same university, where she studied the relation between state of exception and rule of law. She is currently a PhD candidate at the UFPR Graduate School of Law. Heloisa focuses her research on the rule of law throughout the Brazilian military dictatorship and the role the national Supreme Federal Court played at that time. She also coordinates a research group on the Inter-American System of Human Rights and its influence in the Brazilian judiciary. Currently, she also holds the post of visiting research fellow at the Brazil Institute at King’s College London.

Prof. James Cavallaro - Stanford Law School, USA

James Cavallaro is the founding director of Stanford Law School’s International Human Rights and Conflict Resolution Clinic. He received his BA from Harvard University and his JD from Berkeley Law School. He also holds a doctorate in human rights and development (Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Seville, Spain). In 1994, he opened a joint office for Human Rights Watch and the Center for Justice and International Law in Rio de Janeiro serving as director, overseeing research, reporting and litigation before the Inter-American system’s human rights bodies. In 1999, he founded the Global Justice Center, a leading Brazilian human rights NGO. He has held positions at Harvard Law School as a clinical professor of law and executive director of the Harvard Law School Human Rights Program. He joined Stanford Law School’s faculty in 2011. In June 2013, Professor Cavallaro was elected to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

Dr Jorge Contesse - Rutgers School of Law, Newark

Jorge Contesse is Assistant Professor at Rutgers School of Law, Newark. He received his LL.M. and J.S.D. from Yale Law School where he was a Fulbright Scholar and an editor of the Yale Human Rights and Development Law Journal. Previously he was a Crowley Fellow in International Human Rights at Fordham University School of Law, a visiting professor at the University of Miami School of Law, a visiting resource professor at the University of Texas School of Law, and an assistant professor at Diego Portales University School of Law in Santiago, Chile, from which he received his LL.B., and is currently an Adjunct Visiting Professor. Prior to joining the Rutgers’ faculty in 2013, Professor

Contesse held an appointment as a Visiting Fellow at Yale Law's Schell Center for International Human Rights. Professor Contesse co-litigated the *Atala v. Chile* case and acted as expert witness in *Norin Catriman and Others v. Chile*. He has appeared before the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights on both thematic and case hearings. He served as a board member on the National Human Rights Institute in Santiago, Chile and has been a consultant to several international organizations, such as Human Rights Watch and the Ford Foundation.

Caroline de Lima e Silva - University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Caroline de Lima e Silva is a Ph.D. student affiliated with the Autonomisation Group at iCourts, University of Copenhagen. She was granted a CAPES Scholarship (Ministry of Education in Brazil) to support her Ph.D. Her research project aims to assess the impact of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights' jurisprudence on High Courts of Argentina, Brazil and Peru. Employing a socio-legal methodology, Caroline will investigate eventual similarities and differences in legal culture of these countries in order to verify the existence of patterns of behaviour. She received her Bachelor's Degree in Law from the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo and LL.M from King's College University in London. She will be conducting field work in Latin America during 2016.

Dr Alice Donald - Middlesex University, UK

Alice Donald is Senior Lecturer at Middlesex University's School of Law. Alice previously worked as a commissioner, editor and broadcast journalist with the BBC World Service (1991-2005). She was also an Associate of Global Partners and Associates from 2007-10, and Senior Research Fellow at London Metropolitan University from 2010-12.

Dr Par Engstrom – UCL Institute of the Americas, UK

Par Engstrom (BA UCL, MSc London, DPhil Oxford) is Lecturer in Human Rights of the Americas at the Institute of the Americas, University College London. He is also co-chair of the London Transitional Justice Network. His current research interests and publications focus on regional human rights institutions with a particular reference to the Inter-American human rights system, transitional justice, and the international relations of the Americas. He has conducted scholarly research on the IAHR since 2003, and was awarded the Bapsybanoo Marchioness of Winchester Prize for best human rights thesis by Oxford University for his doctoral research on the IAHR. He has given talks and invited lectures on the IAHR at academic conferences, universities, and government agencies in Europe, the US, and Latin America. Prior to entering academia, Dr Engstrom worked at the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) in Geneva.

Karinna Fernandez - University of Essex, UK

Karinna Fernandez holds a law degree from the Valparaíso University, a Master's in International Public Law from the University of Chile and is currently a LL.M. candidate at the University of Essex. She has wide ranging experience in litigating human rights cases at the national and international level, advising various European organisations, such as FIDH, OMCT and REDRESS, on regional legislation. She has also served as an advisor on matters of international penal cooperation and extradition to Chile's Public Prosecutor's Office and as a legal advisor to the Interior Ministry. She is also an Associate Fellow of UCL's Institute of the Americas.

Dr Isabela Garbin - Federal University of Uberlândia, Brazil

Isabela Garbin is Assistant Professor at the Department of Economy at the Federal University of Uberlândia (UFU), where she also coordinates the Centre for Research and Studies on Human Rights (NUPEDH). She received her PhD in 2014 from the International Relations Institute at the University of São Paulo (IRI-USP), defending the thesis "Promise is debt: compliance in the Inter-American

Human Rights System". Isabela currently heads the research project entitled "Inter-American Human Rights: the gap between commitment and compliance," funded by the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) from Brazil, which seeks to define parameters to measure the compliance gap in the region in order to analyse the effectiveness of the IAHRs.

Diana Guarnizo - University of Essex, UK

Diana Guarnizo, LLB (National University of Colombia, Colombia), LLM (University of Essex) is currently a PhD student at the School of Law at the University of Essex. Her PhD thesis focuses on guarantees of non-repetition and violations of socio-economic rights. Diana has also worked as a consultant in women's rights, socio-economic rights and Inter-American System of Human Rights for several organizations, including Oxfam- Intermon, Redress, Colombian Ombudsman, Colombian Commission of Jurist, etc. Previous to this experience, she worked as a Fellow Assistant at the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACoMHR); as a consultant for the Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression at the IACoMHR; and as Assistant Researcher in the Centro de Estudios de Derecho Justicia y Sociedad (Dejusticia).

Dr Courtney Hillebrecht – University of Nebraska-Lincoln, U.S.

Courtney Hillebrecht is an assistant professor of political science at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Her research focuses on the nexus between international human rights law and domestic politics. Her book, *Domestic Politics and International Human Rights Tribunals: The Problem of Compliance*, was recently published by Cambridge University Press (February 2014). Professor Hillebrecht's research has also appeared or is forthcoming in a variety of human rights and political science journals, including *Democratization*, *Human Rights Quarterly*, *Human Rights Review*, the *European Journal of International Relations* and *Foreign Policy Analysis*, among others. Professor Hillebrecht is also the co-editor, along with Patrice C. McMahon and Tyler White, of *State Responses to Human Security: At Home and Abroad*. She is currently working on a multi-method project on the deterrent effects of international criminal accountability. Professor Hillebrecht joined the UNL Faculty in 2010, after completing her Ph.D. in political science at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. She has held research fellowships at the Carr Center for Human Rights (Harvard University), and at the School of Human Rights Research at Utrecht University in the Netherlands.

Anne M. Hoffman - Institute of Latin American Studies, Hamburg

Anne M. Hoffmann is Research Fellow at the GIGA (German Institute of Global and Area Studies) Institute of Latin American Studies and is a member of the GIGA research program "Power, Norms and Governance in International Relations". She is writing her PhD on South American regionalism, where she uses UNASUR as an example for regional social development. She teaches health policies at the University of Applied Sciences in Hamburg and South American regional integration at the University of Hamburg.

Prof. Paul Hunt - University of Essex, UK

Paul Hunt practised as a litigation solicitor in London before specialising in international and domestic human rights law. He has lived, and undertaken human rights work, in Europe, the Middle East, Africa and the South Pacific. In the 1980s, he was Legal Officer of the London-based National Council for Civil Liberties (Liberty). Between 1990 and 1992, he was Associate Director of the African Centre for Democracy and Human Rights Studies in Banjul, Gambia, and Senior Lecturer at Waikato University, in New Zealand. In 1998, he was nominated by the Government of New Zealand and elected by the UN to serve as an independent expert on the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1999-2002). Between 2002 and 2008, he served as UN Special Rapporteur on the

right to the highest attainable standard of health and, in 2008, was awarded an Honorary Doctorate by the Nordic School of Public Health. In 2011-2012, Professor Hunt had some part-time responsibilities with the World Health Organisation (Geneva), advising Assistant Director-General Dr. Flavia Bustreo on human rights issues. He is a member of the Human Rights Centre at Essex University and Adjunct Professor at Waikato University, New Zealand.

Anne-Katrin Speck - Council of Europe / Middlesex University, UK

Anne-Katrin Speck will join, later this autumn, a team at Middlesex University as a research assistant on an ESRC-funded project into implementation of and compliance with decisions of UN treaty bodies and regional human rights bodies, including from the IASHR. She currently serves as Co-Secretary to the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. In this capacity, she has been involved in the Assembly's work on safeguarding the effectiveness of the European Convention on Human Rights, with a particular focus on identifying possible ways to address existing shortcomings in the implementation of the Convention in States Parties. Previously she was a Carlo Schmid fellow at the UNHCR Representation to the European Institutions in Strasbourg, and worked as a consultant for UNHCR in Nuremberg. Anne completed her Bachelor's degree in International Relations at Dresden University of Technology and Moscow State Institute of International Relations, and received an LL.M. in International Human Rights Law from the University of Essex.

Gabriela Kletzel - Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales, Argentina

Gabriela Kletzel is the Director of CELS' International Team. Gabriela has particular expertise in strategizing and conducting advocacy before international human rights systems, the application of international human rights standards by domestic courts and litigation of precedent-setting human rights cases at the national and international level. Before undertaking graduate studies in the US, she worked at CELS as an attorney for strategic litigation and legal defense, and was coordinator of CELS' work before the UN human rights system (2005-2010) and as member of the ESCR team (2002-2005). She was a main researcher for the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights project on "Access to justice as a guarantee of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights" and was part of the team of professors of the Human Rights Clinic run jointly by CELS and the University of Buenos Aires Law School. She graduated summa cum laude from the University of Buenos Aires Law School and obtained an LL.M. at New York University School of Law. She received several academic awards and fellowships, including the Hauser Global Scholarship and the Fulbright Scholarship. She has published several papers in the field of human rights law.

Dr Stefanie Lemke - Netherlands Institute of Human Rights

Stefanie Lemke is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the Netherlands Institute of Human Rights (SIM). With the Prins Claus Chair in Development and Equity (hosted by Professor Javier Couso, Chile), she focuses on the relationship between judicial independence and human rights in countries in transition, with an emphasis on Latin American countries. Previously, she served as a senior research fellow in the rule of law at University of Cologne, Germany (2006-2015). She has a background in law (with a strong focus on public international law and EU law) and studied in various legal systems. She pursued her Ph.D. studies at the University of Cologne, the University of London and the University of Oxford, UK. She also litigated high-profile cases concerning human rights violations in the Americas and the Middle East before the ICC and various UN human rights mechanisms with the European Centre for Constitutional and Human Rights e.V. (ECCHR), a Berlin based human rights NGO (International Crimes and Accountability programme), and practiced with the German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (Department for Governance, the Rule of Law and Democracy). In position of lecturer, she taught public law and regional human rights

systems at the University of Bonn, Germany, and at SIM. She also worked with several commercial and local law firms across the globe and published widely on legal empowerment and access to justice.

Geneviève Lessard - University of Ottawa, Canada

Geneviève Lessard is currently completing a Ph.D. at the School of Political Studies of the University of Ottawa. Her thesis explores the role the inter-American human rights system has played in Latin American democratization processes, with a focus on the case of Colombia. Since 2008, Lessard has been teaching at the University of Montreal's International Cooperation programme. From 2000 to 2010, she worked as a Program Officer (Latin America) with the Canadian International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development (Rights & Democracy), where she was in charge, among other tasks, of following-up with the evolutions of the inter-American human rights system, as well as with civil society efforts to ensure its strengthening. Related publications include: "Civil Society Interactions within the Inter-American Human Rights Institutional Framework: two Case-Studies in Promoting the Strengthening of the Regional Human Rights System" in *Revue Québécoise de Droit International* (2011), "From Quebec to Lima: Human Rights, Civil Society and the Inter-American Democratic Charter", in *Canadian Foreign Policy* (2003), *L'Organisation des États américains (OÉA): de l'ordre international d'après-guerre à celui d'aujourd'hui*, Centre d'études internationales et sur la mondialisation (CEIM) (1998).

Peter Low – UCL Institute of the Americas, UK

Peter Low (BA Int. University of Leeds, MA Kings College London) serves as Network Facilitator of the Inter-American Human Rights Network at UCL's Institute of the Americas. Prior to joining UCL, Peter spent several years living in Colombia, where he worked, in a variety of capacities, on human rights and development issues in the Andean region. Between 2010 and 2013, he ran the UK NGO the Peru Support Group, where he authored research pieces on artisanal and small-scale gold mining, and on a 2005 torture incident at a mine site in northern Peru (part of a collaborative project with Kings College London, Harvard Humanitarian Initiative and others). He later worked, in co-operation with the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office, on a variety of human rights and governance projects in Colombia, Mexico, Panama, and Peru, before joining UCL in mid-2014. In addition to his network management functions, Peter is also conducting research into the role and impact of civil society interactions with the IAHRs in various Latin American countries.

Dr Cristiane Lucena Carneiro – University of São Paulo, Brazil

Cristiane Lucena holds a Ph.D. in Politics (New York University). She is an Assistant Professor at the International Relations Institute, University of Sao Paulo, and has experience in the area of compliance, alternative dispute resolution, and human rights. Her current research investigates the impact of institutional complexity on compliance with international legal commitments, with a particular focus on the international human rights system and the Inter-American Human Rights regime (in collaboration with Simone Wegmann, University of Geneva). At the moment, she is also collaborating on a book project that offers a legal commentary on the Arms Trade Treaty, which was signed in New York in 2013 and is expected to enter into force sometime in 2015. She teaches courses in international relations, on human rights and development, and more recently, on international law and global governance. Cristiane has published on alternative dispute resolution in the WTO, international regime design, and economic sanctions and human rights.

Dr Cecília MacDowell Santos - University of San Francisco, USA

Cecília MacDowell Santos is Associate Professor of Sociology and Director of the Latin American Studies Program at the University of San Francisco. She is also a permanent researcher of the Center for Social Studies at the University of Coimbra. One of her research projects, entitled "Transnational

Legal Activism: Brazilian NGOs and the Inter-American System of Human Rights,” examines the strategies and discourses of NGOs, as well as the responses by the Brazilian State to cases of gender-based violence, racial discrimination against women, violence against indigenous groups, and struggles over political memory and justice presented to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. Building on research for this project, she published a number of journal articles and co-edited the books, *Desarquivando a Ditadura: Memória e Justiça no Brasil* (Hucitec Press, 2009), and *Repressão e Memória Política no Contexto Ibero-Brasileiro: Estudos sobre Brasil, Guatemala, Moçambique, Peru e Portugal* (Brazilian Ministry of Justice, 2010). Drawing on research conducted in Portugal on transnational legal mobilization and human rights, she edited the book, *A Mobilização Transnacional do Direito: Portugal e o Tribunal Europeu dos Direitos Humanos* (Almedina Press, 2012).

Oscar Parra-Vera - Former Senior Legal Officer, Inter-American Court of Human Rights / MSc Candidate, University of Oxford.

Oscar Parra-Vera is a Colombian lawyer, MSc Candidate in Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of Oxford and former Senior Legal Officer at the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (Costa Rica, 2006-2015). He undertook a secondment to the European Court of Human Rights and has also served as "Romulo Gallegos" Fellow and consultant for social rights at the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (Washington, DC). He holds an LL.M in legal theory from the National University of Colombia and was visiting researcher of the Institute of Human Rights at the Åbo Akademi University (Finland). He has been invited as an expert in meetings organized by the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances (2013), the Human Rights Council (2013) and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (2010). He has worked as a researcher at the Ombudsman Office of Colombia, the Colombian Commission of Jurists and as a clerk for the Constitutional Court of Colombia. He has lectured on the Inter-American system issues in several institutions and seminars and has worked as a consultant for the Inter-American Institute for Human Rights (Costa Rica), the Judicial School of Colombia, the Human Rights Center of the University of Chile and the International Institute of Humanitarian Law in Sanremo (Italy). He also is a professor in FLACSO-Mexico's Master's program in Human Rights and Democracy, advisory board member at the Leverhulme Inter-American Human Rights Network, sits on the Editorial Board of the *Inter-American & European Human Rights Journal* and the Advisory Board of the project on "Implementation and compliance with human rights law: an exploration of the interplay between the international, regional and national levels" (2015-2017).

Dr Thomas Pegram – UCL Institute of Global Governance, UK

Tom Pegram (MPhil, DPhil Oxford) is Deputy Director of the UCL Institute of Global Governance and Lecturer in Global Governance at the Department of Political Science. He has held research fellowships at New York University and Harvard Law Schools. Tom also has extensive practical experience working with policy-makers and practitioners at the local and international level, including both governmental and non-governmental agencies. His current research and teaching interests lie at the boundaries of international and domestic politics, with expertise in international politics, comparative politics, human rights, international organizations and processes of democratization in fragile democracies. He specializes in the study of National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs) with a particular interest in their ability to promote and protect human rights as well as enhance political accountability in fragile and established democratic settings.

Prof. Flavia Piovesan - Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo, Brazil

Flavia Piovesan is Professor of Constitutional Law and Human Rights at the Faculty of Law, Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo, Brazil. She was a visiting fellow of the Human Rights Program at

Harvard Law School, and of the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International law; and a human rights fellow at the Centre for Brazilian Studies at the University of Oxford. Currently she is a Humboldt Foundation George Foster research fellow. Professor Piovesan is a Member of the Organization of American States working group for monitoring the San Salvador Protocol on social, economic and cultural rights. She is also a Member of the Latin American and Caribbean Committee for the Defence of Women's Rights, of the National Council in Defence of the Rights of the Human Person, the Centre for Global Justice and the Human Rights University Network. Professor Piovesan is the author of several books and other publications on human rights and global development issues.

Dr Rossana Rocha Reis – University of São Paulo, Brazil

Rossana Rocha Reis holds a BA degree in Social Sciences from the State University of Campinas, a Master's degree in Sociology from the State University of Campinas and a Ph.D in Political Science from the University of São Paulo. Currently she is a researcher at the Center of Support to Studies of Democratization and Development and is an associate professor in University of São Paulo's Political Science Department, working in the undergraduate International Relations program. She is a researcher at the Contemporary Culture Studies Center, editor of the journals *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais* (Brazilian Magazine of Social Sciences) and *Lua Nova* (New Moon), *Revista de Cultura e Política* (Culture and Politics Magazine) and is author of the book *Política de Imigração na França e nos Estados Unidos – Immigration Policy in France and the US (1980-1988)*. She also has experience in the field of Political Science, working primarily on immigration policy, nationality, citizenship, and human rights in the United States and France.

Dr Natalia Saltalamacchia Ziccardi – Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México

Natalia Saltalamacchia Ziccardi is Researcher and Professor at the International Studies department of ITAM (Mexico). She holds a degree in International Relations from ITAM, obtained a Master's at Johns Hopkins University and her doctorate from Universidad Complutense de Madrid. Her many publications include "Derechos humanos en la política exterior. Seis casos latinoamericanos", Miguel Ángel Porrúa/ITAM, 2011, edited with Ana Covarrubias; "México y América Latina. La vía multilateral" in Olga Pellicer and Guadalupe González (eds.), *Los retos internacionales de México: urgencia de una nueva mirada*, México, Siglo XXI, 2011; "Derechos humanos: un espejo para México" in *Revista Nexos* June 2012 (with Pedro Salazar), and "1968 y los derechos humanos en México", in *Foreign Affairs Latinoamérica*, February 2009.

Dr Clara Sandoval – University of Essex, School of Law

Clara Sandoval is a qualified lawyer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Law at Essex University, and Director of the Essex Transitional Justice Network. She teaches and researches on areas related to the Inter-American System of Human Rights, Transitional Justice, Legal Theory and Business and Human Rights. One of her research interests is reparations for gross human rights violations, serious violations of humanitarian law and for international crimes. A list of her more recent publications in this area is available here. Besides her academic commitments, Clara also engages in human rights litigation at the domestic level and within the Inter-American System; and in training and capacity building with organisations such as REDRESS and the International Bar Association (IBA). Clara has been a consultant for the International Criminal Court on reparations and for the OHCHR on reparations and broader issues concerning transitional justice. Clara is a member of the Human Rights International Council of the Human Rights Institute of the IBA.

Dr Patrick William Kelly - University of Wisconsin-Madison

Patrick William Kelly received his Ph.D. in international history in 2015 from the University of Chicago. Starting in August 2015, he will be the A.W. Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. He is currently completing a book manuscript, provisionally titled *Salvation in Small Steps: Latin America and the Making of Global Human Rights Politics*, which will be the first transnational history of human rights based on case studies in Brazil, Chile, the United States, and Argentina. It draws on archival research and oral interviews in nine countries in Latin America, Europe, the United States, and Australia. More broadly, his research and teaching interests include twentieth-century international history, the history of the United States in the world, modern Latin American history, the global Cold War, and the global histories of human rights and humanitarianism. A recipient of international research grants from the Social Science Research Council IDRF and the Fulbright-Hays, he has published in the *Journal of Global History*, *Humanity*, and in a number of edited volumes—most recently in *Religious Responses to Violence: Human Rights in Latin America Past and Present*, ed. Alexander Wilde (University of Notre Dame Press,

f
o
r
t
h
c
o
m
i
n
g

i
n

2
0
1
5