ILPA IMMIGRATION LAW PRACTITIONERS' ASSOCIATION
PRESIDENT: IAN MACDONALD QC

ILPA Further Submission to the Home Affairs Committee Enquiry into Trafficking March 2009

Endorsed by the Anti-Trafficking Legal Project (ATLEP)

A. Introduction

1. ILPA is a professional association with around 1,000 members, who are barristers, solicitors and advocates practising in all aspects of immigration, asylum and nationality law. Academics, non-government organisations and others working in this field are also members. ILPA exists to promote and improve the giving of advice on immigration and asylum, through training, disseminating information and providing evidence-based research and opinion. ILPA is represented on numerous government and other stakeholder groups including the NGO/Stakeholder Consultative Group on Human Trafficking and the Child Trafficking Advisory Group and has provided evidence to many parliamentary committees and in the course of debates on legislation on the subject of trafficking. This year, among other activities, ILPA representatives have been panellists at the workshop on Trafficking convened by the OSCE and the TUC and also observers at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference on trafficking.

2. These submissions are endorsed by the Anti-Trafficking Legal Project (ATLEP), which has given written[1] and oral evidence to the Committee for this enquiry.

3. ILPA submitted written evidence[2] to the enquiry on 7 February 2008. Given the very short timescale for responses, ILPA's response was of necessity brief. We find ourselves in a similar position with this call for further evidence. We have, therefore, sought in this short response to:
   - highlight some very recent developments;
   - provide a brief update on the matters on which our original submission focused;
   - list ILPA submissions and briefings published during the year of relevance to the enquiry.

[1] Available at www.ein.org.uk/resources/ATLeP_Submission_to_the_Home_Affairs_Committee.doc
[2] Available on www.ilpa.org.uk in the section on submissions.

THE IMMIGRATION LAW PRACTITIONERS' ASSOCIATION LIMITED IS A COMPANY LIMITED BY GUARANTEE. REGISTERED IN ENGLAND AND WALES.
REG NO 2350422. REG OFFICE 12 GLENEAGLES COURT, BRIGHTON ROAD, CRAWLEY, WEST SUSSEX RH10 6AD

We have confined this list to documents in the public domain. We trust that this will be of use but please do not hesitate to get in touch with us if further information is required.

B. Recent developments

B.i Damages in tort against traffickers

4. *AT and others v Dulghieru* [2009] EWHC 229 (QB), is the first known example of litigation on behalf of the victims of trafficking for sexual exploitation directly against their traffickers in the UK. The claim based upon the torts arising from the unlawful conspiracy of the defendants to sexually enslave the claimants (four young women nationals of Moldova). Both defendants had been convicted of offences connected with the trafficking of individuals into the UK for the purposes of prostitution. The Honourable Mr. Justice Treacy accepted that the claimants were entitled not only to general damages but also to aggravated damages and accepted that the starting point for the assessment should not be the levels set out by the Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority for such conduct. The judge made a total award of £611,000 (allocated between the claimants by reference to the lengths of their ordeal and also the extent of identified ongoing post-traumatic stress).

B.ii The Definition of Trafficking in UK law under scrutiny

5. Evidence has mounted during the past year that the definition of trafficking in UK law (Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants etc.) Act 2004) is inadequate because it fails to ensure the prosecution and conviction of those who traffic babies and very small children.

6. At Report stage in the House of Lords on the Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants, etc.) Act the Baroness of Anelay of St. Johns, the Conservative Party's front bench spokeswoman, raised the risk of a lacuna and was supported by many other peers. She said:
'I have tabled this probing amendment in response to a concern raised by the Refugee Children's Consortium in its Second Reading briefing … The Government's new paragraph 4(4)(d), which has not yet been debated, improves the clause, which still appears to allow some people who traffic children and families to escape prosecution. I am sure that no one would wish that. It is contrary to the consortium's wishes, certainly to my wishes, and—the consortium believes—the wishes of the Government…. The references to "request or inducement" in subsection (4)(d), and the attempt to produce an exhaustive list of positions of vulnerability, still appear to the consortium not to cover all forms of exploitation that involve an abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability. That is the wording adopted in the United Nations Palermo Protocol on trafficking.'[3]

7. The Baroness Scotland of Asthal, responding for the government, stated:
'…I say to the noble Baroness, I hope by way of reassurance, that we think that mischief is caught by subsection (4)(d). In saying that, let me make it clear that the Government are absolutely committed to tackling human trafficking in all its

[3] *Hansard* HL Report 6 April 2004, col 1642ff

forms. The noble Baroness is absolutely right to say that we are at one in that purpose…This is the sort of scenario at which the amendment is aimed, and we agree that the offences should cover this situation. However, we do not consider that an amendment is necessary to achieve this. …. Let me make it clear that a child will not have to know that they are being requested or induced to do something for an offence to be committed….We think that there is not, therefore, a lacuna, which needs to be addressed or filled by this amendment…. . We believe that these activities would and should be caught. I am very conscious of the Pepper v Hart basis on which I say that…If we thought there was a lacuna, we would want it plugged. The draftsmen and others believe that the mischief which noble Lords have highlighted is covered.'[4]

8. Fulsome as the reassurance was, it did not satisfy those concerned, and the Baroness Anelay, with the same chorus of support, returned to the matter at Third Reading in the Lords. She said:

> *The concern can be simply stated. Is Clause 4 sufficiently broad to cover all cases involving children? … Does it cover situations where the child may not be conscious of what is happening to them? …I have always accepted that the Government do not intend that there should be any lacuna. We have been working as one on this matter. However, it appeared that the gap was as follows. Children may not be subject to treatment amounting to slavery or forced labour. They could therefore not satisfy the definition of exploitation in Clause 4(4)(a). Children may not be trafficked for their organs; thus they may not satisfy the definition in subsection 4(b). As for subsection 4(c), the threat of violence may not be made to the child: the parent may be told that the child will be harmed. The parent may be asked to agree that the child become involved in an activity, and no one may ask the child anything at all. Thus it would appear that those who traffick in children may escape prosecution under this scheme….Following our debates on Report on 18 May, I understand that the Government have had further discussions behind the scenes with the Refugee Children's Consortium. I understand that the Minister may now be in a position to put on record the Government's further statement on their understanding of the term "inducement" in the context of this clause. If the Minister is able to do so and can demonstrate that the clause makes it clear that children do not need to be conscious of what is happening to them, then I anticipate that I shall most certainly, and with great pleasure, be able to withdraw this amendment.'*[5]

9. The Lord Rooker responded for the government:

> *'We are satisfied that the ordinary meaning of the word "inducement" is such that a person may be induced to do something notwithstanding his not being fully aware of what he is being induced to do. We therefore consider that subsection (4)(d) as drafted can apply in cases involving very young children, who may not be fully aware of the situation, of their actions, and of what it is they are being encouraged to do. … We are satisfied that the ordinary meaning of the word "inducement" is such that a person may be*

[4] *Hansard* HL Report 6 April 2004 col 1645ff
[5] *Hansard*, HL Report 6 July 2004 cols 669-670

induced to do something, notwithstanding the fact that that person is not fully aware of what it is he is being induced to do.' [6]

10. The Peace Sandberg case demonstrates that the Baroness Scotland and the Lord Rooker were wrong and the Refugee Children's Consortium was right. On 16 May 2008 Peace Sandberg was jailed for 26 months at Isleworth Crown Court after being found guilty of facilitating illegal entry into the UK. The illegal entry in question was that of a baby believed to have been purchased in Nigeria, allegedly so that Ms Sandberg could claim to qualify for priority housing in the UK. Ms Sandberg was not prosecuted for trafficking because, it was concluded, that the section 4 of the Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants, etc.) Act 2004 was inadequate to capture the trafficking of babies and very small children, e.g. for benefit fraud. The CPS achieved a conviction but had to do so with one hand tied behind their backs. The government's intention is clear, but amendment to the primary legislation is required to address it.

11. ILPA brought the matter to the attention of the Bill team working on the Draft (partial) Immigration and Citizenship Bill in July 2008. ILPA urged that the lacuna be addressed in the Bill. That Bill has now been superseded by the Borders, Immigration and Citizenship Bill. There are now two bills: the Policing and Crime Bill and the Borders, Citizenship and Immigration Bill in which the matter could be addressed. This does seem to be more than ample an opportunity to correct these errors in this parliamentary session and the matter has been raised in debates on both bills[7].

12. It was also suggested at the February 2009 workshop hosted by the OSCE and the TUC which brought together, *inter alia*, representatives of the UK Human Trafficking Centre, the UK Border Agency, the Home Office, the Crown Prosecution Service that the definition of trafficking creates difficulties for bringing a prosecution in practice in that the way the elements of the offence have been broken up in subsections 4(1) to (3) of Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants etc.) Act makes it necessary to prove the requisite intention at the requisite stage of the trafficking process (e.g. necessary to prove the intention of the trafficker at the time when the trafficker brought the person to the UK).

B.iii Confusion in the UK's implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action Against Trafficking in human beings.

[6] *Hansard* HL Report 6 July 2004 cols 671ff

[7] See the 2nd reading in the House of Lords on 11 February 2008 and in particular the comment of the Minister, Admiral the Lord West of Spithead, "…*During the passage of the Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants, etc.) Act 2004 the criminalisation of trafficking for non-sexual exploitation, including of children, was discussed and legislated for. I believe that this is an area where we can have even more focus; it is very important. We have tried very hard, but there are still things that can be done, and that will merit further discussion in Committee*.' *Hansard* HL Report 11 February 2009 Col 1212

13. It has now been decided that cases of trafficking of UK nationals and EEA nationals will be dealt with by the UK Human Trafficking Centre, while other cases will be dealt with in the UK Border Agency. This is the latest development in a long line of confusion created by the way in which the UK has dealt with the notion of a 'competent authority' and looks set to cause real problems in practice.

14. The term 'competent authority' is widely used in international law and indeed in other parts of UK law to describe the State – and make reference to the arm of State with responsibility for a particular area. 'Competent' is a reference to powers, rather than skills. Thus the Council of Europe Convention envisages that all organs of the State will incorporate protection of those who have been trafficked into their duties and responsibilities. The OSCE concept of a 'National Referral Mechanism'[8] is about co-ordinating those various efforts. But what this concept has become in the UK plans for implementation of the Convention is the notion of a centralised decision-making body who will sort those whom there are reasonable grounds to believe have been trafficked from those whom there are not, for all purposes.

15. The difficulties this creates are very clearly illustrated by the case of children. Trafficking of children is one form of abuse of children. Child protection teams should be skilled to identify and respond to cases of trafficking – this is a specialist area but sits firmly within the framework of their responsibilities toward children at risk of harm. Under UK child protection law these teams have responsibilities to identify and to protect children at risk of trafficking. But under the proposed model for implementation of the Convention these teams will be obliged to refer the case to the UK Border Agency or the UK Human Trafficking Centre to determine whether there are reasonable grounds for believing the child to have been trafficked. Those with most information about the case, and most expertise in general child protection, will be referring the case to those with less. Whatever the decision of those UK Border Agency or the UK Human Trafficking Centre, the child protection teams will, under UK law, retain all their own responsibilities toward these children. If they think the child has been trafficked, they must act accordingly – a negative decision from the UK Border Agency or the UK Human Trafficking Centre cannot release them from their obligations under UK child protection law. So what purpose is the second decision serving at all?

16. The case of children is stark, but the same comment can be made for the whole concept of a central 'competent authority'. The police are not going to cease their efforts to prosecute a trafficker just because the 'competent authority' says that the person has been trafficked – or vice versa.

17. Having a central decision that will have implications for a person's support and for other aspects of their subsequent treatment, including immigration decisions on residence permits, raises questions of procedural fairness. We have repeatedly raised questions of procedural and substantive fairness in the

[8] See http://www.osce.org/odihr/19054.html

procedures for determining whether or not a person has been trafficked. What assistance will a person get to make their case? What opportunity will they have to be heard? What opportunity will they have to challenge the decisions of the 'competent authority'? What records will be kept of the decision, and how will these be made available for use in subsequent criminal proceedings or, where relevant, the immigration decision?

18. What we have seen are model referral forms that appear to overlap with, but not to fit with, those used by the UK Border Agency in screening interviews. We have seen nothing on how a person will challenge a decision that there are not reasonable grounds for believing that they have been trafficked unless this is wrapped up in the substantive decision on the immigration application or asylum claim. If the latter is the case it is unclear how the timescales for UK Border Agency decision-making will mesh with the timescales for making a decision on the question of whether there are reasonable grounds for believing that a person has been trafficked to give access to the reflection period. This cannot be done within standard procedures for challenging a UK Border Agency decision on an immigration case before the Asylum and Immigration Tribunal because there is no right of appeal to the Asylum and Immigration Tribunal against a decision that there are not reasonable grounds for believing that one has been trafficked. Thus it would appear that the only possible challenge will be by way of judicial review. How will records of the decision made on whether there are reasonable grounds for believing that a person has been trafficked be made available, including to that person and to representatives?

19. We refer the Committee to the recent House of Commons debate in Westminster Hall on human trafficking where a summary of the questions being raised was provided by Anthony Steen MP, Chair of the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Trafficking in Women and Children:

> *"… article 10 [of the Council of Europe Convention] deals with the identification of victims. [It…] suggests that international good practice is that there is no lead department—a single competent authority—and that decision making should be devolved across a range of authorities at a regional and local level, so that it is closest to the location of the victim…Support services could then be agreed, co-ordinated and provided quickly. For children, that would be through local authority children's services.*
>
> *..the Government propose to make the UK Human Trafficking Centre in Sheffield the single competent authority, with decisions made by UK Border Agency staff inside the UK Human Trafficking Centre. There is now a groundswell of opinion from nearly every non-governmental agency that that is precisely the wrong way to proceed. … decisions will not be transparent …There will be no appeals process, so nobody will know what is going on.…all local authorities, the police, the UK Border Agency and the UK Human Trafficking Centre should all be competent authorities. …If the UK Human Trafficking Centre is the sole competent authority, there will also be operational problems…."*[9]

[9] *Hansard* HC Report 3 February 2009 Cols 158-159WH

20. What we have seen of the proposals for referrals to the 'competent authority' has shown little awareness of questions of consent, including informed consent, or of confidentiality. Nor has it shown awareness of the extent to which referring NGOs could find themselves giving immigration advice, a criminal offence under the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 unless the NGO is regulated by the Office of the Immigration Services Commissioner. The Office of the Immigration Services Commissioner had not been consulted.

21. At the February 2009 workshop hosted by the OSCE and the TUC it was indicated that it is proposed to grant one year Discretionary Leave to Remain in the United Kingdom to people who have been trafficked if they are co-operating with the police or if their personal circumstances are such that a grant of leave would be appropriate. The question was raised whether it will be possible to lodge an appeal against a decision to grant one year Discretionary Leave to Remain. The current statutory framework would mean that there is no right of appeal for a person granted one year Discretionary Leave to Remain, including from a refusal of asylum and a refusal to provide protection under Article 3 of the European Convention of Human Rights. Under section 82 of the Nationality, Immigration & Asylum Act 2002 ("2002 Act") there is a right of appeal only if the decision would leave a person with no leave; there is no right of appeal from a *grant* of leave to remain. There is an exception: a right of appeal from a refusal of an asylum claim arises if an applicant is granted more than one year's leave to remain. This is set out at section 83 of the 2002 Act, which provides:

> "83(1) This section applies where a person has made an asylum claim and—
>
> (a) his claim has been rejected by the Secretary of State, but
>
> (b) he has been granted leave to enter or remain in the United Kingdom for a period exceeding one year (or for periods exceeding one year in aggregate).
>
> (2) The person may appeal [to the Tribunal] against the rejection of his asylum claim."

One possible solution is to grant victims of trafficking Discretionary Leave to Remain for one year and one day, which would mean that they would be afforded a right of appeal.

22. ILPA and others have brought all these matters to the attention of the UK Border Agency.

23. Article 15 of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, which states

> '1 Each Party shall ensure that victims have access, as from their first contact with the competent authorities, to information on relevant judicial and administrative proceedings in a language which they can understand.

2 Each Party shall provide, in its internal law, for the right to legal assistance and to free legal aid for victims under the conditions provided by its internal law. …'

24. Just a short time before the deadline for implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings we have seen nothing on how the UK intends to comply with its obligations under Article 15. Nor have we seen anything on how the timescales for determining that there are reasonable grounds to believe that a person has been trafficked will mesh with the decision-making process in immigration and asylum applications.

25. There continues to be no provision in for guardians for unaccompanied children as is required by the Council of Europe Convention.

C. Update on matters raised in our 7 February 2008 submission.

C.i Access to legal advice and representation

26. The problems highlighted in our February 2008 submission continue. It is getting harder for people who have been trafficked to find a legal aid lawyer to take their case. The only change that may assist is that in cases of particular prisons the Legal Services Commission has been prepared to waive the three-hour cap on travel.

27. The Legal Services Commission has consulted on its proposals for a new bid round for legal aid contracts[10]. These contracts would run from 2010. The proposals would continue the fixed fee regime with the attendant problems for people who have been trafficked highlighted in our initial submission to this enquiry. They risk introducing new difficulties for people who have been trafficked and who seek, an indeed need, legal advice and representation with their bias against complex cases and against small specialist firms undertaking those cases.

28. The Legal Services Commission's proposals for a database of those in receipt of legal aid[11] also raises concerns about the protection of confidential information about people who have been trafficked.

29. The problems with the fixed fee regime risk being exacerbated because of the government's proposal that where a person is not a British citizen nor an EEA national, the decision as to whether there are reasonable grounds for believing that they have been trafficked will be dealt with by the UK Border Agency. The case will proceed alongside the asylum, human rights or other immigration case (for example renewal of a visa as a migrant domestic worker or other worker). No legal aid impact assessment has been carried

[10] See list of ILPA responses at part D below.
[11] In the 2008 consultation *Delivery Transformation*, see list of ILPA responses at part D below.

out of the implications of these proposals. There has been no consideration of the question of challenges to the decision of the 'competent authority'. There has been no consideration of the need to adjust the fixed fee in these cases to take account of the extra work that will be involved in dealing with the question of whether there are reasonable grounds for believing that a person has been trafficked within the timescales required by the decision-making process. The Legal Services Commission had not been consulted. ILPA has brought this matter to the attention of the Legal Services Commission and the UK Border Agency.

C.ii Cases of trafficking in the Detained Fast -Track

30. The situation continues to be as described in our February 2008 submission to the enquiry, whereby a case proceeding through the accelerated procedures of the Detained Fast-Tracked will not be delayed to permit the UK Human Trafficking Centre or the Poppy Project to undertake an assessment despite efforts to persuade the Agency to improve its procedures. Procedures still do not parallel those operated when the Medical Foundation for the Care of Victims of Torture agrees to see a person detained in the fast track procedures. ILPA has expressed concerns at the inadequacy of guidance on trafficking for those 'screening' applicants to decide who will go into the Detained Fast-Track[12].

31. The proposal that the UK Border Agency determines who has been trafficked in cases of people who are not British citizens nor EEA nationals (described above) risks having particular ramifications in the Detained Fast-Track. Where this is being considered, will the case be taken out of the Detained fast track? Will the case be delayed while it is determined whether there are a reasonable grounds for believing that a person has been trafficked? If so, will the person be released?

32. The Asylum Process Instruction Victims of Trafficking, dated 16 June 2008 has been published[13].

C.iii Age disputes

33 In our original submission ILPA said that special attempts to protect trafficked children will only benefit those children if they are recognised as children and disputes over age are a huge barrier to such recognition'. We referred to ILPA's 2007 Report *When is a child not a child? Age disputes and the process of age assessment.*

34. In October 2008, the inadequacy of current age assessment processes was acknowledged by the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child in its

[12] See the documents listed at part D below
[13] See www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/sitecontent/documents/policyandlaw/asylumprocessguidance/specialcases/guidance/victimsoftrafficking.pdf?view=Binary

Concluding Observations of October 2008 on the UK's report under the Convention[14]. The Committee recommended that the UK:

> ***'(e) Give the benefit of the doubt in age-disputed cases of unaccompanied minors seeking asylum, and seek experts' guidance on how to determine age'***

32. The Committee on the Rights of the Child hit upon the most important matter in opening its recommendation with 'give the benefit of the doubt'. ILPA members continue to see cases where all the evidence is compatible with a child being a child, as they say they are, but evidence other than the testimony of the child is also compatible with their being over 18. These are being treated as age disputes.

33. The Government's age assessment working group met for the last time in August 2008. To date we are aware neither of the outcome of the Working Group nor the Government's plans in this area. One subject deliberated by the working group was the question of X-rays as a tool for assessing age. There has still been no final pronouncement on the topic. Meanwhile the main developments in approaches to the resolution of age disputes have come through the courts.

C.iv People who have been trafficked – interface between the immigration and criminal justice systems

34. The latest Crown Prosecution Service Guidance on people who have been trafficked was published on 1 October 2008.[15]

35. People who have been trafficked continue to be prosecuted for immigration (for example, document) offences. In *R v O* [2008] EWCA Crim 2835, O who had been trafficked into the UK for the purposes of sexual exploitation and escaped from the trafficker, had obtained a Spanish ID card and was apprehended at Dover fleeing to France. Although age was disputed she was charged and prosecuted as an adult (there being no finding as to her true age). She was advised to plead guilty to an offence of possessing an identity document which related to someone else with intent to use it to establish facts about herself, contrary to section 25(1)(c) of the Identity Cards Act 2006. Notwithstanding detailed information about her experience of trafficking being available pre-trial and the possibility of a defence of duress under the two Crown Prosecution Service trafficking-related Protocols, she was sentenced to 8 months imprisonment.

36. An out of time appeal was brought against her conviction and sentence. Laws L.J, giving lead judgment in the Court of Appeal allowed O's appeal against

[14] Committee On The Rights Of The Child Forty-Ninth Session, Consideration Of Reports Submitted By States Parties Under Article 44 Of The Convention, Concluding Observations, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,CRC/C/GBR/CO/4, October 2008 at www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/crc/docs/AdvanceVersions/CRC.C.GBR.CO.4.pdf paragraph 71(1)(c).
[15] Crown Prosecution Service, Human Trafficking and Smugglinghttp://www.cps.gov.uk/legal/h_to_k/human_trafficking_and_smuggling/

her conviction and sentence. He referred to the disturbing facts of the case and, with a view to providing guidance, expressed the Court's desire that such events as occurred in O's case would not be repeated. The Court of Appeal recognised the clear intention of the UK Government, in signing the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, to protect the rights of victims of trafficking in the UK and that these obligations require that both prosecutors and defence lawyers are "to make proper enquiries" in criminal prosecutions involving individuals who may have been trafficked.

37. ILPA continues to see cases of minors exploited e.g. in cannabis factories who have been prosecuted.

C.v Sanctions on workers and employers

38. ILPA has repeatedly raised the question of people who have been trafficked, in particular those trafficked for domestic servitude, in its representations on changes to the managed migration system, the subject of another enquiry by the Home Affairs Committee. These featured in prayers against the Statements of Changes in Immigration Rules HC 321 and HC 1113 in both the House of Commons[16] and the House of Lords[17].

39. HC 321 made provision for mandatory re-entry bans, and for mandatory refusals of applications where deception had been used. ILPA brought to the attention of the Joint Committee on Human Rights[18] the problems this would create for people who had been trafficked. The Minister, Liam Byrne MP, questioned by the Committee indicating that he would look again at the situation of people who had been trafficked.[19] On 13 May 2008 the Minister announced that there would be a 'carve-out' for victims of trafficking to be put into effect on ratification of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings. IPA will be monitoring implementation of this. In the meantime this form part of the Entry Clearance guidance: a person accepted to have been trafficked will not be subject to a re-entry ban.[20]

40. ILPA was disappointed that in the debate on HC 1113[21] the latter the Minister of State, Phil Woolas MP, indicated that he did not see the new rules on sponsor licensing as an opportunity to provide protection for workers against exploitation. However, he did indicate that he would give special consideration to the situation of migrant domestic workers, and indeed

[16] 13 May 2008, see www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200708/cmhansrd/cm080513/debtext/80513-0028.htm#0805147000002
[17] 17 March 2008, see www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200708/ldhansrd/text/80317-0013.htm#0803183000002
[18] See list of documents below at part D.
[19] See HC 357-i, 19 February 2008, Q16, at http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/jt200708/jtselect/jtrights/uc357-i/uc35702.htm
[20] Chapter 26. See http://www.ukvisas.gov.uk/en/ecg/chapter26/#point%20four
[21] Fifth Delegated Committee on legislation , 15 January 2009, see http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmgeneral/deleg5/090114/90114s01.htm

extended the transitional arrangements for migrant domestic workers in diplomatic households to May 2010.

D. A selection of Relevant ILPA submissions and materials since 7 February 2008

41. These are listed in chronological order and are all available on the Submissions and briefings pages of ILPA's website: www.ilpa.org.uk .

- ILPA response to the Consultation on draft Detained Fast Track and Detained Non-suspensive Appeals – Intake Selection (Asylum Intake Unit instruction), February 2008
- ILPA submission on changes to the General Grounds for Refusal in the Immigration Rules to be introduced by Statement of Changes in the Immigration Rules HC 321, February 2008
- ILPA letter to Lord Adonis re. Debate on Guardianship for Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children during Report Stage of the Children and Young Persons Bill on 17 March 2008, April 2008
- ILPA response to the UK Border Agency consultation on a Code of Practice for Keeping Children safe from harm, April 2008.
- ILPA briefing on changes to the General Grounds for Refusal in the Immigration Rules to be introduced by Statement of Changes in the Immigration Rules HC 321, May 2008
- ILPA response to the UK Border Agency Consultation on Compulsory Identity Cards for Foreign Nationals, May 2008
- Trafficking and National Referral Mechanisms: ILPA paper following the UK Border Agency workshop on Monday 12th May 2008, May 2008
- ILPA response to the Legal Services Commission consultation Delivery Transformation : Managing legal aid cases in partnership. July 2008
- ILPA Memorandum of Evidence to Home Affairs Committee Draft (Partial) Immigration and Citizenship Bill July 2008
- ILPA Memorandum to the Joint Committee on Human Rights on the Draft (Partial) Immigration and Citizenship Bill September 2008
- Request to both Houses of Parliament to pray against the Statement of Changes in Immigration Rules HC 1113 November 2008
- ILPA comments on the Detained Fast Track and Detained Non-suspensive Appeals – Intake Selection (Asylum Intake Unit instruction) as published (December 2008)
- ILPA response to the Legal Services Commission consultation on legal aid contracts from 2010, January 2009
- ILPA's Briefing on baby trafficking for the House of Lords second reading of the Borders, Citizenship and Immigration Bill February 2009
- ILPA submission to the Joint Committee on Human Rights Enquiry into Children's Rights, February 2008.

Sophie Barrett-Brown
Chair, ILPA 5 March 2008