

## **DRAFT ASIL 2015 Annual Meeting Schedule**

### **TUESDAY, 4/7**

#### **4:00-7:30 p.m.**

***Blacks of the American Society of International Law (BASIL) professional development events, Howard University School of Law***

#### **Description:**

The Blacks of the American Society of International Law Task Force (BASIL), in co-sponsorship with Howard University School of Law, will host a unique series of events that will expose law students and new legal professionals to experienced international practitioners. The event will begin with a panel of prominent lawyers addressing international career opportunities. Attendees will then participate in a 90 minute “speed mentoring” activity, where panelists and additional mentors will each host a table where a small group of students can spend 10-12 minutes asking more personal, directed questions of the participants. Students will then be able to rotate to a new table, gaining the chance to learn about several different avenues of international employment. The speed mentoring event will be followed by a formal reception featuring remarks by Judge Gabrielle Kirk McDonald and Professor Adrien Wing. The BASIL Task Force is an initiative of the American Society of International Law designed to help to increase the number of blacks in international law. The career panel and speed mentoring event will focus on black law students to increase their awareness of the unique experiences they would bring to this exciting field of law. ASIL is pleased to be working with the Black Law Students Association (BLSA) to promote this event.

#### **Participants:**

- Adom Cooper, U.S. Department of State
- Megan Grimball, Attorney-Adviser, Office of International Claims and Investment Disputes, U.S. Department of State
- Mélida Hodgson, Partner, Foley Hoag
- Steve Koh, Trial Attorney, Office of International Affairs, U.S. Department of Justice
- Wendy Patten, Senior Policy Analyst, Open Society Foundations
- Vikram Raghavan, Lead Counsel, World Bank
- Natalie Reid, Partner, Debevoise & Plimpton
- Tamara Shockley, United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF)
- Andrew Solomon, Justice Advisor, USAID
- Darren Walker, United Nations Headquarters

### **WEDNESDAY 4/8**

#### **9:00-11:00 a.m.**

***ASIL Executive Council Orientation***

#### **9:00-12:15 p.m.**

***Institute of Transnational Arbitration (ITA) & ASIL Conference***

#### **11:30-4:00 p.m.**

***ASIL Executive Council Spring Meeting***

#### **2:00 p.m.**

***Annual Meeting registration opens***

**2:00-3:30 p.m.**

*Possible IG business meetings*

**4:30 – 6:00 p.m.**

*Grotius Lecture*: Judge Kenneth Keith, ICJ, “Some Thoughts About Grotius 400 Years On”

Dame Rosalyn Higgins, Distinguished Discussant

**6:00-8:00 p.m.**

*Grotius Reception*

*ILM & Insight Opportunities Reception*

## THURSDAY 4/9

### 7:00-8:30 a.m.

Colleague Societies breakfast

### 9:00-10:30 a.m.

#### *International Law & the Future of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*

##### **Description:**

Given the failure of the most recent round of Israeli-Palestinian peace talks, the future in the region is highly uncertain. How, if at all, might international institutions including the International Criminal Court, the International Court of Justice, the Human Rights Council, and the Human Rights Committee help shape expectations and enable compromise? How can international law best influence the realization of a lasting peace agreement? This panel will explore these questions from a range of perspectives.

##### **Participants:**

- Diana Buttu, Harvard Extension
- Will Schabas, Middlesex University
- Nimrod Karin, NYU School of Law
- Ken Anderson, American University Washington College of Law
- Sean Murphy, (Moderator) George Washington University School of Law

#### *Regional and Sub-Regional Human Rights Tribunals: The African Response*

##### **Description:**

The realization of human rights—particularly, economic, social and cultural rights—across Africa remains a daunting challenge. However, a number of regional and sub-regional courts now exist on the continent: the ECOWAS Community Court of Justice, the East African Court of Justice, the Southern African Development Community Tribunal, the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, and the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights. These courts reflect an increased attention to human rights concerns, but they also face significant hurdles, in terms of their resource constraints and their questionable support among key domestic constituencies. This session will explore the courts' prospects for overcoming these hurdles and advancing human rights.

##### **Participants:**

- Michelo Hansungule (University of Pretoria)
- Laurence Helfer (Duke Law School)
- Azubike Onuora-Oguno (University of Pretoria)
- Ayodeji Perrin (City of Philadelphia Board of Ethics)
- W. O. Egbewole (University of Ilorin, Nigeria) (Moderator)

#### *Legitimacy, Adaptability, and Consent in Modern International Law*

##### **Description:**

International law has always had to balance the need to respond quickly to changed circumstances, on the one hand, with the interest in making law through broad-based, collective processes, on the other hand. This tension has arguably become more pronounced in recent years. Some have called for avoiding international law's formal, consent-based processes, and instead developing international norms through more flexible mechanisms, such as recommended codes of conduct, that do not require a broad state consensus. Yet these new mechanisms raise fresh questions about the legitimacy of the resultant norms. What weight should be given to norms that are produced through these non-traditional mechanisms? How might alternative mechanisms be structured so as to respond to modern challenges, without sacrificing too much in the way of legitimacy? And to what extent is legitimacy even a coherent metric for assessment? The panelists will be pushed hard to address these issues through Socratic questioning.

**Participants:**

- Jutta Brunee, University of Toronto
- Martin Davidowicz, University of Oxford, Faculty of Law
- Joel Trachtman, Tufts Fletcher School
- Benedict Kingsbury, NYU School of Law
- Joseph Weiler, NYU School of Law (Moderator)

***Foreign Relations Law in the Roberts Court: The First Decade (Anti-Corruption IG)*****Description:**

This panel will examine the foreign relations law decisions of the Roberts Court during its first decade. Do its decisions reflect continuity with those of the Rehnquist Court or a difference in approach? Has the Court become less deferential to the Executive? Is “foreign relations exceptionalism” dead?

**Participants:**

- Harlan Cohen, University of Georgia School of Law
- Ganesh Sitaraman, Vanderbilt Law School
- Jean Galbraith, University of Pennsylvania Law School
- Melissa Arbus Sherry, Latham & Watkins LLP
- David Moore, Brigham Young University Law School (Moderator)

***Brazil, Corruption, and the 2016 Summer Olympics (International Law in Domestic Courts IG)*****Description:**

Brazil has the unique fortune of consecutively hosting the FIFA World Cup and the Olympic Games. Brazil also finds itself in an historic anti-corruption reform movement. This panel will explore the role of anti-corruption law in curbing corruption related to these events.

**Participants:**

- Leah Ambler, OECD Latin American Anti-Corruption program
- Carlos Ayres, Co-chair, Anti-Corruption and Compliance Committee, Brazilian Institute of Business Law
- Chris Gaffney, Department of Geography, University of Zurich
- Shaun Freiman, University of Richmond School of Law (Moderator)

***Shifting Sands: The Implications of Undemocratic Election Processes and Borders (International Law Students Association)*****Description:**

Syria, Egypt and Iraq are facing unprecedented challenges to democracy and the rule of law. Allegedly “democratic” elections in Syria were opposed by the UN and the Arab League, while in Egypt, Abdel Sisi has recently appointed a new cabinet, and the unelected, self-proclaimed caliphate Islamic State (ISIS / ISIL) has emerged in Iraq and Syria. This panel will consider the threat to democracy in each of these events, not only in these states but for the region. What role should the international community play in addressing the issue of sham elections in the region? Should the international community recognize the Assad regime in the wake of the irregularities of the Syrian election? What can external actors, such as international organizations, states, or NGOs, do to help give a political voice to the large numbers of refugees that have resulted from the conflicts in the region? What, if anything, should the international community do about concerns regarding the legitimacy of the Abdel Sisi government? The panel will assess past experience to consider whether there is a role for international intervention in each different of these issues, and if so, the different options for international engagement.

**Panelists:**

- Paul Williams, American University Washington College of Law
- Jim Hooper, Public International Law & Policy Group
- Tamer Mahmoud, White & Case

## *Interest group business meetings*

**11:00-12:30 p.m.**

### ***Can International Law Help Prevent the Rapid Disappearance of Wildlife?***

#### **Description:**

The extent to which international environmental law is helping to prevent the trend of rapidly disappearing wildlife is unclear. Moreover, trafficking in endangered species is no longer just an environmental problem; organized criminal and military groups now traffic in endangered species to fund their illicit activities. This session will examine whether and how international law might adapt to these developments. The session will explore the enforcement problems that many countries face at the domestic level, as well as the options for addressing the problem at the international level. For example, if the trafficking in wildlife is not only an environmental but also a security problem, should it be addressed primarily through the mechanisms of international environmental law? What are the advantages and disadvantages of involving other mechanisms, like the UN Security Council? Finally, is the regulation of ivory trade a better alternative to protect the elephant population in Africa than a total banning? This panel will start with the projection of the short film “Last Days”, which shows the close connection between elephant poaching and terrorism, a new and worrying aspect of wildlife trafficking.

#### **Participants:**

- Kelvin Alie, International Fund for Animal Welfare
- Susan Lieberman, Federal Advisory Council on Wildlife Tracking
- John Frederick Walker, author and artist
- Rachelle Adam, former legal advisor of Israel’s Ministry of the Environment; Harvard Law School / Boston College Law School (Moderator)

### ***Rules of the (Video) Game: IHL on the Virtual Battlefield***

#### **Description:**

Video games have a well-earned reputation for their depiction of armed conflict and portrayal of violations or disregard for the laws of war. Nevertheless, this genre informs the paradigm of armed conflict for millions of people. This session of legal and industry experts will use recorded “game walkthroughs” and commentary, to demonstrate how integrating legal principles into video games actually enhances playability by making them more realistic; playing more realistic video games enhances an understanding of the rules that applying during an armed conflict; and realistic gaming can serve as a way to educate and reach large sections of the population that might not otherwise be exposed to such legal issues.

#### **Participants:**

- Seth Hudson, George Mason University
- Daniel Greenberg, International Game Developer’s Association
- Col. Kurt Sanger, United States Marine Corps
- Gary Brown, International Committee for the Red Cross (Moderator)

### ***The Use of Armed Force: Are We Approaching Normative Collapse?***

#### **Description:**

Some have argued that the jus ad bellum is at serious risk of collapsing, given the kinds of legal claims that are now being advanced on humanitarian intervention and the use of defensive force. This roundtable brings together scholars with different perspectives to assess that argument. Are the current “stresses” on the jus ad bellum materially different from or more detrimental to the regime than the stresses of the past several decades? What factors have contributed to the regime’s remarkable resilience since World War II, and will those factors continue to play this role? What is the largest current risk to the regime and how might that risk be mitigated? The roundtable will consider these questions and more through a broad historical lens.

**Participants:**

- Mahnoush Arsanjani, World Bank Administrative Tribunal
- Ian Hurd, Northwestern University
- John Mearsheimer, University of Chicago
- Tom Ruys, University of Ghent, Department of Public International Law
- Tom Farer (Moderator), University of Denver

***The Stagnation of International Law*****Description:**

International lawyers increasingly claim that, on many issues, the traditional processes for making international law have stagnated or become gridlocked. The claim raises questions about the continued relevance of multilateral treaties and institutions—and indeed, of international law itself. This session will assess that claim and its implications for international law. To what extent are traditional lawmaking processes actually stagnant? What accounts for any stagnation? To what extent might alternative mechanisms—like creative interpretations of existing texts, claims on customary international law, or soft law instruments—fill the gap? And what is the proper role of international lawyers if law as law is marginalized?

**Participants:**

- Igno Venkze, University of Amsterdam
- Ayelet Berman, The Graduate Institute
- Dinah Shelton, George Washington University Law School
- Kal Raustiala, UCLA School of Law (Moderator)

***The CRPD & the Treatment of Institutionalized Forensic Patients (Disability Law IG)*****Description:**

The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) obligates States not to discriminate on the basis of disability and sets forth steps that States must take to ensure authentic equality. It re-conceptualizes mental health rights as disability rights, requiring significant reforms to laws and policies affecting persons living with mental illness. Little attention has been paid to its potential impact on patients in forensic institutions. Even in the hidden world of those institutionalized because of psychiatric disability, forensic patients - those institutionalized because of potential or “permanent” incompetency or an insanity acquittal – are the most hidden. Conditions in forensic facilities have frequently been found to “shock the conscience,” and few lawyers or advocates represent this population. This panel seeks to address this gap by critically examining: (1) the importance of key articles in the CRPD; (2) the treatment (or non-treatment) of forensic issues in the drafting process; (3) the relationship among the CRPD and other UN instruments; and (4) and (5), a specific comparative law focus on the state of affairs in Japan and in China. The panel will begin with short presentations by experts but will also encourage input from the audience. It is hoped that this panel discussion will generate a position statement from the ASIL IDL IG that can be submitted to, the UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and other relevant UN Committees.

**Participants:**

- Guo Zhiyuan, Associate Professor, China University of Political Science and Law
- Yoshi Ikehara, Head, Tokyo Advocacy Law Office
- Carole Petersen, Professor, University of Hawai'i School of Law
- Maya Sabatello, Director, Center for the Study of Social Difference, Columbia University
- Michael Perlin, Professor of Law Emeritus, New York Law School (Moderator)

***ASIL-ICCA Task Force on Issue Conflicts in International Arbitration: briefing and discussion  
IG business meetings***

**12:45-2:45 p.m.**

WILIG Luncheon: Anne-Marie Slaughter, President & CEO, New American Foundation (ticketed), “What People-Centered International Law Would Look Like”

**1:00-2:30 p.m.**

***Energy at Sea: How Do Increased Energy Demands Test the Regime for Ocean Governance?***

**Description:**

As the global demand for energy continues to grow, international attention is increasingly focused on the oceans as a source of both renewable and non-renewable energy. Unexplored areas, like the Arctic, are estimated to contain one fifth of the undiscovered and technically recoverable oil and gas resources on the planet. Moreover, new technologies seek to harness energy from the oceans’ winds, tides, currents, and thermal gradients. This roundtable will address the legal, environmental, security, and institutional challenges that these developments raise. The participants will address whether new exploitation activities in the oceans warrant further international regulation and whether the benefits of these activities exceed their environmental risks.

**Participants:**

- Heather Conley, Center for Strategic and International Studies
- Seline Trevisanut, Utrecht Center for Water Oceans and Sustainability
- Rachael Salcido, Pacific McGeorge School of Law
- Maria Gavouneli, Faculty of Law, National Kapodistrian University of Athens
- Catherine Redgwell, University of Oxford (Moderator)

***Bribery’s Victims***

**Description:**

For years, scholars and practitioners have debated the impact of international anti-bribery laws on the primary victims of bribery, particularly individuals in developing countries. The US FCPA, the UK Bribery Act, and other such statutes have reduced the prevalence of corporate bribery at the international level, but the extent to which enforcement has actually benefited the victims is less clear. This panel of scholars, practitioners, and former government officials will discuss how anti-bribery measures impact particular populations and how they might more directly benefit the victims. The session will also examine a number of different proposals to make the measures more effective, including proposals canvassed in the recently published white paper by the Stolen Assets Recovery Initiative, “Left Out of the Bargain.”

**Participants:**

- Andrew Spalding (Richmond School of Law)
- William B. Jacobson (Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP; formerly Department of Justice (FCPA Unit))
- Jeanne Hauch (World Bank, Financial Market Integrity & Stolen Asset Recovery (StAR) Initiative; George Washington University School of Law)
- Michael Hershman (CEO & President, Fairfax Group)
- Philip M. Nichols (University of Pennsylvania School of Business) (Moderator)

***The ICC Crime of Aggression and the Changing International Security Landscape***

**Description:**

In 2017, the parties to the Rome Statute are widely expected to “activate” the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court over the crime of aggression, under the amendments adopted in Kampala. The Kampala amendments reflect a series of compromises, and the associated ambiguities have generated considerable debate about their proper interpretation. Rather than rehash those interpretive debates, this session will focus on the practical effects of activating the ICC’s jurisdiction. In a world in which many use of force decisions are shrouded in controversy over their consistency with international law, how might activating the ICC’s jurisdiction affect both specific decisions to use or refrain from using force and the more general architecture on global security? Are these effects, on the whole, desirable?

**Participants:**

- Sarah Sewall, Under Secretary of State for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights, U.S. Department of State
- Ambassador Kurt Volker, Executive Director, McCain Institute for International Leadership, and former United States Permanent Representative to NATO
- Ambassador Jonas Liisberg, Under-Secretary of State for Legal Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark
- Mort Halperin, Open Society Foundations
- Michael J. Matheson, (Moderator) George Washington University Law School

### ***The Revival of Comparative International Law***

#### **Description:**

This session will examine the concept of “comparative international law”—the idea that, notwithstanding a norm’s international pedigree, actors from different legal systems are likely to interpret and apply the norm differently. The idea was prominent during the Cold War because of self-evident differences between Soviet and Western approaches to international law. Yet the idea fell into disuse with the rise of the United States as a unipolar power. Now that this moment of unipolarity seems to be passing, and the fundamental architecture of world power appears to be changing, comparative international law is having something of a revival. This panel will bring together scholars who are either working on issues relating to comparative international law or developing non-Western approaches to international law.

#### **Participants:**

- Neha Jain, University of Minnesota
- Lauri Malksoo, University of Tartu (Estonia)
- Congyan Cai, Xaimen University (China)
- James Gathii, Loyola University of Chicago School of Law
- Bill Burke-White, University of Pennsylvania Law School (Moderator)

### ***Voices from the Field: Challenges Confronting UN Field Legal Advisers (Government Attorneys IG)***

#### **Description:**

Legal advisers to United Nations peacekeeping missions, like others in the field, have to adapt – often very rapidly – to changes in the global and local landscape. This panel will reflect on the legal and practical difficulties that these lawyers encounter translating their mission’s mandate into reality when multidimensional mandates are constantly evolving and operating environments are increasingly hostile. Among other issues, the discussion will focus on the applicability of international humanitarian law in rapidly changing and asymmetric conflicts, the political and operation constraints on legal advisers in the field, and the management of the legal and reputational risks involved for the United Nations.

#### **Participants:**

- Manuel Calzada, Senior Legal Adviser, UNAMID (Darfur)
- Riccardo Maia, Senior Legal Adviser, MONUSCO (DRC)
- Aurelie Proust, Political Affairs Officer, UNIFIL (Lebanon)
- Mona Khalil, Senior Legal Officer, Office of Legal Counsel, United Nations Office of Legal Affairs (Moderator)

### ***IG business meetings***

#### **2:45-4:15 p.m.**

### ***Intellectual Property Rights, Biodiversity, and Climate Change***

#### **Description:**

This session will discuss the potential role of intellectual property (IP) rights in addressing the global challenge of climate change and sustainable development. IP rights create incentives for research and development of clean technologies, as well as to mitigate against the harmful effects of climate change. However, IP rights are

subject to overlapping diverse legal regimes, encompassing both international trade law (the TRIPS Agreement) and international climate change law (the UNFCCC). The session will focus on options to incentivise the IP system to become more 'eco-friendly', including the mechanisms already adopted by a number of countries for balancing the competing interests.

**Participants:**

- Bassem Awad, Center for International Governance Innovation
- Thaddeus Burns, Senior Legal Counsel, General Electric
- Jayashree Watal, Senior Counselor, Intellectual Property, World Trade Organization
- Fernando dos Santos, Director General, African Regional Intellectual Property Organization

***Litigating the Counterterrorism Activities of the United States in Foreign Courts***

**Description:**

Since 9/11, the United States has engaged in various covert and military activities overseas to combat terrorism. Those affected by these activities have responded by litigating cases against the United States or U.S. officials in non-U.S. courts. This panel will examine whether this kind of litigation is a productive tool for holding the United States accountable. The panel will assess the efficacy and precedential value of recent decisions by the European Court of Human Rights and various domestic courts on issues like the rendition, detention, and mistreatment of terrorism suspects. The panel will also discuss the many challenges to this kind of litigation: uncertainty as to which national or international legal standards apply, complications relating to the production and reliability of the evidence, and the discomfort among many national courts with the prospect of interfering in their countries' foreign affairs.

**Participants:**

- Wolfgang Kalek, General Secretary, European Center for Constitutional and Human Rights
- Julia Hall, Amnesty International
- Amrit Singh, Senior Legal Officer, National Security and Counterterrorism, Open Society Justice Initiative
- Sandra Hodgkinson, DRS Technologies, former official in State and Defense Departments
- Alka Pradhan, Reprieve US (Moderator)

***The Role of International Law in Negotiating Peace***

**Description:**

In 2011, representatives from Serbia and Kosovo met for the first time since Kosovo had declared independence three years earlier, and cameras recorded the action. Using this footage, the documentary "The Agreement" shows these critical talks on peaceful coexistence between Serbia and Kosovo. This two-hour session includes both a viewing and a moderated discussion of the film. The discussion, which will include the chief European Union negotiator and the film's director, will consider the following questions: To what extent can negotiators help drive the peacemaking process or achieve a lasting peace? How does international law help (or not help) bring the parties to the table, and buttress (or undermine) their positions in the negotiating process? More generally, to what extent does international law play a role in each actor's decision making process?

**Participants:**

- Marc Weller (University of Cambridge)
- Sir Robert Cooper, KCMG (EU Peace Negotiator in 'The Agreement')
- Karen Stokkendal Poulsen (Director of 'The Agreement')
- Veronica Fifkak (University of Cambridge) (Moderator)

***Public Morals and Policy Space after the WTO's Seal Products Case***

**Description:**

The WTO Appellate Body's recent ruling in the EC - Seal Products case confronted the issue of morality under WTO law: should a trade-restrictive measure motivated by animal welfare be justifiable on the grounds of "public morals"? This roundtable will focus on the long-term implications of this ruling. For example, how did

EC-Seal Products redefine the meaning of public morals and what, if any, limitations did the case impose on that phrase? Were the Panel and the Appellate Body correct to be so deferential to the measures taken by individual states? How will this approach affect future cases, like Plain Packaging? And what is the decision's likely impact on the scope of the TBT Agreement and the meaning of discrimination in the GATT?

**Participants:**

- Jan Yves Remy, Sidley Austin LLP, previously WTO
- Laura Nielsen, University of Copenhagen
- Pablo Bentes, (Steptoe & Johnson LLP, previously WTO)
- Joanna Langille, New York University (Moderator)

***Picture This: Survey of International Art Law Issues (Cultural Heritage & the Arts IG)***

**Description:**

Art is an “expression of human creative skill and imagination, typically in a visual form such as painting or sculpture, producing works to be appreciated primarily for their beauty or emotional power.” In our rapidly changing world, few things remain constant but from the earliest civilizations to the present, human beings have been compelled to create and collect works of art, as well as steal, forge and deface cultural property. In the 21st century, the art law issues have been magnified by the international art market boom, cross border ownership disputes, ever-conflicting private and public interests as well as technological advancements. For example, proliferation of forgeries produced in Russia or India is amply felt in England and the United States; violations of or threat to national patrimony laws in Turkey and Italy trigger international art loan bans; and the total number of nations that have ratified the Berne Convention is growing annually, thus making a resale royalty right available to more artists around the world. As art forgers become more creative, new technology evolves to detect fakes, but as the art prices grow, so does the push back against art authenticators -- art historians and scientists -- who threaten the investment value of art collectors with inconvenient truth about attribution. Multitude of transnational issues surround sales of valuable art works, antiquities, and ceremonial artifacts of indigenous communities is exacerbated by the disconnect between the common law system and the civil code; it is increasingly affecting private international law and the interests of claimants, collectors and auctioneers.

**Participants:**

- Pierre Ciric, Ciric Law Firm
- Mari-Claudia Jimenez, Partner, Herrick Feinstein LLP
- James Martin, Founder, Orion Analytical, LLC
- Irina Tarsis, Center for Art Law, New York (Moderator)

***ASIL Annual General Meeting***

***IG business meetings***

**4:30-6:00 p.m.**

***2015 Charles N. Brower Lecture on International Dispute Resolution:*** Professor Michael Reisman, “Canute Confronts the Tide: States and the Evolution of the Minimum Standard in Customary International Law”

***New Voices: International Criminal Law***

**Description:**

Submissions from rising scholars in the field will be presented to the audience, with time allotted for questions. The moderator will provide feedback to the presenters regarding the content of their papers.

**Participants:**

- Tom Dannenbaum, Lecturer, University College London
- Jonathan Hafetz, Associate Professor of Law, Seton Hall University; LAPA Fellow, Princeton University
- Matiangai V.S. Sirleaf, University of Baltimore Law School
- David Crane, University of Syracuse School of Law (Moderator)

**7:15-8:30 p.m.**

***ASIL Members Reception***

***“L” Reception***

***Women in International Law Mentoring Program reception***

## **FRIDAY 4/10**

**7:00-8:30 a.m.**

*Asian Society of International Law Breakfast (off program)*

**7:45-8:45 a.m.**

*ASIL New Members Breakfast*

**9:00-10:30 a.m.**

*Complicity in International Law*

**Description:**

In cases ranging from civil actions in domestic courts such as those brought under the U.S. Alien Tort Statute (ATS), to prosecutions in international criminal tribunals, courts today often must decide whether persons, corporations, or even states should be found complicit in violations of international law. U.S. courts in ATS cases wrestle, for example, with whether corporations should be deemed complicit in the actions of the local security forces they employ. International criminal tribunals address the culpability not only of direct perpetrators, but also of those actors who assist the direct perpetrators. The concept of complicity proved equally important in the understanding of state responsibility for genocide that emerged in the Genocide case between Bosnia and Serbia before the International Court of Justice. The explosion of policies and principles surrounding corporate social responsibility has added even more complexity to the discussion. This panel brings together leading experts in each of these sub-fields to talk about the meaning, significance, and overlap of complicity in a rapidly changing world.

**Participants:**

- Chimène Keitner, Hastings (complicity in ATS litigation)
- Beth Van Schaack, Santa Clara (complicity in international criminal tribunals)
- James Stewart, University of British Columbia (business and human rights)
- André Nollkaemper, University of Amsterdam (state responsibility)
- Jaya Ramji-Nogales, Temple University (Moderator)

*The Limits of Judicial Mechanisms for Developing and Enforcing International Environmental Norms*

**Description:**

This session will ask how to develop and apply international environmental norms, where key states disengage from the available lawmaking processes or disagree on the substantive content of the norms. Given the apparent lack of commitment or consensus on these norms, are international courts and tribunals equipped to develop and apply the law case-by-case? To what extent might these bodies impede, rather than advance, positive normative developments? What are the most promising alternatives?

**Participants:**

- Marcos Orellana (Centre for International Environmental Law)
- Alan Boyle (University of Edinburgh School of Law / Essex Court Chambers, London)
- Philippe Gautier (International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea)
- Cymie Payne (Rutgers University, New Jersey)
- Nienke Grossman (University of Baltimore) (Joint Moderator)
- Jacqueline Peel (University of Melbourne) (Joint Moderator)

*Does TTIP Need Investor-State Dispute Settlement?*

**Description:**

The proposed Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) would establish a free trade and investment agreement between the US and the EU, representing the most significant international economic law treaty since the formation of the WTO. One of the most controversial issues in the negotiations is whether TTIP should include investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS). Academics and NGOs in Europe and North America

have attacked ISDS in TTIP as both unnecessary and dangerous for fundamental values, such as democracy, the rule of law and human rights. Others have argued that the dangers of ISDS are overstated, and that removing ISDS from TTIP will cause a harmful precedent for future negotiations with China and other countries. The European Commission has conducted an online consultation process on the topic and received almost 150,000 responses. TTIP, if passed, is likely going to set global standards for international investment protection and investor-State dispute settlement. This session will address the ISDS/TTIP controversy head-on by debating whether ISDS is necessary or desirable, especially in treaties between developed countries. Speakers will assess the evidence that ISDS helps promote investment, that it imposes significant costs on states, and that it constrains states' regulatory space. Speakers will also consider the alternatives for dispute resolution, including state-to-state dispute resolution, if ISDS is not included.

**Participants:**

- Mark Kantor (Independent Arbitrator; Georgetown University Law Center)
- Jason Yackee (University of Wisconsin Law School)
- Ursula Kriebaum (University of Vienna)
- Simon Lester (Cato Institute)
- Andrea Bjorklund (McGill University) (Moderator)

***The Law of War Above the Fold (Lieber Society on the Law of Armed Conflict)***

**Description:**

After highlighting a number of scenarios from current armed conflicts that have been featured in prominent recent news stories (at the time of the conference), speakers will identify the relevant international humanitarian law, international criminal law, or international human rights law doctrines implicated argue for or against a specific position posed by the moderator concerning that issue and that scenario. The panel will aim to use real-life scenarios to illustrate broader dilemmas in IHL and issues that blogs and the media may not be covering with sufficient nuance from an international law perspective.

**Participants:**

- Pnina Sharvit Baruch, Institute for National Security Studies
- Hina Shamsi, American Civil Liberties Union
- Sean Watts, Senior Fellow at the NATO Collective Cyber Defense Center of Excellence
- Robin Geiss, University of Glasgow School of Law
- Naz Modirzadeh, Director, Program on Int'l Law and Armed Conflict, Harvard Law School (Moderator)

***Perspectives on the Restatement (Fourth) Project***

**Description:**

[Pending]

**Participants:**

- John Bellinger, Arnold & Porter
- Sarah Cleveland, Columbia Law School
- Harold Koh, Yale Law School
- William Dodge, UC Hastings College of Law (Moderator)

***IG business meetings***

**11:00-12:30 p.m.**

***Global Public Interests in International Investment Law***

**Description:**

International investment treaties and investor-State arbitration are important tools to protect foreign investments. At the same time, they are criticized for leaving insufficient room for host States to protect public interests. These are not limited to purely domestic concerns. Instead, in many cases, investment disputes impact how other

countries regulate to protect the same public interest, or refrain from regulation. In this sense, investment disputes increasingly touch on global public interests, including (i) public health, e.g. the tobacco cases against Uruguay and Australia; (ii) the environment, e.g. cases concerning subsidies for renewable energy against Canada, Spain and others; and (iii) indigenous peoples' (land) rights, for example in Zimbabwe and the United States. These cases not only implicate the public interest of the respondent State, but more broadly how economic and non-economic public interests are balanced on a global scale. This panel will explore how international investment law currently deals with global public interests and whether further reforms can help investment law accommodate the right balance between investment and non-investment concerns.

**Participants:**

- Clara Brillembourg (Foley Hoag LLP, Washington DC)
- Kate Miles (Gonville and Caius College, University of Cambridge)
- Julie A. Maupin (Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law, Heidelberg)
- José Daniel Amado (Miranda & Amado Abogados, Lima)
- David Caron (The Dickson Poon School of Law, Kings College London) (Moderator)

***Overloading International Human Rights Law***

**Description:**

International human rights law is commonly viewed as protecting fundamental interests that might otherwise go unprotected. Precisely for this reason, many believe that the best way to advance particular interests is to incorporate them into a human rights framework. Those who advocate for causes like animal welfare, the environment, or the control over intellectual property often claim that these interests are or should be human rights. This roundtable will begin by examining how advocates use human rights law to promote interests that have not historically been grounded in the regime. The roundtable will then explore, from an interdisciplinary perspective, the advantages and disadvantages of using human rights law in this way, and the alternatives for promoting these other interests.

**Participants:**

- James Nickel, University of Miami School of Law
- Frederic Megret, McGill University Faculty of Law
- Henry Shue, University of Oxford
- Erika George, University of Utah, College of Law
- Aaron Fellmeth (Moderator), Arizona State University College of Law

***#int\_law @social\_media***

**Description:**

The rise of social media has generated a new kind of conversation about international relations and international law – one that is instant, global and open to anyone with a smartphone or access to the internet. These media provide immediate analysis and debate on current issues, and during periods of rapid change, they shape public perceptions of events or even motivate individuals to take action. This roundtable will explore the effect of social media on the international legal landscape from a range of perspectives. To what extent can these media be expected to create space for non-traditional voices to participate in international legal decisions? What is gained and what is lost when academics try to influence decision makers around the world with short, real-time posts, rather than long and heavily footnoted journal articles? Can actors have a meaningful conversation about international law in exchanges of 140 characters, or is international law being left out of important social media discussions because of its complexity and alienating specialist vocabulary?

**Participants:**

- Philippe Bolojion, UN Director, Human Rights Watch
- Sarah Joseph, Castan Centre for Human Rights Law, Monash University, Melbourne
- Scott Nolan Smith, Associate Director, Portland Communications; Founder & Board Member, Digital Diplomacy Coalition
- Joanne Neenan, (Moderator), Assistant Legal Adviser, UK Foreign Office

### ***The International Legal Framework for Outer Space in a Rapidly Changing World (Space Law IG)***

#### **Description:**

The panelists will debate the sufficiency of the international legal framework for outer space to address the many international governance challenges presented by rapid changes on Earth and in space, and whether the objective of international lawyers should be to extend and apply this framework to contemporary circumstances or replace it altogether.

#### **Participants:**

- Irmgard Marboe, University of Vienna
- Michael Gold, Director of D.C. Operations & Business Growth, Bigelow Aerospace
- Guoyu Wang, Deputy Director, Institute of Space Law, Beijing Institute of Technology
- Brian Israel, Office of the Legal Adviser, US Department of State (Moderator)

### ***New Voices: International Refugee Law & Displacement***

#### **Description:**

Submissions from rising scholars in the field will be presented to the audience, with time allotted for questions. The moderator will provide feedback to the presenters regarding the content of their papers.

#### **Participants:**

- Jill Goldenziel, Harvard University and Boston University School of Law
  - Tendayi Achiume, UCLA School of Law
  - Matthew Gillett, International Criminal Tribunal of the Former Yugoslavia
  - Nema Milaninia, International Criminal Tribunal of the Former Yugoslavia
- Jim Hathaway, Director, Program in Refugee and Asylum Law, University of Michigan School of Law (Moderator)

### ***Jr.-Sr. Scholars Networking Session with the AJIL Board of Editors IG business meetings***

#### **1:00-2:30 p.m.**

***Hudson Medal Luncheon:*** Pierre-Marie Dupuy, moderated by Michael Reisman (ticketed)

### ***Next Steps in Climate Change Regime: Progress on the Road to Paris?***

#### **Description:**

[Session will be in the format of a simulated negotiation.] The 21st conference of the parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Changes, also known as COP 21, will meet this December in Paris. The meeting will cap a four-year negotiation toward a new global climate change agreement to succeed the Kyoto Protocol, originally adopted in 1997. According to the Durban Platform, the negotiating mandate adopted in 2011, the post-2020 agreement is to have “legal force” and “be applicable to all.” The framework expected to emerge would combine “bottom-up” and “top-down” features to encourage both broad participation and the ability to achieve ambitious goals. This spring, governments will begin submitting their “intended nationally determined contributions” to the agreement. Issues for the Paris COP 21 conference include: the legal character of countries’ contributions, how they will be differentiated, adaptation, finance for developing countries, a possible new long-term goal, and ways to raise ambition over time. This session will offer a range of national perspectives on the options and priorities for Paris with a panel of experienced negotiators.

#### **Participants:**

- Xueman Wang, World Bank
- Sue Biniarz, State Department
- Fabrice Vareille, EU Delegation to the United States, Head of Transport, Energy, & Environment
- Elliott Diringer, Center for Climate and Energy Solutions (Moderator)

### ***The National Impact of International Criminal Law***

#### **Description:**

As we head into the second decade of the operation of the International Criminal Court and into the twilight years of the ad hoc tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, the efficacy of the international criminal justice system is open to question. This panel focuses on a particular facet of the question: the impact, if any, of international criminal justice on the laws, institutions, and social and political conditions in states affected by ICC prosecutions. The panel will explore the extent to which states have incorporated into their domestic legal systems the norms and processes of international criminal law. How and why has the practice differed among these states? Have the ICC's practices increased or decreased local support for holding people accountable in the aftermath of mass atrocity crimes? And to what extent should the ICC take these factors into account when deciding which cases to prosecute?

#### **Participants:**

- Sarah Nouwen, University of Cambridge
- Makau Matua, Buffalo Law School
- Nina H.B. Jørgensen, Faculty of Law, the Chinese University of Hong Kong
- Elizabeth Evenson, Human Rights Watch
- Sasha Greenawalt, Pace Law School (Moderator)

### ***Adapting to Change: The Role of International Organizations***

#### **Description:**

International organizations are among the key instruments by which the international community is adapting to a rapidly changing world. Many organizations were created long ago. Their original powers and institutional structures might be limited and insufficient to address a modern challenge. Have international organizations been able to keep pace with changes that occur in the areas in which they carry out their functions? If so, how? If not, why not? Against this background the panel will focus on the practices and strategies by which international organizations respond to contemporary challenges. The panel will discuss specific cases and present broader perspectives on long-term implications for institutional change.

#### **Participants:**

- Stephen Mathias (Assistant Secretary-General for Legal Affairs, United Nations)
- Kimberly Prost (Ombudsperson, United Nations Security Council 1267 Sanctions Committee)
- Lisa Tabassi (Head, Legal Services, Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe)
- August Reinisch (University of Vienna)
- Niels Blokker (Moderator) (Leiden University)

### ***The Rise of China and What it Means for a Changing International Legal Landscape***

#### **Description:**

Although China may be an emerging global superpower, it still refers to itself as a developing country, and its approach to many international legal issues still differs in significant respects from the approach of Western powers. This session will ask how China's rise can be expected to shape international law and international institutions. To what extent will China seek to control the international agenda, or modify existing legal arrangements? And how might others respond to whatever approach China takes?

#### **Participants:**

- Dan Zhu, Fudan University Law School
- Ash Roach, National University of Singapore, former attorney-adviser, U.S. Department of State
- Bingbing Jia, Tsinghua University
- Steve Wolfson, International Law Group, Office of General Counsel, Environmental Protection Agency
- Thomas Kellogg, Open Society Foundations (Moderator)

## ***Fortresses Everywhere: The Containment Paradigm vs. the Refugee Convention's Call for Responsible Sharing (International Refugee Law IG)***

### **Description:**

From Fortress Europe to Fortress Australia, the rich and powerful countries have insulated themselves against refugee flows from the less developed world through a series of domestic laws and policies. This panel will unpack these measures worldwide and examine whether there are ways to revive the intent and purpose of the Refugee Convention regime to share responsibility for global refugee flows. Are new incentives or prohibitions necessary to ensure a fairer sharing of the refugee burden? In particular, the panel will address the situation in the Americas. The expanded definition of “refugee” in the 1984 Cartagena Declaration is spreading like wildfire: almost 20 Latin American states have adopted it, and more states are pushing it further through the Mexico Plan of Action. Latin America has become “the new frontier” for UNHCR refugee resettlement. Three Latin American countries took Palestinian refugees from Iraq who were stranded in camps on the Jordanian and Syrian borders. And the US is facing domestic and international challenges to its treatment of refugee women and children coming from south of its border. What lessons can be drawn from these developments?

### **Participants:**

- François Crépeau, UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants
- Eleanor Acer, Human Rights Watch
- Buti Kale, Deputy Regional Representative, UN High Commissioner for Refugees
- Susan Akram, Boston University School of Law (Moderator)

### ***IG business meetings***

#### **3:00-4:30 p.m.**

### ***Creative Tools for Regulating Global Supply Chains to Advance International Environment Objectives***

#### **Description:**

Ecological threats often result not from deliberate governmental policies but from the accumulated impact of the many, uncoordinated activities of small enterprises and the purchasing decisions of large corporations. Developing countries typically lack the means or inclination to regulate these activities. This session will examine the range of mechanisms—both public and private—that might compensate for that inability or unwillingness of particular states to address sustainability issues. For example, one increasingly popular approach is for industry to work with civil society groups to establish and then meet shared standards for sustainable supply chains. Another approach is for developed countries to adopt laws that aim to fill the governance gaps in developing countries. To what extent are these sorts of approaches appropriate and to what extent are they likely to be effective?

#### **Participants:**

- Motoko Aizawa, Climate Bonds Initiative,
- Tensie Wheeler, Rainforest Alliance
- Catherine Cruvellier, Independent Life Coach, formerly with World Bank (Moderator)

### ***The Right to Privacy in the Digital Age***

#### **Description:**

Well before Edward Snowden's revelations hit the newspapers, courts, lawmakers, scholars, and advocates were already engaged in a lively debate on government surveillance and the right to privacy in the digital age. The reform of the EU's data protection rules, legal challenges to the EU's Data Retention Directive, and a report on communications surveillance by UN Special Rapporteur Frank La Rue all predated the Snowden headlines. In the wake of those headlines, the issue has received even more attention: a proposed EU Data Protection Regulation finally passed the EU Parliament; the European Court of Justice issued two landmark judgments on data privacy; and the UN General Assembly has charged the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights with preparing a report on the right to privacy in the digital age.

This rapid-response discussion will explore how international law is adapting to protect privacy in the face the competing interest in using advanced surveillance technologies to protect national security. Are the emerging national, regional, and international frameworks that govern privacy consistent with one another? What rules apply to government surveillance, what rules apply to corporate conduct, and how do these distinctions affect individuals? To the extent that government surveillance triggers privacy-related obligations under human rights law, do these obligations apply extraterritorially?

**Participants:**

- David Lieber, Google
- Nathan Sales, Syracuse Law School, formerly with DHS
- Dinah PoKempner, Human Rights Watch
- Katherine Strandberg, New York University School of Law
- Paul Schiff Berman, George Washington University School of Law (Moderator)

***The End of the U.S. "War on Terror:" Exploring How this Conflict Might End and the Implications***

**Description:**

We generally think of an armed conflict as having a discrete end, leading to a period of transition into a post-conflict, non-military regime. That paradigm is mismatched to many modern situations. In Afghanistan, the United States has announced that it intends both to end its "combat" role and to maintain a residual military force to help the Afghan government establish a more stable peace. The United States often justifies its counterterrorism operations as part of an ongoing armed conflict against "the Taliban, al Qaeda and associated forces." But to the extent that such a conflict exists, the enemy is geographically dispersed and has a fluid and changing membership; it is not clear when or how that sort of conflict ends. This session will ask how international law does and should respond to this end-of-conflict uncertainty. Can international humanitarian law be reconciled with international human rights law in these situations? How might civil society groups and domestic institutions contribute to or detract from efforts to find appropriate regulatory solutions? And to what extent is the idea of an armed conflict even a useful concept in such settings?

**Participants:**

- Mike Adams, U.S. Department of Defense
- Jen Daskal, American University Washington College of Law
- Fionnuala Ni Aolain, University of Minnesota Law School
- Deborah Pearlstein, Cardozo Law School
- Gabor Rona, former ICRC Legal Advisor, Cardozo Law School (Moderator)

***Economic Sanctions – Hot Topics in 2015***

**Description:**

The UN Security Council's new generation of targeted sanctions represent some of the most creative, wide-reaching and evolutionary tools that the Council uses under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. In parallel, the United States and European Union have been using a wide range of financial and sectorial sections to address varied global security threats—from Iran's nuclear program, to Libya's treatment of Civilians, to Russia's recent activities in Ukraine. This session will examine, through a moderated question and answer discussion, the most pressing issues relating to the use of sanctions as a policy tool, including: (i) the extent to which different entities do, can, and should coordinate their sanctions, (ii) the impact of these sanctions on trade and investment flows, and the associated burdens of compliance on financial institutions, businesses and non-state actors, and (iii) the tension between the security considerations that animate these sanctions and the transparency and due process considerations that favor limiting the application or implementation of sanctions.

**Participants:**

- Katharine Shepherd (Service for Foreign Policy Instruments, European Commission)
- Justyna Gudzowska (Expert, Monitoring Team - 1267 Sanctions Committee, UN Security Council)
- Daniel L. Glaser (Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, U.S. Department of the Treasury)

- David M. Stetson (Co-Head, Government Sanctions Group, Goldman Sachs)
- Kristen Boon (Seton Hall University School of Law) (Moderator)

### ***Human Rights and Sustainable Development in the Context of Fragile States (Human Rights IG)***

#### **Description:**

The nexus of human rights, development, conflict and fragility is the subject of significant research, including in the lead up to the UN's adoption of a post-2015 development agenda and the proposed Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This panel will consider the potential relevance of human rights standards and principles for different stages of development in fragile and conflict states (FCS) Proposed questions: (i) how effectively does proposed Goal 16 address human rights in FCS (implicitly / explicitly); (ii) how can Goal 16 be strengthened to ensure the respect, protection and fulfillment of rights, including through its targets and indicators, without overburdening the Goal or making its targets and indicators too complex; (iii) how must development strategies be adapted to implement human rights obligations in FCS; (iv) how can human rights be reflected in diagnostic tools to identify risk and mitigate harm in FCS (e.g. early warning systems; ex ante risk assessments; analyses of discrimination); (v) how can human rights law inform responses to conflict and strategies for reconstruction; (vi) how to ensure that integrating human rights into the SDGs does not translate into human rights compliance.

#### **Participants:**

- Ozone Agborsangaya-Fiteu, World Bank
- Dapo Akande, Oxford University
- Jan Wouters, University of Leuven
- Andrew Clapham, Professor of Public International Law, Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva
- Siobhan McInerney-Lankford, World Bank (Moderator)

### ***The Future of International Law: A Roadmap for New Professionals***

#### **Description:**

New professionals and law students are invited to a dynamic discussion with practitioners from some of the most rapidly expanding fields of international law. In this interview (in which you can provide the questions), panelists will share their insights on the most pressing issues that face lawyers in the fields of space law, business and human rights, international environmental law, and privacy and national security. A break-out session will then allow attendees to get more personalized advice on entering these fields and on topics that new professionals can research and write on as they prepare for a career in the field. ASIL members and meeting attendees may submit questions to the moderator up to 30 minutes prior to the start of the panel.

#### **Participants:**

- Amie Stepanovich, Access
- Christopher Hearsey, Bigelow Aerospace
- Melissa Blue Sky, Center for International Environmental Law
- Lisl Brunner, Global Network Initiative (Moderator)

### ***IG business meetings***

#### **5:00 – 6:30 p.m.**

**Keynote** (Sponsored by Dutch Embassy): Ahmet Üzümcü, Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons; Controlling Weapons of Mass Destruction

#### **6:30-8:00 p.m.**

##### ***General Reception***

##### ***The Hague Alumni Reception***

##### ***New Professionals Reception***

**7:00-8:00 p.m.**

*ASIL Patron's Reception* (featuring ALI committee)

**8:00 – 10:00 p.m.**

*Gala Dinner*

**10-12 midnight:**

*ILSA/ASIL Dance Party*

## **SATURDAY 4/11**

**7:00-8:30 a.m.**

*ASIL Interest Group Co-Chairs breakfast*

**9:00-10:30 a.m.**

*The U.S. Role in Achieving Global Security*

**Description:**

What role should the United States play in maintaining or establishing international peace and security? Some argue that U.S. military operations have caused more harm than good, and that the United States should refrain from using military force abroad, except when its national security is directly and immediately at stake, or it acts pursuant to a UN Security Council resolution. Others contend that by not intervening in foreign conflicts the United States fails to live up to its legal or moral duties—for example, under existing security arrangements or under the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) framework—or that it leaves a void for other, less savory actors to fill. Panelists will debate these issues. To what extent can the United States realistically address threats to global security? What is the right mix of unilateral and multilateral action, of soft and hard military power, and of pushing international law in a particular direction versus accepting existing restraints under international law? And how might the United States structure its operations or legal positions to establish positive, rather than negative, precedents for international law going forward?

**Participants:**

- Kori Schake, Stanford University, Hoover Institution
- Jake Sullivan, Yale Law School
- Rosa Brooks (moderator), Georgetown University Law Center

*Comparative Perspectives on Executive Unilateralism in Foreign Affairs*

**Description:**

This session will examine the extent to which different countries authorize their executive branches to act unilaterally—without the formal participation of the legislature or judiciary—on issues relating to foreign affairs. Does the executive branch's relative expertise and capacity to act quickly justify giving it substantial discretion to manage a country's foreign affairs? Or is such unilateralism dangerous in a world where decisional consequences may be difficult to assess? And to what extent might international law enhance or check an executive's unilateralism? The discussion will be grounded in the experience of five specific countries: the United States, Germany, South Africa, Israel and the United Kingdom.

**Participants:**

- Rebecca Ingber, Columbia Law School
- Ingrid Wuerth, Vanderbilt Law School
- Heinz Klug, University of Wisconsin
- Gavin Phillipson, Durham University
- Shiri Krebs, Stanford University
- Michael Van Alstine, University of Maryland (Moderator)

### ***Teaching the Skilled International Lawyer (Teaching International Law IG)***

#### **Description:**

As skills education becomes a priority, training international lawyers merits attention. This panel explores how law schools can better prepare students to deal with complex, transnational challenges. The dialogue supports a broader TILIG initiative exploring how the academy may better support public initiatives, civil society, and the private bar.

#### **Participants:**

- Tracy Higgins, Fordham School of Law
- Aparna Polavarapu, University of South Carolina School of Law
- Shruti Rana, University of Maryland School of Law
- Kenneth Rosen, University of Alabama School of Law (Moderator)

### ***Ethical Issues in International Law Practice (New Professionals IG)***

#### **Description:**

This session will explore ethical issues in a variety of international law-related settings. Panelists will address different fields of international law and the common ethical issues new professionals and law students should be aware of when considering careers in these fields. The session will be run using a “rapid response” model, in which the moderator will pose a series of questions for quick analysis and discussion.

#### **Participants:**

- Milan Markovic, Texas A&M University School of Law
- Catherine Rogers, Penn State Law & Queen Mary, University of London
- Kathleen Claussen, U.S. Trade Representative’s Office (Moderator)

### ***IG business meetings***

**11:00-12:30 p.m.**

***Closing Plenary***