



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/AC.26/1994/1
26 May 1994

Original: ENGLISH

UNITED NATIONS
COMPENSATION COMMISSION
GOVERNING COUNCIL

RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE PANEL OF COMMISSIONERS
CONCERNING INDIVIDUAL CLAIMS
FOR SERIOUS PERSONAL INJURY OR DEATH (CATEGORY "B" CLAIMS)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	5
I. METHODOLOGY	7
A. Processing of claims by the Secretariat	7
B. Review of claims by the Panel	9
II. LEGAL ISSUES	12
A. Jurisdiction	12
1. Ratione temporis / Relevant time period	12
2. Ratione personae /Eligible claimants	14
a) Exclusion of claims by Iraqi nationals	14
b) Claims submitted by/for members of the Kuwaiti Armed Forces	14
c) Claims submitted for detained persons	15
d) Missing persons	17
e) Family claims for death	17
f) Claims submitted by third person	19
3. Ratione materiae /Subject matter jurisdiction/ Losses suffered ...	20
a) Definition of serious personal injury	20
b) Claims erroneously filed/death	21
c) Claims erroneously filed/injury	21
4. Ratione loci /Relevance of the place of the loss	23
B. Attribution of losses and damages to Iraq	24
1. Traffic accidents	24
2. Lack of medical care	25
3. Illness or death caused by events	28
related to the invasion and occupation of Kuwait	
4. Injury suffered in refugee camps	28
5. Injury or death related to authorities other than Iraqi	28

III. EVIDENTIARY ISSUES	30
A. General considerations	30
1. Analysis of the different types of evidentiary items	31
a) Identity documents	31
b) Statements by claimants	31
c) Witness statements	32
d) Death certificate or other official documents	32
e) Medical opinions showing cause of death or injury	32
2. Level of evidentiary support	32
B. Claims for serious personal injury	35
1. General approach	35
2. Particular cases	36
a) Injury caused by torture	36
b) Injury caused by sexual assault	37
c) Injury caused by pollution from burning oil wells	38
C. Claims for death	39
1. Proof of the fact of death	39
2. Proof of family relationship	40
D. The causal link	41
IV. RECOMMENDED COMPENSATION AND OTHER DECISIONS	41
A. Overview of the claims	42
B. Recommendations to the Governing Council	43
1. Claims for which compensation is recommended	43
a) By country by consolidated claim number	43
b) By individual claim by country	44
2. Claims for which no compensation is recommended	44
3. Transferred claims	45
4. Other decisions	45
5. Summary of recommendations and decisions	45

ANNEX I*

Breakdown of the recommendations by individual claim by country

ANNEX II*

Claims for which no compensation is recommended

ANNEX III*

Claims to be transferred to the "C" category claims Panel of Commissioners

ANNEX IV*

Eligible claims for which no compensation is recommended at this stage

ANNEX V*

Claims for which additional information has been required

ANNEX VI**

Summary of recommendations and decisions

* contained in document S/AC.26/1994/R.8/Add.1/Rev.1 (restricted distribution).
** attached hereto.

INTRODUCTION

This is the first report that the Panel of Commissioners appointed for claims in category "B" submits to the Governing Council of the United Nations Compensation Commission (the "Commission") in accordance with article 37(e) of the Provisional Rules for Claims Procedure (the "Rules")¹.

The Panel was appointed by the Governing Council on 31 March 1993 upon nomination by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the basis of recommendations made by the Executive Secretary of the Commission². The task of the Panel is to examine claims for serious personal injury and death in category "B" submitted to the Commission and to make recommendations to the Governing Council³.

The Panel held two preparatory working meetings with the secretariat of the Commission on 19-20 July and 13 December 1993 to discuss the methodology and procedures used by the secretariat in the processing of category "B" claims and to organize the work of its substantive sessions. The Executive Secretary delivered the claims with an article 32 report to the Panel on 14 December 1993, along with the information and views submitted by the Governments that have submitted claims and the Government of Iraq. The Panel commenced its work of reviewing claims at its first substantive session held from 14 to 17 December 1993. Subsequent sessions were held from 11 to 14 January, 15 to 18 February, 1 to 5 March, 21 to 25 March and 13 to 14 April 1994. All the preparatory meetings and the substantive sessions were held in Geneva at the headquarters of the secretariat and were conducted in private⁴.

¹ Article 37(e) requires that "[e]ach Panel will report in writing through the Executive Secretary to the Governing Council on the claims received and the amount recommended to be allocated to each Government or other entity for each consolidated claim. Each report will briefly explain the reasons for the recommendations and, to the extent practicable within the time-limit, contain a breakdown of the recommendations in respect of individual claims within each consolidated claim."

² Rules, article 18, para. 1.

³ Rules, article 32, para. 1.

⁴ Rules, article 30, para. 2; and article 33, para. 2.

In the course of those sessions, the Panel reviewed claims in category "B" contained in the first instalment prepared by the secretariat. The first instalment consists of all claims in category "B" that were filed with the Commission by 31 March 1993 and that have been found to meet all the formal requirements set forth in article 14 of the Rules. A breakdown of 1,119 claims in the first instalment is contained in Part IV, infra.

Category "B" claims are claims for the payment of fixed amounts to any person who, as a result of Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait, suffered serious personal injury, or whose spouse, child, or parent died. Category "B" claims have been considered by the Governing Council to be among "the most urgent claims" for which the Council has set forth "simple and expedited procedures" in order to provide "prompt compensation in full" or "substantial interim relief"⁵.

This report is divided into four parts. Part I describes the methodology used by the secretariat for the processing of claims, utilizing procedures as established in the decisions of the Governing Council. This Part also provides an explanation of the methodology by which the Panel examined the claims. Part II describes the main legal issues raised by the claims contained in the first instalment, and the conclusions that the Panel has drawn with respect to those issues. Part III elaborates upon the standards of evidence that the Panel has applied in recommending compensation for a claim. Part IV states the recommendations made in respect of the claims, including the amounts recommended to be allocated to each Government for each consolidated claim. Annexes to this report provide a breakdown of the amounts to be awarded to each individual claimant within each consolidated claim.

⁵ Decision 1, para. 1.(S/AC.26/1991/1).

I . METHODOLOGY

A. Processing of claims by the secretariat

Category "B" claims have been submitted on the standard claim forms prepared and distributed by the secretariat. Governments and other authorized persons, authorities and bodies⁶ have submitted claims on behalf of individuals in the form of consolidated claims. When a consolidated claim was received from a Government or other authorized entity⁷, the Registry of the secretariat determined whether the claim was submitted within the established time-limit, registered the claim, assigned a number to the claim and issued a "Filing Receipt".

The Registry then verified that the claims received met all the formal requirements listed in para. 1 of article 14 of the Rules. Governments or authorized entities that submitted claims not meeting the formal requirements were so notified and given 60 days to correct any deficiencies.

Concurrent with the article 14 review, the secretariat analyzed the claims received for the purposes of preparing a report pursuant to article 16 of the Rules⁸. These reports, containing information on the claims received during the period covered, addressed the significant legal and factual issues raised by the claims submitted. The article 16 reports

⁶ In accordance with Decision 1, para. 19, the Governing Council may request an appropriate person, authority or body to submit claims on behalf of persons who are not in a position to have their claims submitted by a Government.

⁷ For example, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees have submitted claims on behalf of individuals.

⁸ Rules, article 16, para. 1: "The Executive Secretary will make periodic reports to the Governing Council concerning claims received. These reports shall be made as frequently as required to inform the Council of the Commission's case load but not less than quarterly. The reports shall indicate: a) Governments, international organizations or other eligible parties that have submitted claims; b) the categories of claims submitted; c) the number of claimants in each consolidated claim; d) the total amount of compensation sought in each consolidated claim. In addition, each report may indicate significant legal and factual issues, raised by the claims, if any."

were then circulated to the members of the Governing Council, to all Governments that submitted claims to the Commission and to the Government of Iraq. Each of these Governments was entitled to present to the Executive Secretary, for transmission to the Panel, additional information and views concerning the issues raised in the reports⁹.

After the article 16 reports were issued, the information on the claim forms was entered by the secretariat into a computerized database for the purposes of grouping and categorizing the claims. Each claim that was entered into the computerized database was assigned a unique "UNCC Claim Number". The secretariat ran a computer check for each individual claim to verify whether an individual had submitted more than one claim within category "B" for the same injury or death. The secretariat will also run a computer check to verify whether a person is claiming for the higher amount in category "A" (claims for departure), which excludes such a claimant from putting forward claims in any other category¹⁰.

With the assistance of the computer program, category "B" claims that had common legal and factual issues were listed. Claims with significant common legal and factual issues were physically grouped together by the secretariat so as to facilitate the review of claims by the Panel. The secretariat then analyzed the claims within each grouping on a case-by-case basis for the purposes of preparing the claims for submission to the Panel. When a grouping with numerous claims was identified, sample cases that were representative of the grouping were presented to the Panel pursuant to article 37

⁹ Rules, article 16, para. 3: "Within 30 days in case of claims in Categories A, B, ,C; and 90 days in case of claims in other categories, of the date of the circulation of the Executive Secretary's report, the Government of Iraq as well as Governments and international organizations that have submitted claims, may present their additional information and views concerning the report to the Executive Secretary for transmission to panels of Commissioners in accordance with Article 32. There shall be no extensions of the time limits specified in this paragraph."

¹⁰ When processing category "C" or "D" claims, the secretariat will also run a computer check to verify whether a person who is claiming for personal injury or death on Forms "C" or "D", has also claimed for interim relief on Form "B".

(b) of the Rules and in accordance with the methodology agreed to by the Governing Council.

The preparation of the claims by the secretariat included, inter alia, the translation of particularly relevant documents (e.g., certificates of death), the writing of a summary stating the factual and legal issues for each of the claims and a preliminary examination of the claims by an experienced medical expert¹¹ that the Executive Secretary appointed to assist the Panel and the secretariat in the review of category "B" claims. The secretariat then verified manually that the claims had been properly grouped by the computer according to the pertinent legal or factual issues in the claim. This method of processing ensured more accurate groupings than those resulting from the initial use of the computer alone, served to establish new groupings, and tended to limit the marginal variations among the claims within the same grouping.

In order to assist the Panel in its review of the claims, the secretariat submitted the claims with a report pursuant to article 32 of the Rules. Article 32 provides that the Executive Secretary submits to the Panel the claims together with the related documentation, containing the results of the preliminary assessment made by the secretariat with respect to the formal requirements of the claims, and any other information deemed to be useful for the work of the Commissioners, as well as the additional information and views submitted by Governments and international organizations that have submitted claims and the Government of Iraq, in accordance with article 16 of the Rules.

B. Review of the claims by the Panel

The Panel examined the claims submitted to it in this first instalment to determine whether they meet the legal and evidentiary requirements established by the Governing Council and to make recommendations to the Governing Council on the amounts of awards to be allocated to each Government and individual claimant.

¹¹ Dr. Marcel Dubouloz, former Deputy Medical Director of the Medical Division of the International Committee of the Red Cross, Secretary General of the International Society of Disaster Medicine.

The Panel requested the secretariat, in accordance with article 34 of the Rules, to assist it on a continuous basis during the sessions. The secretariat staff members attended all the sessions of the Panel and provided information as required. When necessary, the Commission's medical expert assisted the Panel. The claims were grouped by the secretariat on the basis of factual and legal issues. Some of the groupings were presented to the Panel fully or on a sample basis, but at all times, the Panel retained the option of reviewing the claims on a case-by-case basis. The groupings were separated into two categories: claims for serious personal injury and claims for death. In instances where a claimant filed a claim for a serious personal injury and for the death of a relative in the same claim form, such a claim was then presented twice to the Panel.

When presented with the sample claims of a particular grouping, the Panel determined what elements were required for a claim to be approved. The secretariat then verified that those elements were present in the remaining claims of the grouping that had not been individually reviewed by the Panel. The results of this verification were reported back to the Panel. When there was any doubt about the presence of the required elements in particular claims reviewed by the secretariat, such claims were submitted to the Panel for assessment on a case-by-case basis. Finally, the Panel decided on its recommendations to the Governing Council.

The method of sampling was not applied to all groupings. In view of the characteristics of some of the groupings, the Panel chose to review all the claims contained in them on a case-by-case basis.

In making its recommendations to the Governing Council, the Panel applied Security Council resolution 687 (1991) and other relevant resolutions of the Security Council, Governing Council Decision 1 (Criteria for Expedited Processing of Urgent Claims), Decision 3 (Definition of Personal Injury and Mental Pain and Anguish)¹², Decision 10 (Provisional Rules for Claims Procedure)¹³, Decision 11 (Eligibility for Compensation of Members of the Allied Coalition Armed Forces)¹⁴ and Decision 12 (Claims for Which Established Filing Deadlines Are

¹² S/AC.26/1991/3.

¹³ S/AC.26/1992/10.

¹⁴ S/AC.26/1992/11.

Extended)¹⁵ and other applicable rules of international law¹⁶.

The Panel took into account the information provided by the Executive Secretary in the article 32 report accompanying the submission of this first instalment of claims to the Panel, the reports presented to the Governing Council in accordance with article 16 of the Rules (Reports 1 to 6), all additional information and views presented by Governments that have submitted claims and the Government of Iraq in response to those reports, letters and reports presented by Governments that submitted category "B" claims that provide background information related to their consolidated claims, and relevant United Nations reports¹⁷ as well as other sources.

The Panel adopted this report, including the recommendations to the Governing Council, by unanimity.

¹⁵ S/AC.26/1992/12.

¹⁶ Rules, article 31.

¹⁷ Report to the Secretary-General by a United Nations mission, led by Mr. Abdulrahim A. Farah, former Under-Secretary-General, Assessing the Scope and Nature of Damage Inflicted on Kuwait's Infrastructure During the Iraqi Occupation of the Country from 2 August 1990 to 27 February 1991 (S/22535, dated 22 April 1991), (the Farah Report); Report on the Situation of Human Rights in Occupied Kuwait, prepared by Mr. Walter Kälin, Special Rapporteur of the United Nations Human Rights Commission (E/CN/1992/26 dated 16 January 1992), (the Kälin Report).

II. LEGAL ISSUES

The legal issues raised by the claims in the first instalment are examined under two main aspects: A) jurisdiction, and B) attribution of the losses and damages to Iraq.

A. Jurisdiction

The claims before this Panel are claims for fixed amounts by individuals who have suffered serious personal injury or whose spouse, child or parent died, as a direct result of Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait.

1. Ratione temporis (the relevant time period)

The period between 2 August 1990 and 2 March 1991, referred to in Decision 1 of the Governing Council, has considerable significance for the purpose of verification of claims arising from Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait. 2 August 1990 marks the date that Iraq's troops invaded Kuwait. 2 March 1991 is the date upon which the Security Council adopted resolution 686 (1991) which took note of the suspension of combat operations by Kuwaiti forces and the Member States cooperating with Kuwait. Most of the situations generating Iraq's responsibility that are listed in Governing Council Decision 1, para. 18 must have occurred during that period.

Thus, in principle, a serious personal injury or death should have occurred between 2 August 1990 and 2 March 1991 to be attributable to Iraq's activities associated with its invasion and occupation of Kuwait. The occurrence of a serious personal injury or death outside that time-frame imposes, in general, an extra burden on a claimant to provide an explanation as to why such an injury or death occurring outside this time-period should be considered a direct result of Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait.

Several claims were submitted for serious personal injury or death that occurred outside the relevant time period, where the cause of the injury or of the death could indeed be linked to the invasion. For example, in some instances an injury suffered during the period of the invasion and occupation of Kuwait was the cause of a death that occurred after 2 March 1991, or the lack of medical care in Kuwait during that period

contributed to a serious personal injury or to a death occurring outside that time frame. The Panel has recommended compensation for such claims if satisfactory evidence of a link of the serious personal injury or death to the invasion or occupation of Kuwait was submitted.

A particular issue arose in this context with respect to claims for losses that occurred outside the relevant time period in connection with mine explosions. The Panel had before it several claims for serious personal injury or death caused by the explosion of mines and other ordnance that occurred after 2 March 1991. According to a United Nations report, there were several million mines and other pieces of unexploded ordnance in Kuwait at the end of the occupation. That report stated that "the most lasting environmental problem facing Kuwait will be that of mines and other unexploded ordnance"¹⁸. Being aware of the long lasting effects of this problem, the Governing Council in Decision 12 extended the deadline for the filing of claims for losses and personal injuries resulting from public health and safety risks that occurred after or just prior to the expiration of the established filing deadlines¹⁹. The Panel interprets this Decision to mean that a claim for serious personal injury or death resulting from a mine explosion should be compensated even if that explosion occurred after 2 March 1991.

Moreover, the Panel had before it a large number of other claims where the injury or death occurred after 2 March 1991 that raised the question of the imputability of losses and damages to Iraq²⁰.

¹⁸ Farah Report, para. 538.

¹⁹ This includes injuries suffered from the emanations of burning oil wells, see Part III, section B, item 2 infra.

²⁰ See Part II, section B, item 5, infra.

2. Ratione personae (eligible claimants)

The legal issues related to the competence of the Commission with respect to persons can be examined on the basis of Governing Council Decisions 1, 11 and 12, and concern the following groupings: exclusion of claims by Iraqi nationals; claims submitted by/for members of the Kuwaiti Armed Forces or members of the Allied Coalition Armed Forces; claims submitted for detained persons; family members eligible to submit claims for death; claims submitted by a third person.

a) Exclusion of claims by Iraqi nationals

Governing Council Decision 1, para. 17 states that: "Claims will not be considered on behalf of Iraqi nationals who do not have bona fide nationality of any other State". The first instalment contained no claim submitted by an Iraqi national. In instances where there was some doubt as to the nationality of the claimant, the Panel checked the identity documents found in the claim, and took into account the affirmations provided by the respective Government pursuant to article 14 para.1(c) of the Rules²¹.

b) Claims submitted by/for members of the Kuwaiti Armed Forces or the Allied Coalition Armed Forces

Decision 11 of the Governing Council states that

"...members of the Allied Coalition Armed Forces are not eligible for compensation for loss or injury arising as a consequence of their involvement in Coalition military operations against Iraq, except if the following three conditions are met:

- (a) the compensation is awarded in accordance with the general criteria already adopted; and
- (b) they were prisoners of war as a consequence of their involvement in Coalition military operations against Iraq in response to its unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait; and
- (c) the loss or injury resulted from mistreatment in violation of international humanitarian law (including

²¹ Article 14, para. 1(c) states that a Government submitting claims must affirm "that, to the best of the information available to it, the claimants are its nationals or residents, and that it has no reason to believe that the information stated in the claims is incorrect."

the Geneva Conventions of 1949)".

The organization of the Allied Coalition Armed Forces began a few days after the occupation of Kuwait by Iraq, and continued with the placement of armed forces and air and naval military units from 28 countries, including Kuwait, in the Persian Gulf region.

Among the claims submitted for serious personal injury or death suffered by members of the Kuwaiti Armed Forces, several were put forward for events that occurred during the day of the invasion (2 August 1990) or during the days immediately following. The Panel concludes that the exclusion from compensation stated in Decision 11 is not applicable to these claimants because the Allied Coalition Armed Forces did not exist at that time. In the Panel's view, these claims are compensable since the serious personal injury or death was the direct consequence of Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait.

Claims were also submitted with respect to serious personal injury or death suffered by Kuwaiti military personnel, including members of the Kuwaiti resistance, at the end of the relevant time period. The Panel considers that the exclusion from compensation stated in Decision 11 of the Governing Council is applicable only to members of the Kuwaiti Armed Forces that were integrated as units under the command of the Allied Coalition Armed Forces. For this reason, Decision 11 is not applicable to Kuwaiti members of the resistance or other military personnel who remained within Kuwaiti territory and suffered personal injury or death due to the Iraqi invasion and occupation of Kuwait. Therefore, the Panel recommends the payment of compensation also in these cases.

c) Claims submitted for detained persons

The Panel had before it claims filed on behalf of persons who are asserted to be still in detention in Iraq. All of these claims were submitted for serious personal injury on behalf of Kuwaiti nationals by the Kuwaiti Government. The issue presented by these claims is whether a claim can be submitted on behalf of a person who is presumed to be detained, for a serious personal injury allegedly suffered by the detainee himself/herself.

The Governing Council has established special guidelines for the submission of claims for losses and personal injuries resulting from detention in Iraq. Decision 12, para. 1 (b) states that such claims "should be submitted to the Commission within one year of the detainee's release...but not later than the time limit to be established pursuant to para. 2 of this decision"²². Therefore, the Panel concludes that a claim for serious personal injury suffered by a person who was held in detention by the Government of Iraq has to be filed by the detainee, within one year of his/her release.

The Governing Council has also foreseen the possibility that these persons may in fact be deceased in which case, according to the same Decision, the claims "should be submitted to the Commission within one year...of the death of the detainee, as legally determined by the detainee's Government, but no later than the time limit to be established pursuant to para. 2 of this decision."²³ Once the detainee's Government has determined that the detainee is deceased, then a claim may be submitted by his/her family for his/her death.

Thus, Decision 12 institutes two courses of action in the case of claims of or on behalf of detainees: either the detainee submits a claim for serious personal injury, or the detainee's Government declares the detainee to be deceased, in which case the family of the deceased may submit a claim for death.

The Panel concludes that these claims submitted by third parties for the serious personal injury of detainees cannot be considered for compensation at this stage. Compensation, if any, would be awarded for claims for serious personal injury submitted by the detainee personally after his/her release, or for claims for death submitted by the family after it has been

²² Decision 12, para. 2: "When the Executive Secretary determines that the processing of all remaining claims before the panels of Commissioners is likely to take no more than one year to complete, he should so notify the Governing Council. The Governing Council should thereupon establish the final time limit for the submission of claims covered by paras. 1(a) and 1(b) of this decision. The Governing Council should establish the final time limit at its next meeting after receiving such notification and should allow at least three additional months from the date of its decision for the filing of the claims."

²³ Idem.

determined by the detainee's Government that the detainee is deceased.

d) Missing persons

Some death claims were submitted by families for relatives who seemingly disappeared during the invasion and occupation of Kuwait by Iraq. These families made inquiries, or tracing requests to the International Committee of the Red Cross, but were unable to locate their relatives. The Panel recommends that compensation be awarded where from the documentation submitted it could be presumed that the "missing" person is deceased.

In instances where it could not conclude that the "missing" person is deceased, the Panel holds that compensation cannot be recommended at this stage and that a new claim can be submitted if the family ever receives confirmation of the death.

e) Family members eligible to submit death claims

Decision 1, para. 13 states that "no more than \$10,000 will be paid for death...with respect to any one family (consisting of any person and his or her spouse, children and parents)". The Panel interprets this definition of family to exclude death claims put forward by other relatives such as brothers or sisters, grandchildren, grandparents, nieces, nephews or uncles and aunts of the deceased.

In reviewing the claims for death it became apparent that the concept of "family" was being interpreted differently by both claimants and Governments in various countries. The issue as a whole was raised in the following manner in an article 16 Report:

"...in circumstances where compensation is claimed for death ... relating to a family member, there is an issue as to whether included in the terms parents, child or spouse are, e.g., adopted children, foster parents, wards, guardians and other legally cognizable family relationships under the laws of various countries. A related issue is whether the age of children, marital status, or other factors should affect the eligibility for compensation and/or the ceilings in respect of claims for death ... relating to a parent, child or spouse".

The Panel considered the comments made on this issue by some Governments, including the Government of Iraq.

The first issue that arose with respect to determining what constitutes a family was whether the age of children, marital status, or other factors should affect the eligibility of claimants for compensation. The Panel examined all the available documentation, including the decisions of the Governing Council, the article 16 reports and the Government responses to the article 16 reports, including that of the Government of Iraq, and came to the conclusion that the age of children, marital status or other factors should not affect the eligibility for compensation. The Panel holds that Decision 1 should be applied without any limitation with respect to the age or marital status of the family member.

The second issue that arose with respect to the definition of family was whether the terms "parent" or "child" include adopted children, foster parents, wards, guardians and other legally cognizable family relationships under the laws of various countries. Decision 1 does not contain any further definition of the terms "parent" or "child", and taking into account the comments and views made by Governments in response to this issue as raised in article 16 reports, the Panel finds it appropriate, in conformity with general principles of private international law, to apply to each claimant his or her own national law in interpreting these terms. Where national laws accord a claimant legal rights similar to those accorded to a biological parent or child, the claimant will be treated as a biological parent or child for the purposes of the processing of the claims in category "B".

A third issue faced by the Panel was whether, for example, in the event of a man's death, his wife and minor children could claim as a family unit, his adult children could each claim as separate family units, and the deceased's parents could claim as yet a third family unit, to each of which the ceiling of US\$10,000 would apply. For the purpose of applying the ceiling, the Panel determines that the word "person" in Decision 1, para. 13, means the deceased in the case of death. Thus the Panel concludes that the "family" is composed of the deceased (whose death is to be compensated), his or her parents, all of his or her children, and his or her spouse. Accordingly, the Panel finds that it is not possible to consider different units inside the family for the purpose of the application of the US\$10,000 ceiling to claims in category "B".

However, Decision 1 does not refer to the particular situation where the deceased has more than one legally recognized wife, as is the case in some claims. The Panel, taking into account this particular situation, considers that each wife and the children born from that union constitute a separate family unit for the purpose of applying the US\$10,000 ceiling. For instance, if a man had more than one wife, each of the wives and her respective children constitute a separate family and the ceiling of US\$10,000 can be applied to each. For the purpose of compensation, the parents of the deceased are considered a part of the family of the deceased as a whole.

f) Claims submitted by a third person

In a few cases, claims for serious personal injury were submitted by someone other than the injured person himself/herself, for example, a parent, sibling, relative, or even a person not belonging to the claimant's family. The Panel holds that, as a general rule, no one but the injured person himself/herself is entitled to claim for a serious personal injury.

This rule, however, must be applied taking due account of the circumstances of each particular case. Some persons are to be considered legally entitled to claim on behalf of others, e.g., a parent for a minor child, or any person acting either under a power of attorney received from the injured person or pursuant to a court decision. The Panel also considers a third person entitled to claim on behalf of an injured person when it has found adequate evidence in the claim that the injured person was in no position to claim him/herself, and when in addition a sufficient link existed between the two (e.g., parent and adult child, husband and wife). In all such cases, the Panel recommends that the compensation be awarded only to the injured party, and not to the person who submitted the claim.

The situation is different when a claim for injury is submitted by the executor of the estate of a deceased person who had suffered a serious personal injury, when there was no link, alleged or probable, between the death and the injury. In the Panel's view, an executor of an estate is not eligible to claim for an injury suffered by the deceased, since the right to claim belongs only to the injured person himself/herself. If the deceased had filed a claim for injury before his/her death, then the claim would likely have been part of the estate that the executor administers. But in the

claims at issue, the deceased had not claimed for serious personal injury before his/her death. Consequently, the executor cannot claim for the payment of an obligation that, at the time of the death of the injured person, had not yet arisen.

3. Ratione materiae (subject matter jurisdiction)

The subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission for category "B" claims is defined in Governing Council Decisions 1, 3, 8, and 11. These decisions establish what type of injuries or deaths are compensable. Category "B" claims should have been filed only for a serious personal injury suffered by the claimant, or for the death of a claimant's parent, spouse or child, directly resulting from Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait.

a) Definition of serious personal injury

In accordance with the relevant Governing Council Decisions, the Panel determines that it cannot recommend compensation for personal injuries it does not consider serious. "Serious personal injury" has been defined in Decision 3 to mean

- "(a) Dismemberment;
- (b) Permanent or temporary significant disfigurement, such as a substantial change to one's outward appearance;
- (c) Permanent or temporary significant loss of use or limitation of use of a body organ, member, function or system;
- (d) Any injury which, if left untreated, is unlikely to result in the full recovery of the injured body area, or is likely to prolong such full recovery."

It is further stated in Decision 3 that

"[s]erious personal injury does not include the following: bruises, simple strains and sprains, minor burns, cuts and wounds; or other irritations not requiring a course of medical treatment."

Where, on the basis of the evidence, an injury is not considered serious, the Panel does not recommend compensation. The Commission's medical expert provided advice to the Panel as to whether an injury would or would not require a course of medical treatment. On the basis of his advice, and given the

other elements found in the claim, a number of claims are not recommended for compensation on the grounds that the injury was not serious.

b) Claims erroneously filed as death claims

In some cases, claims were submitted for death but raised the issue as to whether they should have been presented for a serious personal injury. These claims were related to miscarriages, abortions and stillbirths.

A related issue was raised in the article 16 reports as follows:

"Several claims have been brought for death of new-born babies or for premature deliveries due to the conditions prevailing in Kuwait during Iraq's invasion and occupation. Unwanted or forced abortions allegedly due to the conditions during the invasion and occupation are also referred to as the cause for serious personal injury or death claims".

The Panel took into account comments made by some Governments, including the Government of Iraq.

The Panel reviewed such claims on a case-by-case basis and sought advice from the Commission's medical expert. The Panel came to the following conclusions with respect to such claims:

- a pregnant woman was more vulnerable than other people to the difficult conditions resulting from the Iraqi invasion and occupation of Kuwait and their traumatizing effects, including the lack of medical care during this period, and the difficulty in receiving specialized care. Such conditions could well have severely impacted on the health of a pregnant woman or of a new-born;
- a miscarriage, an abortion or a stillbirth is considered, for the purposes of compensation, as a serious personal injury suffered by a woman.

However, if a new-born suffered a serious personal injury or died because of a premature delivery²⁴, a claim could be filed for the serious personal injury of the child or his/her death.

c) Claims erroneously filed as injury claims

²⁴ According to the medical expert, a delivery is generally considered premature from the end of the 26th week until the end of the 32nd week of pregnancy.

Decision 3 of the Governing Council establishes a distinction between "serious personal injury" (which includes both physical and mental injuries) and "mental pain and anguish". The Commission's medical expert advised that "in the medical semiology, psychological trauma is an injury which is more serious than mere psychological pain or anguish". However, the claims filed in category "B" showed that the difference between a "mental injury" and "mental pain and anguish" is often difficult to ascertain. Indeed, many claimants were not aware of this distinction as can be seen from the terminology they used in filling Form B. They often used the term "mental pain and anguish" when, in fact, the symptoms they were describing corresponded to a mental injury such as "Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder". In cases where the claimant submitted evidence proving the existence of a mental injury and its direct relation to Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait, the Panel recommends the payment of compensation, irrespective of the words used on the claim form.

On the other hand, a claim for "mental pain and anguish" should not be put forward under category "B", but rather should be made under either categories "C" or "D". Under category "B", to be eligible for compensation for serious personal injury, a claimant must demonstrate that he or she has suffered a physical or mental injury. On 26 October 1992 and 19 March 1993 the secretariat sent letters to all Governments emphasizing that they "should advise claimants to refrain from presenting category 'B' claims that are based only on the fact of hiding or detention and do not demonstrate physical or mental injuries". In order to deal with the claims for mental pain and anguish that were submitted as category "B" claims, the secretariat proposed to Governments either to withdraw these claims and resubmit them under either forms "C" or "D", or to authorize the secretariat to "transfer" such claims from the Panel dealing with the category "B" claims to the panels that deal with "C" or "D" claims. A number of Governments modified their submissions by either withdrawing or requesting the transfer of the claims for mental pain and anguish submitted on claim forms "B".

However, several claims for mental pain and anguish were not withdrawn or transferred, and they therefore came before this Panel for review. In view of the fact that such claims were submitted by the claimants on the wrong claim forms, the Panel decided to request the Executive Secretary to reallocate those claims to the Panel of Commissioners dealing with

category "C" claims, in accordance with article 32, para. 3 of the Rules.

The Panel also had before it a number of claims where claimants did not indicate whether their claims were for "mental injury" or for "mental pain and anguish". Since these claimants did not present evidence of the mental injury, the Panel decided to request the Executive Secretary to also reallocate these claims to the Panel of Commissioners dealing with category "C" claims so that Panel "C" can determine whether the claimants were seeking compensation for mental pain and anguish, although they may not have used this expression on their claim forms.

4. Ratione loci (relevance of the place of the loss)

With respect to claims submitted for serious personal injury or death, nothing in either Security Council resolution 687 (1991) or in the decisions of the Governing Council establishes jurisdictional limitations based on where the event causing the loss took place.

In reviewing the question as to whether the location of the event affects the Commission's jurisdiction over a claim, the Panel first considered the wording of resolution 687 (1991), that refers to "any direct loss, damage..." resulting from Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait, without specifying where such loss or damage should have occurred. The Panel also noted para. 18 (d) of Decision 1, where the Governing Council explicitly envisaged as a cause of damage the breakdown of civil order in Kuwait or Iraq during the relevant period.

The Panel concludes that the Commission has jurisdiction over a claim irrespective of where the serious personal injury or death occurred. The place of the event is not in itself a basis to determine whether the Commission is competent or not. However, the Panel finds that where a serious personal injury or death occurred in Iraq or Kuwait, this can more easily be attributable to Iraqi actions, whereas a claim based on an incident occurring outside Kuwait or Iraq needs to be more fully substantiated.

B. Attribution of losses and damages to Iraq

Resolution 687 (1991) of the Security Council establishes the principle of Iraq's liability "for any direct loss, damage (...) as a result of Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait". Although the cause of a serious personal injury or death is clear in some instances such as where a person was killed or injured by an Iraqi soldier during the occupation, the direct link between the invasion and a serious personal injury or death is not so clear in other instances. The issue of the attribution to Iraq of the alleged serious personal injury or death was raised in a number of cases that have been grouped as follows.

1. Traffic accidents

The Panel had before it a number of claims where the alleged cause of an injury or death was a road traffic accident. This issue was raised in article 16 reports in the following terms:

"The issues of foreseeability and remoteness of losses from Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait are raised by situations in which (persons) died, were injured or suffered financial losses in automobile or other accidents that occurred while (they) were in the process of departing from Iraq or Kuwait. Some of these accidents occurred while the claimants were travelling through neighbouring countries."

The Panel considered additional information and views presented on this matter by Governments, including the Government of Iraq.

The Panel concludes that the decision on such a claim depends on the particular circumstances of the event, such as whether the accident involved an Iraqi military vehicle, the date on which it occurred, its location, how it happened, and the documentation supporting the claim.

In this respect, a distinction must be made between "military" accidents and other road traffic accidents. Due to the circumstances prevailing at the time of the invasion and occupation of Kuwait by Iraq, the Panel is of the view that in principle all accidents involving an Iraqi military vehicle were a direct consequence of the invasion. The Panel considers

such accidents to be the result of "actions by officials, employees or agents of the Government of Iraq or its controlled entities during that period [2 August 1990 to 2 March 1991] in connection with the invasion or occupation", or of "the breakdown of civil order in Kuwait or Iraq during that period"²⁵. The Panel further concludes that "military accidents" could also be the result of a military action, such as an air raid that caused a driver to lose control and flip the car, or the chasing by Iraqi Forces of a Kuwaiti vehicle.

Other road traffic accidents are not considered directly linked to the invasion and occupation of Kuwait, unless they meet a number of additional criteria. One of these criteria is the date of the accident. An accident occurring on the first day of or on the days immediately following the invasion of Kuwait is found to be related to the "breakdown of civil order". The Panel also determines that a similar situation exists with respect to an accident occurring just before 2 March 1991. The Panel concludes, however, that such a presumption does not exist with respect to an accident happening in between these two periods, notwithstanding its location in Kuwait or Iraq, unless clear evidence of a direct link with the invasion and occupation can be found.

The place of the accident is also found to be significant. As a general rule the Panel determines that the farther the place of the accident was from the claimant's point of departure from Iraq or Kuwait, the more unlikely it was that a link existed between this accident and Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait. As indicated above, the fact that an event occurred in Kuwait or Iraq was considered by the Panel to be a positive element, but was not sufficient in itself to establish such a link.

2. Lack of medical care

Another issue was raised in article 16 reports in the following terms:

"In category 'B', certain claims have been put forward with respect to injuries that occurred in situations where, due to the lack of availability of proper medical facilities and treatment in Kuwait after 2 August 1990, injuries went untreated and resulted in more severe

²⁵ Decision 1, para. 18.

injuries, long term complications or death. The issue raised is whether such injuries or deaths are directly related to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait."

The Panel considered additional information and views on this matter presented by some Governments, including the Government of Iraq.

The issue raised by such claims is whether deaths caused by general hardship and difficulties, lack of medicine and medical equipment, or lack of proper medical care resulting from the invasion and occupation of Kuwait are to be considered as direct losses. In considering this issue it must be remembered that Decision 1, para. 18(d), of the Governing Council states that losses suffered as a result of the breakdown of civil order in Kuwait or Iraq during the period of the invasion and occupation are to be considered as direct losses to individuals resulting from the invasion and occupation of Kuwait.

The United Nations reports²⁶ indicate that the level of health care in Kuwait was severely reduced as a consequence of the Iraqi occupation.

Prior to the invasion most of the physicians and nurses operating in Kuwait were foreigners. An immediate effect of the invasion was the departure of the vast majority of physicians and nurses from Kuwait²⁷. By the end of the occupation, the number of health care providers in Kuwait was approximately 20 percent of the pre-invasion level. Those who stayed in the country had to face a number of difficulties to perform their work and were prevented, in many instances, from providing appropriate medical care due to the continuous presence of armed Iraqi soldiers in hospital wards, administrative offices and operating theatres²⁸.

As a result of this massive departure of medical and paramedical staff, most of the health care centers in Kuwait were closed and those hospitals that remained open were operating at 10 to 20 percent of their original capacity.

²⁶ Farah Report and Kälin Report, see footnote 17 supra.

²⁷ Farah Report, para 424; Kälin Report, paras. 191, 197.

²⁸ Kälin Report, paras. 190-191.

The provision of health care services was also curtailed due to the destruction and pilferage of hospital equipment, vaccines, surgical tools, hospital beds, and medical supplies. Certain types of treatments could not be administered any more (e.g., transplant operations, dialysis).

Moreover, access to the still operating health care services was restricted, at least for some persons²⁹. For example, the population of Kuwait was ordered to exchange Kuwaiti identity documents for Iraqi documents and access to medical facilities was denied to persons who refused to comply with these orders. There were other restrictions such as the first right of access to medical services for Iraqi military personnel, curfew hours and limited ambulance services.

The Panel took into account the foregoing information when it reviewed the numerous claims for serious personal injury or death that were allegedly related to lack of medical care due to Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait. With the help of the Commission's medical expert, the Panel defined the following criteria under which a serious personal injury or a death due to a lack of medical care is considered to be a direct consequence of Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait:

- a serious personal injury or a death that was a consequence of the lack of equipment, medicine or medical care regarded as indispensable under usual circumstances, is determined to be directly related to the invasion and occupation of Kuwait. For example, a number of diabetic persons were deprived of the necessary drugs or treatments so that they developed other serious illnesses, and, in some cases, died;

- a serious personal injury or a death attributed to the lack of medical care, equipment or medicine must be the consequence of an acute deterioration, or of a very severe exacerbation, of the health condition of a person, and not just of an aggravation arising from the normal course and development of a preexisting illness or injury.

²⁹ Kälin Report, para. 194.

3. Illness or death caused by events related to the invasion and occupation of Kuwait

The events during the invasion and occupation of Kuwait often greatly impacted on people's health in such a way that in many cases they provoked the death or illness of individuals. For example, a fatal heart attack was caused by the stress and emotion of seeing one's son arrested by Iraqi Forces, or because of the panic and fear induced by a bomb explosion even though the person was not physically wounded. The Panel recommends the payment of compensation where there is a link between the physical condition that caused the death and the invasion or occupation. The same criteria are, mutatis mutandis, applied to claims submitted for serious personal injury.

In other instances, there was no specific event that caused a serious personal injury or death, but the general circumstances prevailing in Kuwait during the period of the occupation by Iraq may have had such an effect. The Panel has applied to these cases the same criteria as above and recommends payment of compensation where evidence is provided.

4. Injury suffered in refugee camps

In some cases, the claimant stated that he/she suffered an injury while in a refugee camp outside Iraq and Kuwait. The Panel took into account that a great number of the people who left Kuwait or Iraq due to the conflict had no other choice but to try and reach their home country through the Iraqi-Jordanian border. These people were then placed in refugee camps where they had to stay a number of days under very difficult living conditions despite all the efforts of the authorities in charge. It was these conditions that led to various injuries, some of which were serious. The Panel recommends compensation in these cases as it considers these injuries to be a direct consequence of Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait.

5. Injury or death related to authorities other than Iraqi

The Panel had before it a number of claims submitted by persons who were allegedly arrested in Kuwait by Kuwaitis during the days immediately preceding 2 March 1991 and were then interned in Saudi Arabia in camps for Iraqi prisoners of

war. Some of these claimants were allegedly tortured by those who were in control of the camps. All such claimants had Jordanian passports.

A number of other claims were from Jordanian nationals who had been living in Kuwait before Iraq's invasion and whose personal statements indicated that the injuries or death suffered were the result of actions by Kuwaiti nationals or authorities, in particular mistreatment during detention. The issue was raised in article 16 reports in the following terms:

"A substantial number of claimants in category 'B' have put forward claims in which they assert that they were kept in detention or mistreated in Kuwait after 2 March 1991".

The Panel considered comments made on this issue by several Governments, including the Government of Iraq.

All these claims raise the issue as to whether the losses and damages claimed can be considered as a "direct" result of Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait, or, in other words, are attributable to Iraq.

The Panel determines that in such cases there is no "direct" link to the invasion and occupation of Kuwait because these acts were accomplished by authorities or persons and in places out of the control of the Iraqi authorities.

Moreover, in the view of the Panel, these acts are not covered by para. 18 of Decision 1 which states that claimants may be compensated for serious personal injuries suffered as a result "of military operations or threat of military action by either side during the period 2 August 1990 to 2 March 1991," since the acts that caused the injuries cannot be considered "military operations."

Therefore, while the Panel recognizes that the claimants in this group presented well-substantiated claims, and that under general principles of law these claimants would be entitled to claim for compensation for the injuries or death suffered, the Panel cannot recommend the payment of compensation from the Compensation Fund for them.

III. EVIDENTIARY ISSUES

Article 35, para. 1 of the Rules sets forth the general rule on evidence applicable to all categories of claims and the power of the panels to assess such evidence. The text of the provision is as follows:

"Each claimant is responsible for submitting documents and other evidence which demonstrate satisfactorily that a particular claim or group of claims is eligible for compensation pursuant to Security Council resolution 687 (1991). Each panel will determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of any documents and other evidence submitted."

The evidentiary standards to be applied in particular to claims in category "B" are set forth in article 35, para. 2 (b) of the Rules:

"For the payment of fixed amounts in the case of serious personal injury not resulting in death, claimants are required to provide simple documentation of the fact and date of the injury; in the case of death, claimants are required to provide simple documentation of the death and the family relationship. Documentation of the actual amount of loss will not be required."

In addition, and since only claims for losses, damages or injuries that were a direct consequence of Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait are compensable³⁰, this direct link has also to be proved by the claimant.

A. General considerations

One of the key issues facing the Panel in this first instalment of claims is to determine what evidence is required under the standards established by Governing Council Decision 1 for the claims to be eligible for compensation. The following is an overview of the different types of evidence submitted by claimants in support of death and injury claims and some background information concerning the availability and validity of such evidence in the context of the circumstances surrounding the invasion and occupation of Kuwait.

³⁰ Security Council resolution 687 (1991), para. 16.

1. Analysis of the different types of evidentiary items

a) Identity documents

Different evidentiary items were provided by claimants as proof of identity.

The "B" claim form instructs the claimant to submit documentation confirming his/her identity and nationality, such as a photocopy of a passport or national identity card. The claim form provides spaces for the claimant to indicate his/her passport number, national identity card number, civil identification number issued by the Kuwaiti authorities, or residency permit number issued by the Iraqi authorities. For death claims, the "B" claim form requests the claimant to provide the passport number, Kuwaiti civil identification number, or the Iraqi residency permit number of the deceased in the space provided on the claim form.

In addition to the information on the claim form, claimants usually submitted a photocopy of their passports, Kuwaiti civil identification cards, their family registration record, or travel documents that were issued by the relevant authorities to allow them to leave Kuwait or Iraq after the invasion. Claimants' passports often contained visas that indicated that the claimant had been a resident of Kuwait or Iraq, or exit stamps from the Iraqi authorities that indicated that the claimant had departed from Kuwait or Iraq during the relevant time period. In claims for death, the death declaration or death certificate attested to the identity of the deceased. In addition, a number of claimants provided the passport number, Kuwaiti civil identification number, or Iraqi residency permit number of the deceased on the claim form. The Panel considers this sufficient documentation of the identity of the claimant or the deceased. The issue of the proof of family relationship between the claimant and the deceased is discussed in section "C" below.

b) Statements by claimants

A majority of the claims are supported by a claimant statement. The evidentiary weight to be given to statements by claimant may be determined in light of the following factors:

(i) The claims processing and screening program established by each claimant country, and specifically whether the statements were prepared pursuant to an interview of the

claimant by a screening official, or whether the claimant was interviewed about the contents of his or her statement;

(ii) General background information compiled by national authorities, international organizations or other independent entities regarding the nature and causes of injury or death purportedly as a result of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait; such general background information may provide secondary or circumstantial support for the claim and the allegations contained in the claimant's statement;

(iii) The general level of education of the person preparing the statement, and the relationship of the claimant to the deceased.

c) Witness statements

A number of claims are supported by witness statements. The witness statement may be an independent document prepared by the witness, or the assertions contained in the claimant's statement may have been attested to by one or two witnesses. The evidentiary weight to be given to witness statements may be analyzed and determined in light of the following factors:

(i) The relationship of the witness to the deceased or the injured person, keeping in mind that under hostile conditions and circumstances involving urgency, the only available witness may be a person related to the victim;

(ii) General background information compiled by national authorities, international organizations or other independent entities regarding the nature and causes of death purportedly as a result of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. As with claimant statements, such general background information may provide secondary or circumstantial support for the assertions contained in the witness statements;

(iii) The national claims processing and screening program of the claimant country, and specifically whether the witness statement was prepared with the involvement of a screening official, or whether the witness was interviewed by the national claims screening authorities regarding the assertions in the witness statement;

(iv) General evidentiary principles relating to the quality and relevance of the witness statement, such as

whether the statement indicates the bases for the witness' testimony (i.e., time, place, first hand knowledge of the events).

d) Death or burial certificate, or other official documents

A death or burial certificate, or similar document prepared by an official entity (i.e., national authority, foreign embassy, international organization), such as a letter informing the deceased's family of the death, may be regarded as conclusive evidence of the fact of death. In some instances, depending on the issuing authority and the exact contents of the certificate, these documents may also be very probative of the cause of death. The reliability of such documentation as to the cause of death depends on the procedures adopted by the relevant authority or entity in issuing the document. Martyr's Certificates issued by Kuwait, and death certificates issued by Iraq, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait are examples of such documents.

e) Medical opinions showing the cause of death or injury

Certain of the claims are supported by an opinion prepared by an individual doctor or a committee of doctors who evaluated the cause of death or injury.

2. Level of evidentiary support

Nearly all the claims for serious personal injury and death were supported by some form of proof, although most of the claims in the first instalment contained a minimal level of documentary evidence. The scarcity of evidentiary support characterizing many claims may be attributable mainly to the circumstances prevailing in Kuwait and Iraq during the invasion and occupation period. Under the general emergency conditions prevailing in the two countries, thousands of individuals were forced to flee or hide, or were held captive, without retaining documents that later could be used to substantiate their losses. In addition, many claimants chose not to or could not return to Iraq or Kuwait, and therefore had difficulty producing primary evidence of their losses, damages or injuries.

Moreover, the lack of medical documentation or death certificates may be explained by the breakdown in civil order

within Kuwait ensuing Iraq's invasion. Because large numbers of doctors, nurses and hospital administrative staff had fled Kuwait in the aftermath of the invasion, hospital administrative services were operating much below their normal capacity and many patients had to be cared for at home. Accordingly, the contemporaneous preparation of doctor's reports, medical certificates and records, or death certificates was severely limited³¹. Thus, in a significant number of cases medical reports did not exist or records were lost.

The scarcity of evidentiary support where massive numbers of claims are involved is not a phenomenon without precedent in international claims programs, in particular if the events generating responsibility have taken place in abnormal circumstances such as those prevailing in Kuwait and Iraq during the conflict. An analysis of the practice of international tribunals regarding issues of evidence shows that tribunals often had to decide claims on the basis of meagre or incomplete evidence. It has been observed that the lowering of the levels of the evidence required occurs especially "in the case of claims commissions, which have to deal with complex questions of fact relating to the claims of hundreds or even thousands of individuals"³².

The Governing Council, in Decisions 1 and 7, has established a gradation in the requirement of evidence for the different categories of claims, setting forth more relaxed standards of evidentiary support for claims in categories "A", "B" and "C" (urgent claims) and among those categories, for claims for fixed amounts (Decision 1, paras. 11, 12 and 15).

Recalling that para. 11 of Decision 1 states that "simple" documentation of the fact and date of the injury or of the death will suffice as proof, some Governments have stressed the fact that many claimants were unable to provide full documentation to substantiate their claims. They are of the view that the claimant's own statement describing what happened can support claims on form B.

The Panel noted considerable disparities concerning the degree of evidence submitted, among claims submitted by

³¹ Kälin Report, paras. 189-200.

³² Durward D. Sandifer, Evidence Before International Tribunals, Revised Edition 1975 at 22.

different Governments, and within them, among individual claims. This was mainly due to the differences among the claims programs that were instituted in various countries. In some countries claimants completed their claims under the supervision or with the assistance of a national claims program official, and evidentiary items provided by claimants were reviewed by program officials. The particular socio-economic situation of the claimants, such as education and income levels have also had an impact on the way claims were prepared and submitted to the respective Government.

All the circumstances mentioned above were taken into account in assessing the evidence submitted in each case, but the Panel required in all cases a minimum level of evidence to recommend an award of compensation.

B. Claims for serious personal injury

1. General approach

Two elements are required by the Panel in order for a claim for serious personal injury to be compensable: a) evidence of the date and fact of the injury; b) proof of causation (evidence showing that the cause of the injury is linked to the Iraqi invasion and occupation of Kuwait).

The Panel noted that the circumstances prevailing in Kuwait and in some of the neighbouring countries during the period 2 August 1990 to 2 March 1991 made it extremely difficult for claimants to obtain contemporaneous medical documentation. The Panel therefore accepted non-contemporaneous medical documentation as sufficient evidence of the fact of the injury.

However, requiring medical documentation as proof of the injury is subject to several exceptions. For some claimants it may have been difficult to obtain medical reports documenting their injuries due to the reduced level of health services in Kuwait during the occupation³³. Claimants may have found it difficult to consult a doctor for personal or cultural reasons as in the case of sexual assault or torture. The claimant may also have been unable to receive any medical assistance due to

³³ See Part III, section A, item 2 supra.

the circumstances of the event, e.g., injuries suffered in the desert while escaping from Iraq or Kuwait. In such cases, the Panel has accepted other documentary evidence, witness statements and, in certain cases, the personal statement by the claimant as sufficient proof of the fact of the injury.

2. Particular cases

a) Injury caused by torture

The Panel had before it a number of claims, the majority of which were submitted by the Government of Kuwait, where the claimant stated that he/she had been detained by Iraqi Forces and while in detention had been tortured. Decision 3, para. 2 of the Governing Council states that "'serious personal injury' also includes instances of physical or mental injury arising from ... torture...."

Most of these claimants have submitted a personal statement affirming they had been detained and tortured, and an official document from the Kuwaiti authorities or the International Committee of the Red Cross stating that the person had been detained. However, a vast majority of these claimants have not submitted any medical documentation. The Commission's medical expert confirmed that many torture victims often do not wish to seek the help of a physician, as they may wish to suppress the memory of the torture, or they may be embarrassed to admit that their mental health has been affected by the ordeal. Furthermore, some forms of torture do not leave any appreciable physical scars and a physician would not have been able to offer a written assessment of the physical injuries suffered by the claimant.

The Panel also took into account the fact that Kuwaiti nationals were particularly exposed to mistreatment by Iraqi forces while in detention as it was stated in a United Nations report³⁴. Considering all these factors, the Panel

³⁴ Kälin Report, para. 115: "According to interviews conducted by the Special Rapporteur, the Farah Mission and the Kuwaiti Association for the Defence of Victims of War, torture was widespread. An indication of the widespread use of torture was given by Dr. Al-Hammadi's two studies. Among the 100 former detainees repatriated from Iraq whose condition was analyzed in the first study, 76 claimed to have been subjected to some kind of torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, and 261 out of 330 former detainees examined in the

determines that compensation should be awarded to those claimants who showed that they were tortured by Iraqi forces while in detention, even if they were not able to submit medical documentation, provided that the fact of detention has been attested to by an official authority.

b) Injury caused by sexual assault

Governing Council Decision 3, para. 2 states that "'serious personal injury' also includes instances of physical or mental injury arising from sexual assault....". The Panel had before it some claims where rape by members of the Iraqi military forces was asserted as the cause of the injury. These claimants did not provide any medical documentation. The Commission's medical expert was of the view that many rape victims often do not wish to seek the help of a physician, as they may wish to suppress the memory of the rape, or they are embarrassed to admit that they have been sexually assaulted. Furthermore, a physician would not have been able to offer a written assessment of the physical injuries suffered by the claimant, unless the claimant presented herself for treatment immediately after the attack, which would have been difficult during the invasion and occupation of Kuwait.

The Panel notes that it is a well-documented fact that many women were raped by Iraqi forces, as was stated in a United Nations report³⁵.

second study reported having been subjected to physical or psychological torture or abuse." and

para.117: "(i)n numerous cases, torture and inhuman, cruel or degrading treatment resulted in a permanent physical or mental damage. Medical and psychiatric reports made available to the Special Rapporteur showed that former victims of torture still suffer from, inter alia, partial paralysis, pains, severe forms of depression, sleep disturbances and nightmares, severe anxiety, partial amnesia and inability to concentrate, often requiring medical and psychological care."

³⁵ Kälin Report, para. 182: "...women particularly were victims of rape. According to the information received and interviews conducted during the Special Rapporteur's visits to Kuwait, the following categories of cases of rape can be distinguished:

- a) Rape of foreign women by Iraqi soldiers during the first two weeks of the occupation. Most, but not all, of the victims were young women of Asian origin....
- b) Rape of women during house searches by Iraqi army personnel, sometimes in front of close relatives...

Taking the above-noted factors into account, the Panel recommends compensation for claims for rape where circumstantial evidence is available³⁶.

c) Injury caused by pollution from burning oil wells

There were very few claims in this grouping caused by pollution emitted from burning oil wells. The issue was raised in article 16 reports, in the following terms:

"Some claimants in Category "B" assert that they suffer from serious respiratory problems arising from the air pollution as a result of the burning oil fields in Kuwait".

The Panel reviewed additional information and views made by the Governments that have submitted claims and by the Government of Iraq on this issue, as well as a United Nations report³⁷.

It is the view of the Panel that claims for serious personal injury caused by the pollution emitted from Kuwaiti oil wells are compensable as the environmental damage from burning oil wells was, according to United Nations reports, caused by Iraqi occupying forces³⁸.

-
- c) Other women were reportedly raped when abducted for that purpose from check-points or from the street.
d) Finally, rape was used as a method of torture...."

³⁶ As was stated by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, Velasquez Rodriguez Case, Judgment of 29 July 1988, para 130: "...direct evidence, whether testimonial or documentary, is not the only type of evidence that may be legitimately considered in reaching a decision. Circumstantial evidence, indicia, and presumptions may be considered, so long as they lead to conclusions consistent with the facts."

³⁷ Kälin Report, para. 204: "The Special Rapporteur was informed by doctors in Kuwait that after February 1991, there had been a certain increase of health problems, especially of children, elderly or sick persons, which might be attributed to environmental pollution caused by burning oil wells. Such problems were described as 'limited', although the increase of cases of respiratory problems was substantial."

³⁸ Farah Report, para. 138, and Kälin Report, para. 203.

Both the fact of the injury and the cause of the injury must be mentioned in relevant medical documentation before compensation can be recommended. The Panel relied, when necessary, on an assessment by the Commission's medical expert that the pollution emitted from burning oil wells could have caused the particular serious personal injury alleged by a claimant.

C. Claims for death

The Panel determines that claims for death are compensable where three elements are present in the claim: a) evidence of the fact of the death, b) proof of the family relationship between the claimant (or claimants) and the deceased, and c) proof of causation (evidence of the link of the death to the invasion and occupation of Kuwait by Iraq).

1. Proof of the fact of death

A death or burial certificate, or similar document prepared by an official entity (i.e., national authority, foreign embassy, international organization) such as a letter informing the deceased's family of the death, was regarded as conclusive evidence of the fact of the death. In some instances, depending on the issuing authority and the exact contents of the certificate, these documents were also found to be probative of the cause of death.

As in the case of medical documentation for serious personal injury, in many cases death certificates could not be issued at the time of the death for the following reasons:

- the cause of death had to be investigated by a doctor and the number of medical professionals who could conduct such an investigation during the occupation was limited;
- there were large numbers of deaths in Kuwait that were not contemporaneously certified or recorded, and hence, there was a considerable backlog of investigations that had to be conducted before a death certificate could be issued;
- in some instances, families received death certificates from Iraqi authorities during the occupation and had to convert these to Kuwaiti death certificates after the liberation.

Thus, in a significant number of cases, death certificates were not issued until many months after the death

occurred. Considering the circumstances described, the Panel finds that such death certificates constitute sufficient proof of the fact of death.

Following liberation, the Kuwaiti authorities established a Martyr's Office to declare as martyrs certain persons who died during the occupation of Kuwait. According to a report of the Martyr's Office, it investigated mainly the fact and the cause of death. Such martyr's certificates were submitted with respect to a number of death claims by the Government of Kuwait. Taking into account the scrutiny followed by the Martyr's Office for issuing the martyr's certificates, the Panel accepted these documents accompanying claims submitted by the Government of Kuwait as sufficient evidence of the fact of death.

2. Proof of family relationship

Decision 1, para. 12 states that simple documentation of the family relationship is required for a claim for death in category "B" to be compensable. The Panel holds that a marriage certificate, birth certificate, certificate of inheritance, or family registration record is sufficient proof of family relationship for the purposes of these claims since the names of the deceased and claimants appear therein. A passport that includes the name of the deceased and the claimant(s) is also considered sufficient proof of the family relationship. The Panel finds, however, that the structure of a claimant's name that often states the claimant's name, the father's name, and sometimes the grandfather's name (as seen in many Arabic names), is, by itself, not sufficient proof of the family relationship between the claimant and the deceased.

The Panel had before it cases where only the structure of the claimant's name gave any indication of the family relationship and where no other proof of family relationship had been submitted. Since in these claims the Panel ascertained that there was a causal connection between the death or serious personal injury and the invasion or occupation of Kuwait it requests that the relevant Governments provide additional information relating to the family relationship between the claimant(s) and the deceased.

D. The causal link

Pursuant to Security Council resolution 687 (1991), evidence is required showing that the serious personal injury or death was a consequence of the Iraqi invasion and occupation of Kuwait.

The Panel considers a death certificate or any other official document (e.g., a police report) sufficient evidence of the link to the invasion if such death certificate or official document indicates that the cause of death was connected to the invasion. In the case of death certificates that do not state the cause of death, other documentary evidence explaining how the death was a consequence of the invasion is accepted by the Panel as sufficient evidence of a causal connection if other elements in the claim are consistent with the contents of the statement.

In claims for serious personal injury, the Panel considers evidence such as a witness statement, an affidavit or a medical report, as sufficient proof of the link of the injury to the invasion and occupation of Kuwait. In certain cases, the Panel considers a personal statement explaining the link of the serious personal injury to the Iraqi invasion and occupation of Kuwait as sufficient proof of a causal connection when it is confirmed by the Commission's medical expert that the injury is consistent with the cause as invoked by the claimant.

IV . RECOMMENDED COMPENSATION AND OTHER DECISIONS

This part of the report provides a brief overview of the claims contained in the first instalment and, based on the determinations explained above, sets out the recommendations of the Panel to the Governing Council regarding this instalment of claims pursuant to article 37 (e) of the Rules.

These findings are without prejudice to the conclusions and findings of panels for other categories of claims.

A. Overview of the claimsCategory "B" Claims Contained in the First Instalment

<u>Country</u>	<u>Death</u>	<u>S.P.I.</u> ³⁹	<u>Total</u>
1. Australia	0	4	4
2. Bahrain	0	22	22
3. China	3	1	4
4. Czech and Slovak Rep.	0	2	2
5. France	0	27	27
6. Iran	1	1	2
7. Japan	0	2	2
8. Jordan	218	285	503
9. Kenya	0	1	1
10. Kuwait	296	68	364
11. Mauritius	0	1	1
12. Pakistan	4	9	13
13. Poland	2	2	4
14. Sri Lanka	16	45	61
15. Thailand	3	1	4
16. United Kingdom	2	88	90
17. United States	2	12	14
19. F.R.Yugoslavia ⁴⁰		0	1
TOTAL	547	572	1,119

³⁹ SPI: serious personal injury.

⁴⁰ FRY: Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).

B. Recommendations to the Governing Council

Pursuant to article 37 (e) of the Rules, the Panel hereby presents its final recommendations on the claims contained in the first instalment of category "B" claims for each country by consolidated claim. A breakdown of these recommendations by individual claim within each consolidated claim is also attached. This section also provides a summary of the other decisions of the Panel.

The recommendations and decisions are presented as follows:

- claims for which the Panel recommends the payment of compensation;
- claims for which the Panel recommends that no compensation be awarded;
- claims the Panel requested the Executive Secretary to transfer to the category "C" Panel of Commissioners (transferred claims);
- claims for which no recommendation has been made at this stage;
- summary of all recommendations and decisions, by country.

1. Claims for which compensation is recommended

The Panel recommends the payment of compensation for 670 individual claims. The amounts of compensation for claims in the first instalment, with respect to each consolidated claim, are the following:

- a) By country by consolidated claim number (in alphabetical order)

<u>Country</u>	<u>Consol. Clm Number</u>	<u>Recommended Amount</u> <u>(USD)</u>
Australia	AU/00027/01B	2,500
China	CN/00148/01B	5,000
Slovak Republic*	CZ/00085/01B	2,500

* The claims were initially submitted by the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic. The award of compensation is to be paid to the Government of the Slovak Republic.

France	FR/00070/01B	37,500
	FR/00127/02B	15,000
	Total FR	52,500
Iran	IR/00063/01B	2,500
Jordan	JO/00103/01B	982,500
Kenya	KE/00105/01B	2,500
Kuwait	KW/00007/01B	95,000
	KW/00014/02B	80,000
	KW/00144/03B	1,222,500
	Total KW	1,397,500
Mauritius	MU/00080/01B	2,500
Pakistan	PK/00024/01B	22,500
Poland	PL/00116/01B	10,000
Sri Lanka	LK/00109/01B	110,000
Thailand	TH/00095/01B	10,000
United Kingdom	GB/00019/01B	22,500
	GB/00055/02B	10,000
	GB/00071/03B	10,000
	GB/00102/04B	32,500
	GB/00131/05B	15,000
	GB/00161/06B	17,500
	Total UK	107,500
United States	US/00006/01B	7,500
	US/00040/02B	15,000
	US/00097/03B	12,500
	Total US	35,000
F.R.Yugoslavia ⁴¹	YU/00008/01B	2,500
=====		
TOTAL RECOMMENDED AMOUNT		2,747,500

b) By individual claim by country

The breakdown of the recommendations for each country is presented by UNCC claim number within each consolidated claim, and indicates the name of each individual claimant. The breakdown is attached in Annex I by country in alphabetical order.

2. Claims for which no compensation is recommended

The claims with respect to which the Panel recommends that no compensation be awarded are listed in Annex II by country, in alphabetical order, by UNCC claim number, indicating the name of each individual claimant.

⁴¹ FRY: Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)

3. Transferred claims

The claims that the Panel requested the Executive Secretary to transfer to the Panel of Commissioners dealing with the category "C" claims, in accordance with article 32, para.3 of the Rules, are listed in Annex III by country in alphabetical order, by UNCC claim number and by claimant name.

4. Other decisions

The Panel has considered claims that were filed for serious personal injury on behalf of persons that are asserted to be still in detention in Iraq, and death claims filed for "missing persons". No award of compensation is recommended at this stage for these claims that are listed in Annex IV.

In a number of cases, the Panel has requested that more information be provided by Governments. The relevant list appears in Annex V.

5. Summary of recommendations and decisions

The Panel recommends compensation for 670 claims; it does not recommend compensation for 307 claims; it requests the transfer of 88 claims to the Panel of Commissioners for category "C" claims; it requests additional information in 40 cases, and it declines to make any recommendation at this stage for 14 claims.

Annex VI summarizes all the claims in the first instalment by country, together with the respective recommendation or decision.

Geneva, 14 April 1994

(Signed) Mr. Mohamed Bennouna
Chairman

(Signed) Ms. Denise Bindschedler-Robert
Commissioner

(Signed) Ms. Fang Ping
Commissioner

Annex

ANNEX VI/SUMMARY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS

COUNTRY	CLAIMS RECOMMENDED FOR PAYMENT	CLAIMS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR PAYMENT	TRANSFERRED CLAIMS	MISCELLANEOUS CLAIMS	TOTAL NUMBER OF CLAIMS	TOTAL AMOUNT (USD)
AUSTRALIA	1	1	2		4	2500
BAHRAIN			22		22	
CHINA	2	2			4	5000
SLOVAK REP.	1	1			2	2500
FRANCE	21	2	4		27	52500
IRAN	1			1	2	2500
JAPAN		1	1		2	
JORDAN	241	232	6	24	503	982500
KENYA	1				1	2500
KUWAIT	303	30	6	25	364	1397500
MAURITIUS	1				1	2500
PAKISTAN	7	5		1	13	22500
POLAND	3		1		4	10000
SRI LANKA	34	25		2	61	110000
THAILAND	3			1	4	10000
UNITED KINGDOM	39	7	44		90	107500
UNITED STATES	11	1	2		14	35000
F. R. YUGOSLAVIA	1				1	2500
TOTAL	670	307	88	54	1119	2747500