panels from two member panels, as I recall, was largely cost effectiveness and efficiency. The practice of single member panels at the Board was well established and I would even say entrenched since it was accepted by everyone, by the time the current Act came into force."

The same sentiments are echoed by the New Zealand Refugee Status Appeals Authority.

## Final comment

The Refugee Appeal Board is adamant that the proposed wording of section 8C(2) cannot work in practice and should not be accepted as it stands. The Board submits, with respect, that the proposal the Board has made (on page 9) is the only reasonable way to go in the future.

The Refugee Appeal Board thanks the Honourable members of the Portfolio Committee for having been granted the chance to comment on and to make its inputs to the Refugee Amendment Bill, 2008.

Tjerk Damstra (Acting) Chairperson Refugee Appeal Board.

FIGURES	evolude	2000-2001
1 144100	CAUIUUC	2000-2001

rigures ex	clude 2000-200	P		_		-		-		
	2002					-		Rec	eived Fi	nalised
	Braamfontein		PE	_	CT	Pta		1		
Received	162			99		_	579		1351	
Finalised Braar	44	90	-	81	10		186			411
	2003									
	Braamfontein	Durban	PE		CT	Pta	3			
Received	26			96		_	212		431	
Finalised	34	39		38	10		205			326
	2004									
	Braamfontein	Durban	PE		CT	Pta	3			
Received	21			1			95		234	
Finalised	37	65		2	28	3	153			285
	2005					-				
	Braamfontein	Durban	PE		СТ	Pta	a .			
Received	155			64	48	3	222		587	
Finalised	155	98		64	48	3	222			587
	2006									
	Braamfontein	Durban	PE		CT	Pta	3			
Received	624	568	3	343	69	7	248		2480	
Finalised	153	112		84	108	3	128			585
	2007									
	Braamfontein	_	PE		CT	Pta		-		
Received	484	276	1	32	-	-	130		1648	
Finalised	198	132	1	119	22:	2	68			739
						-			6731	2933

<sup>\*</sup> Remember that our report to MiN reflected from 2000 til 10-05-2007, whilst this is from 2002, thus figures vary since the report, appeals have been added to the stats