

Cameroon

I am here: [Home](#) > [Laws & Policy](#) > [Country Specific Policy](#) > [Operation Guidance Notes](#) > [Cameroon](#)

1. Introduction

1.1 This document summarises the general, political and human rights situation in Cameroon and provides information on the nature and handling of claims frequently received from nationals/residents of that province. It must be read in conjunction with any CIPU or COI Service Cameroon Country Information Bulletins.

1.2 This document is intended to provide clear guidance on whether the main types of claim are or are not likely to justify the granting of asylum, Humanitarian Protection or Discretionary Leave. Caseworkers should refer to the following Asylum Policy Instructions for further details of the policy on these areas:

API on Assessing the Claim

API on Humanitarian Protection

API on Discretionary Leave

API on the European Convention on Human Rights

1.3 Claims should be considered on an individual basis, but taking full account of the information set out below, in particular Part 3 on main categories of claims.

Source documents

1.4 Where source numbers have been cited, these refer to the source documents which are listed at the end of this note.

2. Country assessment

2.1 Cameroon is a republic dominated by a strong presidency. Despite the country's multiparty system of government, the Cameroon People's Democratic Movement (CPDM) has remained in power since the early years of independence from the British and French in 1960-1. **[1][3]** In 1990 in response to growing civil unrest and political organisation under the unofficial opposition Social Democratic Front (SDF), President Biya approved the legalisation of a multi-party system would be adopted. Legislative elections were held in May 1992 and were contested by 32 political parties. The first presidential elections under a multi-party system in October 1992 were fiercely contested and controversial. President Biya was re-elected by a narrow margin (39-36%) over the leading opposition candidate, John Fru Ndi of the Social Democratic Front. International observers regarded the elections as flawed. **[1]**

2.2 Legislative elections were held again in May 1997, with the ruling CPDM winning 109 of the 180 seats in the National Assembly. There were claims of widespread fraud; results were referred to the Supreme Court and international election monitors were again critical. A Commonwealth Observer Group report made several recommendations, including the creation of an independent electoral commission. The government established the National Elections Observatory in 2001, making it a permanent body in 2003. **[1]**

2.3 Opposition leaders complained of widespread irregularities, fraud and non-respect of the electoral law in the 2002 elections. Some called upon President Biya to cancel the result and threatened not to take up their seats in the National Assembly. The July elections had already been postponed from January 2002 to July, due to concern that the newly established National Elections Observatory would not have had the time or resources to prepare. Then on 23 July - polling day - a presidential decree was issued, postponing them for another week, due to a lack of preparation by the Ministry of the Interior. In many areas, voting materials had not been distributed. Despite the presence of the National Elections Observatory, July's elections have reinforced calls for the establishment of a fully independent body to run the elections, as recommended by the Commonwealth Secretariat following the 1997 elections. **[1]**

2.4 Biya was re-elected in presidential elections in October 2004 amid allegations by opposition parties and the Catholic Bishops' Conference of Cameroon of vote-rigging and law-breaking. A Commonwealth Observer Group concluded that the electoral process lacked the necessary credibility in a number of key areas, including denying some voters the right to vote. However, the Group believed that the intention of those who voted was reflected in the result. **[2b][3][4]**

2.5 The disputed oil-rich Bakassi peninsula remained under the control of Nigerian forces in 2004, despite a 2002 ruling by the International Court of Justice in The Hague that it be handed over to Cameroon. Nigerian forces had not vacated the area by deadlines set for May and September 2004. **[2a][4]**

2.6 Cameroon's human rights record is poor. Extra-judicial executions, protracted detention without trial, torture of detainees and appalling prison conditions were all highlighted by the UN Special Rapporteur on Torture in 1999. The international community (through the European Union, the Commonwealth, the United Nations, and bilaterally) has been pressing the Government of Cameroon ever since to implement the recommended reforms. Cameroon has been described as one of the world's most corrupt countries and corruption exists at all levels of society. [1][3]

2.7 The judiciary was subject to significant executive influence and suffered from corruption and inefficiency in 2004. During the year the Government continued to commit numerous serious human rights abuses. Citizens' ability to change their government remained severely limited. Political leaders were reportedly detained to prevent public meetings and demonstrations. Security forces committed numerous unlawful killings and were responsible for regular torture, beatings, and other abuses of persons, particularly detainees and prisoners. The government did not investigate reports in 2004 of torture, 'disappearances' or deaths in police custody. Impunity remained a serious problem in 2004. Prison conditions are harsh and life threatening. Security forces continued to arrest arbitrarily various opposition politicians, local human rights monitors, and other citizens, often holding them for prolonged periods without charges or trials, and, at times, incommunicado. [3][4]

2.8 The Government continued to restrict freedoms of speech and press and harassed and threatened journalists in 2004. The Government restricted freedom of assembly and limited freedom of association. Security forces limited freedom of movement. Corruption was a serious problem. Violence and discrimination against women remained serious problems. There were reports of trafficking in persons, primarily children, for the purposes of forced labour. Societal discrimination against indigenous Pygmies and ethnic minorities continued. The Government continued to infringe on worker rights and restricted the activities of independent labour organisations. Child labour remained a serious problem. There were reported incidents of slavery and forced labour, including forced child labour. [3][4]

2.9 The 'Bepanda Nine' case of 2002 was a particularly worrying example of human rights abuse in Cameroon. Nine men were arrested by the Cameroon Government's anti-gang brigade, the Commandement Operationnel, for stealing a gas bottle. They subsequently disappeared, presumed murdered by the Commandement Operationnel. Following international pressure, the Government of Cameroon held an official enquiry, the results of which have not been made public. A trial was held of eight Commandement Operationnel officers implicated in the disappearances. Of the eight men, only two were found guilty of the lesser crime of violating orders - charges of murder and torture having been reduced. The victims' families have appealed against the verdict. This is only one case amongst a series of human rights violations allegedly perpetrated by the Commandement Operationnel, which has since been disbanded. [1]

2.10 The Government of Cameroon set up a Human Rights Commission in 1992, but it lacks funds and does not make public its reports. On 29 June 2000 Prime Minister Musonge announced a National Governance Programme, preparation of which was a requirement for Cameroon's application for Heavily Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) status. The objectives of the programme include reinforcing the rule of law and reforming the judicial system. [1][2b]

3. Main categories of claims

3.1 This Section sets out the main types of asylum claim, human rights claim and Humanitarian Protection claim (whether explicit or implied) made by those entitled to reside in Cameroon. It also contains any common claims that may raise issues covered by the API on Discretionary Leave. Where appropriate it provides guidance on whether or not an individual making a claim is likely to face a real risk of persecution, unlawful killing or torture or inhuman or degrading treatment/ punishment. It also provides guidance on whether or not sufficiency of protection is available in cases where the threat comes from a non-state actor; and whether or not internal relocation is an option. The law and policies on persecution, Humanitarian Protection, sufficiency of protection and internal flight are set out in the relevant API's, but how these affect particular categories of claim are set out in the instructions below.

3.2 Each claim should be assessed to determine whether there are reasonable grounds for believing that the claimant would, if returned, face persecution for a Convention reason - i.e. due to their race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion. The approach set out in Karanakaran should be followed when deciding how much weight to be given to the material provided in support of the claim (see the API on Assessing the Claim).

3.3 If the claimant does not qualify for asylum, consideration should be given as to whether a grant of Humanitarian Protection is appropriate. If the claimant qualifies for neither asylum nor Humanitarian

Protection, consideration should be given as to whether he/she qualifies for Discretionary Leave, either on the basis of the particular categories detailed in Section 4 or on their individual circumstances.

3.4 This guidance **is not** designed to cover issues of credibility. Caseworkers will need to consider credibility issues based on all the information available to them. (For guidance on credibility see para 11 of the API on Assessing the Claim)

3.5 Also, this guidance does not generally provide information on whether or not a person should be excluded from the Refugee Convention or from Humanitarian Protection or Discretionary Leave. (See API on Humanitarian Protection and API on Exclusion under Article 1F or 33(2) and API on DL)

All [APIs](#) can be accessed via the IND website at:

3.6 Members of the SDF

Many claimants will apply for asylum based on ill treatment amounting to persecution at the hands of the state authorities due to their membership of, involvement in or perceived involvement the main opposition political party: the Social Democratic Front (SDF).

3.6.2 Treatment. The SDF is the largest opposition political party to play a major role in opposition political party activity and contested elections throughout 2004. The SDF is a legally registered political party and has seats in the National Assembly and mayoral representation throughout the country. SDF members are not considered to be at risk of persecution on the basis of membership of the SDF. **[3][5a]** (paras 5.64 - 5.65) John Fru Ndi, National Chairman SDF told the UK delegation of a fact finding mission to Cameroon in January 2004 that government officials and the police harass and intimidate members of the SDF. Young people whose parents are members of the SDF in particular are harassed and intimidated by the government. Many young SDF supporters are also stopped from obtaining jobs or starting up new businesses. Often the government claims that they have not paid the correct taxes so keep postponing the necessary documents needed to start a new business. It is difficult for many young SDF supporters to live in Cameroon because of the harassment and intimidation. However, it must be noted that this form of intimidation is not used against all SDF members. **[5b] (para 3.2)**

3.6.3 Opposition parties, including the SDF, continued to operate under severe constraints in 2004. There were reports that supporters were arbitrarily detained and their public gatherings obstructed by the security forces. During campaigning for municipal by-elections in June 2004 there were reports of some hostile encounters between members of the CPDM and the SDF and security forces took action to prevent violence. On 6 July 2004 a peaceful march in Yaounde was blocked by hundreds of anti-riot gendarmes. Among the demonstrators said to have been assaulted was party leader John Fru Hdi and a number of SDF MPs. On 20 August 2004 John Khotem, an SDF leader was beaten to death near Bamenda, the capital of north-west province, reportedly by followers of a local CPDM leader and MP. Following mass protests by SDF supporters, 11 people were arrested in September 2004 in connection with the killing. The 11 and the MP had not been formally charged by the end of 2004. **[3][4]**

3.6.4 Sufficiency of protection. As this category of applicants' fear is of ill treatment/persecution by the state authorities, they cannot apply to these authorities for protection.

3.6.5 Internal relocation. As this category of applicants' fear is of ill treatment/persecution by the state authorities, relocation to a different area of the country to escape this threat is not feasible.

3.6.6 Conclusion. The SDF is the largest opposition party to play a major role in opposition political activity. It is a registered party and therefore being a member is not illegal. In spite of the party's activities continuing to be subject to restrictions by the government during 2004, SDF affiliates are not considered to be at risk of treatment amounting to persecution on the basis of their membership of, or association with the party. Likewise the SDF leadership are not considered to be at risk of persecution by the state security forces. Membership of, involvement in, or perceived involvement in the SDF at any level is not likely to amount to ill-treatment that engages the UK's obligations under the 1951 Convention. The grant of asylum in such cases is therefore not likely to be appropriate.

3.7 Members of the SCNC or SCYL

3.7.1 Some claimants will apply for asylum based on ill treatment amounting to persecution at the hands of the state authorities due to their membership of, involvement with or perceived involvement with the secessionist groups: the South Cameroons National Council (SCNC) or the South Cameroons Youth League (SCYL).

3.7.2 Treatment. The SCNC was established in 1995 to represent the interests of the anglophone community and has advocated complete succession or full independence of the two southern anglophone provinces from the francophone majority. The SCNC is not a political party and is not registered but shares a number of supporters with opposition parties, most notably the SDF. Some members of the SCNC have used violence to obtain political concessions from the government. The SCYL is a youth organisation known to be connected to the SCNC. **[5a] (para 5.70)** The SCNC informed the delegation of a UK fact finding mission to Cameroon in January 2004 that many of its members are harassed, followed and occasionally beaten by the government security forces because of their alliance. SCNC members and their families are denied privileges in society, such as schooling and jobs. The SCNC are suppressed by the government and are offered bribes to keep quiet about their objectives. **[5b] (para 3.8)**

3.7.3 The Human Rights Defence Group (HRDG) stated in 2004 that SCNC members are tried in military tribunals because these are not open to the public. The moment a person tries to advocate their rights, members of the ruling party as well as government authorities can order police to harass that person. The SCNC representative said that President Biya stops the SCNC from holding meetings. According to the SCNC, freedom of movement is a problem for their members and their families because they fear for their lives and are constantly being watched by government authorities. **[3][5b] (paras 3.9 - 3.11)**

3.7.4 The UNHCR in Cameroon stated in January 2004 that although in the past particular groups have suffered treatment amounting to persecution by state authorities within the country, this is no longer the case. In the past members of the SCNC have faced harassment and inhumane treatment by the police. For example, between 1999-2002 there were some clashes between SCNC members and the police and some SCNC activists were jailed for their behaviour. **[5b] (paras 3.12 - 3.14)** The government and security forces continued to harass and arrest participants at SCNC meetings reportedly held SCNC activists in temporary detention in 2004 though there was no reliable estimate of the number held at the end of the year. The SCNC (and affiliated groups) remains a proscribed organisation. **[3][4]**

3.7.5 Sufficiency of protection. As this category of applicants' fear is of ill treatment/persecution by the state authorities, they cannot apply to these authorities for protection.

3.7.6 Internal relocation. As this category of applicants' fear is of ill treatment/persecution by the state authorities, relocation to a different area of the country to escape this threat is not feasible.

3.7.7 Caselaw.

IAT/AIT Determinations: MF (Cameroon) [2004] UKIAT 00341 promulgated 29 November 2004. SCNC member - risk on return. The IAT found that SCNC members are harassed but the objective evidence does not indicate that membership of the SCNC is likely to lead to persecution (paragraph 14). Attendance at a single demonstration in the UK does not indicate the appellant has been an active political supporter in the UK (paragraph 16). "The fact that an official came out of the embassy and took pictures of all the demonstrators does not of itself indicate that the appellant is likely to be identified by the authorities in Cameroon as a political activist." (paragraph 16) "...all the activities the appellant undertook on behalf of the SCNC were public and non-violent and nothing that she did was secret. Yet she did not come to the adverse attention of the authorities... Were she to be returned to Cameroon today, and did resume her political activities, we find that there is no reasonable likelihood of the appellant being persecuted for a Convention reason or being subjected to treatment contrary to Article 3 of the ECHR." (paragraph 17)

3.7.8 Conclusion. SCNC and SCYL activities are sometimes subject to close monitoring by the authorities, some members continue to encounter discrimination or harassment and an unconfirmed number of affiliates continue to be held in temporary detention however there is no evidence that this treatment generally amounts to persecution. Therefore there is no evidence to suggest that mere membership of, involvement with, or perceived involvement in the SCNC or SCYL would in itself lead to persecution and a grant of asylum in such cases is therefore not likely to be appropriate. Claimants who have been involved in illegal or criminal activities on behalf of the SCNC or SCYL are likely to fear prosecution by the authorities rather than persecution. The grant of asylum in such cases is therefore also not likely to be appropriate.

3.8 Members of human rights organisations

3.8.1 Some claimants will apply for asylum based on ill treatment amounting to persecution at the hands of state authorities due to their membership of or involvement with international or local human rights organisations.

3.8.2 Treatment. A number of domestic and international human rights groups generally operated without government restriction, investigating and publishing findings on human rights cases. However, government officials repeatedly impeded the effectiveness of local human rights NGOs during 2004 by limiting access to

prisoners, refusing to share information, and threatening and using violence against personnel. [3][5b] (paras 4.1 - 4.4)

3.8.3 Between mid-May and mid-November 2004, police harassed Philip Njaru, a human rights activist and Executive Director of the Kumba-based Friends of the Press Network, a human rights organisation in Southwest Province. Njaru had been investigating and disseminating information on the case of Bernard Afuh, whom the police burned to death. Access by international NGOs to prisons reportedly improved during 2004. The activities of virtually all of these groups were limited by a shortage of funds and trained personnel. Observers have criticised the country's NGO laws for giving the Government the opportunity to deny authorisation to operate or eliminate NGOs by decree. [3]

3.8.4 Numerous domestic human rights NGOs operated in the country in 2004, including, among others, the National League for Human Rights, the Organisation for Human Rights and Freedoms, the Association of Women Against Violence, and the Cameroonian Association of Female Jurists. [3][5b] (paras 4.5 - 4.20) The Government harassed and arrested NGO members during 2004. For example, on 21 July 2004, gendarmes arrested and detained Joseph Chongsi of the Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy under false pretences; they alleged that he had not paid a debt. He was released on 23 July 2004 and received an official apology from the Prison Administrator in Bamenda. [3]

3.8.5 During its June/July 2004 session, the National Assembly greatly expanded the role and powers of the National Commission on Human Rights (NCHRF). The Commission was granted the authority to summon witnesses and to publish their reports and the findings of their investigations. While the NCHRF remained hampered by a shortage of funds, it conducted a number of investigations into human rights abuses, visited prisons, and organised several human rights seminars aimed at judicial officials, security personnel, and other government officers. In July, the NCHRF organised a 2-day seminar for NGOs and government officials to develop a training curriculum on human rights for law enforcement, members of the judiciary, and other citizens. Although the Commission infrequently criticised the Government's human rights abuses publicly, its staff intervened with government officials in specific cases of human rights abuses by security forces, attempted to stop Friday arrests, and sought to obtain medical attention for jailed suspects in specific cases. [3]

3.8.6 Sufficiency of protection. As this category of applicants' fear is of ill treatment/persecution by the state authorities, they cannot apply to these authorities for protection.

3.8.7 Internal relocation. As this category of applicants' fear is of ill treatment/persecution by the state authorities, relocation to a different area of the country to escape this threat is not feasible.

3.8.8 Conclusion. There were reports in 2004 that government officials repeatedly impeded the effectiveness of local human rights NGOs by limiting access to prisoners, refusing to share information, and threatening and using violence against personnel. However, domestic and international human rights groups generally operate without government restriction, investigating and publishing findings on human rights cases and the NCHRF greatly expanded its activities in 2004. Claimants who cite their membership of local or international human rights groups as the basis of their application are unlikely to encounter ill-treatment amounting to persecution within the terms of the 1951 Convention. The grant of asylum in such cases is therefore not likely to be appropriate.

3.9 Prison conditions

3.9.1 Claimants may claim that they cannot return to Cameroon due to the fact that there is a serious risk that they will be imprisoned on return and that prison conditions in Cameroon are so poor as to amount to torture or inhuman treatment or punishment.

3.9.2 Consideration. Prison conditions were described as harsh and life threatening in 2004. Prisons are seriously overcrowded, unsanitary, and inadequate, especially outside major urban areas. Due to a lack of funds, serious deficiencies in food, health care, and sanitation are common in almost all prisons, including "private prisons" in the north operated by traditional rulers. Prisoners are kept in dilapidated colonial-era prisons, where the number of detainees is four to five times the intended capacity. According to a report by the International Centre for Prison Studies, published in late July 2004 by the Catholic newspaper La Croix, there were 67 detention centres for the country's approximately 20,000 detainees. Overcrowding was exacerbated by the large number of long pre-trial detentions. [3]

3.9.3 Health and medical care is almost non-existent, and prisoners' families are expected to provide food for their relatives in prison. Douala's New Bell Prison contained 7 water taps for a reported 3,500 prisoners, contributing to poor hygiene, illness, and death. Prison officials regularly tortured, beat, and otherwise abused prisoners with impunity. Several prisoners died due to harsh prison conditions and inadequate

medical treatment. Corruption among prison personnel is widespread. Prisoners sometimes can bribe wardens for special favours or treatment, including temporary freedom. [3]

3.9.4 In May 2004, the Secretary of State in Charge of Penitentiary Affairs at the Ministry of Territorial Administration, Emmanuel Oteh, visited prisons around the country. As a result of his tour, the refurbishment of a Yaounde detention centre formerly used for political prisoners was underway at the year's end. Also in May 2004, an additional 800 individuals were recruited to work in the prison system. [3]

3.9.5 There are few detention centres for women, who routinely are held in prison complexes with men, occasionally in the same cells. In July 2004, the Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, a human rights organisation based in Bamenda in the North West Province, criticised this practice. Mothers sometimes are incarcerated with their children or babies. Juvenile prisoners often are incarcerated with adults, occasionally in the same cells or wards. There were credible reports in 2004 that adult inmates sexually abused juvenile prisoners. Pre-trial detainees routinely were held in cells with convicted criminals while some high-profile prisoners were separated from other prisoners and enjoyed relatively lenient treatment. [3]

3.9.6 The Government has granted international humanitarian organisations access to prisoners. Both the local Red Cross and the NCHRF made infrequent, unannounced prison visits during 2004. The Government continued to allow the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) to visit prisons. During 2004, the ICRC stated that the Government allowed international NGOs to have increased access to prisons. [3]

3.9.7 Conclusion. Whilst prison conditions in Cameroon are poor with severe overcrowding, unsanitary conditions, a lack of health and medical care throughout the prison system being particular problems, conditions are unlikely to reach the Article 3 threshold. Therefore even where claimants can demonstrate a real risk of imprisonment on return to Cameroon a grant of Humanitarian Protection will not generally be appropriate. However, the individual factors of each case should be considered to determine whether detention will cause a particular individual in his particular circumstances to suffer treatment contrary to Article 3, relevant factors being the likely length of detention the likely type of detention facility and the individual's age and state of health.

4. Discretionary Leave

4.1 Where an application for asylum and Humanitarian Protection falls to be refused there may be compelling reasons for granting Discretionary Leave (DL) to the individual concerned. (See API on Discretionary Leave)

4.2 With particular reference to Cameroon the types of claim which may raise the issue of whether or not it will be appropriate to grant DL are likely to fall within the following categories. Each case must be considered on its individual merits and membership of one of these groups should not imply an automatic grant of DL. There may be other specific circumstances not covered by the categories below which warrant a grant of DL - see the API on Discretionary Leave.

4.3 Unaccompanied minors

4.3.1 The policy on unaccompanied minors is set out in the API on Children. Unaccompanied minors who have not been granted asylum or HP can only be returned where they have family to return to or there are adequate reception arrangements. At the moment we do not have sufficient information to be satisfied that there are adequate reception arrangements in place.

4.3.2 Unaccompanied minors without a family to return to, or where there are no adequate reception arrangements, should if they do not qualify for leave on any more favourable grounds be granted Discretionary Leave for a period of three years or until their 18th birthday, whichever is the shorter period.

4.4 Medical treatment

4.4.1 Claimants may claim they cannot return to Cameroon due to a lack of specific medical treatment. See the IDI on Medical Treatment which sets out in detail the requirements for Article 3 and/or 8 to be engaged.

4.4.2 In 2004, all national hospitals and some provisional hospitals provided specialised care in most medical fields, including cancer, HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, cardiovascular disease, eye, ear, nose and throat diseases, as well as many other diseases/illnesses.

Health centres are found mostly in the remote rural areas but health centres do exist for primary care in towns. District hospitals are also found, mostly in rural areas but do occur in the urban areas.

Approximately, 75% of health centres and district hospitals are found in the rural areas. Provincial hospitals

on the other hand are mainly found in the urban areas, specifically in the province capitals. The national hospitals are located in the two main towns, Yaoundé and Douala. **[5b] (paras 15.6 - 15.7)**

4.4.3 There is approximately one doctor per 10,000 people and one nurse per 2,250 people. Essential medicine is generally available in most public health facilities and non-profit health organisations run by the church. The actual amount of available medicine is up to 75%. However, it is only available to approximately 50% of the population because many people cannot afford to pay for the drugs or prefer to go to the traditional healers. This is indicated by the fact that of all drugs prescribed, only 50% are dispensed. There are 40 people working within the central committee in Yaoundé and they co-ordinate and manage the control of AIDS throughout Cameroon. Anti-retroviral drugs are available through 11 centres at around £20 per month. **[5b] (paras 15.8 - 15.9, 15.19 & 15.31)**

4.4.4 Where a caseworker considers that the circumstances of the individual claimant and the situation in the country reach the threshold detailed in the IDI on Medical Treatment making removal contrary to Article 3 or 8 a grant of discretionary leave to remain will be appropriate. Such cases should always be referred to a Senior Caseworker for consideration prior to a grant of Discretionary Leave.

5. Returns

5.1 Factors that affect the practicality of return such as the difficulty or otherwise of obtaining a travel document should not be taken into account when considering the merits of an asylum or human rights claim. Returns are to the capital Yaounde.

5.2 Cameroonian nationals may return voluntarily to any region of Cameroon at any time by way of the Voluntary Assisted Return and Reintegration Programme run by the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) and co-funded by the European Refugee Fund. IOM will provide advice and help with obtaining travel documents and booking flights, as well as organising reintegration assistance in Cameroon. The programme was established in 2001, and is open to those awaiting an asylum decision or the outcome of an appeal, as well as failed asylum seekers. Cameroonian nationals wishing to avail themselves of this opportunity for assisted return to Cameroon should be put in contact with the [IOM](#) offices in London on 020 7233 0001.

6. List of source documents

[1] UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO)

Country profile: Cameroon. Last updated 21 January 2004 at

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/servlet/Front?pagename=OpenMarket/Xcelerate/ShowPage&c=Page&cid=1007029394365&a=KCountryProfile&aid=1019501174254>

[2] British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC)

a. Country profile: Cameroon. Last updated 3 May 2005 at

http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/africa/country_profiles/1042937.stm

b. Timeline: Cameroon. Last updated 16 July 2005 at

http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/africa/country_profiles/1021488.stm

[3] US Department of State: Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labour

Country Report on Human Rights Practices 2004: Cameroon. Released 28 February 2005 at

<http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2004/41592.htm>

[4] Amnesty International

Annual Report 2005: Cameroon. At <http://web.amnesty.org/report2005/cmr-summary-eng>

[5] UK Immigration and Nationality Directorate: Country Information and Policy Unit.

a. Cameroon Country Report October 2003.

b. Report of fact-finding mission to Cameroon January 2004 at

http://www.ind.homeoffice.gov.uk/ind/en/home/0/country_information/fact_finding_missions.html

**Asylum and Appeals Policy Directorate
August 2005**