

COUNCIL MONITOR

International Service for Human Rights



Human Rights Monitor Series

COUNCIL UPDATE – ITEM 2 HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL, 10TH SESSION 5 MARCH 2009

Overview	1
Annual dialogue with the High Commissioner.....	2
Functioning of human rights mechanisms	2
Relationship between the Council and OHCHR	3
Composition of the staff of OHCHR.....	4
Country engagement strategy	5
Specific country situations	6
Thematic areas.....	7
General debate - reports of the High Commissioner.....	8
Further information.....	8

Overview

On 5 and 6 March, the Human Rights Council (the Council) held an interactive dialogue with the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Ms Navanethem Pillay, on the occasion of the presentation of her annual report. The Council also heard a brief presentation by the Deputy High Commissioner, Ms Kyung-wha Kang of various thematic reports submitted by the High Commissioner or the Secretary-General. The substance of these reports will be discussed later during the 10th session, under the appropriate items.

The dialogue between member and observer States of the Council, national human rights institutions (NHRI), non-governmental organisations (NGOs) on one side, and the High Commissioner on the other, was held in a constructive atmosphere. It was welcome that the High Commissioner answered questions several times, rather than only once at the end of the dialogue, which was conducive to a more interactive discussion. It was notable that the High Commissioner did not shy away from difficult and specific questions put to her, and she answered most questions in a very structured and detailed manner. Several NGOs took the floor, and raised a variety of country situations. It was noteworthy that the High Commissioner took time to respond, sometimes individually, to these statements as well.

While the States that took the floor generally appreciated the High Commissioner's efforts at holding open and transparent consultations with all States throughout the year, and commended her openness to dialogue, some States continued to be rather critical with regards to OHCHR's field presences and the composition of staff of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). Some States also repeated the calls for a formal

debate in the Council on the relationship between OHCHR and the Council, whereas others were firmly of the opinion that this relationship is sufficiently clear.¹

Annual dialogue with the High Commissioner

The High Commissioner focused on the lessons from the first sessions of universal periodic review (UPR) and how the mechanism could be strengthened, made proposals for new ways of discussing and addressing chronic human rights issues and situations, and discussed several thematic issues as well as her country visits to Colombia, Haiti, the United Kingdom (UK) and Germany.² She also briefly touched on OHCHR's work at the country and regional level.

In addition to raising institutional issues, the High Commissioner touched on a broad range of thematic issues. In the context of the upcoming Durban Review Conference, the High Commissioner particularly highlighted **racial discrimination**. Among other things, she explained that there would be side events during the conference to guarantee the optimal participation of civil society. Ms Pillay also put considerable focus on discussing **discrimination against migrants**, especially in the wake of the global economic crisis. Making a rare link between the Council's work, and other current affairs, the High Commissioner stressed her commitment to **combat impunity**, reiterating the Secretary-General's call on the Sudan to cooperate fully with the all UN entities in view of the indictment of its President Omar Al-Bashir by the International Criminal Court (ICC).³ Other thematic points raised included the implementation of economic, social and cultural rights, the prevention of genocide, and finding the right balance between freedom of expression and incitement to hatred.

The High Commissioner also raised a number 'encouraging as well as worrying' developments of human rights situations in particular places. She welcomed the announcement by the United States (US) that it will close Guantanamo Bay, and reported progress with the deployment of human rights advisers in Guinea, Kenya, Niger and the establishment of regional offices in Addis Ababa, Yaoundé, Pretoria and Dakar. On the other hand, she spoke with 'great concern' of the human rights situations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Somalia, the Sudan and Zimbabwe, the precarious situation of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Sri Lanka, serious allegations of human rights violations in Georgia, and the suffering of the Rohingya minority in Myanmar.

States and NGOs taking part in the interactive dialogue commented on a large number of institutional and thematic aspects covered in the High Commissioner's report. The main points of the discussion are highlighted below.

Functioning of human rights mechanisms

Many States commented on the functioning of the **UPR**, and on the High Commissioner's suggestion that independent expertise could enhance the process. Overall, the High Commissioner's assessment of the UPR in her annual report and her statement was very positive, and she did not raise any of the criticisms of the process thus far which NGOs have raised.⁴ Some States, while appreciating the utility of the mechanism, highlighted room for improvement.⁵ France supported Ms Pillay's call for more substantive expertise, particularly in the context of evaluating implementation of commitments made by States during the UPR process.

While most comments were positive, Cuba (on behalf of NAM) questioned the way OHCHR prepares the reports that serve as a basis for the review, and in particular the summary of stakeholder information. In her response, the High Commissioner stressed that the same methodology, based on the principle of equality, is used in preparing all

¹ For more information about this issue, see ISHR's *Human Rights Monitor 2008*, available at www.ishr.ch/hrm08 for a more detailed discussion on this issue.

² The High Commissioner's complete statement is available on the OHCHR extranet, at <http://portal.ohchr.org/portal/page/portal/HRCExtranet/10thSession> (username: 'hrc extranet' password: '1session').

³ See for instance <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=30081&Cr=darfur&Cr1=icc>.

⁴ See for instance ISHR's *Overview of the 1st and 2nd session of the UPR*, available at www.ishr.ch/publications.

⁵ Chile (on behalf of GRULAC), France, Ireland, Mexico.

reports. Colombia, who had been criticised for its treatment of civil society participating in the UPR, used the opportunity to present its efforts to follow-up to the recommendations made during the UPR.⁶

In relation to **special procedures**, repeated references to the *Code of Conduct of special procedures mandate holders* and to the scope of special procedures mandates were made by some States.⁷ The High Commissioner stressed that the Code of Conduct was provided to each new mandate holder, and that the Coordination Committee of special procedures had established an advisory procedure to take up all matters brought before it. She also confirmed a point raised by Amnesty International that there is currently a mismatch between available resources to support the work of the special procedures and the expectations placed on them.

In relation to the High Commissioner's support to the **treaty bodies**, some critical remarks were made. Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC) said the treaty bodies should base their work on 'credible and reliable information'. While generally supporting the efforts at harmonising the working methods of treaty bodies, China urged the High Commissioner to 'strictly abide with the rules of ECOSOC', presumably for the accreditation of NGOs.⁸ The High Commissioner, in her response, was very clear that while OHCHR does screen out information that is anonymous or incompatible with the treaty in question, the treaty bodies are independent entities, which are only supported by OHCHR.

In her annual report, the High Commissioner had suggested the introduction of **new formats** in the Council's methods of work, such as special briefings or events, declarations, President's statements or press statements, including for dealing with country specific situations. Unsurprisingly, this suggestion for innovative ways to discuss and address issues was immediately questioned by some States, with Egypt (on behalf of the African Group) claiming that such Presidential statements on a particular country situation would be 'contradictory to the institution-building text'.⁹

Several delegations expressed their concern about the late **availability of documents** in all working languages for the Council and UPR sessions.¹⁰ During the organisational meeting of the Council's 10th session, the Ambassador of Algeria had suggested that only reports that are available two weeks in advance of any meeting be considered. While it is indeed difficult for all stakeholders to engage effectively with the Council without the prerequisite information, it is important that the rules for submission of reports are applied equally to all issues. In her responses, the High Commissioner explained that OHCHR has established an internal tracking system to work towards more timely submission of reports.

Relationship between the Council and OHCHR

The question of the **relationship between OHCHR, the High Commissioner and the Council** was again one of the main themes of the debate.¹¹ Several delegations thanked the High Commissioner for her open approach, and welcomed the broad consultations she had held with delegations over the past few months. Chile (on behalf of GRULAC) welcomed the additional transparency brought about by these consultations.

While all States claimed to 'support and uphold the independence of the High Commissioner',¹² calls for a 'more institutionalised relationship'¹³ continued. Several States and groups of States¹⁴ wished to see a formal discussion

⁶ See http://www.ishr.ch/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=472&Itemid=511.

⁷ Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC), Cuba (on behalf of NAM), Algeria, Malaysia.

⁸ The interpretation into English of the statement from Chinese was not very clear. During the consideration of the Chinese State report by the Committee against Torture, China had objected to the consideration of information provided by some NGOs. There is no requirement for NGOs to be ECOSOC accredited to be able to submit information to the treaty bodies. See ISHR's report on the examination, available at www.ishr.ch/publications.

⁹ Angola shared this assessment. Sri Lanka said any new mechanism would have to ensure objectivity.

¹⁰ Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC), Cuba (on behalf of NAM), Philippines.

¹¹ See ISHR's *Human Rights Monitor 2009*, available at www.ishr.ch/hrm08.

¹² Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC).

on the Council's agenda on this relationship. Referring to a non-paper drafted by the former Moroccan Ambassador, Mohammed Loulichki, Algeria suggested that while 'this should not be considered undermining [the High Commissioner's] independence, consultations on the relationship between OHCHR and the Council should continue.¹⁵ The Philippines wanted to see 'long term strategic planning' between the Council and OHCHR. Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC) suggested that the non-paper prepared by Ambassador Loulichki would be a good basis for continuing the discussion.

A different group of States was firmly opposed to any formal discussion of the relationship.¹⁶ They argued that the relationship is sufficiently clear, and should not be further discussed by the Council. They underlined the importance of the independent role of OHCHR and welcomed the High Commissioner's open and transparent approach towards the Council.

In a detailed and principled response to these comments, the High Commissioner set out three criteria for a continued 'positive relationship': the necessary independence of OHCHR and the need to work in a spirit of mutual trust; the need for genuine cooperation and clarity about OHCHR's work and working methods; and the need to distinguish between the Strategic Framework and OHCHR's Strategic Management Plan. Ms Pillay appreciated the supportive comments, and said she 'welcomed discussion on this with the principle of acceptance of the status of the Council and the independence of the High Commissioner'. She recalled that the institution of the High Commissioner and the Council were both created by the General Assembly as complementary mechanisms. With reference to the challenging task of promoting and protecting human rights, she stressed that the field can 'accommodate two key players'. Calling for genuine cooperation between both 'key players' she committed to continue to provide clarity on OHCHR's plans.

Turning to the planning process for OHCHR activities, which some States have been trying to use to give the Council more control over OHCHR's work, she agreed that consultations with all stakeholders, including governments, NGOs and others are essential. However, she cautioned against trying to transform this process of consultations into a process with a formal outcome, as this would be 'seriously difficult with regard to the practices of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General'. In this context, she recalled that OHCHR was not a specialised agency but part of the UN secretariat. Finally, repeating the advice of her predecessor, Ms Louise Arbour, she again attempted to clarify the difference between the 'strategic framework' as part of the UN planning process and OHCHR's internal 'Strategic Management Plan'. She urged States to not confuse the two processes, and to use precise language. It seems that by now, the difference between the two documents is amply clear to those States that want to understand the difference. Rather, the confusion caused in the past seems a deliberate attempt at influencing the operational aspects of OHCHR's work.¹⁷

Composition of the staff of OHCHR

The recurring discussion on the composition of the Staff of OHCHR is also related to the desire by some States to exert more control, through the Council, on OHCHR. On a regular basis, some States complain about the lack of a 'balanced geographical representation' among OHCHR staff. Although both the previous and current High Commissioner have recognised the under-representation of some regions as a problem, and have started addressing it, some State again made strong critical comments on this topic.¹⁸ They stated that the regional representation

¹³ Egypt (on behalf of the African Group).

¹⁴ Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC), Egypt (on behalf of the African Group), Cuba (on behalf of NAM), Algeria, Indonesia, Tunisia, Morocco.

¹⁵ The non-paper is available at

http://www.ishr.ch/administrator/index2.php?option=com_docman§ion=documents&task=download&bid=263.

¹⁶ Czech Republic (on behalf of the EU), France, Ireland, Switzerland, Italy, Mexico, Austria, the US.

¹⁷ See for instance ISHR's *Daily Update* on the dialogue with the High Commissioner during the March 2008 session, available at http://www.ishr.ch/hrm/council/dailyupdates/session_007/7_march_2008.pdf.

¹⁸ Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC), Egypt (on behalf of the African Group), Cuba (on behalf of NAM) and many developing countries belonging to these groups.

within OHCHR was ‘seriously imbalanced’ and Cuba (on behalf of NAM) asked that the High Commissioner indicate a timeline for fixing this problem. Egypt (on behalf of the African Group) claimed that the composition of OHCHR staff should reflect the ratio of the different regional groups within the UN system. Bangladesh even suggested that the secretariat of the Council, as a part of OHCHR, should reflect the same regional diversity as the Council.

In her response, the High Commissioner, acknowledged the problem and said the issue was ‘high on her list’. Ms Pillay pointed out that progress towards a more geographically balanced OHCHR staff had been made. She also pointed out that in terms of gender balance, OHCHR is exemplary.¹⁹ She pleaded for States’ understanding that she needs to ‘address the issue with caution’ and with ‘due regard to the rights and aspirations’ of her staff. After all, she said, she has to respect the human rights of her staff, and categorically rejected the idea of simply dismissing staff from overrepresented regions.

Country engagement strategy

Several States commented on the High Commissioner’s country engagement strategy and the establishment of country and regional offices. The majority of States acknowledged the importance of OHCHR’s country presence and welcomed the current work of the Office at regional and country levels.²⁰ Several States including Norway, Brazil, Canada, and Japan requested the High Commissioner to continue and further develop this aspect of OHCHR’s work.

Unsurprisingly, many States argued that the Council and all countries concerned should have a greater say in this process. They claimed that the OHCHR presence is only visible in ‘the South’ and questioned the criteria for establishing country offices.²¹ They were generally from regions where the High Commissioner has not yet been able to establish a presence, namely the Middle East and North Africa, and South-West Asia.

In response to these criticisms, the High Commissioner stressed that out of 51 country presences, 16 are human rights components of peacekeeping missions. While she agreed that these are mainly deployed in Africa, she stressed that they are dependent on Security Council resolutions and not on OHCHR decisions. The second type of country engagements are human rights advisors to UN country teams. These are deployed for thematic work in all regions, on the request of UN resident coordinators.²² Therefore, on balance, there are only two standalone OHCHR offices in Africa (Togo and Uganda) and four regional offices. The High Commissioner also emphasised that country and regional offices are only established with the consent of the government concerned or in regards to regional offices at least with the consent of the majority of the countries in the region. In addition, activities by a regional office in specific countries in that region are only carried out with the explicit consent of the visited country. In this context, it was notable that the representative of the African Union explicitly welcomed the High Commissioner’s strategy of consultation with countries concerned.

The High Commissioner added that countries increasingly understand that OHCHR offices are a source of support to the national and local authorities. She agreed with the United Kingdom that such support should not be regarded as a stigma but as an indication of transparency and willingness to cooperate with the international community. Finally the High Commissioner argued that her existing country engagement strategy needs to be consolidated, and as States increasingly seek assistance from OHCHR, she is strongly committed to continue and strengthen OHCHR’s country engagement.

¹⁹ In this context it is interesting to note that the discussion did not touch on the gender balance within staff from each region.

²⁰ The Czech Republic (on behalf of the European Union, Turkey, Croatia, Macedonia, Ukraine, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Moldavia), Chile (on behalf of GULAC), Italy, France, UK and Northern Ireland, Republic of Korea, USA, Spain, Belgium, Austria

²¹ Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC), Egypt (on behalf of the African Group), Yemen (on behalf of the Arab Group), Angola.

²² There are human rights advisors in all regions, but the High Commissioner mentioned specifically those in Moldova, Georgia, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

In relation to the concern of inordinate attention to developing countries, the High Commissioner reported on the efforts towards establishing an OHCHR regional office for Europe in Brussels. The office is scheduled to be operational in the second half of 2009 and will address human rights violations in Europe, and will in particular focus on racism, discrimination, migration, economic and social rights, impunity and criminal justice, and the promotion and protection of human rights in the fight against terrorism. The office will work closely with other UN institutions already present in Brussels and with EU institutions, governments, and civil society.

Specific country situations

In her presentation, the High Commissioner elaborated on recent missions to Colombia, Haiti, the UK and Germany. She also mentioned her attendance at the Summit of Heads of State and Government of the African Union. She expressed ‘pressing concern’ about the human rights situations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Somalia, the Sudan, Zimbabwe, Georgia, and the suffering of the Rohingya minority in Myanmar. Some States generally welcomed the reference to specific situations.²³ Japan emphasised that the list provided was not exhaustive.

Sri Lanka

The High Commissioner expressed great concern about the human rights violations in Sri Lanka. During the interactive dialogue, much attention was paid to the precarious situation of IDPs in Sri Lanka.²⁴ Amnesty International called for more humanitarian assistance to persons affected by the conflict, and stressed that the restrictions on the press and NGOs make the work of the OHCHR essential to ensure sufficient information is available to the Council. Human Rights Watch urged the Council to address the ‘chronic human rights violations’ in Sri Lanka and asked for the deployment of international monitors and for an end to repression against human rights defenders.

In response, the High Commissioner explained that OHCHR is currently engaged in a dialogue with the Government and other UN agencies in order to investigate how to assist the affected population. She added that OHCHR had asked the Government to agree to the establishment of a country office, which has not yet been accepted.

Sri Lanka, in a notably balanced statement, announced that it has always been open to dialogue and cooperates with UN entities. It informed the Council of its agreement to receive a senior human rights advisor. However, when using its right of reply, Sri Lanka used a very aggressive tone, claiming that the information presented by NGOs was wrong. The delegate regretted having stayed in Geneva to listen to the ‘coterie of self-sustaining hysterics’ presented by Human Right Watch and ‘play Sherlock Holmes’ trying to find out about the ‘origins of the falsehoods’. Sri Lanka further argued that Human Rights Watch was not willing to meet when invited to a dialogue. Sri Lanka also heavily criticised the Western press for its handling of the current conflict. He ended by suggesting that the Council should ‘improve human rights rather than providing a platform for those with more money than sense’.

The Sudan

In her opening presentation, the High Commissioner expressed ‘pressing concern’ about the situation in the Sudan. She drew attention to the recent indictment of the President of the Sudan, Omar Al-Bashir for crimes against humanity and war crimes by the International Criminal Court (ICC). She urged the Government to cooperate with all UN entities, and ensure the safety of its population. Several States stepped in to the defence of the Sudan, with Egypt (on behalf of the African Group) arguing that cooperation with the ICC is a matter of State sovereignty, and claiming that asking States to ‘do more than what they have committed to’ would be contrary to the Vienna

²³ Austria, Japan.

²⁴ Ireland, the Czech Republic (on behalf of the EU), Germany, Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International. International Commission of Jurists (ICJ).

Convention on the Law of Treaties. Nigeria stated that the ICC should not be ‘politicised’. The Sudan, unsurprisingly, claimed that with issuing the arrest warrant, the ICC had become ‘politicised’ and lost its credibility.

Several NGOs, on the other hand, welcomed the decision by the ICC.²⁵ Human Rights Watch stressed that the indictment made clear that ‘even those at the top can be held to account’. The Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies recalled that all States parties to the *Rome Statute* have an obligation to abide by the arrest warrant.

Occupied Palestinian territories

Several States expressed their dissatisfaction that the High Commissioner did not refer in detail to the situation in the occupied Palestinian territories (OPT) and in Gaza in particular.²⁶ However, the High Commissioner explained that some issues would be discussed at a later point during the session of the Council. She stated ‘there is no doubt about the importance’ that she attaches to the situation, and stressed that focused and detailed discussions would take place under the dedicated Item 7.

Colombia

The work of OHCHR in Columbia was used as an example by several States to highlight the positive impact that field presences of OHCHR can have.²⁷ Norway was interested to know how OHCHR assists NGOs and human rights defenders and the Government in the follow up of the UPR. Norway was also interested in the status of the OHCHR country office. The High Commissioner reported that the recruitment process for the head of the office had been successfully completed.²⁸

Other country situations

During the interactive dialogue other human rights situations were raised by States and NGOs including in Afghanistan, Bolivia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Georgia, Iraq, Kenya, Myanmar, Somalia and Tibet (China). The High Commissioner’s responses remained relatively vague. Germany, Haiti and Guatemala all welcomed the High Commissioner’s recent visits to their respective countries and the Russian Federation extended an invitation to the High Commissioner to visit soon.

Thematic areas

A large range of thematic issues were raised. The upcoming **Durban Review Conference** received particular attention. While all States welcomed the High Commissioner’s work in preparing for the Review Conference, and wished her well in the quest for a successful outcome, the tensions among States about the process were implicit in some statements. Many States expressed their hope for a consensual outcome of the process.²⁹

In discussing the OHCHR-organised seminar on **balancing freedom of expression and incitement to hatred**, States raised concerns about religious discrimination. The United States expressed concern about the concept of ‘defamation of religions’ and about efforts to establish new limits to freedom of expression. Canada welcomed the seminar, and together with Amnesty International recalled that the seminar had found existing legal standards to be sufficient to balance the different freedoms at stake.

²⁵ Human Rights Watch, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies.

²⁶ Egypt (on behalf of the African Group), Yemen (on behalf of the Arab Group), Kuwait and Algeria.

²⁷ Spain, Norway, Belgium

²⁸ Mr Christian Salazar, UNICEF’s former representative in Iran was appointed as the new head of office.

²⁹ Chile (on behalf of GRULAC), Argentina, Tunisia, Austria, Morocco.

The **protection of the rights of migrants** also drew attention from many States.³⁰ Ecuador, while recalling that the issue of migration was discussed at the recent special session on the world economic crisis, expressed its disappointment that developed States refused to engage in a discussion. Thailand stressed that while it was important to respect the rights of migrants, the national security concerns of States needed to be taken into account.

Other issues raised included discrimination against women,³¹ poverty,³² human rights education and training,³³ combating impunity,³⁴ the right to development,³⁵ and the contribution of civil society to the work of OHCHR.³⁶

General debate - reports of the High Commissioner

The Deputy High Commissioner presented a number of thematic reports, which will be discussed during the 10th session. The annotated agenda of the Council's session provides a short summary for each of these reports, and is available at <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/10session/reports.htm>. The reports attracted limited attention in the interactive dialogue.

Brazil and the UNDP³⁷ drew attention to the report of the Secretary-General on the protection of human rights in the context of HIV/AIDS. The Philippines expressed its reservations about the report on the relationship between climate change and human rights. The Russian Federation supported the proposal made by the Deputy High Commissioner in her statement of clustering all reports in relation to the rights of indigenous peoples at one session of the Council, and suggested to follow the same pattern for reports related to minority issues.

Of particular note was the presentation of the Secretary-General's report on cooperation with representatives of United Nations human rights bodies, which will be discussed under Item 3.³⁸ The Deputy High Commissioner expressed her shock at the killing of two human rights defenders in Kenya. The two defenders had provided information to the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions on the occasion of his recent visit to Kenya.³⁹ The Kenyan delegation expressed its regret about the killings. It stressed that it takes its obligations of ensuring the safety of all peoples, including those providing information to UN officials very seriously.

Further information

For further information on the Council, please consult the following resources:

- Web site of the International Service for Human Rights, providing up-to-date information before, during and after sessions of the Council: <http://www.ishr.ch/council>. During the session, ISHR will provide information about the Council's proceedings on a regular but not daily basis. You can subscribe to receive alerts of our publications by sending an email to information@ishr.ch.

³⁰ Philippines, Indonesia, Mexico, Ecuador, Thailand.

³¹ Chile (on behalf of GRULAC), Azerbaijan, Switzerland, UK, New Zealand.

³² Chile (on behalf of GRULAC).

³³ Qatar, Indonesia.

³⁴ Switzerland, Argentina, Japan.

³⁵ Guatemala, Bangladesh.

³⁶ Ireland.

³⁷ In a joint statement with UNAIDS.

³⁸ A/HRC/10/36.

³⁹ See <http://www.unhcr.ch/hurricane/hurricane.nsf/view01/E5BEEE68AA4BC615C1257571005B509C?opendocument>.

- Web site of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) on the 10th session of the Human Rights Council: <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/10session>. For direct access to reports considered, check <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/10session/reports.htm>.
- More informal documents and draft resolutions are available on the ‘OHCHR extranet’ at <http://portal.ohchr.org/portal/page/portal/HRCExtranet>. Username: ‘hrc extranet’ Password: ‘1session’.

NGOs and human rights defenders seeking more specific information or individual advice on the Council session, please contact the ISHR secretariat by email or phone at +41 (0) 22 919 71 00.

COUNCIL MONITOR STAFF

Eléonore Dziurzynski, Communications Officer
Michael Ineichen, Human Rights Officer
Gareth Sweeney, Deputy Manager
Katrine Thomasen, Manager International Programme

CONTRIBUTORS

Jessika Croizat, Intern
Joelle Dek, Intern
Surya Gopalan, Intern
Ladino Knapp, Intern
Beth Leaner, Intern
Clara Martino, Intern
Patriani P. Mulia, Intern
Isabella Ries, Intern

ABOUT THE PUBLICATION

The Council Monitor forms part of the Human Rights Monitor Series produced by ISHR. It provides you with information about all the key developments at the Human Rights Council, including Daily Updates during the session of the Council, an Overview of the session, briefings and updates on the major issues of concern in the transition from the Commission on Human Rights to the Council and other key reports. It is currently an online publication that can be found at www.ishr.ch.

SUBSCRIPTION

If you wish to receive the Council Monitor Daily Updates by e-mail during the Council session, please e-mail information@ishr.ch with 'subscribe' in the subject line. Your e-mail address and personal information will not be shared or sold to any third parties. We may from time to time send you a notification about other publications in the Human Rights Monitor Series that you may be interested in downloading or subscribing to.

COPYRIGHT, DISTRIBUTION AND USE

Copyright © 2009 International Service for Human Rights. Material from this publication may be reproduced for training, teaching or other non-commercial purposes as long as ISHR is fully acknowledged. You can also distribute this publication and link to it from your website as long as ISHR is fully acknowledged as the source. No part of this publication may be reproduced for any commercial purpose without the prior express permission of the copyright holders. ISHR accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracies arising from or connected to unapproved or unofficial translations of its publications or parts thereof.

DISCLAIMER

While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the information contained in this publication, ISHR does not guarantee, and accepts no legal liability whatsoever arising from any possible mistakes in the information reported on, or any use of this publication. We are however happy to correct any errors you may come across so please notify information@ishr.ch.