

COUNCIL MONITOR

International Service for Human Rights



Human Rights Monitor Series

HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL, 3RD SESSION DAILY UPDATE, 30 NOVEMBER 2006

Overview	1
Agenda.....	2
Rules of Procedure and Special Sessions.....	4
Working Methods	5
Consultations on a proposed Working Group on the agenda, programme and methods of work.....	7
Other Practical Issues	8

Overview

Today's sessions of the Human Rights Council (the Council) were devoted to a discussion on methods of work and future agenda of the Council. The discussions were divided into three segments: agenda; methods of work; and rules of procedure. The President noted that the subject of special sessions had also been raised by Canada in a non-paper of the JUSCANZ¹ group that had been circulated to the Council, and proposed that this may be dealt with while discussing the rules of procedure.

The Council also had before it two non-papers circulated by the Asian Group and the European Union (EU) relating to future working methods of the Council and the non-paper of the Secretariat on the programme of work of the Council for the following year.² The President requested that the discussion follow a pattern of general comments by member States, observer States and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in the morning meeting and statements on specific issues in the afternoon.

The President also notified the Council that the Secretariat was circulating a draft decision of the President on the establishment of an additional open-ended intergovernmental inter-sessional Working Group to formulate concrete recommendations on the Council's agenda, annual programme of work, methods of work and rules of procedure. As the Council completed its discussions on methods of work and agenda of the Council before, the President suggested that the Council hold informal consultations on the draft decision on the establishment of a third open-ended inter-sessional Working Group.

¹ Japan, United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

² The text of all non-papers and statements are available at the OHCHR extranet, which can be accessed at www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/form.htm (fill out the form on the page to receive the user name and password).

Informal events held during the day included a discussion on the Universal Periodic Review (UPR), hosted by Switzerland, and a panel discussion organised by Canada and Afghanistan on international cooperation in supporting the implementation of human rights in Afghanistan.³

Agenda

The President pointed out that during its first year, while carrying out the institutional building tasks it is required to under General Assembly *Resolution 60/251*, the Council was operating on an exceptional basis and nothing that was done in relation to its agenda, timetable or working methods should be considered a precedent for subsequent years. He said that the Council was working on the basis of an operational agenda, timetable and programme of work over this period.

From the statements that were made by States on the issue⁴, it appeared that there were two main but diverging approaches to the future agenda of the Council. Several States called for a structured and thematically organised agenda, evoking memories of the former Commission on Human Rights' (the Commission) agenda.⁵ Many other States however called for an agenda that was more flexible and not organised on a pre-set list of thematic issues that would have to be discussed at every session.⁶

Finland, on behalf of the European Union (EU),⁷ was the first to introduce the common language of 'predictability, yet flexibility' for the future agenda of the Council. Predictability, in their view, would provide stakeholders with clarity on the issues that would be discussed and acted on by the Council in any given year, allowing all stakeholders to plan their activities according to a clear timetable.⁸ However, flexibility was required to spread issues in a manner that made operational sense, to respond to developments on the ground, and to adapt the agenda according to reflections at the end of each year. Finland suggested that the same 'basic agenda' should be used at every session, with the exception of: the High-Level segment which would take place once a year at the main session; covering urgent situations; reports and interactive dialogue with the special procedures; recommendations from the UPR and complaint mechanisms for decisions by the Council; expert advice; a different set of specific issues to be discussed at each session under 'promotion and protection of human rights'; and adoption of the report of the session. Urgent issues could be raised seven days prior to any session.

The Algerian Ambassador, in a statement on behalf of Algeria rather than the entire African Group, stated that while he welcomed the idea of flexibility, he did not agree with Finland's proposed basic agenda as he thought this was pre-judging the substance of the Council's work. He also said that he found the current agenda difficult and preferred a straightforward and clear agenda and felt that the good aspects of the Commission on Human Rights' procedures should not be thrown out along with the bad. He stated that he was not clear what 'promotion and protection of human rights' would cover. Finland responded to explain that under the item of 'promotion and protection of human rights', different issues could be addressed in each session but that to ensure predictability and flexibility, a list of proposed human rights issues for discussion could be submitted to the President and then allocated by him across all the sessions. The Philippines stated that the Council would need a mechanism to approve the issues that would be proposed and they could not simply be put on the agenda for future sessions.

³ See *Bulletin of Informal Events*, 30 November 2006, available at www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/3session/bim.htm for additional details. For informal summaries of parallel NGO events, see the reports published by CONGO, available at www.ngocongo.org/index.php?what=news&id=10363.

⁴ Oral statements made at the Council can be found on the OHCHR extranet (fill out the form on the page to receive the user name and password) at www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/form.htm.

⁵ Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC), Argentina, Cuba, China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, and Lesotho.

⁶ Finland, on behalf of the European Union (EU), Australia, Canada, and Japan.

⁷ The following States had associated themselves with the statement: Bulgaria, Romania, Croatia, Turkey, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia, Iceland, Ukraine, and Moldova.

⁸ In their non-paper, the EU highlighted that the agenda should allow NGOs, NHRIs and other non-governmental stakeholders in particular to plan their attendance.

Canada also proposed an agenda that was not modelled on thematic lines and had many points of convergence with the EU proposal, while adding follow-up as a specific item. In addition, they also suggested holding roundtables, involving States, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), United Nations (UN) agencies, NGOs and national human rights institutions (NHRIs) to address implementation challenges and identify practical steps and cooperative measures for enhancing implementation of human rights. They also recommended holding an expanded seminar on a designated topic that would be proposed by the President for each session. They referred to this as an agenda of “inputs” rather than categories of rights and emphasised that the agenda should be flexible and focused on implementation. Australia welcomed the EU non-paper and stated that the Council should avoid repeating the mistakes of the Commission and avoid creating an unnecessarily long agenda. They particularly welcomed the item on interactive dialogues with special procedures in the EU’s proposed basic agenda as well as the item on ‘promotion and protection of human rights’. Japan also supported the EU non-paper and stated that they would not like to have an unnecessarily detailed and cluttered agenda. India said that they agreed with the idea of predictability and flexibility spelt out in the basic agenda and would like to discuss the EU’s proposal further at the Working Group. They suggested that reports from the special procedures could be distributed throughout the year,⁹ correlated to the issues that would be discussed under the proposed item of ‘promotion and protection of human rights’. The same could also be done for input from the expert body or any other mechanism of the Council.

The United States of America (USA) provided a preliminary checklist of substantive elements that needed to be covered, including an update or report by the High Commissioner; a structured dialogue with special procedures; and consideration of the reports of the Universal Periodic Review.

Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC) called for an agenda that was predictable, and added in paraphrase of the Asian Group’s non-paper that it must also be balanced and transparent. Pakistan expressed support for a thematically organised agenda,¹⁰ which gave equal reflection to economic, social and cultural rights as to civil and political rights, as well as to collective and individual rights.¹¹ In their view, the thematic issues that should be included were: the right to self-determination; occupation and its implications; racism and combating defamation of religions (as a single heading); respect for freedom of religion and belief; and the right to development. Cuba added that it would also like to see the issues of sustainable development and eradication of poverty addressed, and informed the Council that it would arrange a meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement to prepare a ‘draft agenda’. While the OIC expressed strong opposition to the maintenance of country-specific agenda items,¹² they wished to see the question of the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT) remain as a separate agenda item, as this fell under the thematic issue of occupation. This was later supported by Syria, Palestine and Iran.

Mexico declared that any approach should maintain the broad characteristics of the Commission’s thematic agenda. Argentina also called for as clear and precise an agenda as possible. In their view, the need for flexibility to take up urgent situations could be met by addressing these under the ‘other issues’ item.

Many delegations stressed the need for a predictable agenda¹³, and most also recognised the attendant need for flexibility.¹⁴ Others such as Russia, stated that flexibility during the period of transition was acceptable, but should not become synonymous with a lack of organisation in the Council. The Philippines felt that while balancing flexibility with predictability, in their view it was more important to lead more towards predictability. India added that it would like to see a structured agenda ideally by the 4th session of the Council, but no later than the 5th session. China repeated the need for a structure by the second year, adding that this certainty was helpful to small NGOs outside Geneva who wish to attend.

⁹ Canada agreed with this proposal.

¹⁰ This was supported by, Argentina, Cuba, China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Lesotho.

¹¹ This was supported by Cuba, China, Indonesia, Lesotho, and Malaysia.

¹² This was supported by Cuba, China and Malaysia.

¹³ Indonesia, Bangladesh, Malaysia, China, Philippines aligned themselves to the Asian group position paper and in its reference to predictability; Canada, Russia, India, Brazil, Cuba, Japan, Korea spoke of the need for predictability without reference to

¹⁴ Canada, Brazil, China, Bangladesh, Korea, Mexico, Norway, International Service for Human Rights.

The Republic of Korea added that the agenda for the Council should be structured to respond effectively to emergency situations and emerging trends in human rights. They said that the agenda should also allow for discussion of human rights issues in a substantive way and pay close attention to follow-up. They also called for the UPR to be placed as a regular item on the agenda at each session of the Council.

The Friends World Committee for Consultation (Quakers UN Office) stated that the Council needs to have an annual programme of work that does not change year by year. In addition, a programme of work for each session could be drawn up at the previous session. Human Rights Watch added that the agenda should include a section for 'issues' where newly arising or urgent issues are addressed. Only when the Council adopts an approach that includes this aspect will the Council begin to address violations worldwide concluded Human Rights Watch. The International Service for Human Rights (ISHR) noted that predictability was important to NGOs outside of Geneva and commended China's statement about NGO participation in the Council.

The President explained that there was a need for the Council to use the same terminology across all six working languages. He explained the term 'agenda' referred to the items (topics) that the Council would address in its future session, the term 'programme of work' referred to the calendar of the Council for the year, and 'timetable' for the specific calendar for each session, but they were missing a word for the specific and more detailed agenda or calendar for each session in all the languages. He stated that in his view, the Council should not have a single agenda unless it could be covered exhaustively and a generic agenda was needed to allow a breakdown of the 40 to 50 specific topics that would fall within categories on the generic agenda. He also emphasised that the yearly cycle was important, as the General Assembly had asked the Council for an annual report. He also stated that in most multilateral bodies the agenda is discussed and re-negotiated and there are mechanisms in place to do so.

Rules of Procedure and Special Sessions

Despite the President's appeals to broaden the debate, the majority of the State dialogue on rules of procedure and special sessions consisted of a discussion of the recently circulated JUSCANZ¹⁵ paper *Proposed Ground rules for Special Sessions of the Human Rights Council*.¹⁶ These were that a specific description of the human rights violations that gave rise to the request should accompany the request for a special session; there should be a gap of four working days between the time of submission of the request and convening of a special session; draft resolutions or decisions should be circulated at least 48 hours before the session; there should be at least one open-ended consultation on the text of any draft resolution or decision; OHCHR, should where feasible, provide the Council with a background note on the situation; the High Commissioner or her representative should address the situation at the beginning of a special session; the special session should be results-oriented and geared to achieving practical outcomes, the implementation of which could be monitored and reported on at the next regular session of the Council; and no further special sessions convened on a subject until it has been taken up by a regular session of the Council.

Algeria¹⁷ expressed disappointment that the JUSCANZ paper was only available in English, especially since Canada is a bilingual country. Canada apologised, stating that the paper was not exclusively a Canadian submission and the working language of JUSCANZ was English. Algeria criticised the JUSCANZ paper for defeating the purpose of having special sessions, which is to respond quickly to emergency situations, by instituting too many cumbersome bureaucratic procedures.¹⁸ They remarked that the forthcoming 4th special session on the situation in Darfur would not have been easy to arrange with all these obstacles in place. Cuba emphasised that a four-day preparatory period would result in further suffering for the victims on the ground, resulting in deaths of victims and that special sessions were meant to deal with emergencies and find solutions. Morocco expressed concern that the proposal would require a lengthy justification by the States

¹⁵ Japan, United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand.

¹⁶ Available on the HRC extranet at <http://portal.ohchr.org/portal/page/portal/HRCExtranet/3rdSession> (password required).

¹⁷ Oral statements made at the Council can be found on the OHCHR extranet (fill out the form on the page to receive the user name and password) at www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/form.htm.

¹⁸ This concern was shared by Cuba, Philippines, Argentina, Morocco and Ecuador.

calling for a special session, and also stated that it limited the Council's effectiveness in addressing massive human rights violations if they could not take action before the next regular session. They referred to General Assembly *Resolution 60/251* Operative Paragraph 10, which only provides that a special session may be called with the support of one-third of the Council and stated that extra conditions had deliberately not been imposed so new requirements should not be applied now. Finland (on behalf of the EU), Australia, Canada and the Netherlands took the floor in favour of the proposal, in particular the provision calling for at least one open-ended consultation on draft resolutions.¹⁹ Algeria agreed that this point was important, but stated that it should form part of the Council's standard operating procedure, not merely for the special sessions.

Canada spoke in defence of the paper, arguing that its purpose was not to restrict the actions of the Council, but to set transparent ground rules²⁰ in order to regulate an institution that was shaping up to be an important tool for the Council. It emphasised the need to be clear about the human rights violations that are the focus of a special session. Canada and Australia also highlighted that a four-day gap was essential to allow for necessary preparation and for delegations to communicate with and receive instructions from their capitals.

A few States engaged in a general discussion of rules of procedure. The Philippines commented that up to the present the Council had used a mixture of General Assembly and Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) rules of procedure, as well as some practices from the Commission on Human Rights. They reminded the Council that *Resolution 60/251* allowed it to formulate its own rules of procedure, but otherwise the General Assembly rules would apply. They also suggested that these rules form the core element of the Council's future rules of procedure and informed the Council that they had been working on this topic and might share a paper with the Council at the appropriate time.

Brazil was of the opinion that the rules of procedure should be discussed after the Council reform process was completed, and that it was premature for these to be determined by a working group. For the present time, it was sufficient to reply on Section 13 of the General Assembly rules of procedure, as well as *Resolution 60/251*.

India stated that they agreed with the Secretariat on the need to consolidate the currently applicable rules and procedures and the new ones into a single document to avoid confusion.

Working Methods

Saudi Arabia,²¹ on behalf of the Asian Group, had provided a non-paper to the Council that contained five suggestions for the working methods of the Council. These covered: a structured agenda; an early deadline for the submission of draft resolutions; a limited number of open-ended informal consultations during sessions; President's open-ended consultations; and participation of non-members, including NGOs and NHRIs. Chile found many useful points in the document submitted by Saudi Arabia but noted that the Council does not need to re-invent the wheel. Instead they suggested that the Council build upon pre-existing working methods.

In the general discussion, Senegal recommended that the working methods of the Council should be renewed regularly, involve a round of presentations that ensures universality, and be set up in an inclusive manner. Iran added that the methods of work should respect religious beliefs. Mexico supported working methods, which would be dynamic and contain procedures for follow-up. Norway took the time to express their appreciation for the Asian Group's proposal that the basis for the future methods of work should be 'openness, transparency and inclusiveness.'

Cuba emphasised the need for codification of working methods to ensure transparency and predictability. They also stated that the Commission on Human Rights' working methods should be taken into account and

¹⁹ The Netherlands expressed its surprise that States which had previously spoken so favourably of open dialogue and cooperation. Argentina voiced its support for open-ended consultations, but expressed reservations on the other provisions.

²⁰ Australia also advanced this view.

²¹ Oral statements made at the Council can be found on the OHCHR extranet (fill out the form on the page to receive the user name and password) at www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/form.htm.

that they welcomed the Asian Group's non-paper, which provides a clear basis for the Council's future work in establishing and codifying working methods and rules of procedure.

Frequency and duration of sessions

Finland (on behalf of the EU)²² took the view that the 'three essential sessions' of the Council should be in March/April, June/July and September, and that a one-week session in June 2007, as proposed in the Secretariat's non-paper, would be inadequate for receiving updates from special procedures and renewing special procedure mandates. Malaysia expressed preference for three regular sessions in March-April (4 weeks), September (3 weeks) and November-December (three weeks). Japan on the other hand proposed four sessions per year with substantive issues in every session. Brazil expressed a preference for four sessions through out the year. They stated that the interactive dialogues with special procedures should be clustered by themes and divided across sessions.

The Republic of Korea stated that the Council should hold multiple sessions with the participation of special procedures to ensure focused dialogue.

Informal consultations and resolutions

India stated that the issue of informal consultations required urgent attention.²³ They stated that they were unclear about the basis on which a combination of open-ended informal consultations and consultations in smaller groups had been used, while rarely having meetings of elected members of the Council. They reminded the Council of the consensus-based understanding that had been reached before the 1st session of the Council that the expanded Bureau system would be replaced by the current bureau which will deal only with organisational issues, with substantive issues being addressed by the Council itself. India was concerned by the way in which informal consultations had been conducted in the past in smaller groups, the Council would appear to be reverting back to the system of the expanded Bureau. In their view, all informal consultations must take place only with the full participation of all members of the Council, in the spirit of inclusiveness and also to ensure that the same issues are not re-opened at the formal meetings of the Council.

Finland (on behalf of the EU) was concerned that the right of sponsors to organise informal consultations should not be limited by the Asian Group's proposal that the President hold informal consultations on draft resolutions. In their view, there was no need for the President to hold consultations unless there were exceptional circumstances. The Philippines replied that under the Asian Group proposal, the informal consultations convened by the President would not be a negotiating platform but would only be for information purposes, to inform delegations about the status of various proposals and negotiations and that would help smaller delegations who could not attend all negotiations. It was not meant to affect sponsors ability to negotiate draft resolutions.

Finland (on behalf of the EU) stated that the Council has maintained the system of resolutions and decisions, but should also contemplate other working methods, including panel debates and seminars. The outcome of these should be as operational as possible. Draft texts should be circulated as early as possible and at least before the penultimate week of the session. Annual resolutions should not be repeated by default. Finally, the EU recommended that all organisations should be informed well in advance of all organisational issues. The USA specified that at least one informal consultation should be held on each draft text. The Philippines also indicated that appropriate deadlines needed to be set on the submission of resolutions.

The OIC did not comment on resolutions beyond its customary opposition to the use of country-specific resolutions. The OIC, Cuba, China and Morocco supported the removal of country-specific resolutions and the use of thematic resolutions in the spirit of cooperation.

Argentina stated clearly that the system of resolutions was still the best on offer to the Council.

²² Oral statements made at the Council can be found on the OHCHR extranet (fill out the form on the page to receive the user name and password) at www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/form.htm.

²³ Oral statements made at the Council can be found on the OHCHR extranet (fill out the form on the page to receive the user name and password) at www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/form.htm.

Participation of NGO, national institutions and other stakeholders

Finland (on behalf of the EU)²⁴ was the first to note the role to be played by NGOs, NHRIs, OHCHR, special procedures and other relevant actors. The EU took note of the participation of NGOs in the interactive dialogue with special procedures and thought that this was a positive step for the Council at the 2nd session that should be maintained. Norway further welcomed this process of interactive dialogue and drew attention to the message of the Secretary-General on Wednesday, referring to special procedures as the 'crown jewel of the system'. It also paid particular credit to the value of an interactive dialogue with the High Commissioner. The importance of effective NGO participation was further stressed by Argentina, Brazil, and the USA. Russia, on the other hand, viewed the future success of the Council as being determined by the responsible actions of States, NGOs and the President of the Council.

The Quakers cited the notable feature of the Council's 2nd session, which was the extensive participation of NGOs in the inter-active dialogues with the special procedures, which was made possible by the fact that negotiations on texts were not occurring at the same time. The Quakers encouraged the Council to consider the advantages of this process for future sessions. Additionally the Quakers said that a programme of work for each session should be prepared long enough in advance to allow NGOs and delegations to prepare and plan their participation. The International Service for Human Rights stated that the methods of work should encourage cooperation and consensus-building.

Consultations on a proposed Working Group on the agenda, programme and methods of work

The President presented a draft proposal for the establishment of an open-ended intergovernmental inter-sessional Working Group to formulate concrete recommendations on the Council's agenda, annual programme of work, methods of work and rules of procedure. The draft suggested that the Working Group would be authorised to meet for ten days, half of them to be scheduled before the 4th session and half of them before the 5th session. The decision also provides for the participation of all stakeholders and for consultations to be undertaken in a transparent, well scheduled and inclusive way. It also suggests that the OHCHR provide the Working Group with any background information it may require. The President explained that the Working Group's meetings would not overlap with those of the other two existing Working Groups on Review of Mechanisms and Mandates and on the Universal Periodic Review.

The President stated that he was in the hands of the Council and he could Chair the Working Group if the members so wished, appoint facilitators to lead the discussions as had been done for the other working groups or appoint someone else to be the Chair.

Algeria expressed its support for the draft proposal, while adding that the issue was not particularly urgent, as rules of procedure already existed for the adequate functioning of the Council. Argentina thanked the President for his initiative in proposing the draft proposal. Argentina raised three questions concerning the draft. First, they questioned why "Programme of Work" was not included in the title of the report. Second, they suggested the inclusion of a third preambular paragraph in the proposal, highlighting the discussions that had already taken place during the 3rd session. Thirdly, Argentina proposed the use of a more specific deadline for the work of the Working Group considering that only four sessions had been currently planned. The President then clarified that indeed the title of the proposal should be altered to include the suggested phrase, 'Programme of Work', proposed by Argentina. The President explained that he would propose a 5th session to be held in June 2007 to the Council but that the Bureau was currently discussing this issue and evaluating the conference services available at that time.

²⁴ Oral statements made at the Council can be found on the OHCHR extranet (fill out the form on the page to receive the user name and password) at www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/form.htm.

Cuba highlighted that they placed fundamental importance on the discussions on the future agenda over other issues and that they had been given a mandate to represent by the Non-Aligned Movement on this issue. Cuba supported the offer of the President to act as a Chair of the Working Group,²⁵ noting the useful role he had played as Chair of other working groups. Cuba also supported the call for a 5th session of the Human Rights Council to take stock of what had been achieved in the Council's inaugural year of work.

Switzerland thanked the President for his draft, but suggested that it may be useful to call on non-Bureau members as facilitators as the Bureau was already acting as facilitator for the other Working Groups.

The Russian Federation expressed their gratitude for the proposal, noting its role in enhancing the effectiveness of the Council. They commended the balanced nature of the proposal, while noting similar editorial concerns as expressed by Argentina concerning operative paragraph 3. They also suggested the possibility of other facilitators to assist the President as Chair of the Working Group.²⁶ The President clarified that he would appoint facilitators from amongst other member States, if it was agreed that facilitators would be useful.

The Philippines supported the proposal, whilst commending the preambular additions suggested earlier by Argentina. The Philippines showed support for operative paragraphs 1 and 2 relating to the establishment of the Working Group, as well as its ten-day mandate. Brazil stressed the proposed Working Group as a priority of the Council. Brazil suggested the amendment of the third line of operative paragraph 1. This amendment would ask that the recommendations of the Working Group on the Council's rules of procedure be presented at "a later stage".

India suggested that the Working Group cooperate with parallel working groups, and also suggested the use of an open and flexible deadline for the mandate of the Working Group.

Earlier in the sessions itself, most States had expressed their support for the creation of a Working Group²⁷ and it can therefore be expected that the President's draft decision will be adopted at the close of the 3rd session of the Council.

Other Practical Issues

During the sessions the President also announced that he had received a request to hold a special session on Darfur,²⁸ supported cross-regionally by more than one third of the members of the Council. A draft resolution, co-sponsored by 29 member States, has also been submitted. They have requested that the special session be held on 12 December 2006.

²⁵ This was supported by the Philippines and India.

²⁶ This was supported by the Philippines.

²⁷ Pakistan (on behalf of OIC), the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Morocco, Senegal, Korea, USA, China, Indonesia, Brazil, India, and Canada.

²⁸ The request and the draft resolution are available at the OHCHR extranet, which can be accessed at www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/form.htm (fill out the form on the page to receive the user name and password).

COUNCIL MONITOR STAFF

Meghna Abraham, Program Manager, Information Program

Gareth Sweeney, Human Rights Officer, Information Program

Eléonore Dziurzynski, Communications Officer, Information Program

Contributors

Jay Bahadur, Intern

Maxence Delchambre, Intern

Valeria Fruzzetti, Intern

Brigit Morris, Intern

Gergey Pasztor, Intern

Chris Sidoti, Director

Katrine Thomasen, Human Rights Officer, Liaison, Coordination and Advocacy Program

Una Walsh, Intern

Brennan Webert, 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/hrm/council

SUBSCRIPTION

If you wish to receive the Council Monitor Daily Updates by e-mail during the Council session, please e-mail information@ishr-sidh.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 AND DISTRIBUTION

Copyright © 2006 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 holder.