

# COUNCIL MONITOR

International Service for Human Rights



Human Rights Monitor Series

## COUNCIL UPDATE – ITEM 2, UPDATE FROM THE HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL, 12<sup>TH</sup> SESSION 15 AND 16 SEPTEMBER 2009

Overview .....	1
Update by the High Commissioner .....	2
General debate .....	3
Discrimination .....	3
Protection of civilians in armed conflict.....	4
Economic, social and cultural rights .....	4
Rights of migrants.....	5
Freedom of expression and human rights defenders ....	5
2011 Review of the Council.....	5
Independence of OHCHR.....	6
Special procedures.....	7
Country situations.....	7
Further information.....	8

### Overview

On 15 and 16 September, the Human Rights Council (the Council) heard and discussed an update from the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Ms Navanethem Pillay. The High Commissioner focused on a number of ‘overarching concerns’ that that will be priorities of her Office for the next biennium including combating discrimination; protection of civilians in armed conflict and fighting impunity; revitalised pursuit of economic, social and cultural rights; the rights of migrants; attacks on freedom of expression and human rights defenders; and strengthening the human rights system, in particular the treaty bodies, the special procedures and the Council itself. In addressing these issues it was notable that Ms Pillay drew attention to concerns and positive developments in relation to more than 35 specific countries. States broadly endorsed the High Commissioner’s statement as highlighting important issues of concern to them. Many, including the OIC and the African Group, also specifically appreciated the drawing of examples from countries around the world as a sign of objectivity and a balanced approach. The statement prompted several States to reply to the High Commissioner’s comments. Whereas some provided useful clarifications, others including Zimbabwe, Sri Lanka and the Sudan, refuted the comments as baseless and an expression of double standards.

The opening meeting of the session was delayed by over five hours whilst the Council Bureau attempted to address a point of order regarding the status of the representative of Honduras. Brazil and Argentina raised the point that the delegate present was not in fact the official representative of the Constitutional Government of

President Zelaya, and requested that he not be permitted to represent the State at the session. The President of the Council, Ambassador van Meeuwen, ruled that the Council would follow the decision taken by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Credentials Committee, according to which the present Ambassador was no longer the recognised representative of the elected Government. The President therefore ruled to suspend discussion of this matter, announcing that further discussions would take place within the Council Bureau. He dismissed a point of order by the representative from Honduras, saying that a non-member State of the Council could not raise a point of order at that time. Obviously furious, and shouting, ‘I will be back’, the Ambassador left the room escorted by Security guards. The event also reflected badly on the Bureau, and caused unnecessary delay due to a foreseeable issue.

Ms Pillay’s presentation was preceded by statements by the Sri Lankan Minister for Human Rights and Disaster Management, the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organisation Affairs of the United States, and Her Royal Highness Princess Bajrakitiyabha of Thailand. The Sri Lankan Minister, Mr Samarasinghe, was keen to allay concerns about the continuing IDP situation in the Country, saying that ‘over 14,500 people have been cleared to leave the camps’. Out of a total of reportedly 290,000 this does not appear to be a significant number of returnees, yet the Minister attempted to justify the slow progress by claiming that it was in the security interests of the rest of the country to ensure ‘stringent and thorough’ checks. In contrast, the US Assistant Secretary of State for International Organisation Affairs, Ms Brimmer, set out the aims for the United States’ new membership of the Council, including a strong focus on ensuring and enhancing the freedom of expression. She stated that the US is motivated by the ‘pernicious machinations of countries seeking to obscure and deny their abuses’, and encouraged the Council to use country-specific resolutions to demonstrate its collective will and duty to protect human rights wherever they are threatened. She emphasised that constructive dialogue and adherence to principles of truth and universality were key to the further protection of human rights.

#### Update by the High Commissioner

The High Commissioner presented a number of ‘overarching concerns’ that affect many States and form the roots of chronic human rights situations and emergencies in a strong statement to the Council. These issues will be priorities for the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights for the next biennium. Ms Pillay first of all drew attention to the serious implementation gap between international pledges and commitments and national realities and again underlined the primary responsibility to promote and protect human rights.

She highlighted that the scourge of **discrimination** affects all countries and drew attention to some of the most egregious examples. Ms Pillay spoke of ‘age-old discrimination’ against and exclusion of indigenous people and drew examples from Colombia and Bolivia, and called on Canada, New Zealand and the US to follow Australia’s example and endorse the *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. She expressed concerns about recent unrest in China’s Xinjiang and Tibet regions and the attacks and discrimination against Roma in more than a dozen European countries.<sup>1</sup> Ms Pillay also highlighted the denial of women’s rights in many countries, and highlighted that the situation of women in the Gulf region falls short of international standards.

The High Commissioner again focused on lack of respect for international humanitarian law and human rights law during **armed conflicts** and drew attention to the situations in Afghanistan, Colombia, the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the occupied Palestinian territory, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Yemen. Ms Pillay urged the Council to insist on full accountability for all violations. She underlined that the Council is adequately equipped to consider concrete measures and propose remedies for human rights violations.

Ms Pillay also encouraged revitalised efforts to realise **economic, social and cultural rights** and ratification of the Optional Protocol to the *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hungary, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Ireland, Lithuania, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Spain, Slovenia, Sweden, UK.

The High Commissioner again expressed concerns about the treatment of irregular **migrants**, including their detention, and the deaths of migrants at sea with specific references to Libya, Malta and Italy. She was deeply disturbed by the low level of ratifications of the *International Convention on the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families* and called on States to ratify it.

A large part of the statement was dedicated to the ‘**suppression of free voices**’ and the High Commissioner expressed concerns about the treatment of named human rights defenders and journalists in Myanmar, Sri Lanka, Zimbabwe, and the Russian Federation as well as detention of peaceful protesters in Iran. She called on all States to protect human rights defenders. In this context, Ms Pillay also highlighted the obstacles to human rights protection posed by democratic deficits highlighting examples from Afghanistan, Fiji, and Honduras.

Finally, she focused on the strengthening of the UN human rights system, drawing attention to the need to strengthen and streamline the work of the treaty bodies; ensuring that the Council focuses on pressing human rights issues and specific situations; ensuring that the UPR is a ‘reliable and truthful mirror of country situations’; and increase support for the work of the special procedures.

### General debate

During the general debate that followed, many States and NGOs took the floor to discuss points raised in the High Commissioner’s update, as well as to push for further discussion of the relationship between OHCHR and the Council, the upcoming review of the Council in 2011, and highlight the latest challenges to the independence of the special procedures.

### Discrimination

Several States made forceful statements endorsing the High Commissioner’s reiteration of the primary responsibility on governments to enhance protection against discrimination. Nigeria (on behalf of the African Group) recognised the importance of eliminating discrimination in all its forms, with Sweden on behalf of the European Union (EU) supporting this statement. Pakistan, on behalf of the Organisation of Islamic Conference (OIC), stated that ‘respect for religious and cultural diversity is vital to a discrimination-free society’, and that discrimination ‘sows the seeds of conflict’.

Not surprisingly, most States focused on discrimination against women, indigenous people and ethnic minorities, although some also addressed human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity.

The High Commissioner’s comments regarding the situation of women in the Gulf region elicited a strong reaction from several States in the region. The Sudan expressed its ‘surprise’ that this had been considered an example of discrimination by the High Commissioner, and said that rules on indecency exist in many countries. Sudan said that it therefore had no choice but to assume that this accusation was part of a concerted ‘will to target a whole nation’ and had expected Ms Pillay to highlight more of the recent progress within the State on women’s rights. This spurious response failed to substantively address the comments made by the High Commissioner. Turkey argued that ‘the traditions and nature of the states’ have to be considered, while the UK spoke out about justifications of discrimination against women based on religion or tradition. Other States were more supportive of eliminating discrimination against women, with France taking the opportunity to call for a separate thematic mandate on discrimination against women. Cuba, Chile and Mexico also expressed their support for the High Commissioner’s thematic focus on women’s rights, with the latter announcing that it will put forward a draft resolution on laws which discriminate or encourage discrimination against women to establish a new mandate to address this issue. Colombia offered its commitment to supporting this resolution. Norway stated that elimination of this kind of discrimination can only hope to be achieved if national laws which encourage or permit such acts are abolished, indirectly also offering support for a new mandate.

On the subject of protection of indigenous peoples, Egypt, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), Qatar, the Philippines, Bolivia and Ecuador all expressed their support for highlighting the issue. Ecuador encouraged the High Commissioner to call upon all States to sign the *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous*

*Peoples*,<sup>2</sup> whilst Bolivia shed light on the problem of international corporations not respecting indigenous peoples. Egypt also supported the call for all States to endorse the Durban Review Conference outcome document.

Racism and the rights of ethnic minorities were also raised, but only by a handful of States outside of those which had been highlighted in the High Commissioner's update, namely Nigeria (on behalf of the African Group), Qatar, Chile and Sweden (on behalf of the EU). Nigeria commended Ms Pillay's call for all remaining States to adopt the Durban Review Conference outcome document with a view to ensuring the elimination of racism and xenophobia. Sweden (on behalf of the EU) acknowledged that national policies must comply with international law and assured the Council that the EU is sensitive to the rights of Roma people and is committed to protecting them. The Asian Legal Resource Centre regretted the lack of attention by the High Commissioner to discrimination based on work or descent.

Sweden (on behalf of the EU) argued that anti-discrimination principles should be applied to all people regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity. A number of States, including Australia, Slovenia, the Czech Republic, Sweden, France, the Netherlands and Ireland highlighted issues of sexual orientation and gender identity with Ireland welcoming the High Commissioner's participation in a high-level panel where she robustly rejected claims that human rights protection does not extend this far. France stated that discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity is systematic in certain countries, and reminded the Council of the joint statement on sexual orientation and gender identity which has so far been signed by 67 States and which was delivered at the General Assembly in December 2008.

### **Protection of civilians in armed conflict**

This topic received a considerable amount of support and attention during the general debate. Sri Lanka sought to ward off further international attention and expressed a very uncooperative and anti-interventionist approach to human rights monitoring. It said that it was inaccurate of the High Commissioner to say that internally displaced people (IDPs) are being 'interned' in the country, claiming the State has a duty to 'keep them in safety until they can be resettled'. It also expressed its confidence that 'by the end of January 2010 most will have been resettled'. It concluded by saying that 'normalcy' has been restored following the fighting and called for the acceptance of 'home-grown solutions which respect our traditions'.

Sweden (on behalf of the EU) and Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC) endorsed the topic as a priority for OHCHR, as did Azerbaijan, Indonesia, South Africa, the UK and Slovenia. Turkey warned against overlap with the work of other bodies focusing on international humanitarian law. Ecuador supported the thematic focus and highlighted its concern for non-international armed conflicts taking place in South America. Slovenia was concerned that accountability for war crimes committed against civilians must be seen to be ensured, as a 'precondition for peace and security'. Egypt also spoke on the subject of impunity, saying that too often perpetrators of crimes against civilians have been allowed to go unpunished. Tunisia highlighted its concern for the targeting of civilians in Afghanistan and Iraq, with the Russian Federation supporting this position, while Qatar reiterated the need to apply IHL and human rights law in tandem when addressing the situation in the occupied Palestinian territories.

### **Economic, social and cultural rights**

Some States, particularly those from the developing world, followed up on the High Commissioner's comments on economic, social and cultural rights. Bangladesh, Indonesia, Brazil, Cuba and Algeria commended the High Commissioner for her attention to the issue. Nigeria (on behalf of the African Group) commended the timely focus as the financial crisis is causing particularly negative consequences for aid-provision and poverty reduction in Africa. Similar comments were made by the African Union. Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC) also raised the financial crisis as a crucial issue and called for a review of international trade laws in line with basic human rights principles. Malaysia noted that economic development was a key prerequisite for the enjoyment of human rights, whilst Germany conversely stated that poverty is 'no excuse' for human rights violations.

---

<sup>2</sup> See <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/drip.html>.

In a reference to trade embargoes placed upon it, Zimbabwe accused the High Commissioner of failing to address ‘economic, social and cultural rights being violated by foreigners’ and called for a ‘fairer report’.

South Africa pointed out that the justiciability of these rights is still not recognised in many countries. Slovenia suggested that better protection and respect for economic, social and cultural rights would contribute greatly to the prevention of armed conflicts, especially non-international ones.

The Russian Federation informed the Council that it is currently considering ratifying the Optional Protocol to the *International Convention on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* (ICESCR), while Slovenia confirmed that it will ratify the Protocol at the next General Assembly session in New York later this year. South Africa brought up again the status of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights that it would like to see ‘rectified’ and not reporting to or having its members elected by the Economic and Social Council.

### **Rights of migrants**

Nigeria (on behalf of the African Group) called on all States to ratify the *International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families* (CMW). Recognising that migrants are often subjected to the most serious forms of inhumane treatment, it reaffirmed that all States are obliged to protect and fulfil the rights of all persons under their jurisdiction. Ecuador supported the recommendation on ratifying CMW, as did Mexico and Algeria. Sweden (on behalf of the EU) made a rather general statement, calling on all States to ensure that their migration policies comply with international law, while Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC) registered the topic as a ‘concern’. The Philippines and Turkey also endorsed the topic of migration as one of high priority for OHCHR.

Algeria suggested that the High Commissioner study the links between migration and transitional justice. Egypt (on behalf of NAM) declared that the procedure of mandatory detention for migrants should not be allowed to continue, and respect for migrants’ rights must be guaranteed regardless of immigration status. South Africa was also concerned with this and called for more attention to be paid to the issue of undocumented migration. Bangladesh and the Philippines highlighted the link between undocumented migration and trafficking in persons with the latter urging OHCHR to concentrate more on combating trafficking.

### **Freedom of expression and human rights defenders**

Several States addressed the topic of freedom of expression and protection of human rights defenders. France highlighted frequent violations of the right to freedom of expression and Canada drew attention to attacks against human rights defenders and journalists. Ireland and Austria called for better protection of defenders with Austria encouraging the Council to examine what it could do to provide concrete protection. Slovenia asked the High Commissioner what OHCHR would do to protect defenders. Japan called on all States to respect the work of human rights defenders.

While Mexico endorsed the High Commissioner’s comment that freedom of expression is essential, the African Union called for this right to be balanced with the need to combat incitement to racial and religious hatred. Canada expressed the hope that the resolution on freedom of expression being negotiated at this session would be adopted by consensus. Canada traditionally sponsored the resolution but the initiative has been taken over by the US and Egypt.

### **2011 Review of the Council**

Several States used the opportunity to comments on the upcoming review of the Council’s work. This has become more topical as the Russian Federation is proposing a resolution to establish a working group to begin the review

process.<sup>3</sup> Egypt and the Maldives stated that they would take active part in the review process. Algeria and Turkey noted that the process should be State driven with Algeria stating that it should start as soon as possible. The Russian Federation underlined that the process should be completed by 2011, perhaps in response to reluctance by some States to start the process quickly and fear that its conclusion could therefore be delayed.<sup>4</sup>

The Maldives argued that the review process should include an assessment of how the Council could become more accessible to small delegations and those without a presence in Geneva. While Algeria suggested that the review process should take account of the experiences gained by OHCHR, South Africa called for it to clarify the relationship between the Council and OHCHR (further discussed below). Japan and Tunisia wished for the review process to be an opportunity to strengthen the Council. China cautioned that the Council should respect its mandate. Amnesty International stated that the review should begin with an assessment of the extent to which the Council has implemented its mandate and concluded that it had fallen short in several respects, primarily because of a lack of political will.

### **Independence of OHCHR**

Despite strong displays of commitment to the continued independent work of OHCHR,<sup>5</sup> several States again attempted to undermine both the High Commissioner and her Office.

Tunisia called for a greater geographical representation within OHCHR and hoped for enhanced cooperation between OHCHR and the Council. This echoes calls from States in previous Council sessions calling for OHCHR to be made more accountable to the Council. Indeed, similar statements emerged from Algeria, which suggested that the Council should be consulted on the next OHCHR strategic management plan. Zimbabwe supported these comments and went on to make one of the most flagrant attempts to undermine the work of OHCHR. It questioned Ms Pillay's impartiality and accused her of holding Zimbabwe 'in contempt' for her investigation and findings on the country situation in Zimbabwe itself. It furthermore claimed that there can be no 'unilateral establishment of OHCHR country offices without full Council support' and demanded that OHCHR 'ought to perform much better'. Rather surprisingly, the President of the Council did not recall the standards of dignity and respect that should be respected within the Council's debates.

Syria criticised the High Commissioner's choice of country situations, accusing her of 'singling out a very long list of some isolated situations', and asking her to provide more information on the occupied Syrian Golan territory. It concluded, somewhat contradictorily, by summarising that the High Commissioner should not be selective in her reports. In a further outburst, China stated that it 'deplored' the apparent 'pointing of fingers at sovereign States' by the High Commissioner and questioned the status of her relationship with the Council, including the extent of her mandate. It concluded by suggesting 'greater supervision and guidance of the High Commissioner's work'. India took a slightly more tactful approach in its criticism. In an apparent attempt to further strengthen the accountability of the Office to the Council, it suggested creating methods of assessing OHCHR's success, with a view to reporting this back to the Council.

Demonstrating a more cooperative attitude towards OHCHR, Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC) praised the High Commissioner's 'fair and impartial' approach and hoped it would continue. The Netherlands rebutted those that criticise the comments by the High Commissioner in her report arguing that States should engage in a discussion of relevant issues not yet highlighted, rather than focusing their attention on attacking the authority and independence of OHCHR.

---

<sup>3</sup> The draft resolution suggests that the working group should be set up after the Council's March 2010 session. The first informals were held on 18 September 2009.

<sup>4</sup> The EU, Switzerland, Mexico would like the process to start late in 2010. Other States are flexible on when to start work on this, including the Philippines and Singapore.

<sup>5</sup> From States including Sweden on behalf of the EU, Pakistan on behalf of the OIC, the United States of America, Colombia, Australia, Ireland, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Mexico, Romania, Belgium, Chile, the UK, Italy, Turkey, Japan, Slovenia, Sweden, Bangladesh, France, Morocco and the Netherlands.

Other States which took a more cooperative attitude and had suggestions for future areas of focus included: Burkina Faso, which called for more funding to be provided to enable OHCHR to carry out its work better; the Philippines, which encouraged OHCHR to focus more on the issue of trafficking; and Argentina, which encouraged OHCHR's work on the right to truth, and particularly the need to preserve national archives in States which have gone through a period of transitional justice.

### **Special procedures**

Several States expressed strong support for the system of special procedures,<sup>6</sup> with Chile highlighting the importance of country mandates in particular. Austria and Sweden highlighted the need for more resources to be provided to the special procedures to support their increasing work load. Azerbaijan and Tunisia called for special procedures mandate holders to respect their mandates and the Russian Federation and Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC) urged compliance with the Code of Conduct. Egypt (on behalf of the NAM) and Algeria stated that OHCHR should play an increased role in ensuring compliance with the Code of Conduct. Algeria referred to two specific incidents of non-compliance with the Code of Conduct, while Egypt (on behalf of NAM) noted 'a persistent trend' of 'some mandate holders' to ignore the Code. It was not clear what was being referred to.

### **Country situations**

The High Commissioner's attention to such a large number of country situations resulted in a rich debate with comments and clarifications from many States that have often not been actively engaged in the Council's work.

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bolivia, Bulgaria, China, Colombia, the Czech Republic, Italy, Qatar, Romania, the Russian Federation, Slovakia, Tunisia, and Yemen (on behalf of the Arab Group) all replied to the High Commissioner's comments on their countries or region, in the case of the Gulf countries. Most of these countries provided updates or clarifications about the issues raised. A few were critical of the High Commissioner's analysis with China arguing that the tensions in Xinjiang and Lhasa were an 'internal matter' that had no relation with minority issues. Tunisia (on behalf of the Arab Group) argued that States have a sovereign right to enter reservations to international treaties in response to Ms Pillay's call on countries to lift reservations to CEDAW.

States and NGOs also used the debate as an opportunity to raise situations of particular concern to them. Several States welcomed the drawing of attention to a large number of situations as a sign of a balanced and objective approach by the High Commissioner.<sup>7</sup> Australia Chile underlined the need to address all situations of violations wherever they occur. The US queried how the Council could best ensure concrete changes on the ground.

Human Rights Watch urged the Council to establish a special rapporteur on **Afghanistan**. Nord Sud XXI again called for a special rapporteur on Iraq.

The UK was concerned about the 'dire situation of women' in the **Democratic Republic of the Congo** and shared the High Commissioner's concerns about discrimination against women in **the Sudan**. FIDH expressed concern about intimidation and harassment of human rights defenders in the DRC.

Some Latin American countries condemned the coup in **Honduras** and underlined that they only recognise President Zelaya's Government.<sup>8</sup>

France called for release of all prisoners detained during the election protests in **Iran** and for full accountability for any human rights violations. The UK also expressed concerns about restrictions on freedom of expression in Iran. Sweden (on behalf of the EU) expressed 'special alarm' at the situations in Iran, **Myanmar, Zimbabwe and Sri Lanka**. Canada and Chile also expressed concern about the situation in Myanmar. Human Rights Watch stated

---

<sup>6</sup> Australia, Austria, Slovenia, Sweden.

<sup>7</sup> Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC), Ireland, Nigeria (on behalf of the African Group).

<sup>8</sup> Ecuador, Chile, Brazil.

that Sri Lanka had broken its promises to the Secretary-General and called on the Council to urge the Government to restore the right to freedom of movement and to establish an international investigation into violations committed during the conflict.

Several NGOs echoed the High Commissioner's concerns about the killing of defenders in the Russian Federation.<sup>9</sup>

Tunisia (on behalf of the Arab Group) stated that it would have liked to receive an update on OHCHR's work in **Somalia**.

Tunisia (on behalf of the Arab Group) and Syria also regretted the lack of attention to the 'deteriorating situation in the **occupied Syrian Golan**'. Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC) noted that the High Commissioner had not mentioned 'other situations' that deserved to be addressed but it was not clear which countries the OIC had in mind. Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC) stated that the follow up discussion on the **special session on Gaza**, scheduled for Tuesday 29 September 2009, would be an opportunity 'to show good faith'. The International Commission of Jurists stated that both sides to the conflict should be held accountable for violations committed.

Cuba drew attention to the imprisonment of five Cubans in the **US** noting that their detention had been found to be arbitrary by the Working Group on arbitrary detention.

### Further information

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

- Follow ISHR on Twitter: [@ishr\\_geneva](https://twitter.com/ishr_geneva).
- 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](mailto:information@ishr.ch).
- Oral statements made at the Council, as well as other 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'.
- Web site of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) on the 12<sup>th</sup> session of the Human Rights Council: <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/12session>. For direct access to reports considered, check <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/12session/reports.htm>.

*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.*

---

<sup>9</sup> HRW, FIDH.

## **COUNCIL MONITOR STAFF**

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

## **CONTRIBUTORS**

**Felice Drott**, Intern  
**Jade Johnston**, Intern  
**Mabel Kirabo**, Intern  
**Isabella Ries**, Intern  
**Peter Tubman**, Intern  
**Katelan Wick**, 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 Council 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](http://www.ishr.ch).

## **SUBSCRIPTION**

If you wish to receive the Council Monitor Council Updates by e-mail during the Council session, please e-mail [information@ishr.ch](mailto: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](mailto:information@ishr.ch).