

# COUNCIL MONITOR

International Service for Human Rights



Human Rights Monitor Series

## DAILY UPDATE HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL, 9<sup>TH</sup> SESSION 16 SEPTEMBER 2008

Overview .....	1
Continued general debate on Item 3.....	1
Rights of reply .....	2
Special Rapporteur on the Sudan.....	2
Interactive dialogue .....	3
General debate on Item 4 .....	4
Informal consultations and meetings.....	7
Advisory services and technical assistance for Cambodia.....	7
Human rights voluntary goals.....	8
Meeting on the human rights situation in the Sudan .....	8

### Overview

The Human Rights Council continued its debate on Item 3 with statements from NGOs. It also discussed the report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in the Sudan and the follow-up report on Darfur. The Council was divided on this topic between those that saw the situation as much improved and those that continue to be alarmed by the Special Rapporteur's reports of ongoing human rights violations. The African Group stated that it was considering terminating the mandate, although it was willing to find a consensual solution.

During the general debate on Item 4 ('human rights situations that require the Council's attention') States took the floor to express concerns about specific country situations, which included Sudan, Burma/Myanmar, Sri Lanka, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), Georgia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, and Zimbabwe. During the day, Japan also held informal consultations on its draft resolution on 'advisory services and technical assistance for Cambodia'.

### Continued general debate on Item 3

The Council continued its general debate on Item 3, promotion and protection of all human rights, with statements from NGOs. NGOs addressed issues related to self-determination, the right to development, violations of the rights of human rights defenders, conscientious objection to military service, and violence against children.

A number of organisations used the opportunity to comment at length on specific human rights situations, in particular in Jammu and Kashmir,<sup>1</sup> Pakistan,<sup>2</sup> and in Western Sahara.<sup>3</sup> In response to several of these statements the President stated that they did not belong to the item under discussion but instead related to the Council's agenda item on human rights situations that require its attention (Item 4). He called on all participants to show respect for the rights of others and be more restrained in their statements. While it appears that a small number of organisations continue to misuse their speaking rights, it is regrettable that the same comment was made by the President in relation to a statement by an NGO commenting broadly on human rights violations against human rights defenders in Asia and drawing specific examples from incidents in the Republic of Korea.<sup>4</sup> Another statement on restrictions on the right to freedom of expression and association in Asia with examples from the Republic of Korea and Malaysia did not draw similar comments from the President.<sup>5</sup>

### Rights of reply

India and Pakistan exchanged rights of reply on Jammu and Kashmir. Algeria replied to a statement by an NGO on Western Sahara.<sup>6</sup> Iraq commented on the situation of women and children in its country. Italy replied at length to a statement by Ecuador on migration policy explaining that its national policy is in accordance with human rights and reiterating its commitment to fighting racism. In response, Ecuador noted that its statement was merely aimed at calling attention to repressive policies that criminalise migration.

### Special Rapporteur on the Sudan

The report by Ms Sima Samar, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Sudan, concerned her visits to Darfur, Khartoum and the transitional area in southern Sudan in July 2008.<sup>7</sup> Ms Samar declared that the Sudan remains fraught with challenges and that despite positive steps taken by the Government to improve the situation of human rights many interlocutors reported an 'overall deterioration'. She stressed that there has been little implementation of her past recommendations and impunity remains prevalent. Ms Samar drew attention to violations committed by all parties in the Sudan, including the recruitment of child soldiers, arbitrary arrest and detention on the grounds of ethnicity, the lack of information provided by the Government concerning charges against detainees and their whereabouts, the prohibition of the employment of lawyers by detainees, the torture and mistreatment of detainees, and the inhuman conditions in detention centres. She reiterated that it is the responsibility of both the State and rebel groups to provide protection to civilians in areas under their control. Ms Samar acknowledged the efforts made by the Government to campaign against the recruitment of child soldiers, the deployment of more police, especially female police, to Darfur, and the increased governmental activities against sexual and gender-based violence. Concern was raised, however, over the continuing restrictions on freedom of expression, association and assembly especially in light of the upcoming elections in the Sudan in 2009. The Special Rapporteur urged that these restrictions be relaxed. The Special Rapporteur called for impartial, transparent and comprehensive investigations into human rights violations, full and unimpeded access for UNAMID and UNMIS to all parts of the country, including prisons and detention centres, and the facilitation of humanitarian access. Ms Samar

---

<sup>1</sup> International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, World Islamic Congress,

<sup>2</sup> Interfaith International.

<sup>3</sup> Union de l'Action Feminine.

<sup>4</sup> Asian Legal Resource Centre.

<sup>5</sup> Forum-Asia.

<sup>6</sup> Union de l'Action Feminine.

<sup>7</sup> A/HRC/9/13, A/HRC/9/13/Add.1 (Report on the status of implementation of the recommendations compiled by the Group of Expert on Darfur).

expressed her hope that the Council continues to monitor the implementation of recommendations until full implementation is achieved.

The Sudan spoke as a concerned country and regretted that the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) had not included the Government's comments to the report. These were circulated in the room a few minutes later. Sudan stated that the report is more credible than previous reports, but noted with regret that it did not condemn attacks by rebel forces. The Sudan also highlighted its efforts in preparation for the elections next year. Finally, it urged the Council to transform its resolutions into tangible action by commending the Government for its efforts.

### Interactive dialogue

The interactive dialogue that followed saw a well-known division in the Council in relation to country mandates in general and the situation in the Sudan in particular. It seems difficult to reconcile the differing and contradictory pictures that are being painted of the situation by the Special Rapporteur on the one hand and the Government on the other hand. The Council is divided between these two stories. In this regard, it was interesting that Bangladesh argued that the discrepancy between the two pictures was 'worrying' and should give rise to further thought.

On the one hand a number of States regretted that the human rights situation in the Sudan has not improved significantly despite some efforts by the Government. They acknowledged the cooperation between the Government and the Special Rapporteur. However, the United Kingdom (UK) expressed disappointment that the Special Rapporteur had not been given access to all places, while Costa Rica and Ireland urged that the Sudan facilitate the work of the Special Rapporteur and her team in the future. This group of States echoed the concerns expressed by the Special Rapporteur with regard to the prevalence of impunity,<sup>8</sup> sexual and gender based violence, and attacks on humanitarian workers and agencies,<sup>9</sup> torture, recruitment of child soldiers and restrictions on freedom of the press.<sup>10</sup> Several NGOs also drew attention to the issue of impunity and urged the Sudan to cooperate with the International Criminal Court (ICC).<sup>11</sup>

This group of States, and all NGOs that took the floor,<sup>12</sup> supported the extension of the mandate until the full implementation of the Special Rapporteur's recommendations.<sup>13</sup> Notably, Burkina Faso stated that the Special Rapporteur's recommendations should 'not remain dead letters'. While the UK stated that the Government had not implemented the recommendations of the Experts Group, Bangladesh argued that the Government was dealing seriously with them, although progress might be slow.<sup>14</sup> In this regard, Norway underlined that the future mandate must have a clear monitoring component and include follow-up to the work of the Experts Group on Darfur. Zambia urged the Government to expedite implementation of the recommendations of the Experts Group on Darfur and the Special Rapporteur.

On the other hand, several States argued that the human rights situation is improving as a result of the Government's efforts. Several States welcomed the level of cooperation with the Special Rapporteur and the

---

<sup>8</sup> France, Germany, Chile, UK, Japan, Costa Rica, New Zealand, Canada, Zambia, Sweden, Australia, Switzerland, Uganda, Amnesty International.

<sup>9</sup> UK, Ireland, Japan, Norway, Australia, Uganda.

<sup>10</sup> Switzerland, Australia, Uganda.

<sup>11</sup> Human Rights Watch, International Court of Jurists, International Federation Of Human Rights Leagues (FIDH), World Organisation Against Torture (OMCT)

<sup>12</sup> Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, International Court of Jurist (ICJ)s, International Federation Of Human Rights Leagues (FIDH), World Organisation Against Torture (OMCT)

<sup>13</sup> France (on behalf of the EU), Chile, Netherlands, Japan, Costa Rica, Norway, Switzerland, Australia, Uganda.

<sup>14</sup> See for instance ISHR's *Human Rights Monitor 2007* for background on the Experts Group. Available at [www.ishr.ch](http://www.ishr.ch).

positive developments towards implementation of recommendations.<sup>15</sup> Egypt (on behalf of the African Group) characterised the Sudan's relationship with the Council as 'commendable', and argued that the international community has a duty to encourage these positive efforts. Many of these States stressed political solutions and dialogue with the Government as the best means to secure further progress for human rights in the Sudan.<sup>16</sup> While many argued that the conflict is an obstacle to human rights, it was notable that Zambia took the opposite view arguing that there can be no peace where there is not respect for human rights. A number of States called on the international community to strengthen its support to the Sudan through technical and financial assistance.<sup>17</sup> China argued that the root cause of the problems facing the Sudan is poverty.

Speaking more specifically of the mandate of the Special Rapporteur, Egypt (on behalf of the African Group) stated that there was a need to 'end the proliferation of human rights mechanisms' on the Sudan and that the mandate was a 'burden' on the Government. Egypt also asserted that the UN mandate is hindering regional and domestic mechanisms. Displaying a skewed understanding of the role of different human rights mechanisms, Egypt (on behalf of the African Group) said that the Sudan will remain subject to universal periodic review (UPR) and a large presence of the OHCHR. In light of the statement by the Sudan, which seemed to indicate a lack of support for the mandate, it was interesting that Egypt (on behalf of the African Group) merely stated that it is seriously considering terminating the mandate but that it will work towards a consensual outcome. Several States reiterated their known position against country mandates<sup>18</sup> but supported the efforts of the African Group towards a consensual outcome.<sup>19</sup> Notably, Algeria explicitly supported the Sudan's request to end the mandate. On the other hand, Zambia argued that special procedures mandates should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis considering the actual situation and highlighted there are gaps in the promotion and protection of human rights in the Sudan

In her replies, Ms Samar stressed the importance of continuing the mandate to allow voice of the people on the ground to be heard, with or without her as the mandate holder. She reiterated that impunity is one of the main concerns and stressed the need for all war crimes to be investigated. She emphasised the need for 'stronger action to stop the culture of impunity' and called specifically on the Organisation of the Islamic Conference (OIC) and the Arab Group to support the people of the Sudan in this effort. She also emphasised the importance strengthening the cooperation between the Government of the Sudan and international mechanisms.

#### General debate on Item 4

During the general debate on Item 4, human rights situations that require the Council's attention, States took the floor to express concerns about specific country situations.

Replicating the interactive dialogue with Ms Sima Samar, the situation in Sudan was again commented on from both sides. Many States expressed their serious concerns about the human rights situation in **Sudan**, particularly Darfur, with some affirming that it had not improved in the last year.<sup>20</sup> France and the UK urged the Government to ensure that human rights violators were brought to justice. The Czech Republic noted continued attacks against civilians and humanitarian workers, as well as the prevalence of sexual violence, even against children. While noting progress in certain areas (for example, legislative reform) Ghana reported

---

<sup>15</sup> Egypt (on behalf of the African Group), Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC), Burkina Faso, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Tunisia, Qatar, Malaysia, Iran.

<sup>16</sup> Morocco (on behalf of the Arab Group), China, Burkina Faso, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Tunisia, Qatar, Malaysia, Iran.

<sup>17</sup> Egypt (on behalf of the African Group), China, Syria.

<sup>18</sup> Egypt (on behalf of the African Group), Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC),

<sup>19</sup> Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC), Cuba,

<sup>20</sup> France, on behalf of the EU, Ireland, Czech Republic.

that grave violations continued, and called on the Sudan to implement the recommendations of the former Experts Group, to accelerate legal reform, address impunity, and bring violators to justice. Canada called for the Special Rapporteur to work with the Sudan to give full effect to the recommendations of both the Special Rapporteur and the former Experts Group.

In contrast, several States welcomed what they considered to be improvements in the human rights situation in Sudan, and the positive efforts by the Government to address human rights issues (including through ‘full cooperation’ with the international community).<sup>21</sup> Some States called on the international community to provide adequate support for UNAMID (the African Union/United Nations Hybrid operation in Darfur) and UNIMIS (United Nations Mission in the Sudan) to enable these forces to carry out their mandates.<sup>22</sup>

France, speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU), noted that **Burma/Myanmar** still faced considerable human rights challenges. It urged the authorities to grant humanitarian organisations full access to victims. Other concerns raised included the continued detention of political prisoners.<sup>23</sup> Japan noted that despite some progress on drafting a new constitution, grave concerns remained. France (on behalf of the EU) and the UK encouraged Burma/Myanmar to implement the recommendations of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar.

The Russian Federation and **Georgia** blamed one another for instigating the recent conflict in South Ossetia. Georgia asserted that its military had acted in self-defence, and claimed that credible reports had confirmed that a massive deportation of ethnic Georgians had taken place. It urged that the facts of the case be examined through an inquiry involving the international community. The Russian Federation criticised what it saw as ‘double standards’ – the portrayal of some States as rogue human rights violators, and concealment of others’ violations for geopolitical or strategic reasons. It cited the example of Georgia, which had long been portrayed by the West as a ‘model young democracy’, but whose ‘impunity’ and ‘aggression’ had triggered the recent conflict.

Many States voiced their concerns about alleged violations of human rights and international humanitarian law during the recent conflict in South Ossetia.<sup>24</sup> Delegations stressed the importance of allowing the return of internally displaced persons and refugees to their homes, and the provision of aid without hindrance to the most vulnerable.<sup>25</sup> Lithuania condemned the actions by the Russian Federation, and stressed that the latter’s unilateral recognition of independence for the disputed regions violated the territorial integrity of Georgia, and ‘artificially created territories’. Latvia asserted that the granting of citizenship ‘en masse’ to another population in another State, and the subsequent use of force to protect such ‘nationals’ abroad, should not be allowed. Latvia and Poland expressed support for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Georgia. Meanwhile Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan and Belarus welcomed the role of the Russian Federation in stabilising the situation in the Caucasus, with Belarus explicitly blaming Georgia for its ‘provocation’.

France (on behalf of the EU) reported that the human rights situation in the **Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea** (DPRK) had not improved,<sup>26</sup> and expressed concern about the ‘precarious’ humanitarian situation. Japan called on the DPRK to allow a visit by the Special Rapporteur, and to strengthen its cooperation with

---

<sup>21</sup> Notably, these were exclusively Arab States, including Yemen, United Arab Emirates, Iraq, the League of Arab States.

<sup>22</sup> Ghana, Yemen, Iraq.

<sup>23</sup> France, on behalf of the EU, the United Kingdom.

<sup>24</sup> Romania called on the OHCHR to take action and investigate allegations of such violations. Poland also supported calls for an independent assessment of alleged violations. The United Kingdom supported the proposal for a UN fact-finding mission to Georgia.

<sup>25</sup> The United Kingdom, Canada, Georgia, Latvia, Romania, Poland, Lithuania, Estonia.

<sup>26</sup> Japan, United Kingdom made a similar point.

the international community.<sup>27</sup> The UK encouraged States to treat emigrants as refugees and refrain from returning them to DPRK, where they faced an increased risk of human rights violations.

The human rights record of the **Islamic Republic of Iran** (Iran) drew heavy criticism from States. Delegations expressed strong concerns about continuing executions (including of juvenile offenders), stoning, torture, the repression of religious and ethnic minorities, restrictions on freedom of expression and the press, and the treatment of women and human rights defenders.<sup>28</sup> France (on behalf of the EU) stressed that the Government of Iran needed to meet the international standards it had voluntarily accepted.<sup>29</sup> The UK made the point that the draft apostasy law risked adversely affecting religious minorities, including the Baha'i community.<sup>30</sup>

States identified a number of concerns about the situation in **Sri Lanka**, including continued kidnappings, executions, enforced disappearances, and restrictions on freedom of expression (including intimidation of journalists).<sup>31</sup> Japan noted some positive steps, including the development of a national action plan on human rights. The Netherlands urged Sri Lanka to combat impunity, and to reconsider its position on allowing an independent human rights monitoring presence in the country. Canada and Ireland called on Sri Lanka to facilitate unhindered humanitarian access to conflict-affected areas.

On the **Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)**, France (on behalf of the EU) welcomed the Government's cooperation with the International Criminal Court (ICC), but noted that serious violations continued. Similarly, Switzerland and the Netherlands noted the violent situation that continued in the east of the country, which had displaced many. The UK criticised the 'catalogue of human rights abuses' in the DRC, including rape, arbitrary arrest, and poor prison conditions. The Netherlands and Belgium emphasised widespread sexual violence against women, and general impunity. In this context, Switzerland suggested a visit to the DRC by the Special Rapporteur on violence against women.

On **Zimbabwe**, a number of States criticised the violence against civilians, massive displacement, beatings, and assassinations that had occurred in recent months.<sup>32</sup> France (on behalf of the EU) and the UK urged the Government of Zimbabwe to lift restrictions that had been placed on the activities of NGOs. A number of States welcomed the recent power-sharing agreement,<sup>33</sup> and expressed hope that it would lead to the resolution of outstanding human rights issues. Switzerland called on the new Government to improve the human rights situation, including by ending arrests, arbitrary detention, torture, and extrajudicial killings. Canada suggested an enhanced role for the UN in monitoring and assisting the 'recovery' in Zimbabwe.

Several Latin American States, including Chile, on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC), spoke in solidarity with the Government of **Bolivia**, which faced a violent challenge to its authority. Chile (on behalf of GRULAC) supported an appeal by the Government of Bolivia to investigate recent killings in the Pando region, and urged OHCHR to continue to monitor the situation and provide technical support to the Government. Bolivia invited the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism

---

<sup>27</sup> The UK made a similar point.

<sup>28</sup> France (on behalf of the EU), Netherlands, Canada, UK, Belgium. The UK added that Iran executed more juvenile offenders than any other country, and that, despite Government guarantees that the practice of stoning would be halted, there were no clear guarantees that this would occur.

<sup>29</sup> Canada added that Iran continued to ignore calls made by the international community over the last five years (in Iran-specific UN General Assembly resolutions) to address its human rights situation.

<sup>30</sup> Belgium also expressed concerns about the plight of the Baha'i.

<sup>31</sup> France, on behalf of the EU, Canada.

<sup>32</sup> Canada referred to these violations as 'State-sponsored political retributions' directed at opposition forces. Ireland made a similar reference.

<sup>33</sup> France (on behalf of the EU), Japan, Canada. The Netherlands and Ireland expressed the hope that the new governing configuration would work to re-establish the rule of law.

to visit. Venezuela suggested that ‘dark foreign interests’ had promoted the recent events in Bolivia, while Cuba explicitly accused the United States of America (US) of interference.

While several States welcomed the release of some political prisoners in **Belarus**,<sup>34</sup> the UK expressed continued concern about the overall human rights situation, particularly with regards to freedom of expression and association. Canada, Poland and Lithuania expressed the hope that upcoming elections would be carried out in a free and fair manner, with the participation of independent international observers.

Other countries of concern raised under Item 4 included **Uzbekistan**,<sup>35</sup> **Eritrea**,<sup>36</sup> and **Somalia**.<sup>37</sup> Cuba raised concerns about the use of secret prisons and torture in the context of the ‘war on terror’, while the Russian Federation expressed concerns about the situation in Afghanistan and Iraq, and suggested that the Council consider re-establishing special procedures for these countries.<sup>38</sup> Pakistan asserted that the people of **Jammu and Kashmir** were being denied their fundamental right to self-determination, and called on the Council to help alleviate their suffering. Iran criticised the human rights situations in **France** and **Germany** (particularly the situation of ethnic, racial, and religious minorities, and the prevalence of Islamophobia), the **UK** (counter-terrorism legislation, and its treatment of detainees in Afghanistan and Iraq) and **Canada** (the treatment of indigenous peoples). Iran made the curious point that, in France, women were underrepresented at senior levels of their professions. It was notable that Iran made these comments as a normal Item 4 statement, while in the past similar comments were made in the form of a right of reply at the end of the debate.

The general debate did not finish and will continue on 17 September 2008.

#### Informal consultations and meetings

#### **Advisory services and technical assistance for Cambodia**

Japan hosted informal consultations on the draft resolution on ‘advisory services and technical assistance for Cambodia’, which seeks to extend by one year the special procedure on the situation of human rights in Cambodia.<sup>39</sup> Japan shared its latest draft text, which includes various comments submitted by other States. Reflecting the cautious approach taken in the negotiation of the draft, it stressed that it was developing the resolution in close consultation with the Government of Cambodia, which had ‘not yet [given] the full green light’. Japan advised that the text sought to reflect the positive efforts Cambodia had made to improve its human rights situation in the last decade, while also setting out continuing concerns about human rights violations, including violence against political and civil activists, land rights issues, and impunity.

While the UK and New Zealand noted that the text was moving in the right direction, the latter added that it could be further ‘strengthened’, perhaps by reducing the emphasis on congratulatory comments. Australia and Slovakia expressed appreciation for the explicit elaboration in the text of the role of the mandate, namely that the newly appointed Special Rapporteur would carry out the former functions of the Special Representative to the Secretary-General (the current title of the mandate holder).

---

<sup>34</sup> Canada, the United Kingdom, Poland, Lithuania.

<sup>35</sup> By the Netherlands, who expressed concerns about restrictions on the freedom of expression, while acknowledging the release of political prisoners.

<sup>36</sup> The Netherlands noted the detention of thousands of political prisoners without access to due process, violations against religious minorities, torture, and the absence of press freedom.

<sup>37</sup> Raised by the Netherlands.

<sup>38</sup> Belgium made the point that civilians in Iraq and Afghanistan continued to be affected by violence, and that both country situations were characterised by the absence of the rule of law.

<sup>39</sup> For more information and an account of the interactive dialogue on this issue, see ISHR’s *Daily Update* of 15 September 2008, available at [www.ishr.ch](http://www.ishr.ch).

Cambodia expressed concerns with some elements of the text. In particular, it argued that the reference ‘noting concerns (...) about the use of State resources in election campaigning’, and a separate reference to violence against political and civil activists, did not give due regard to improvements that had taken place on the ground. The Cambodian Ambassador stressed, for example, that the democratic process, including the conduct of transparent elections, had improved markedly in recent years.<sup>40</sup>

Japan announced that it would accept further comments on the draft resolution until 10 a.m. on Thursday 18 September 2008.

### **Human rights voluntary goals**

States expressed much interest in Brazil’s new draft resolution on human rights voluntary goals. The new text is more firmly rooted in agreed language, citing for instance the *Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action*. The most significant change was the replacement of goals relating to the progressive abolition of the death penalty and the issuance of standing invitations to special procedures with goals on the removal of unilateral coercive measures and increasing of resources allocated to development assistance. There was a clear division among States in their responses to this alteration. Developing countries largely supported the new goals,<sup>41</sup> while European and other States regretted their inclusion.<sup>42</sup>

Other concerns expressed by States included the explicit reference to the withdrawal of reservations to the core international human rights treaties as a goal,<sup>43</sup> and the allusion to the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* as a ‘deadline’ for the attainment of the goals.<sup>44</sup> There was a general agreement among States that in cases of controversy, it is best to refer to agreed language, in particular the *Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action* and Human Rights Council *Resolution 6/26*.<sup>45</sup>

Brazil promised to redraft the resolution and hold further informal consultations before the deadline for its submission (18 September 2008, noon).

### **Meeting on the human rights situation in the Sudan**

For the second time during this session, the Permanent Mission of the Sudan organised a ‘briefing’. Speakers spoke on the human rights situation in Darfur, addressing namely the situation of gender based violence and accountability in the justice system. They depicted rather positive account of the improvements in the Sudan, emphasised that the Government has undertaken steps to improve the situation, and stressed that what is now holding progress back is the lack of support from the international community. With respect to accountability and in support of the allegedly strong judicial system, the speakers drew a curious analogy between the high number of indictments in the Sudan versus the high cost, low indictment rate of the International Criminal Court and the International Criminal Tribunal of Rwanda.

---

<sup>40</sup> See also ISHR’s *Daily Update* of 15 September 2008 for the differing judgements passed on the ‘transparency’ of these elections.

<sup>41</sup> Egypt, Cuba, Bangladesh, Algeria.

<sup>42</sup> Italy (on behalf of the EU), Canada, Portugal, United States, Switzerland, Netherlands, Austria, New Zealand.

<sup>43</sup> Egypt, Singapore, South Africa, Algeria. These States argued that reservations allow for the universal ratification of such treaties.

<sup>44</sup> Singapore, South Africa.

<sup>45</sup> A/HRC/RES/6/26.

## **COUNCIL MONITOR STAFF**

**Paul Dziatkowiec**, Human Rights Officer  
**Eléonore Dziurzynski**, Communications Officer  
**Michael Ineichen**, Human Rights Officer  
**Yuri Saito**, Fellow  
**Gareth Sweeney**, Deputy Manager  
**Katrine Thomassen**, Manager International Programme

## **Contributors**

**David Björnhage**, Intern  
**Lauren Gecuk**, Intern  
**Birte Mackeprang**, Intern  
**Marita Swain**, Intern  
**Rebecca Whelan**, 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](http://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](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 © 2008 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).