

COUNCIL MONITOR

International Service for Human Rights



Human Rights Monitor Series

HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL 6TH SPECIAL SESSION 23 AND 24 JANUARY 2008

Overview	1
Statement by the High Commissioner for Human Rights.....	2
Comments by members and observers	3
On the situation.....	3
On the role of the Council, other UN bodies and the international community	5
On the outcome	6
Adoption of the draft resolution.....	7
Explanations of vote.....	8
President's closing remarks.....	8

Overview

The Human Rights Council (the Council) held its 6th special session on 23 and 24 January 2008. The session was convened at the request of the group of Arab States and the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) with the support from some other States¹ to consider and take action on human rights violations emanating from Israeli military incursions in the occupied Palestinian territory (OPT), including recent ones in occupied Gaza and the West Bank town of Nablus.

The President of the Council, Ambassador Doru Romulus Costea of Romania, opened the session by inviting Ms Louise Arbour, the High Commissioner for Human Rights (the High Commissioner) to make a statement. This was followed by comments from member States and observers, including non-governmental organisations (NGOs). After two rounds of informal consultations that had been held prior to the special session, Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC) and Syria (on behalf of the group of Arab States) tabled a draft resolution.

¹ The request was supported by the following members of the Council: Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Cuba, China, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Malaysia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, and Uruguay.

Despite the fact that the discussion during the special session were polarised, and more or less followed the same pattern as earlier debates in the Council on the situation of Palestine, the atmosphere seemed to be slightly different this time. The fact that the humanitarian situation in Gaza was indeed precarious when the session was held,² and that the draft resolution was formulated in comparatively mild terms, led to a very dim glimmer of hope that the Council could find, for once, a way out of its political impasse regarding the human rights situation. However, while some States categorically insisted that the resolution include a reference to the rockets directed at Israeli civilians by Palestinian armed groups, the sponsors of the resolution were not willing to acknowledge violations by Palestinians. *Resolution S-6/1* thus could not garner consensus.

The 6th special session again showed the Council's difficulty in dealing with human rights situations. The Council's failures are two-fold. First, other situations requiring urgent attention often do not receive it. Second, in relation to the Palestine-Israel situation itself, the politics of the Council have prevented the serious, concentrated action that is required. Again, the possibility of a strong, consensus resolution of the Council was dismissed in favour of polarised point-scoring. This does no service and offers no support to those in that region whose human rights are being routinely violated, Palestinians, Israelis, and others.

Statement by the High Commissioner for Human Rights

The High Commissioner stated that the recent flaring up of conflict in the OPT led to an escalation of human rights violations.³ She pointed out that this is the case both for those living in Israel and for Palestinians, and that the right to life is in danger for everyone in the region. She asserted that the Israeli practice of collective punishment, disproportionate use of force, and targeted killings continues, as does the Palestinian militants' practice of indiscriminate firing of mortars and rockets into Israel. She illustrated this statement by presenting the reported numbers of Israelis and Palestinians killed and injured in the last two months in Gaza, Nablus and the West Bank, of which many were civilians.

The High Commissioner particularly highlighted the critical situation in Gaza, where the closure of border crossings escalated the violence and led to shortages of food, fuel and other supplies. Using notably clear language, she 'exhort[ed] the Government of Israel to completely lift all restrictions to the free flow of desperately needed aid and essential supplies to Gaza', but stressed that aid could not compensate for the denial of basic and fundamental rights. She reiterated that the use of collective punishment is strictly prohibited under the Geneva Conventions. The High Commissioner underscored the need for accountability for breaches and violations of international humanitarian and human rights law, and for adequate reparation to victims. She urged all parties in the conflict to stop violence and to respect international legal obligations.

She called upon the international community to fulfil its responsibility to protect civilians from war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide, and ethnic cleansing. In the context of recent political initiatives in relation to the situation, she emphasised that the human rights dimension should be 'properly addressed' regardless of the development of a political settlement to the conflict. Finally she impressed upon the international community the need to respond with urgency and with appropriate measures to the desperate and worsening situation for the people of Gaza.

² On 23 January, there was a 'mass break-out' from Gaza, as Palestinians destroyed the wall separating the Gaza strip from Egypt and tens of thousands of people left the Gaza strip to buy much needed supplies in Egypt.

³ Oral statements made at the Council are available on 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). The special session was also webcast; the archive of video and audio files is available at <http://www.un.org/webcast/unhrc/index.asp>.

Comments by members and observers

The President underlined in his opening remarks that the discussion should focus only on the issue that was raised in the request for the convening of the special session.⁴ He called on all delegations to observe the speaking time (five minutes for member States and concerned countries and three minutes for observers) and approach the topic with the necessary respect. Most speakers complied with this plea and the President only interrupted and called to order one speaker.

Notably, Israel was not present at the special session. It had decided, along with the United States of America, to boycott the session.

On the situation

The debates during the special session followed the same pattern as the 1st and 3rd special session held in 2006, and the consideration of the agenda item on the human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories during the 6th regular session of the Council.⁵ All speakers expressed their deep concern about the situation in the OPT, and in particular about the humanitarian crisis in Gaza. However, the Council was broadly divided between two approaches to the situation, and consequently also to addressing it. Some States took positions between these two camps. The majority of the members of the group of Arab States, The African group and the OIC, as well as some other States focused on the violations committed by Israel against the Palestinian people. These speakers generally called on Israel to respect international humanitarian law and to end the occupation, lift the siege on Gaza and provide full humanitarian access. Slovenia, on behalf of the European Union (EU) and other States⁶ insisted on taking what they described as a more ‘balanced approach’. They also commented on the attacks by Palestinian militants on Israeli civilian targets. These speakers called on all parties to comply with human rights and international humanitarian law.

Palestine, as a concerned country, broadly described the military offensive against the Palestinian people and the siege on Gaza as war crimes⁷ and collective punishment.⁸ Some speakers emphasised the lack of accountability for the violations committed by Israel.⁹ Cuba, on behalf of the non-aligned movement (NAM), characterised the escalating military incursions as grave breaches of international law. Egypt (on behalf of the African group) condemned the most recent attacks that had resulted in a number of people killed and in widespread destruction of property and livelihood.¹⁰ It described the attacks as part of a broader campaign of illegal measures, including collective punishment through burning of farmland and continued construction of the illegal barrier in the West Bank. Other speakers also described the Israeli actions in Gaza and the closing of the border as a form of collective punishment towards the Palestinian population.¹¹

⁴ The request of the special session asked the Council ‘to consider and take action on human rights violations emanating from Israeli military incursions in the Occupied Palestinian Territory including the recent ones in occupied Gaza and West Bank town of Nablus.’

⁵ On the 1st and 3rd special sessions, see International Service for Human Rights, *Human Rights Monitor 2006* (Geneva, 2007) p. 49-52. On the 6th session of the Council, see the ISHR session overview, available at www.ishr.ch.

⁶ Canada, Australia.

⁷ International Federation of Human Rights Leagues (FIDH), Union of Arab Jurists.

⁸ Supported by Malaysia, Jordan, Bangladesh, Qatar, Sudan.

⁹ Palestine, Cuba (on behalf of the NAM), Iran, Malaysia, Sri Lanka.

¹⁰ Also mentioned by Cuba (on behalf of the NAM).

¹¹ Argentina, South Africa, Norway, Human Rights Watch.

Many other speakers also expressed concern at the closing of the borders of Gaza with Israel, and the restrictions on freedom of movement within the West Bank.¹² Slovenia (on behalf of the EU) spoke of chronic malnutrition and disease among children under five, lack of access to safe drinking water and severe poverty. Many speakers also referred to the interruption of basic supplies as a result of the closure of the border crossings to and from Gaza and their impact on the functioning of basic services such as hospitals, sewage, and water facilities.¹³ Several States compared the closure of Gaza with the creation of an enormous prison holding more than 1.5 million people.¹⁴ Jordan noted that the military measures and the stiff economic sanctions had inflicted disproportionate suffering. Norway stated that the blockade was ‘destroying life’. Slovenia (on behalf of the EU) acknowledged that the Israeli military incursions had further exacerbated the severe humanitarian crisis and called on it to reverse the current situation.¹⁵ Syria (on behalf of the Group of Arab States and the OIC) noted that if aid was not allowed into the OPT immediately, a humanitarian catastrophe would unfold. Other speakers argued that the humanitarian situation was already disastrous.¹⁶

Many speakers underlined that the main reason for the continuing violations was the Israeli occupation of the OPT.¹⁷ Egypt (on behalf of the African group) stated that the occupation was a threat to regional and international peace and security. Nigeria noted that the suffering of the Palestinian people was a result of the failure of the international community to establish a two state solution. Angola expressed the view that the current crisis was a result of the complexity of the situation in the Middle East.

Many speakers expressed their concern at the loss of lives on both sides¹⁸ and called on all parties to exercise restraint and end the violence.¹⁹ Some speakers expressed deep concern at the launching of rockets on Israeli civilian areas.²⁰ They called on the Palestinians to address this and other Israeli security concerns.²¹ The Russian Federation acknowledged that some responsibility for the deteriorating situation lies with certain groups in Gaza that have launched attacks and thus risked the aspirations of the Palestinian people. Sri Lanka stated that the right of the Palestinians to resistance did not encompass attacking civilians.

While recognising Israel’s legitimate right to self-defence when faced with Palestinian attacks, several speakers urged it to exercise utmost self-restraint and highlighted that any action taken in exercise of that right should comply with its international legal obligations.²² In Egypt’s view, the Israeli reactions to the rocket attacks were disproportionate. Egypt seemed to directly criticise those that had expressed concern about the Palestinian actions, when it added that it was unacceptable that some speakers equated the oppressor and the oppressed.²³ Algeria also expressed particular concern at this equation, stating that it was a biased and politicised position that would threaten the Council’s credibility.

¹² Slovenia (on behalf of the EU).

¹³ Cuba (on behalf of the NAM), Slovenia (on behalf of the EU). The Center on Housing Rights and Evictions expressed particular concern at lack of water purification and lack of adequate water supply.

¹⁴ Syria, on behalf of the Arab Group and the OIC, Qatar, League of Arab States.

¹⁵ Supported by Angola.

¹⁶ Egypt (on behalf of the African Group), Slovenia (on behalf of the EU), Jordan, Bangladesh.

¹⁷ Egypt, North South 21.

¹⁸ Zambia.

¹⁹ India, Brazil, Slovenia (on behalf of the EU), Switzerland, Russian Federation, Angola, Turkey, Australia, Ecuador, Norway, Chile, International Commission of Jurists, Human Rights Watch.

²⁰ Slovenia (on behalf of the EU), Canada, Switzerland, Costa Rica.

²¹ Slovenia (on behalf of the EU), Costa Rica.

²² Supported by Zambia, Canada, Angola, Norway.

²³ Supported by Sri Lanka, Algeria, Yemen.

Many speakers emphasised the need to find a peacefully negotiated *political* solution to the conflict.²⁴ Several delegations commented on the recent efforts to reinvigorate the peace process, including the Annapolis Conference and the Donor's Conference held in Paris.²⁵ Egypt (on behalf of the African group) stated that the Israeli military campaign threatened to undermine these efforts.²⁶ Costa Rica argued that the humanitarian crisis also affected the prospect for peace. Slovenia (on behalf of the EU) regretted the recent developments and emphasised the need to maintain the positive impetus generated by the re-launch of peace negotiations between the two parties.²⁷ It underlined that the goal was still to create an independent Palestinian State and that the current situation was incompatible with a just and enduring peace. Some speakers also commented on the prospect of an independent Palestinian State. Palestine itself questioned Israel's commitment to a viable, contiguous and independent State.²⁸ Syria (on behalf of the group of Arab States and the OIC) agreed, saying that the aggressions against the Palestinian people demonstrated Israel's unwillingness to end the occupation and withdraw its settlements.

On the role of the Council, other UN bodies and the international community

Many speakers expressed their gratitude for the statement by the High Commissioner.²⁹ However, Egypt (on behalf of the African group) believed that the High Commissioner carries a particular responsibility to focus on the situation in the OPT and called on her to conduct more visits to the region, report more regularly on all violations arising from the Israeli occupation, and include this information in the regular updates to the Council. In its national capacity, Egypt went further and stated that the High Commissioner's statements raised questions about whether she was fulfilling her mandate. Cuba (on behalf of the NAM) considered that the High Commissioner should assume clear responsibilities in relation to the situation, without specifying clearly what these should be. Malaysia encouraged the High Commissioner to play a more active role beyond the reporting obligations outlined in the draft resolution, geared towards ending the human rights violations.

Egypt (on behalf of the African group) called on all relevant human rights mechanisms to address the situation in the OPT. Syria (on behalf of the group of Arab States and the OIC) argued that the United Nations, and in particular the Human Rights Council³⁰ and the Security Council,³¹ should condemn Israel. It called on those bodies as well as the Secretary-General and the High Commissioner to end their silence and hold Israel accountable. Specifically, it demanded that the Council call on Israel to stop its acts of aggression and end the siege on the OPT to allow humanitarian agencies to deliver aid.³² Many others also urged the Council to intervene and put an end to the violations³³ and to the occupation.³⁴ Human Rights Watch specifically suggested that the Special Rapporteur on the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health should undertake an urgent mission to Gaza to assess the health situation.

²⁴ India, South Africa, Australia.

²⁵ Indonesia, Malaysia, Brazil, Qatar, South Africa, Turkey, Lebanon, Australia, Norway. In late November 2007, United States convened a peace conference in Annapolis, bringing together Palestinian and Israeli to reinvigorate the stalled peace process (see for example www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=4284&l=1 or http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/7126541.stm). In mid December, France hosted a 'donors conference' in Paris, where States announced their contributions to revive the Palestinian economy (see for example www.guardian.co.uk/israel/Story/0,,2228904,00.html).

²⁶ Nicaragua, Morocco.

²⁷ Supported by Australia.

²⁸ Supported by Qatar.

²⁹ Palestine, Syria (on behalf of the Arab Group and the OIC), Cuba (on behalf of the NAM), Pakistan, OIC.

³⁰ Pakistan.

³¹ Supported by Cuba (on behalf of the NAM).

³² Supported by Egypt (on behalf of the African Group), United Arab Emirates.

³³ Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Russian Federation.

³⁴ Sudan, Iran.

Slovenia (on behalf of the EU) stated that the Council was the appropriate forum to consider and take action on all human rights situations of concern. Canada and Australia also highlighted this aspect of the Council's mandate but went further in stating that the Council should examine all situations in a balanced and objective manner. They further argued that the holding of the special session represented an imbalance in itself, and Australia noted that placing blame on only one side was 'not helpful'.

Cuba (on behalf of the NAM) expressed its regret that the Secretary-General was not present for the special session, noting that he had been in Geneva earlier the same day.

Several speakers stated that the international community as a whole had been silent in response to the situation. They called on it to get more actively engaged in putting an end to the conflict³⁵ and the occupation.³⁶ Sri Lanka argued that the situation in Gaza was only made possible by the actions of the international community, which remained silent and had even become complicit in the violations. China stated that the international community must adopt effective measures. Syria (on behalf of the group of Arab States and the OIC) argued that the international community should condemn Israel in a manner proportionate to the level of its aggression. Egypt (on behalf of the African group) called on the international community to provide protection for Palestinian civilians³⁷ and the means to address the human rights violations suffered and bring those responsible to justice.³⁸ The OIC, somehow echoing the comments by the High Commissioner, stated that protection had to be provided regardless of a political solution. It did not explain which measures it envisaged in this regard. Nicaragua stated that there was a need for a true peace process open to monitoring by the international community, including the UN and in particular the Security Council.

On the outcome

Syria (on behalf of the group of Arab States and the OIC) stated that it was necessary to send a clear message to Israel as the occupying power to immediately stop criminal attacks and the cutting off of essential supplies to the Palestinian people, such as electricity, water, fuel and medical supplies.³⁹ Egypt (on behalf of the African group) argued that the Council's credibility and relevance depends on its ability to send a united and unequivocal message that it would continue to monitor the Israeli violations until they come to an end.⁴⁰ Referring to human rights situation in general, Norway stated that the Council's credibility would depend on its ability to discuss and take action on human rights situations and ensure implementation of its decisions.

Indonesia hoped for a concrete outcome that could put an end to the violations. Pakistan noted that the purpose of the draft resolution was to relieve the suffering and ensure humanitarian access. It further stated that the draft resolution called on all parties to respect international humanitarian law. Bolivia acknowledged that the holding of the special session would not resolve the underlying issues but expressed the hope that the suffering of the Palestinian people could be alleviated and that violations could be prevented from recurring. Canada was more critical and stated that the draft resolution lacked the necessary balance in addressing both Israeli violations and those committed by Palestinians. It clearly voiced its opposition to the draft, and announced that it would vote against the draft.

³⁵ Palestine, Senegal.

³⁶ Palestine, Algeria, Iran.

³⁷ Supported by Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, Yemen.

³⁸ Cuba, on behalf of the NAM, also underlined the need for the international community to hold the responsible accountable and prevent repetition of the violations.

³⁹ Egypt, Bangladesh, Qatar, Venezuela

⁴⁰ Supported by Saudi Arabia, Libya.

Several speakers recalled earlier special sessions that had also addressed the human rights situation in the OPT.⁴¹ They regretted that the outcome of these special sessions had not been implemented and reiterated that Israel has a duty to comply with the Council's decisions.⁴² Kuwait stated that the lack of implementation called into question the Council's prestige and credibility. The Sudan called on the Council to establish the necessary mechanisms to ensure implementation of its decisions. The International Commission of Jurists suggested that the special procedures were best placed to ensure follow up to Council decisions. Human Rights Watch suggested that Israel should report to the Council on the implementation of the decision at the 7th session scheduled from 3 to 28 March.

Cuba, on behalf of the NAM, expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be adopted with the broadest support possible. Several States hoped for a consensual outcome.⁴³ Norway recalled that the outcomes of the 4th and 5th special sessions had been adopted by consensus, and emphasised that it expected nothing less of the Council at this time.

Adoption of the draft resolution

A draft resolution had been submitted by Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC) and Syria (on behalf of the group of Arab States) the previous day.⁴⁴ Open-ended informal consultations had taken place on 21 and 22 January 2008 in accordance with the guidelines in the institution-building text. The draft asks Israel to immediately lift its blockade on Gaza, and urges 'all parties concerned to respect the rules of human rights law and international humanitarian law and to refrain from violence against the civilian population.' Finally, it requests the High Commissioner to report to the 7th session of the Council in March 2008 on the implementation of the resolution.

Syria introduced the text, reiterating that the group of Arab States, the OIC and the Permanent Delegation of Palestine had drafted the resolution with the fundamental objective to protect the Palestinian people, to avoid a humanitarian disaster and to put an end to violations of international humanitarian law and human rights law.⁴⁵ It claimed that all comments were taken into account with enormous flexibility in order for consensus to be reached.

However, Syria noted with regret the attempts to 'politicise' the question, as some States seemed to demand a balance between the violator and its victims. After maintaining that the text was now both balanced and logical, Syria stated that it hoped the resolution could be adopted by consensus in a spirit of cooperation, as this would give the Palestinian people a sign that its suffering are being noted by the international community.

Palestine, as a concerned State, was given the floor to make general comments on the draft resolution. It commented on Israel's boycott of the special session. It emphasised that Israel's absence should not have been voluntary, and suggested that Israel should have been expelled from all UN bodies for its inhuman and atrocious policies and practices against the Palestinian people. Palestine expressed its hope of establishing a

⁴¹ The 1st and 3rd special sessions addressed the situation in the OPT. They took place on 5-6 July 2006 and 15 November 2006 respectively. The missions established at these two special sessions were not successful, because Israel refused to grant cooperate with them.

⁴² Egypt (on behalf of the African group), Malaysia, Pakistan, Algeria, Iran, Tunisia, Yemen, Venezuela.

⁴³ Russian Federation, Qatar, Switzerland, Tunisia, Costa Rica.

⁴⁴ Draft resolutions for special sessions have to be tabled 24 hours before the start of the special session.

⁴⁵ The text of the draft resolution is available on the OHCHR extranet. The OHCHR extranet can be accessed (fill out the form on the page to receive the user name and password) at www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/form.htm.

Palestinian State by the end of 2008. It also ended with criticism of those States that had prevented the draft resolution from being adopted by consensus.

Despite calls for a consensus adoption of the text by a number of States, political reality once again dictated the outcome. The Council adopted *Resolution S-6/1* by vote, with 30 States in favour, one against and 15 abstentions.⁴⁶

Explanations of vote

Some States made an explanation of vote **before the vote**, and most of them later abstained. Slovenia (on behalf of the EU) joined the sponsors of the draft in condemning the acts of Israel, but deplored the fact that only one side's suffering is mentioned in the draft resolution. It regretted the imbalanced resolution, and in particular requested a mention of Israel's right to self-defence in the draft. Guatemala that the launching of rockets and mortars from Palestinian territories against Israel be stopped, and highlighted the need for a serious and balanced solution from the Council.

Japan called upon both Palestinians and Israelis to exercise utmost self-restraint. It said that all parties should have been included in finalising the draft. Regrettably many comments during the informal meeting prior to the session had not been taken into account. The Russian Federation explained that it would have preferred to adopt the resolution by consensus. Cameroon welcomed the efforts of the international community to bring peace to the region, but stressed that the Security Council was addressing the situation and that it was not desirable for the Human Rights Council to consider it at this time.

A number of States explained their vote **after the vote**. Ghana emphasised that the resolution was neither strong nor broad enough to alleviate the suffering. It underlined that Israel had a responsibility to protect its own population from rocket attacks, but that it was nevertheless obliged to ensure the safety of the population under occupation. Ghana also urged the Palestinian Authority to take necessary measures to end the rocket attacks. Brazil reiterated its firm belief in dialogue and a constructive approach. It deplored the unacceptable use of violence by both sides to achieve justice and peace, warning that it would not contribute to achieving a peaceful solution.

China expressed its great regret and discontent over the lack of consensus. After criticising 'certain regional groups' who have adopted a position on the Palestinian question that appears justified but is in fact irresponsible, it questioned the future credibility of the Council. Switzerland expressed its hope that the Council in the future will be able to act in the spirit of non-confrontation. It referred to the text in the resolution as 'not satisfactory' and 'not balanced,' as it did not reflect violations by all parties.

President's closing remarks

Before closing, the President of the Council shared his comments on the 6th special session, and on special sessions in general. He said that the convening of the session demonstrated that the Council can react swiftly to situations that require its attention as entrusted by both General Assembly *Resolution 60/251* and the

⁴⁶ *In favour*: Russian Federation, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Uruguay, Zambia, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Nicaragua. *Against*: Canada. *Abstention*: Guatemala, Japan, Slovenia, Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cameroon, France, Germany, Ghana, Italy, Netherlands.

Compared to the resolutions adopted at the 1st and 3rd special session, this shows a slight move towards a more consensual approach. *Resolutions S-1/1* and *S-3/1* were adopted with 29 votes to 11, with 5 abstentions and 32 votes to 8, with 6 abstentions respectively.

institution-building package. The President suggested the lessons learnt, the agreements reached and the failure to agree on some contentious issues merited serious consideration after each special session.

The President stressed that special sessions should be reserved for grave and urgent matters, and asked the Council's members to consider the need for holding a special session both before requesting and after holding a special session. He urged the members of the Council to keep in mind the victims on both sides in conflicts, and then reflected on the functioning of the Council as an institution. In what seemed to be a mild criticism of the non-consensual outcome that was just passed, President Costea expressed his confidence that the Council would continue to 'increase its maturity'. This would allow it to 'approach such situations with more wisdom in the future as it has proved it can do with many other situations'.

COUNCIL MONITOR STAFF

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

Contributors

Annika Åberg, Intern
Carol Ponte Vidal, Intern

ABOUT THE PUBLICATION

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

SUBSCRIPTION

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

COPYRIGHT AND DISTRIBUTION

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.

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.