

# UPR MONITOR

International Service for Human Rights



Human Rights Monitor Series

## UNIVERSAL PERIODIC REVIEW, 1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION ECUADOR, REVIEWED ON 7 APRIL 2008, AFTERNOON

General information on Ecuador .....	1
Information submitted to the Working Group .....	2
State report.....	2
Official UN documents.....	2
Other relevant stakeholders .....	3
Interactive dialogue .....	3
Presentation by Ecuador .....	3
Key issues .....	4
Concluding remarks.....	7
Adoption of the report [9 April, 5.30 pm] .....	7

### General information on Ecuador

#### Membership of the Human Rights Council

Ecuador is not a member of the Human Rights Council.

#### Members of the troika

Italy, Mexico, India<sup>1</sup>

#### National consultation

Ecuador held consultations with relevant stakeholders through a questionnaire, interviews, and meetings<sup>2</sup>. It held a final meeting to discuss the report with Government representatives in Cancilleria on 19 January 2008.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ecuador requested that a member of its regional group be among its troika. Regional groups selected: Asian Group, Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries, Western European and other Group. There were no objections by Ecuador or by the members of the troika to the selection. For a full summary of the selection of troikas, see

[http://www.ishr.ch/hrm/council/councilalert/council\\_update\\_7session.pdf](http://www.ishr.ch/hrm/council/councilalert/council_update_7session.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> The meetings were held in the cities of Quito and Guayaquil

## Information submitted to the Working Group

### State report<sup>3</sup>

Ecuador's State report began by outlining the core domestic human rights legal framework and providing an overview of efforts to fulfil its international human rights obligations. In the second part of the report, Ecuador provided information on institutions, policies and legislative initiatives dealing with specific matters such as the right to physical integrity, penitentiary rehabilitation, torture, access to justice, right to health, right to education, right to culture, right to labour, housing rights, right to food, rights of vulnerable groups, and collective rights. The third part of the report refers to the need for international cooperation in areas such as assistance in the present drafting of Ecuador's Constitution, the evaluation and redesign of the national plan of human rights, the development of human rights training modules in the governmental sector, and on the development of mechanisms that would facilitate civil society participation in these developments.

### Official UN documents<sup>4</sup>

The OHCHR compilation of official UN documents welcomed Ecuador's accession to several international human rights treaties, while noting that a number remained to be ratified<sup>5</sup> It acknowledged a number of legislative initiatives,<sup>6</sup> the establishment of the Office of the Ombudsmen,<sup>7</sup> the cooperation of the Government with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the open invitation extended to all special procedures of the Human Rights Council,<sup>8</sup> and a number of policy measures relating to indigenous people,<sup>9</sup> gender equality,<sup>10</sup> child rights,<sup>11</sup> and asylum-seekers.<sup>12</sup> The section on implementation of human rights obligation listed specific concerns, which included discrimination against migrant women, indigenous and Afro-Ecuadorian people,<sup>13</sup> the excessive use of police force,<sup>14</sup> torture,<sup>15</sup> domestic violence,<sup>16</sup> the prohibition of abortion,<sup>17</sup> the judicial system,<sup>18</sup> limitations to freedom of expression,<sup>19</sup> high rates of

---

<sup>3</sup> State report available at [www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/PAGES/ECSession1.aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/PAGES/ECSession1.aspx)

<sup>4</sup> A/HRC/WG.6/1/EQU/2, available at [www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/PAGES/ECSession1.aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/PAGES/ECSession1.aspx)

<sup>5</sup> Core universal human rights treaties to which Ecuador is party: International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD); International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (CCPR), and its second Optional Protocol; Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and its Optional Protocol; Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT); Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and its two Optional Protocols; International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (CRMW).

<sup>6</sup> Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR), Committee against Torture (CAT), Committee on Migrant Workers (CMW), and the Working Group on the question of the use of mercenaries.

<sup>7</sup> Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC), and CESCR.

<sup>8</sup> CAT.

<sup>9</sup> A/HRC/4/32/Add.2, para.17.

<sup>10</sup> CESCR.

<sup>11</sup> CRC.

<sup>12</sup> CMW.

<sup>13</sup> CERD, CMW, Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).

<sup>14</sup> CERD, CAT.

<sup>15</sup> CAT.

<sup>16</sup> CESCR, Human Rights Committee.

<sup>17</sup> HRC.

<sup>18</sup> Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers.

<sup>19</sup> Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression and opinion.

unemployment,<sup>20</sup> child labour,<sup>21</sup> the state of the health system,<sup>22</sup> education,<sup>23</sup> high rates of poverty amongst the indigenous population,<sup>24</sup> the impact of oil exploitation on indigenous communities,<sup>25</sup> and the situation of detained immigrants awaiting deportation.<sup>26</sup>

### Other relevant stakeholders

The OHCHR summarised the information submitted by nine civil society stakeholders.<sup>27</sup> Stakeholders reported the misuse of constitutional safeguards by judges,<sup>28</sup> the lack of human rights knowledge in the judiciary;<sup>29</sup> and the lack of commitment of the Government to properly implement the decisions and recommendations of the human rights mechanisms of the United Nations and of the Inter-American system.<sup>30</sup> It was also noted that resolutions issued by the Office of the Ombudsman are not of a binding nature.<sup>31</sup> Comisiones Ecumenicas de Derechos Humanos illustrated the persistent practices of killing and torture by law enforcement officials, the conditions and practices in detention centres, and the delays in the administration of justice. It was alleged that limits to freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly were recurrent,<sup>32</sup> and that gender equality was not yet a reality in the labour market. Finally, the negative impact of oil development, of illegal logging and of the Plan Colombia<sup>33</sup> on indigenous communities were reported.<sup>34</sup>

### Interactive dialogue<sup>35</sup>

### Presentation by Ecuador

The Minister of Justice and Human Rights, Mr Gustavo Jalkh, headed the delegation of Ecuador. He opened by stressing that the UPR was a “watershed in the development of human rights”. He ensured the Working Group of Ecuador’s commitment to international human rights mechanisms, including through the ratification of the *Convention on the Rights of Persons With Disabilities*, which led to the Convention’s entry into force.

---

<sup>20</sup> CESCR.

<sup>21</sup> CRC, CESCR.

<sup>22</sup> Special Rapporteur on the right to health.

<sup>23</sup> UNICEF, UNESCO, CERD, CESCR, CMW.

<sup>24</sup> CERD, Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous people.

<sup>25</sup> Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous people.

<sup>26</sup> Working Group on Arbitrary Detention.

<sup>27</sup> Comision Ecumenica de Derechos Humanos (CEDHU), Centre for Reproductive Rights (CRR), Comite de America Latina y el Caribe para le Defensa de los Derechos Humanos, Cultural Survival in collaboration with Harvard College Students Advocates (CS-HCS Advocates), Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC), Fundacion Regional de Asesoría en Derechos Humanos (INREDH), Observatorio Ciudadano de Servicios Públicos (OCSP), Reporters Without Borders (RWB), Society for Threatened Peoples (STP). Available at A/HRC/WG.6/1/ECU/3, available at [www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/PAGES/ECSession1.aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/PAGES/ECSession1.aspx).

<sup>28</sup> INREDH.

<sup>29</sup> CEDHU.

<sup>30</sup> INREDH.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid

<sup>32</sup> Ibid

<sup>33</sup> Plan to combat trafficking, which includes blank crop spraying of coca plants with powerful herbicides. The plan affects the Ecuadorian area bordering Columbia.

<sup>34</sup> HCS Advocates.

<sup>35</sup> Most statements made at the UPR Working Group can be found at <http://portal.ohchr.org/portal/page/portal/UPR/1session/>. Fill in the form at [www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/form.htm](http://www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/form.htm) to receive username and password. Audiovisual archives of the meetings of the Working Group ‘webcast’ are available at [www.un.org/webcast/unhrc/index.asp](http://www.un.org/webcast/unhrc/index.asp).

Moving to internal mechanisms, the Minister listed the National Development Plan, the National Human Rights Plan (currently under review), the Peace Plan for the Northern Border, and the establishment of the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights as examples of internal mechanisms designed to protect and promote human rights. He reminded the Working Group that the political situation in Ecuador over the past 10 years had to be taken into account when evaluating the human rights situation in the country,<sup>36</sup> and explained that the current Government was in the process of drafting a new Constitution on the basis of a popular referendum.

Mr Jalkh then chose to use his statement to react to questions that Ecuador had received from States through the troika. This included: the training of law enforcement officials, where he claimed that Ecuador was committed to combating impunity for all violations of the right to life; the strengthening of the independence of the judiciary; the removal of the jurisdiction of police and military courts when it comes to human rights violations committed by State officials; and a commitment to improve the situation of prisons and enable programmes of social reintegration. It recognised that overcrowding in prisons, which were built to hold 7,000 prisoners but were now holding 17,000, warranted the declaration of a ‘prison emergency’ by the Government, and that resources of up to \$90 million were now being used to build new facilities and to improve programmes of reintegration and education. The creation of a national public defence office would also help in alleviating the huge number of persons awaiting trial in Ecuador, who it was claimed constituted up to 70% of detainees in the country.

The Minister also drew attention to the State’s ‘new vision’ towards the implementation of economic, social and cultural rights, including a 38% increase in the national budget dedicated to better access to education. It also drew attention to its large number of refugees, and claimed that according to the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) its asylum practice remained one of the best in the world.

### Key issues

States were virtually unanimous in congratulating Ecuador for its **efforts in promoting and protecting human rights** and for the **national report**. However, the Russian Federation and Pakistan regretted that the report was only available in Spanish one day prior to the review. Many noted with satisfaction that the Government had carried out broad consultations with civil society in drafting the report, on which Cuba sought additional information. Chile required further information on proposals brought up in the constitutional reform debate for strengthening human rights. Ghana furthermore asked how the constitutional reform would strengthen the rights of migrants, indigenous, elderly and Afro-Ecuadorians. Many States highlighted that Ecuador has shown excellent cooperation with the United Nations mechanisms and welcomed its issuing in 2002 of standing invitations to all special procedures of the Council.<sup>37</sup> Many States also commended Ecuador for being the first country in Latin America to adopt a **national human rights plan of action**.<sup>38</sup> Tunisia, furthermore asked how the Government evaluated the implementation of the plan. Ecuador answered that the intent was to go further and establish strict parameters to measure the policies adopted.

A number of States raised their concern with the **system of detention** in the country.<sup>39</sup> Guatemala requested additional information on measures undertaken to reduce **overcrowding in prisons** and on perspectives on how to replace detention with alternative sanctions. Sweden sought further information on the time frame to

---

<sup>36</sup> Ecuador has had six presidents in the past 10 years. The national constituent is currently discussing the ‘institutional reconstitution’ of the country.

<sup>37</sup> Mexico, Peru, Azerbaijan.

<sup>38</sup> Mexico, the Russian Federation, China, Peru and Indonesia.

<sup>39</sup> Guatemala, Cuba, UK, Sweden.

implement these measures. The Netherlands commended Ecuador's 'honest and comprehensive' reporting on the difficulties faced, and requested information, also by way of a recommendation, on how Ecuador plans to implement the recommendations that may arise from the UPR in this regard. Ecuador responded that the Government was setting up seven new detention centres to deal with the lack of 10000 places. Additionally, it stated that more conclusive measures for rehabilitation and social reintegration of detainees were being developed and that the Government was undertaking a prison census, which will provide a full picture of the situation in the country. Ecuador furthermore explained that the real solution to the situation was to improve the judicial process. Therefore, a public criminal defence unit was being instituted to ensure that all persons have access to an appropriate defence.

Brazil wanted to know more about reforms and institutional progresses to improve **access to justice**. Ecuador said that a strategic plan was being developed to remove geographic, cultural and economic barriers. Twenty new criminal courts were being established to give better geographical coverage and accelerate the judicial procedure. A national public defence system was also being developed to ensure that all individuals had the right to a due process, regardless of financial means. Finally, Ecuador said that it was also seeking to establish mediation centres.

Mexico recommended that Ecuador might go further in **combating torture**. It wondered whether the Government had implemented a national programme dealing with the matter, and if the process of ratification of the Optional Protocol to the *Convention against Torture* would be completed in a near future. France acknowledged that human rights was being taught to the police, and recommended the establishment of inspection bodies in the police to identify instances of human rights violations. The Republic of Korea inquired whether torture was explicitly defined in the criminal code. Ecuador assured that the ratification of the Optional Protocol was underway and said the Government was willing to set up a national inspection mechanism to inspect police performance.

On the subject of **judicial reform**, France required further information on measures to strengthen the **independence of the judiciary**, with many other States stressing the need to guarantee *de facto* autonomy of the judiciary and enquiring if there were further plans in this regard.<sup>40</sup> Sweden stated that it wished to follow up on its question submitted to the State via the troika, which already solicited the response from Ecuador that it intended to eliminate the competence of military and police courts when it comes to human rights violations perpetrated by State officials. Sweden wanted to know which instance would decide that the action was a human rights violation and thus was eligible to be considered in a civil court. Ecuador also acknowledged the need to convert the constitutional principle of independence of the judiciary into practice and explained that the Government hopes to establish a career programme based on a meritocracy system. It stressed that the Government intended to promote the participation of civil society in the judicial selection process so as to guarantee transparency and combat corruption.

Concerning **training of the security forces**, the United Kingdom welcomed the Government's human rights training programme to prevent abusive action against detainees and the United States furthermore wanted to know what was being done to combat impunity in the security forces. Ecuador responded generally that practical and theoretical training was held in public security agencies and that there were cases of law enforcement officials held accountable by the ordinary justice system for human rights violations.

**Gender** was a crosscutting issue in the interactive dialogue. Mexico and Italy recommended that combating violence against women should be a priority and asked for further information on the legal framework and policies dealing with the matter. Indonesia requested further information on progress in advancing women's rights in the political sphere. Slovenia asked whether Ecuador was addressing the double discrimination faced by women of ethnic minorities and wanted to know how a gender perspective could be integrated into

---

<sup>40</sup> UK, USA, Italy.

migration policies. Furthermore, it asked what was being done to apply human rights principles with regard to **sexual orientation and gender identity** and wanted to know if concrete steps were established to investigate violations against sexual minorities. It recommended that such policy be pursued in accordance with the Yogyakarta Principles.<sup>41</sup>

Ecuador acknowledged that despite the official recognition of gender equality, there remained many shortcomings. It explained that the 1998 Constitution included gender equality and that a National Council for Women<sup>42</sup> was established to ensure the effectiveness of this provision. Ecuador noted that the Council for Women would need support from gender organisations in relation to the drafting of the new Constitution. Ecuador also stressed that Ecuador had signed many international agreements relating to gender equality and that an equal opportunities plan had been drafted in collaboration with civil society organizations. Ecuador assured that combating violence against women was one of the Government's priorities, and that 31 family commissions had been set up up to receive complaints. Ecuador did not respond, however, to questions raised in relation to discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation

Many States addressed the human rights of **indigenous peoples**. The Republic of Korea asked how the Government was ensuring the protection and promotion of indigenous rights. Bolivia asked what specific measures were adopted to avoid discrimination against indigenous people. Mexico requested further information on bilingual education and asked how indigenous systems of justice coexisted with the national system. Uruguay also asked how the indigenous justice system coexisted with international human rights standards. Ecuador stated that the Constitution acknowledges the multicultural and multi-ethnic composition of the country. Ecuador noted that Ecuador is party to the *International Labour Organisation's Convention No. 169*<sup>43</sup> and co-sponsored the *UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People*. Furthermore, it stated that the Ministry of Interior, the Ministry of Health and the Office of the Ombudsman had specific offices dealing with indigenous matters. Ecuador explained that much progress was made towards the recognition of the indigenous system of justice. Nevertheless it stressed that the system had to be in harmony with the Constitution and with general principles of human rights.

Brazil acknowledged that Ecuador was an important actor in the implementation of the *International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families* and asked what measures the Government was adopting to promote integration and combat discrimination against **migrants** and **refugees**. The Republic of Korea sought further information on the establishment of Ecuador's migration legal framework. Honduras also wished to know if there was any programme to support the return of nationals from abroad. Ecuador explained that the Government established policies to promote integration of those requesting residence in the country and added that small and medium size programmes were established to protect the production activities of migrant workers. It noted that refugees and exiles have equal access to citizens to health and education services. Ecuador acknowledged the potential of Ecuadorians living abroad and declared that the Government had established a voluntary return programme, as well as a micro credit programme to attract nationals abroad to return home.

Pakistan requested details on indicators relating to improvement in conditions for **Afro-Ecuadorians**. Germany also wanted to know what measures were adopted to fight social discrimination against this group. Ecuador said that a comprehensive territorial integration programme was adopted with focus on the economic development of Afro-Ecuadorians.

---

<sup>41</sup> Yogyakarta Principles on the Application of International Human Rights Law in Relation to Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity, available at <http://www.yogyakartaprinciples.org/>.

<sup>42</sup> This Council also incorporates civil society organisations.

<sup>43</sup> Convention concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries.

Mexico referred to a ‘state of emergency’ in the **health system** of the country. Ecuador stressed that policies related to health were current priorities, and that the Government established a house-by-house basic health treatment programme and a programme to eradicate malnutrition. It further explained that considerable resources were being allocated to improve infrastructure and promote generic drugs.

Cuba highlighted that **education** is still not accessible to all and asked what the time frame was to achieve universal education. Ecuador explained that a 10-year education plan was developed with broad participation and entered into action in 2005 with the aim of providing universal public basic education. Entry barriers were reduced with the elimination of financial contributions. Furthermore, Ecuador highlighted that schoolbooks were comprehensive, respected cultural diversity, and were translated into indigenous languages. Investments were also made to improve the quality of the education. There was a budgetary increase to invest in educational infrastructure, to improve teacher’s wages and to invest in training.

The UK welcomed plans to combat **child** labour and expressed its hope for their effective implementation and evaluation. Germany requested more details on measures adopted to combat child labour and sexual exploitation. Ecuador said the Government sought to increase social protection of children and to eliminate the phenomena of street children. A national protection plan was also established to identify areas in which children are subject to labour and sexual exploitation.

Mexico and Nicaragua welcomed the ratification of the *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* and Argentina requested further information on measures taken to promote the rights of this vulnerable group. Ecuador did not respond to these questions. Honduras required information on progress made in regard to the protection of the **rights of elder people**. Ecuador responded that a new system was established to provide comprehensive care services to this group.

Peru asked if Ecuador had a law on **access to information** and if so what progress was made regarding its implementation. Ecuador said there currently existed a law on transparency of information.

### Concluding remarks

In conclusion, Mr Jalkh stated that Ecuador fully supported the UPR process as an instrument that would provide equal treatment to all States and which had great potential to strengthen States’ capacity to protect and promote human rights. It thanked the work of the troika members and all the country representatives for their valuable comments. It stressed that the Government sought further assistance and looked forward to the recommendations. Ecuador reiterated its commitment to international human rights mechanisms and standards and affirmed it was in process of ratifying the conventions it had signed in the last two years. Finally, it stressed that States had the responsibility to guarantee human rights to all individuals within its territory.

### Adoption of the report [9 April, 5.30 pm]

The Working Group’s report on Ecuador was scheduled to be adopted alongside the report of Bahrain on 9 April 2008, as Bahrain’s report had been delayed from 12.30 pm as the draft had not been circulated in time for consideration.<sup>44</sup> In the report, Bahrain had chosen to accept certain recommendations from the interactive dialogue, which meant the corresponding countries that proposed the recommendations were listed in the last

---

<sup>44</sup> For a review of the adoption of the Bahrain, and the discussion that took place surrounding the modalities that the Working Group should pursue in relation to the report of Bahrain and subsequent reports, see ISHR’s review at [www.ishr.ch/hrm/upr/upr\\_1st\\_session/upr\\_001\\_bahrain.pdf](http://www.ishr.ch/hrm/upr/upr_1st_session/upr_001_bahrain.pdf)

chapter<sup>45</sup>. Ecuador, on the other hand, had decided that it could accept *all* of the recommendations,<sup>46</sup> meaning that the recommendations and corresponding countries were not listed. This led to a protracted debate about whether there was a requirement to list all recommendations and assign the respective countries to this list. The reasoning, argued Egypt, Pakistan, Algeria and others was that the report was ‘just a factual reflection’ of the discussion and that the recommendations were not the collective will of the Working Group. They therefore favoured the model used in the report on Bahrain.<sup>47</sup> Others simply stated that the individual States’ recommendations are already in the summary text of the report for all to see. Slovenia added that it was important to adhere to the institution-building text’s requirement that all recommendations which do not meet with the consent of the State are also reflected.

However, the fundamental sticking point blocking the adoption of the Working Group’s report on Ecuador came from Egypt. The draft report’s reference to sexual orientation provoked Egypt into declaring that the entire report was inadmissible and ‘illegal’ unless the issue of sexual orientation had already been mentioned in the State’s pledges, as there was no international consensus on this issue and it therefore did not fall under the basis of the review. Next, Egypt claimed, States would be making recommendations ‘on the right to parking’.

No State supported Egypt’s position. Ecuador requested that a decision on the report could not be delayed as the entire delegation would have left by the following morning, and it agreed, following the compromise proposal by Mexico, that it would be happy if the list of recommendations also listed the individual States who proposed each recommendation, so that the report could be amended and adopted *ad referendum*. Guatemala then admonished Egypt for undermining the sovereign right of the State to decide for itself what recommendations it chooses to accept, and argued that Egypt had lost sight of the fact that Ecuador’s willingness to accept *all* recommendations was the most important outcome.

Egypt then, remarkably, proposed that the text be amended so that the reference to sexual orientation be identified as a ‘voluntary pledge’ in the text, to which the President swiftly interjected that Egypt was in no position to tell Ecuador whether or not its decision was a ‘voluntary pledge’. Egypt then stated that this was not a human right and as a member of the Working Group it could not accept its inclusion. It therefore called for a vote. The President re-iterated, with notable irritation, that the State under review does not need to prove to Egypt or the Working Group whether it has made ‘pledges or commitments’ and if it decides to accept a recommendation ‘it is its sovereign right’ and ‘not relevant to any other member of the Working Group’. Ecuador also intervened to state that all recommendations in the text are areas in which the State is already working and it ‘will not accept anything that goes further than the will of Ecuador’.

Cuba then intervened to try to avoid the need for a vote by restating Mexico’s proposal above and requesting that there might be a footnote which would explain the reasoning of why such a proposal may stand, as explained by the President.<sup>48</sup> This did not suffice for Egypt. Sri Lanka, perhaps most notably, then took the floor to rebuke Egypt for the type of precedent it would set. It forewarned of the type of ‘chaos’ that would ensue if States were able to accept certain recommendations, only for the Working Group to re-open the text and challenge their sovereign decision. He told the representative of Egypt that there are ‘different strokes for different folks’ and that he should ‘lighten up’.

---

<sup>45</sup> The draft Working Group report on Bahrain can be found at <http://portal.ohchr.org/portal/page/portal/UPR/1session/>. Fill in the form at [www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/form.htm](http://www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/form.htm) to receive username and password.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>47</sup> Supported by Russia and Cuba.

<sup>48</sup> Guatemala also took the floor to fundamentally oppose any precedent of a vote, or of including explanatory footnotes, or forms of reservations in the text.

The President requested a short break to discuss the matter with the troika and Ecuador. He then reconvened the meeting to declare that the question of protection from discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation was in fact contained in chapter II(3)8 of the national report and also in Ecuador's pledges submitted to the previous President of the General Assembly. Egypt requested precise information 'so that they could see it'. If this was the case, they conceded, then they could accept the report. On this basis, finally, the report was adopted.

The floor was then given to Ecuador to present a final statement on its commitments to implement the recommendations of the UPR. Italy also spoke on behalf of the troika to thank all involved.

## **COUNCIL MONITOR STAFF**

**Paul Dziatkowiec**, Human Rights Officer  
**Eléonore Dziurzynski**, Communications Officer  
**Michael Ineichen**, Human Rights Officer  
**Vanessa Jackson**, Human Rights Officer  
**Rosa Sanz**, Fellow  
**Gareth Sweeney**, Deputy Manager  
**Yuri Saito**, Fellow  
**Katrine Thomasen**, Manager

### **Author of this report**

**Ana Carolina 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](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).