



Welcome to IADL,  
International Association of Democratic Lawyers

# U.N. ACTIVITIES BULLETIN

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF DEMOCRATIC LAWYERS

In Consultative Status with ECOSOC and Represented at UNESCO and  
UNICEF

[www.iadllaw.org](http://www.iadllaw.org)

September 2013

---

**Office of IADL President**

Jeanne Mirer  
113 University Place, 8th Floor  
New York, New York 10003  
United States

**IADL Permanent Representatives to the United Nations**

Prof. Lennox Hinds, Permanent Representative New York  
Evelyn Dürmayer, Permanent Representative Vienna  
Micòl Savia, Permanent Representative Geneva

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORT ON U.N. ACTIVITIES IN NEW YORK.....	2
OTHER U.N.-RELATED ACTIVITIES.....	8
REPORT ON U.N. ACTIVITIES IN VIENNA.....	10
REPORT ON U.N. ACTIVITIES IN GENEVA.....	11
ANNEXES.....	19
UN CALENDAR.....	20

### **REPORT ON U.N. ACTIVITIES IN NEW YORK**

#### **UPDATE ON CHOLERA CASE AGAINST THE UNITED NATIONS**

IADL-member the *Bureau des Avocats Internationaux* (BAI), and its U.S.-affiliate the Institute for Justice & Democracy in Haiti (IJDH), are continuing the fight for justice for victims of cholera introduced to Haiti by reckless waste management by the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH). After the U.N. tersely rejected claims for reparations submitted by 5,000 victims of cholera as “not receivable,” BAI and IJDH have been preparing for litigation in U.S. court.

In May 2013, the claimants’ attorneys submitted a brief to the U.N. Office of Legal Affairs, challenging the legal basis for the dismissal and requesting the establishment of a standing claims commission to hear the claims independently, as required by the Status

of Forces Agreement (SOFA) signed between the U.N. and Haiti. The attorneys requested a response within 60 days.

BAI's Managing Attorney and IADL Bureau member Mario Joseph traveled to Washington D.C. to meet with members of U.S. Congress, USAID and the U.S. Department of State to discuss the cholera case as a part of a series of meetings organized by the jury of the prestigious Martin Ennals Award. Mario is a finalist for the 2013 award, which recognizes individuals who distinguish themselves in an exceptional way in the fight against the human rights violations by courageous and innovative means. The winner will be announced in a ceremony in Geneva in October.

Partners in the movement for a just U.N. response have also continued to organize and advocate at the U.N. Representative Maxine Waters (D-CA) organized a U.S. Congressional letter to the Secretary-General that questioned the U.N.’s refusal to consider the claims and called on the organization to accept responsibility.

The Haiti Advocacy Working Group (HAWG), a coalition of NGOs and faith-based groups devoted to Haiti-U.S. policy, hosted a delegation of community activists from Haiti who gave briefings and held bilateral meetings with Member States in support for a just U.N. response. On 11 June 2013, at a HAWG organized event at the U.N. Church Center, Beatrice Lindstrom, IADL Alternate Representative to the U.N. in New York and Staff Attorney at IJDH, delivered a presentation on the cholera case to NGO partners.

On 5 July 2013, the last day before the 60-day deadline, the U.N. responded to the claimants, but provided no further explanation for the refusal to receive the claims. The U.N. rejected requests to establish a standing claims commission, submit the claims to mediation, or a meeting to explore amicable solutions. The U.N. also responded to the Congressional letter, providing a dishonest account of progress made to combat cholera in Haiti.

BAI and IJDH are now preparing to represent Haitians and Haitian-Americans who have been injured by cholera in a groundbreaking lawsuit in New York court. “We now have no choice but to take the U.N. to court to stop cholera’s killing and seek justice for victims and their families,” said Brian Concannon, lead attorney at IJDH. “The cholera victims, the U.S. Congress and the taxpayers around the world who fund the U.N. all deserve better.”

## **DEFENDING THE RIGHTS OF HAITIAN LAWYERS**

In recent months, the Haitian lawyers Newton Saint-Juste and Michel Andrew,

and IADL Bureau Member and human rights defender Mario Joseph began experiencing an increase in threats and harassment once again, including an illegal attempt by a judge to arrest Michel André and a surge in death threats against Patrice Florvilus, another prominent human rights attorney in Haiti.

Previously, in response to the threats against Haitian lawyers Newton Saint-Juste and Michel André, and fellow IADL member and human rights defender Mario Joseph, IADL organized a successful petition to the Inter-American Commission for Human Rights, in the last quarter of 2013. The mobilization played a critical role in securing a subsidence in threats and improved security.

\* \* \*

## **INDIGENOUS RIGHTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

### **IDLE-NO-MORE MAKES FIRST APPEARANCE AT UNITED NATIONS; CALLS FOR WORLD-WIDE ACTION AGAINST CANADA’S EXPLOITATION OF TAR-SANDS OIL**

IADL Alternate Representative Claire Gilchrist attended a side event on 14 May 2013, sponsored by Idle-No-More, during the [Twelfth Session of the UN Permanent Forum](#) on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) in New York, 30-31 May, 2013. The UNPFII is an advisory body to the [Economic and Social Council](#) (ECOSOC), with a mandate to

discuss indigenous issues related to economic and social development, culture, the environment, education, health and human rights.

Idle-No-More is a world-wide indigenous-led mass movement which is drawing attention to the devastating impact of Canadian tar sands exploitation on people and the environment. Representatives of Idle-No-More explained that the Canadian tar sands project is currently the largest carbon-emitter on Earth and is contributing to a rise in cancer and tumors for Native people on neighboring land, as well as death and cancer of wildlife.

Idle-No-More was started by four women, including three Native women and one non-Native woman, in December 2012 at a series of teach-ins held in Saskatchewan, Canada. Since its inception, it has sparked a renewal of action to promote sovereignty and climate action all over the world.

## **IROQUOIS SIX NATIONS MARK THE 400<sup>TH</sup> ANNIVERSARY OF SOVEREIGNTY TREATY WITH NON-NATIVES**

On 10 August 2013, IADL Alternate Representative Claire Gilchrist attended the Two Row Wampum Festival in New York City, to commemorate the 400<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Two Row Wampum Treaty. The treaty, dating from 1613, defends sovereignty and promotes solidarity between the Haudenosaunee indigenous people and non-Natives. The Festival marked the conclusion of a

symbolic reenactment of the treaty formation in the form of a two-week canoe paddle on the Hudson River, ending in New York City on 9 August 2013 to participate in the United Nations International Day of the World's Indigenous Peoples. More information on the events is available at <http://honorthetworow.org/new-york-city-two-row-festival-saturday-august-10/>

The Festival was organized by the Onondaga Nation, the American Indian Community House, and the American Indian Law Alliance. Representatives of the Haudenosaunee Environmental Task Force (HEFT) also attended. HEFT is the environmental agency of the Haudenosaunee, or Iroquois, League of Six Nations, and representatives of Idle No More, a world-wide grassroots indigenous-led movement to help build sovereignty and resurgence of nationhood, to pressure government and industry to protect the environment and to build allies in order to reframe the nation to nation relationship.

In discussions with Claire, a HEFT representative explained current challenges to addressing environmental impacts of United States action on Haudenosaunee people. Power plants in local New York State municipalities re-route waterways which then deprive neighboring Native nations of water, but local municipalities do not address these concerns unless forced to do so by the United States federal environmental agency, the EPA. Although the HEFT and the EPA now have some constructive relations, pressure from United States citizens in New York could create the political will for negotiations at the local level. For more information

on the HEFT as well as on ally action, please see the following websites: [www.heft.org](http://www.heft.org); <http://www.peacecouncil.net/NOON/index.html>.

\* \* \*

## INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

### SECURITY COUNCIL HEARS REPORTS ON COMPLETION STRATEGY AND THE MICT (RESIDUAL MECHANISM)

In June, Judge Theodor Meron, President of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and of the Mechanism for the International Criminal Tribunals (MICT or Residual Mechanism), reported that appeals at the ICTY will extend beyond December 2014 and may not be completed until mid-2017.

On 1 July 2013, the Hague Branch of the MICT opened. It opened in Arusha a year earlier, in 2012. The MICT will hear appeals against ICTY judgments or sentences for ICTY cases where the Notice of Appeal is filed after 1 July 2013. It is also expected that the MICT will hear future contempt allegations, and address the enforcement of sentences, and oversee the monitoring of cases in national courts, including the recently transferred case of *Munyagashari* to Rwanda. [NOTE: The ICTR Bureau passed a resolution opposing the transfer of the *Munyagashari* case]. There are two cases currently in French courts, and one case (*Uwinkindi*) in Rwandan courts.

Meron pointed out the US's reaffirmation of its commitment of financial rewards for ICTR fugitives under its "Rewards for Justice" Program in its War Crimes office. The US representative discussed this same issue, but made no reference to the ICC as a vehicle for international justice in his remarks.

Judge Joensen, ICTR President, reported that all ICTR trials are completed, and the completion of the appeals judgment in one of the last co-defendant cases will not be until July 2015.

Joensen referred to the "dire problem" of relocation of the acquitted persons: currently there are seven (7) acquitted persons and three (3) who have completed sentences. The ICTR is working the SC Informal Working Group, chaired by Guatemala, on a relocation plan. The target date for completion of archives work is December 2014 and he stressed its aim to make the Tribunal records accessible.

The Rwandan representative repeated Rwanda's request for the archives, which has been endorsed by the East African community. He also pointed out that a) jurisprudence of Tribunal on genocide has not prevented genocide deniers; b) serious concern about lack of trust between survivors and ICTR (referring to ICTR acquittals of members of Rwandan government); c) concern about transfers to France; d) role of US in tracking of FDLR. He reminded the SC that April 2014 is the 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Genocide against Tutsis.

Minutes are available at [www.un.org](http://www.un.org) under Security Council meetings tab. The document is S/PV.6977.

## **PRESENTATION BY PRESIDENT JOENSEN OF THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIBUNAL FOR RWANDA (ICTR)**

On 12 June, at an event sponsored by the African Affairs Committee of the Bar of the City of New York, ICTR President Joensen discussed some of the contributions and criticisms of the ICTR, which has now completed its work. In July 2012, the ICTR was replaced by the Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals (MICT or Residual Mechanism). Joensen has criticized the ICTR for prosecuting only one side of the conflict in Rwanda in 1994, and has pointed out that this is an obstacle to reconciliation. While the ICTR has promoted reconciliation, it has a limited ability to influence any matters in Rwanda.

Consistent with his previous biennial reports to the Security Council on the Completion Strategy, Joensen stressed the need to identify countries willing to accept those who have been acquitted. Less than half of the acquitted persons have been re-located in Europe. The majority, however, live in "safe houses" with those persons who have completed their sentences, in Arusha, Tanzania, under the protection of the U.N. One acquitted person, Dr. Andre Ntagerura, has lived in a "safe house" since 2004! Despite repeated pleas to the Security Council, most countries are not coming forward to accept these persons.

When IADL questioned him about compensation for the acquitted person, Joensen noted that only one acquitted person was granted "nominal" compensation of \$2000 dollars for a violation of his right to counsel. There

is no rule which grants compensation at the ICTR, and there can be no legal remedy. But, his own country, Denmark, has a policy of compensated those acquitted in criminal cases.

Joensen highlighted the role of the US at the ICTR: the first draft of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence in 1993 came from the US State Department. For years now, the US has been involved through its "Rewards for Justice" program, offering rewards for ICTR fugitives.

Alternate Representatives Claire Gilchrist and Beth Lyons attended the event.

\* \* \*

## **ACCOUNTABILITY OF PRIVATE MILITARY AND SECURITY COMPANIES (PMSCs)**

The "Use Of Private Military and Security Companies by the United Nations" was the topic of an event on 31 July 2013, at U.N. Headquarters in New York, sponsored by the Working Group on the Use of Mercenaries (WG). This event was part of the WG's study on the use of PMSCS by the U.N. bodies worldwide. The WG will report outcomes of the study to the U.N. General Assembly in 2014.

The WG was established in July 2005 (U.N. Commission on Human Rights Resolution 2005/2). It focuses on the use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the



exercise of the rights of peoples to self-determination.

The WG succeeded the mandate of the U.N. Special Rapporteur on the use of mercenaries which had been in existence since 1987.

The Working Group monitors and researches mercenaries and mercenary-related activities in all their forms and manifestations, including the actions of private military and security companies (PMSCs). The Working Group also develops guidelines; conducts country visits; receives individual complaints; publishes annual reports, studies, and articles; and presents proposals to encourage the further protection of human rights.

Permanent Representative Micol Savia called the Bureau's attention to the WG in July 2012, but the meeting in New York at that time was closed.

Alternate Representative Beth Lyons attended the event on 31 July 2013.

The panelists included U.N. officials, academics, NGO representative, and experts in private security from South Africa. They addressed the urgent need of the U.N. to set standards on the use of private military and security companies (PMSCS). The use of such private contractors by the U.N. and Member States is increasing: for example, the U.S. outsources civilian police functions at all of its U.N. Missions; PMSCS play key roles in U.N. peace-keeping

operations and are multi-dimensional in their tasks (which include trainings of armies, construction of airports, training of Prosecutors in Liberia, etc.). The need for transparency, an international code of conduct, as well as accountability for wrongful acts committed by private entities while under contract with the U.N. was emphasized.

The event was webcast, and is available at <http://webtv.un.org/search/working-group-on-the-use-of-mercenaries-panel-event-use-of-private-military-and-security-companies-by-the-united-nations/>

It appears that the issue as to whether PMSCS are to be considered mercenaries is still under study and discussion. The 2011 Draft of a possible Convention on PMSCS (A/HRC/WG.10/1/2) references to prior conventions on mercenaries, but falls short of defining PMSCS as mercenaries. No doubt, this remains a contentious issue.

In 1976, IADL's Permanent Representative to the UN Lennox Hinds assisted in drafting the Luanda Convention on Mercenaries in Luanda, Angola. This Convention formed the basis for Article 47 of the 1977 Additional Protocol for the 1949 Geneva Conventions. Article 47 is defines mercenaries and clearly states that they have no right as combatants or prisoners of war.

## **UPCOMING ACTIVITIES**

The 12<sup>th</sup> Session of the Assembly of States Parties (ASP) will be held in The Hague, 20-28 November 2013. General information is available at [http://www.icc-cpi.int/en\\_menus/asp/sessions/documentation/12th-session/Pages/default.aspx](http://www.icc-cpi.int/en_menus/asp/sessions/documentation/12th-session/Pages/default.aspx) and [www.iccnw.org](http://www.iccnw.org). Future registration information will be forwarded to the Bureau.

## **OTHER U.N.-RELATED ACTIVITIES**

### **U.N. PRE-PAID LEGAL SERVICES PLAN FOR U.N. STAFF**

IADL's knowledge and expertise of the workings of the U.N. has now been expanded to benefit the U.N. staff.

In 2011, IADL Permanent Representative to the U.N. Lennox Hinds established, through his firm Stevens, Hinds and White, P.C. a pre-paid legal services plan for U.N. employees in New York. The plan covers civil and criminal matters as well as representation of individuals and classes of individuals in their litigation over terms and conditions of employment at the U.N. in New York. These disputes are litigated at the U.N. Dispute Tribunal (UNDT) in New York (which also has branches in Geneva and Nairobi) and the U.N. Appeals Tribunal. Alternate Representative Claire Gilchrist

has been the principal administrator and lawyer in the Plan. They have won victories such as the reinstatement of benefits for 28 night shift workers in the print shop of the United Nations; stopping a U.N. manager from arbitrarily terminating the contracts of 60 staff members; and obtaining a court order requiring U.N. Management to establish fair and non-discriminatory criteria for eliminating jobs in the U.N. Safety and Security Service.

\* \* \*

### **IADL AND AAJ MEMBER LUIS ROBERTO ZAMORA BOLANOS SPEAKS ON THE "RIGHT TO PEACE" IN SEATTLE, WASHINGTON, UNITED STATES.**

(Thanks to Lynne Wilson, Seattle NLG member, for this report)

Global awareness of the human right to peace expanded in late June this year when Costa Rican lawyer Roberto Zamora spoke to a large audience at Seattle University School of Law. The crowd of about 100 consisted not only of lawyers and law students but included a surprisingly large number of young peace activists. Zamora's talk was hosted by the Seattle Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, the World Peace Through Law Section of the Washington State Bar Association and El Centro de la Raza, a social justice organization that has advocated for Seattle's minority communities for over 40 years. Everyone who attended agreed that Zamora's excellent two hour presentation greatly enhanced their



appreciation of international human rights law and also provided a glimmer of hope for a more peaceful world.

Zamora's talk centered on the historical background and details of cases he has litigated before the Costa Rican Supreme Court and the Inter-American Commission of Human Rights. Preliminarily, he emphasized that the modern concept of a "right to peace" means the "accomplishment of all other human rights in the absence of fear, violence or want" rather than simply the absence of war. Although such a right permeates many United Nations' founding documents, Costa Rica is one of only a few countries with a "peace clause" in its Constitution. Article 12 of the Costa Rican Constitution arose from its history as pacifist country: In 1949, Costa Rica abolished its military (except for self-defense and police forces), permanently adopting peace as a "guiding principle of our society." It is the repeated recent violation of this clause by the Costa Rican government that has inspired Zamora to attempt to enforce the "right to peace" through litigation.

Zamora's cases include two recent ones that are awaiting decision at the IACHR: one challenges Costa Rica's participation in weapons trade under the Central American Free Trade Agreement and the other challenges his government's repeated granting permission to the U.S. military to perform "policing" duties in Costa Rica's huge maritime zone in the Pacific Ocean, including the deployment of over 12 thousand U.S. troops, 45 warships, two aircraft carriers, 180 Blackhawk helicopters, and ten military "attack" jets. Another case pending before the

Costa Rican Supreme Court challenges Costa Rica's sending of police officers for military training to the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (formerly the U.S. Army School of the Americas) in Ft. Benning, Georgia.

Zamora described in detail his precedent-setting victories in 2004, 2008 and 2010 in which the Costa Rican Supreme Court recognized the "right to peace" under both its constitution and international law. In the first of these cases (brought by Zamora in 2003 as a law student), the Court in 2004 held unconstitutional as a violation of its "promise" of "neutrality" Costa Rica's support for the U.S.'s invasion of Iraq. In the second, the Court in 2008 held unconstitutional Costa Rican President Oscar Arias' 2006 "Arms Decree" under which Costa Rica was authorized to mine uranium for the manufacture of fuel and nuclear reactors for military use. In the third, the Court in 2010 annulled a presidential "Forbidden Weapons Decree" that would have allowed local police to routinely use military weapons such as Uzis, M-16s and AK-47s. The most important of these is the "Arms Decree" case since in that case the Costa Rican Supreme Court unanimously and eloquently recognized the human right to peace as a "positive international obligation" independent of its constitution and also held that the mining of uranium "even for self-defense" violates the right to a healthy environment. Further information about Roberto Zamora's campaign for the right to peace can be found at [www.peaceasahumanright.org](http://www.peaceasahumanright.org).

\* \* \*

**REPORT ON U.N.  
ACTIVITIES IN VIENNA,  
by Evelyn Duermayer, IADL  
Permanent Representative in Vienna**

**IADL PARTICIPATES IN  
VIENNA 20+ CONFERENCE,  
25-26 JUNE 2013**

IADL Permanent Representative Evelyn Duermayer and Alternate Representative Lilian Hofmeister participated in the Vienna 20+ Conference for CSOs (civil society organizations) on the occasion of the 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the 1993 World Conference on Human Rights and its Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, issued on 25 June 1993.

In 1993, more than 7000 and as many as 10 000 persons were present in Vienna, when the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action were adopted (25 June 1993). These documents embodied the important principle that human rights are universal, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated.

Some major outcomes of this event in 1993 included the nomination of High Commissioner for Human Rights (adoption at the General Assembly December 1993) and a U.N. special rapporteur on violence against women.

Twenty years later, 140 persons from CSOs held long debates in different working groups on the achievements and blind spots of the past two decades. At times, the objectives of these discussion were not very clear. However, the Conference produced the Vienna +20 CSO Declaration (attached in the Annex). The Declaration covers the primacy of human rights; women's

human rights; extraterritorial obligations; austerity, macroeconomic policies and financial regulations; binding obligations and regulation of transnational corporations; food and nutrition; torture, cruel, and inhuman or degrading treatment of punishment; private security and military operators; human rights defenders; human rights in the post-2015 sustainable development agenda; social security; the right to an effective remedy for human rights violations; indigenous peoples.

One key note speaker was Anamarie de Nemenzo (the Philippines). She especially referred to the situation of women in her country and pointed out that the church should come to terms with women's issues, especially the accountability mechanisms and the access to justice regarding cases of rape and domestic violence. One representative of DKA Austria (Development Cooperation of the Catholic Children's Movement) insisted that the church is against abortion.

Another key note speaker was Olivier de Schutter, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food. His analysis was clear and very critical. He made four proposals : 1) international agencies should influence their governments to take human rights into account; 2) strong accountability mechanisms are needed in the reduction of inequality; 3) equality between men and women especially in the families and gender stereotypes are needed, and the gaps between trade and investments and human rights are growing since 1993; 4) a world court of human rights should be created.

One highlight was the side event with the Minister of Women's Affairs and

Citizens Services Gabriele Heinisch-Hosek. The event was full of women, some men and the atmosphere was cordial. The presentations were very general, except those of Rosa Logar and Charlotte Bunch. Both insisted on the fact that women should organize themselves and also seek men's participation.

The Vienna +20 Declaration was distributed at the Conference of Experts. The selected experts were invited by Navi Pillay, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and Michael Spindlegger, the Austrian Minister of International and Foreign Affairs as the Minister.

Invitations were limited to some experts and observers, such as IADL, which was only permitted to attend the opening and closing sessions of the Conference.

Lilian Hofmeister, the IADL Alternate Representative at the U.N. in Vienna and Austrian candidate for CEDAW participated as an Expert in the Working Group 2 on women's issues. The Working Group was chaired by Ms. Marcia Kran. Hofmeister characterized the contributions of the group as "modest," and felt that the input was limited because it was often repetitious.

\* \* \*

## **REPORT ON IADL'S U.N. ACTIVITIES IN GENEVA DURING THE 23<sup>rd</sup> SESSION OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL (27 May - 14 June, 2013)** by Micòl Savia, IADL Permanent Representative in Geneva

IADL actively participated in the 23<sup>rd</sup> session of the Human Rights Council, submitting two joint written statements (one on the US embargo against Cuba and the other one on the Israeli legal system) and making five oral interventions (on drones, Turkey, Guantanamo, right to peace and Palestine). IADL also organized a side-event on femicide and attended different other parallel meetings.

### **US embargo against Cuba**

IADL, together with the Centre Europe – Third World (CETIM) and the American Association of Jurists (AAJ), submitted a **joint written statement** demanding the immediate and unconditional lifting of the illegal embargo that continues to be imposed on Cuba by the United States, despite the condemnation of the overwhelming majority of Member States of the United Nations General Assembly. Indeed, during the 21<sup>st</sup> vote of the General Assembly in 2012, 188 of 193 States declared the necessity to lift the blockade against Cuba.

Official Cuban sources estimate the direct economic damage inflicted on Cuba by the US embargo since it began (1962) at more than 104 billion dollars. The normative content of the embargo – especially the extraterritorial nature of

its rules, which means to impose unilateral US sanctions on the international community - is a violation of the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter. The embargo is also a violation of international humanitarian rights and international human rights. It violates the principle of sovereignty of States, upheld by jurisprudence of the International Court of Justice, to freely choose their political, economic, social and cultural system. It is also an intolerable violation of the right of the Cuban people to self-determination, given that the embargo deprives them of their own means of subsistence and economic and social development. Furthermore, the embargo directly contradicts freedom of trade, navigation and movement of capital, a right that the USA claims everywhere else in the world.

The US embargo against Cuba is illegal, illegitimate and inhuman. The measures of constraint listed above constitute an undeclared act of war by the US against Cuba, the social and economic effects of which prevent the full enjoyment of the human rights of the Cuban people. They clearly aim to cause maximum suffering and to harm the physical and moral integrity of an entire population, especially the most vulnerable (amongst whom are children and old people). In this respect, they may constitute a crime against humanity.

For all these reasons, CETIM, IADL and AAJ demanded the immediate and unconditional cessation of this intolerable embargo and, given the proliferation of unilateral coercive measures in flagrant violation of international law in force, we urged the Human Rights Council to create a new

mechanism of special procedures (Special Rapporteur or Working Group) with the mandate to investigate the impact of the unilateral, coercive measures affecting the enjoyment of human rights and to propose measures, including compensation to the victims, to put an end to this kind of practice (see **annex 1**: the statement is available in English, French and Spanish).

### **No justice or remedy for Palestinian victims in the Israeli legal system**

IADL, the Palestinian Centre for Human Rights (PCHR) and the Arab Organization for Human Rights submitted a **joint written statement** analysing the difficulties and insurmountable obstacles in pursuing justice for Palestinian victims within the Israeli legal system.

Since the beginning of its occupation of the occupied Palestinian territory, Israel has committed widespread and systematic violations of international law, including grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions and crimes against humanity. However over the past few decades the possibility of achieving accountability for Israeli international law violations has decreased dramatically.

Various legislative amendments and judicial decisions have imposed legal and procedural obstacles, which preclude the possibility of effective investigations, and lead to the denial of individual victims' legitimate right to an effective remedy, as well as the loss of considerable investments of time and money.

Israel disregards its State duty, under international law, to investigate and prosecute alleged violations of international law, and to make reparations for breaching or violating international legal principles. Palestinian victims are systematically denied the right to an effective judicial remedy. This has led to the development of a culture of impunity, in which Israel is permitted to consistently violate the rule of law without repercussion. While victims of past crimes wait for justice, the lack of accountability continues to give way to future violations (see **annex 2**).

**Extra-judicial, summary or arbitrary executions: development and proliferation of Lethal Autonomous Robotics (LARs)**

IADL and CETIM made an **oral intervention** during the Interactive Dialogue with the Special Rapporteur on extra-judicial, summary or arbitrary executions. The report presented by the Special Rapporteur, Mr. Christof Heyns, focused on Lethal autonomous robotics (LARs), which are new weapon systems that can select and engage targets without any human intervention (see **annex 3**).

Currently these weapon system are used only by the US, the UK and Israel but the danger of their proliferation is easy to envisage.

IADL, recalling the 3000 victims of the US drones war in Pakistan, expressed serious concerns about the development and future proliferation of LARs which, omitting human beings in decisions about whether and when to hit a target, could doubtful respect the international

humanitarian law principles of proportionality and distinction. Moreover, because of the aversion to risking lives of human soldiers, States that use LARs may more readily deploy LARs than real human soldiers, and lower the threshold for using lethal force, thereby violating the principle of *last resort*.

As recognized by the Special Rapporteur, the use of these robots can threaten State sovereignty, creating serious international division and weakening the rule of international law. Moreover, “military technology is easily transferred into the civilian sphere” and LARs could thus be used by States to suppress all kinds of social protests and peaceful demonstrations. Finally, serious concerns arise about legal accountability. Who could be held accountable for crimes committed by these robots? The producer, the programmer? Indeed the many levels likely to be involved in decisions about deployment could result in a potential accountability gap or vacuum.

Even though the Special Rapporteur (SR) underlined all these sets of problems, the report he presented is not very good. Indeed, some parts of it look like an advertisement for “clean war”. The SR arrives to say that at least these robots will not torture or rape, unless they are programmed for that! And, the report concludes with a demand for national moratoria on these new technologies.

For these reasons, during its oral intervention, IADL thanked the Special Rapporteur for focusing on this important issue. But IADL also pointed out that he did not draw the necessary

conclusions from his study: national moratoria are not a sufficient solution; the development, production and use of LARs must be outright banned under any circumstances (see **annex 4**).

### **Turkey: freedom of peaceful assembly**

On June 4<sup>th</sup>, during the General Debate on Item 3 of the Agenda (“Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development) IADL made an **oral intervention** denouncing the harsh repression of protests in Turkey and urging the government of Turkey to immediately put an end to all forms of violence against peaceful demonstrator and to promptly investigate all allegations of abuse and to ensure accountability for those responsible for such gross violation of international human rights law and standards.

As the excessive use of force is frequently used by police to disperse protests in Turkey, IADL called upon the Special Rapporteur on freedom of peaceful assembly and of association to envisage a visit in this country as soon as possible. Finally, IADL urged the Council to condemn the disproportionate use of force against peaceful demonstrators and opponent, regardless of where it take place (see **annex 5**).

### **Guantanamo: hunger strike**

During the general debate under Item 4 (“Human rights situations that require the Council's attention”), IADL called the attention of the Council to the dire situation at Guantanamo, where more than 100 men have launched a hunger strike to protest their conditions of confinement and indefinite detention,

and at least 23 of them are being violently force-fed. Detainees who are refusing food have been stripped of all possessions, including a sleeping mat and soap, and are made to sleep on concrete floors in freezing solitary cells. Detainees have reported being subjected to sleep deprivation and being dragged around like animals. Attorney David Remes, who represents two detainees, reported “shocking” genital searches “designed to deter” detainees from meeting with their lawyers.

IADL agreed with the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, the U.N. Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, the UN Rapporteur on Torture, the U.N. Rapporteur on Human Rights and Counter-Terrorism, and the U.N. Rapporteur on Health, who issued a statement through the U.N. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, saying that the indefinite detention at Guantanamo constitutes “cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment.”

IADL also agreed with the statement’s observation that “hunger strikers should be protected from all forms of coercion, even more so when this is done through force and in some cases through physical violence . . . Nor is it acceptable to use threats of forced feeding or other types of physical or psychological coercion against individuals who have voluntarily decided to go on a hunger strike.”

IADL called upon the Human Rights Council to encourage President Obama to use the waiver provision contained in Section 1028(d) of the 2013 National Defense Authorization Act that allows transfers of detainees when it is in the national security interest of the United States and to stop blocking the release of



detainees cleared by habeas corpus proceedings (see **annex 6**).

### **Right to peace**

During the general debate that followed the presentation of the report by the President of the Working Group on Right to Peace, IADL made an **oral intervention** strongly supporting the ongoing process toward the codification of this fundamental right (on this topic, see previous U.N. reports).

Peace is the primary goal of the United Nations, the same reason of its existence. Several international declarations and resolutions recognized the human right to peace. The Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace adopted by the General Assembly in 1978 proclaimed that “every nation and every human being, regardless of race, conscience, language or sex, has the inherent right to life in peace’ and that “respect for this right is in the common interest of all humankind and an indispensable condition of advancement of all nations, large and small, in all fields”. In 1984 the General Assembly reiterated that the peoples of the world, have the “sacred right to peace” and that “the promotion of its implementation constitute a fundamental obligation of each State.”

Federico Mayor, former Director General of UNESCO, made remarkable efforts in order to codify the human right to peace. In 1997 he presented to the UNESCO General Conference the Oslo Declaration which defined peace as a human right and a duty. The draft recalled that: “Every human being, all states and other members of the international community and all peoples

have the duty to contribute to the maintenance and construction of peace” and that social justice is a key element of peace.

Currently an overwhelming majority of Member States support these ideas and principles at the Human Rights Council, even though a few countries still refuse to discuss about human right to peace.

IADL warmly thanked the tireless efforts made by different actors to shape the content of this “sacred right” and encouraged all States to constructively engage in the process of progressively negotiating a U.N. declaration on right to peace: recognition and codification of human right to peace must be a priority (see **annex 7**).

With its resolution A/HRC/23/L.21 (adopted by a vote of 30 in favour, 9 against and 8 abstentions)<sup>1</sup> the Council decided that the Working Group on Right to Peace shall hold its second session for five working days in 2014 and requested the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the Working Group to conduct informal consultations with Governments and relevant stakeholders before the second session of the Working Group and to prepare a new text, on the basis of the discussions held

---

1 Votes in favour (30): Angola, Argentina, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guatemala, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Sierra Leone, Thailand, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, and Venezuela. Against (9): Austria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Japan, Montenegro, Republic of Korea, Spain, and United States. Abstentions (8): India, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, and Switzerland.

during the first session of the Working Group and the intersessional informal consultations to be held.

On this issue IADL collaborated closely with the Spanish Society for International Human Rights Law (SSIHRL) and with the Japanese delegation, in particular with Jun Sasamoto, who was representing the Japanese Bar Association.

### **Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories**

During the General Debate which followed the presentation of the report by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Palestine, IADL expressed its deepest solidarity and support to Professor Richard Falk for the defamatory attacks he suffered in the fulfillment of his mandate and urged the Human Rights Council to defend its mandate holders from such irresponsible and dishonest accusations. Indeed, as you can see in the first page of his report, Prof. Falk has been harshly attacked by the “NGO” UN Watch and others. (See **annex 8**)

As usual, the Israeli government did not allow the Special Rapporteur to visit the occupied territories, failing once more to cooperate with international mechanisms. In its statement, IADL suggested that such a non-cooperative attitude, together with Israel's persistent violation of international law implicates the elements provided by Article 6 of the United Nation Charter.

The report by Prof. Falk underlined the well known devastating effects of Israel's prolonged occupation, the illegal blockade of Gaza and the periodic

military operations and incursions in the Occupied Palestinian Territories by the Israeli security forces. Gaza has been converted into a large open air prison and one of the more impoverished territories in the world. Optimistic U.N. projections foresee the collapse of Gaza as a viable entity by 2020. Israel's occupation shows no signs of ending and the interests and well being of the civilian population are jeopardized, perhaps irreversibly.

After 46 years, Israel continues to flout, with total impunity, international humanitarian law. IADL expressed serious concerns for the failure of High Contracting Parties to the Geneva Conventions to uphold the duty set forth in common article 1 “to respect and to ensure respect for the present Conventions in all circumstances” and denounced that the impunity granted to Israel by the international community, and in particular by some countries, starts to assume the character of complicity in war crimes.

IADL concluded by urging the international community to fully implement the recommendations of the Special Rapporteur and in particular:

- to establish a commission of inquiry into the situation of Palestinian detained or imprisoned by Israel with particular regard to the situation of children tried by military courts and the misuse of administrative detention;
- to investigate the activities of business that profit from Israel's settlements.

IADL also urged the government of Israel:

- 1) to end the occupation of Palestine;
- 2) to lift immediately the illegal blockade of the Gaza Strip in place since mid-2007, which constitutes a form of collective punishment prohibited under international humanitarian law;
- 3) to dismantle buffer zones and allow Palestinian farmer to take full advantage of their agricultural land;
- 4) to allow Palestinian people to make use of their maritime area up to 20 miles and to stop all acts of aggression against fishermen and farmers;
- 5) to assure travel permits for those needing urgent medical treatments;
- 6) to put an end to the policy of administrative detention and to ensure respect of international law and standards related to the treatment of prisoners and in particular to stop immediately the ill-treatment of children detainees that, according to UNICEF, are “widespread, systematic and institutionalized”;
- 7) to respect the terms of the ceasefire agreed after the operation “Pillar of Defense” and therefore to stop incursions and target assassinations and to allow movement of people and goods at all the border crossing (see **annex 9**).

### **IADL SIDE EVENT ON FEMICIDE**

On June 5<sup>th</sup> 2013, IADL organized a side event on “Femicide: the strategic role of NGOs in making States responsible for the implementation of due diligence obligation”. Barbara Spinelli, representing IADL, introduced and moderated the panel. The speakers were all very well known experts in the field of women rights. The attendance at the meeting was high and included representative of member States. Also our colleague Lilian Hofmeister, candidate of Austria for the CEDAW, was among the public and made an interesting intervention. Finally, it was a great success. In the annexes you will find an excellent and exhaustive report of the event prepared by Barbara Spinelli (see **annex 10**).

\* \* \*

**CORRECTION to the May 2013 Bulletin Report on Geneva: IADL issued two oral statements at the Human Rights Council in February-March 2013 on Israel’s refusal to submit to its Universal Periodic Review, and the report of the UN-mandated International Fact-Finding Mission which investigated the impact of the Israeli settlements on the human rights of the Palestinians. The oral statements were drafted and presented by Permanent Representative Micol Savia, and supported by PCHR and CETIM.**

**WATCHING U.N  
.MEETINGS ON THE WEB**

**If you are interested in a particular U.N. event, but cannot personally attend, you can watch it on WEBTV from the U.N. You can sign up at [webtv.un.org/subscribe](http://webtv.un.org/subscribe) to receive daily/nightly schedules of events to be webcast.**

The IADL *U.N. Activities Bulletin* is prepared under the direction of the Permanent Representative to the U.N. in New York, Prof. Lennox S. Hinds. This issue was edited by Beth Lyons, with assistance from Claire Gilchrist. Reports were contributed by Evelyn Durmayer, Claire Gilchrist, Beatrice Lindstrom, Beth Lyons, Micol Savia, Barbara Spinelli and Lynne Wilson. This *Bulletin* was produced on 31 August 2013.

:

**ANNEXES**

**For U.N. Activities in Vienna:** [Vienna 20 CSO Declaration FINAL-post2.pdf](#); [Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action.html](#) (1993); [v20-action-week-programme.pdf](#) (Vienna+20 Action Week, 24-28 June 2013)

**For U.N. Activities in Geneva:**

1. Joint written statement on US embargo against Cuba (in English, French and Spanish). [WS\\_embargo\\_Cuba\\_\(esp\).pdf](#); [1\) WS\\_embargo\\_Cuba\\_\(fr\).pdf](#); [WS\\_embargo\\_Cuba\\_\(eng\).pdf](#)
2. Joint written statement: “No justice or remedy for Palestinian victims in the Israeli legal system.”  
[WS\\_No\\_justice\\_or\\_remedy\\_for\\_Palestinian\\_victims\\_in\\_the\\_Israeli.pdf](#)
3. Report of the Special Rapporteur on extra-judicial, summary or arbitrary executions (Lethal autonomous robotics – LARs).  
[Report\\_on\\_LARs.pdf](#)
4. IADL oral intervention on LARs. [IADL\\_oral\\_intervention\\_on\\_LARs.pdf](#)
5. IADL oral intervention on freedom of peaceful assembly in Turkey.  
[IADL\\_oral\\_intervention\\_on\\_Turkey.pdf](#)
6. IADL oral intervention on Guantanamo.  
[IADL\\_oral\\_intervention\\_on\\_Guantanamo.doc](#)
7. IADL oral intervention on Right to Peace.  
[IADL\\_oral\\_intervention\\_on\\_Right\\_to\\_Peace.pdf](#)
8. Report of the Special Rapporteur, Prof. Richard Falk, on the situation of the human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories (Gaza)  
[Report\\_Richard\\_Falk\\_on\\_Gaza.pdf](#)
9. IADL oral intervention on the human rights situation in Palestine (Gaza)
10. Report of the side-event “Femicide: the strategic role of NGOs in making States responsables for the implementation of due diligence obligation”  
[Report\\_of\\_IADL\\_side\\_event\\_on\\_Femicide.pdf](#)

# CALENDAR OF EVENTS AT U.N. CENTRES – SEPTEMBER - DECEMBER 2013

## NEW YORK

### September 2013

New York	Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, Fall session	3 September - 13 December	
-	New York	Committee on Conferences, substantive session	3 - 9 September
-	New York	UNICEF, Executive Board, second regular session	3 - 6 September
-	New York	Executive Board of UNDP/UNFPA/UNOPS, second regular session	9 - 13 September
-	New York	UN-Women, Executive Board, second regular session***	16 - 18 September
-	New York	General Assembly, 68th session	17 September - December
-	New York	Commission on Sustainable Development, twentieth session**	20 September
-	New York	General Assembly, High-level Meeting of the General Assembly on the realization of the Millennium Development Goals and other internationally agreed development goals for persons with disabilities: "The way forward: a disability inclusive development agenda towards 2015 and beyond"	23 September
-	New York	First meeting of the High-level political forum on sustainable development under the auspices of the General Assembly	24 September
-	New York	General Assembly, High-level meeting of the General Assembly on Nuclear Disarmament	26 September
-	New York	Eighth Conference (AFC) on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (Article XIV)	27 September



## October & November 2013

- New York	General Assembly, 68th session, Fourth Committee	3 October - 14 November
- New York	General Assembly, High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development	3 - 4 October
- New York	General Assembly, 68th session, First Committee	4 October - 6 November
- New York	General Assembly, 68th session, Second Committee	7 October - 13 December
- New York	General Assembly, 68th session, Third Committee	7 October - 27 November
- New York	General Assembly, 68th session, Sixth Committee	7 October - 15 November
- New York	Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf, 33rd session****	7 October - 22 November
- New York	General Assembly, 68th session, Fifth Committee	7 October - 20 December
- New York	Follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the 2002 International Conference on Financing for Development and the 2008 Review Conference: sixth High-level Dialogue on Financing for Development	7 October
- New York	Advisory Committee on the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law, 48th session	8 October
nnNONOV		
New York	Disarmament Commission, organizational session**	4 November
- New York	Investments Committee, 219th meeting	5 November
- New York	United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities	11 November
- New York	UNU, Council, sixtieth session	21 - 22 November
- New York	Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Special Meeting in Observance of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People**	25 November
- New York	United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, second regular session**	26 November
- New York	Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals, Fifth session**	November

## December 2013

New York Ad Hoc Committee of the General Assembly for the Announcement of Voluntary Contributions to UNRWA\*\* 3 December

	New York	Independent Audit Advisory Committee, 24th session**	11 - 13 December
	New York	Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals, Sixth session**	December

## GENEVA CALENDAR

### September 2013

	Geneva	Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, tenth session	2 - 13 September
	Geneva	UNCTAD, Working Party on the Strategic Framework and the Programme Budget, 65th session (technical cooperation)	2 - 4 September
	Geneva	Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, nineteenth session	9 - 13 September
	Geneva	Human Rights Council, 24th session	9 - 27 September
	Geneva	Committee on the Rights of the Child, 64th session	16 September - 4 October
	Geneva	UNCTAD, Trade and Development Board, 60th session	16 - 27 September
	Geneva	WIPO, Assemblies of Member States	23 September - 2 October
	Geneva	Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, Working Group on Communications under the Optional Protocol to the Convention, 27th session	25 - 27 September
	Geneva	Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, 56th session	30 September - 18 October

- Geneva	United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture, Board of Trustees, 38th session	30 September - 4 October
- Geneva	Working Group on Discrimination Against Women in Law and in Practice, eighth session	30 September - 4 October
- Geneva	UNHCR, Executive Committee, 64th session	30 September - 4 October

## October 2013

- Geneva	States Parties to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, fourteenth meeting	1 October
- Geneva	Committee on the Rights of the Child, pre-sessional working group, 65 <sup>th</sup> session	7 – 11 October
- Geneva	Human Rights Committee, pre-sessional Working Group on Communications, 109 <sup>th</sup> session	7 – 11 October
- Geneva	Human Rights Council, Intergovernmental Working Group on Effective Implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, eleventh session	7 – 18 October
- Geneva	Human Rights Committee, 109 <sup>th</sup> session	14 October – 1 November
- Geneva	ILO, Governing Body and its committees, 319 <sup>th</sup> session	17 – 31 October
- Geneva	Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, pre-sessional working group, 58 <sup>th</sup> session	21 – 25 October
- Geneva	Human Rights Council, Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, seventeenth session	21 October – 1 November
- Geneva	Committee of Experts on International Cooperation in Tax Matters, ninth session	21 – 25 October
- Geneva	United Nations Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Populations, Board of Trustees, 26 <sup>th</sup> session	21 – 25 October
- Geneva	Committee against Torture, 51 <sup>st</sup> session	28 October – 22 November
- Geneva	Voluntary Fund for Technical Cooperation in the Field of Human Rights, Board of Trustees, 39 <sup>th</sup> session	28 October – 1 November
- Geneva	Human Rights Council, Working Group on Enforced and Involuntary Disappearances, 101 <sup>st</sup> session	30 October – 8 November

## November 2013

•	Geneva	Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 51st session	4 - 29 November
•	Geneva	Committee on Enforced Disappearances, fifth session	4 - 15 November
•	Geneva	UNCTAD, Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting, thirtieth session	5 - 8 November
•	Geneva	Committee against Torture, Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, 21st session	11 - 15 November
•	Geneva	High Contracting Parties to Protocol V to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects	11 - 12 November
•	Geneva	Human Rights Council, Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, 68th session	13 - 22 November
•	Geneva	High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, fifteenth annual conference	13 November
•	Geneva	States parties to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, annual meeting	14 - 15 November
•	Geneva	Human Rights Council, working group of experts on people of African descent, thirteenth session	18 - 22 November
•	Geneva	United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund on Contemporary Forms of Slavery, Board of Trustees, eighteenth session	18 - 22 November
•	Geneva	Security Council, Governing Council of the United Nations Compensation Commission established pursuant to Security Council resolution 692 (1991), 76th session	19 - 21 November
•	Geneva	Human Rights Council, Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, sixth session	25 - 29 November
•	Geneva	Subcommittee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods, 44th session	25 November - 4 December
•	Geneva	Human Rights Council, Forum on Minority Issues, sixth session	26 - 27 November

## December 2013

•	Geneva	Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights,	2 - 6
---	--------	--	-------

	pre-sessional working group, 52nd session	December
Geneva	Human Rights Council, Working Group on the use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of people to self-determination, twentieth session	2 - 6 December
Geneva	UNCTAD, Working Party on the Strategic Framework and the Programme Budget, 66th session	2 - 4 December
Geneva	States parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, thirteenth session	2 - 6 December
Geneva	Human Rights Council, Forum on Business and Human Rights	3 - 4 December
Geneva	Subcommittee of Experts on the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals, 26th session	4 - 6 December
Geneva	States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction	9 - 13 December
Geneva	Ad Hoc Committee of the General Assembly for the Announcement of Voluntary Contributions to the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	10 December

## VIENNA CALENDAR

### September 2013

Vienna	IAEA, Board of Governors	9 - 13 September
Vienna	UNCITRAL, Working Group II (Arbitration and Conciliation), 59th session	16 - 20 September
Vienna	IAEA, General Conference, 57th session	16 - 20 September
Vienna	UNCITRAL, Working Group I, Twenty-second session (Dates to be confirmed)	23 - 27 September
Vienna	IAEA, Board of Governors	23 September

### October 2013

Vienna	Preparatory Commission for the	7 - 9 October
--------	--------------------------------	---------------

	Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, Working Group A and informal/expert meetings, 44th session	
- Vienna	International Narcotics Control Board, 108th session	28 October - 15 November
- Vienna	Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, 41st session	28 - 30 October

## November 2013

- Vienna	Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime: Working Group on Trafficking in Persons, Fifth session	6 - 8 November
- Vienna	Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime: Working Group on the Smuggling of Migrants, Second session	11 - 13 November
- Vienna	UNCITRAL, Working Group III (Online Dispute Resolution), 28th session (Dates to be confirmed)	18 - 22 November
- Vienna	IAEA, Board of Governors, Technical Assistance and Cooperation Committee	25 - 27 November
- Vienna	IAEA, Board of Governors	28 - 29 November

## December 2013

- Vienna	UNCITRAL, Working Group VI (Security Interests), 24th session (Dates to be confirmed)	2 - 6 December
- Vienna	UNCITRAL, Working Group IV (Electronic Commerce), 48th session (Dates to be confirmed)	9 - 13 December
- Vienna	Panel of External Auditors of the United Nations, the Specialized Agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency, Fifty-fourth regular session	9 - 10 December
- Vienna	United Nations Board of Auditors, 43rd special session (1 meeting)	11 December
- Vienna	Joint Meetings of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, reconvened 55th session, and Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, reconvened 21st session	12 December
- Vienna	Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, reconvened 22nd session	13 December
- Vienna	Commission on Narcotic Drugs, reconvened 56th session	13 December
- Vienna	UNCITRAL, Working Group V (Insolvency Law), 44th session (Dates to be confirmed)	16 - 20 December





