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FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAAS</td>
<td>American Association for the Advancement of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELS</td>
<td>Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESC</td>
<td>UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CICC</td>
<td>Coalition for the International Criminal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>Civil society organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCR</td>
<td>Economic, social and cultural rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSOC</td>
<td>Economic and Social Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC</td>
<td>Human Rights Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICESCR</td>
<td>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>International Criminal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and communication technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHRI</td>
<td>National Human Rights Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-governmental organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPR</td>
<td>Universal Periodic Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

HURIDOCS would like to thank all who contributed to the Conference:

- The speakers and chairs of the various panels
- The presenters at the labs / workshops
- The presenters at the marketplaces
- The convenors of the regional meetings
- The participants who contributed actively to its success
- ICVolunteers and the group of volunteers who provided support throughout the Conference
- The translators and the photographer, who were also engaged through ICVolunteers
- The members of the HURIDOCS Continuation Committee: Kofi Kumado (Chairperson), Judith Dueck, Aurora Javate de Dios, Jonathan Kuttab, James Lawson, Aida Maria Noval and Agnethe Olesen (Treasurer), for taking the initiative and developing the concepts behind the Conference as well as the programme
- The HURIDOCS Secretariat (Bert Verstappen, Daniel D’Esposito and Nejib Ghali as well as interns Michael Harris and Aja Roddy) for preparations and support
- The Conference Rapporteur: Mariette Grange
- Elodie Cantier-Aristide for her contributions to the Conference report
- The International Conference Centre of Geneva for hosting the Conference

HURIDOCS would like to thank the following donors for their support and generous contributions towards the Conference:

- Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
- Canton of Geneva
- Federal Foreign Office of Germany
- Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom
- Norwegian Ministry for Foreign Affairs
- OxfamNovib, the Netherlands
- Permanent Mission of the Netherlands in Geneva
- Open Society Institute
- Ville de Genève
I. A BIRD’S EYE VIEW

The conference provided several tools and suggestions to civil society to explore possibilities for advocacy initiatives vis-à-vis two new international mechanisms and bodies. HURIDOCs’ mission to strengthen the capacity of human rights organisations to manage and communicate human rights information provided a natural value added element in the Conference programme. Participants were invited to look at the challenges presented by the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) - set up by the United Nations (UN) Human Rights Council (HRC) - and the International Criminal Court (ICC) through the prism of new communication tools.

One hundred and fifty-three participants from over 60 countries assembled for three days in Geneva for this ambitious and visionary exercise. They listened to and interacted with two dozen leading human rights experts, United Nations and regional organisations officials, academics, scientists, communication wizards, and representatives of governments, national human rights institutions as well as national, regional and international non-governmental organisations and coalitions. The purpose was to enable the participants to explore possible use for human rights information in the UPR and ICC, become innovative, discover unique techniques and facilitate exchanges for the future. Four plenary sessions unpacked the nuts and bolts of the UPR and the ICC. This provided a platform to governments, UN and ICC officials and to representatives of civil society to share perspectives and experience with both bodies. Another two sessions analysed common communication needs and new tools to communicate information. Participants were further energized by two sets of labs and workshop sessions. These enabled them to visualize concrete applications of the workings and use of information tools including satellite imagery, video advocacy, software and packaging tools, and methodologies for management of cases and information about human rights violations, and to discover specialized websites. Networking and peer to peer exchange opportunities were also afforded through a number of market place practical presentations.

II. SETTING THE STAGE

Participants were at the outset reminded of a time, not so long ago, when different parts of the human rights movement could not even meet. Two keynote addresses then helped shape the vision beyond the seemingly insurmountable barriers of the UPR and ICC complex concepts and structures.

First, H.E. Martin Ihoghiian Uhomoibhi, Permanent Representative of Nigeria to the UN and President of the Human Rights Council, recalled that the central focus of the HRC was the promotion and protection of human rights. He described information as the lifeblood of the chief UN human rights body and the element that lubricated its work. Without it, he said, the work of its independent investigation mechanisms (the special procedures) would be severely imperilled and he added that silence or complicity in silence was the worst enemy of the HRC. He also stressed the need for the HRC to remain engaged in dialogue, to create awareness and share best practices.

The President quoted Bertrand Ramcharan’s statement that “information and communication technologies are not only means of exchanging and disseminating information, but crucial tools to improve the enjoyment of human rights”¹ and emphasized that sharing information not only empowered but also built capacity. He warned against pitfalls: Information flows can become static, or so noisy as to be ineffective

Faced with the proliferation of online platforms and digital information, he challenged participants to:

- Build synergies and effective information channels
- Present information that is actionable

• Retain freshness and integrity
• Use information and communication technology (ICT) tools to generate debate on human rights information and issues.

Finally, he applauded OpenEvsys, the new open source software developed by HURIDOCs to document information on human rights violations as a tool that can ultimately help those who seek to influence decision makers, emphasising that information channels would bring benefits to the HRC and the ICC.

Second, lawyer and judge Silvana Arbia, who had recently begun her term as Registrar of the International Criminal Court, provided a thorough account of the creation, methodology and activities of the International Criminal Court. She recalled the active role played by human rights organisations and activists in support of the creation of the Court. The link for human rights groups to engage with the ICC, she said, is to be found in the Rome Statute, which stipulates that the interpretation of the law has to be consistent with internationally recognized human rights, and must not discriminate on any grounds (such as gender, age, race, colour, language, religion or belief, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, wealth, birth or other status.)

Ms. Arbia explained that the ICC involves in its judicial proceedings a number of participants who are individual persons. The fundamental rights of the accused, suspects and witnesses have to be protected, and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) play a critical role as recipients and transmitters of information. The challenge for the Court has been to communicate on the rights of participants in the proceedings and on the court’s work to a variety of audiences. It has developed a broad outreach programme (in parts through its five field offices), using an e-court system and LiveNote broadcasts.

The Court has opened investigations in four situations: the Democratic Republic of Congo, Northern Uganda, Darfur/Sudan, and the Central African Republic. The ICC Prosecutor’s office is also analyzing other situations in three different continents, including Afghanistan, Chad, Colombia, Côte d’Ivoire, Georgia and Kenya. The most serious problem facing the ICC is cooperation as it cannot try in absentia. It is hoped that increased communication and information will permit and encourage States to cooperate. The Court exists to assist national systems and to educate national judicial authorities if necessary. Another challenge is security of witnesses, explained Ms. Arbia. Until now, only ten states have offered to protect witnesses through relocation (none in Africa). In relation to the important role of civil society (CS) she stated that:

• It is essential for groups to know the functioning of the Court
• Civil society is a very good asset as it can send information about human rights violations, inform victims about their rights and assist the Court in its outreach activities
• Lawyers and counsels do not need to come from States parties
• Cooperation of human rights actors and local and national institutions is essential to continue and support the decisions of the Court.

The Registrar added that CS involvement includes risks for actors, especially the intermediaries. The Court is analysing this and has received feedback from associations and organisations based on a questionnaire. It will make an assessment and will conclude on what action to take.

The keynote presentations illustrated a number of parallels between the UPR and the ICC:

• CS has been strongly involved in setting up, monitoring, and feeding into both processes which would be much less effective without it
• Both entities are still very new, and engaging with them is a pioneering exercise
• They offer complex avenues that civil society organisations (CSOs) have to study and understand before making the strategic choice of opting for them in their own work
III. CIVIL SOCIETY AND THE UNIVERSAL PERIODIC REVIEW

A number of panels, labs and workshops unpacked the UPR and enabled participants in the Conference to:

- Gather concrete information on the UPR process
- Decide what was applicable to their own context, and
- Understand how to strategize and to concretely prepare for the UPR.

Presentations and analyses by officials from the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), representatives of government, national, regional and international human rights NGOs, representatives of national human rights institutions, academics, researchers, human rights advocates, trainers and regional organisations provided comprehensive and multi-faceted perspectives on the UPR.

The format chosen for this report does not systematically attribute statements to speakers and panellists, but seeks to provide a reader-friendly and action oriented series of easily digestible bullet points under various headings. Presentations on UPR related themes were made (in chronological order) by Eric Tistounet (Chief of the Human Rights Council Branch and Secretary of the Human Rights Council), Bob Last (Senior Human Rights Adviser, UK Mission to the UN), Geneva, Marianne Lillebjer (Adviser International Law and Organizations Program, Amnesty International), Kim Giyoum (UN Advocacy Programme Manager, Forum Asia), Thomas Schwarz (Head of Communication and Awareness Raising Department, European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights), Julie de Rivero (Geneva Advocacy Director, Human Rights Watch), Judith Cohen (Head of Parliamentary Liaison Programme, South African Human Rights Commission), Isabelle Heyer (Representative to the United Nations, Colombian Commission of Jurists), Malak Poppovic (Executive Director, Conectas) and Adrien-Claude Zoller (Director, Geneva for Human Rights). The information presented in plenary was supplemented by labs/workshops sessions organised by Roland Chauville (President of UPR Info), Gunnar Berkemeier (Associate Human Rights Officer, OHCHR) and Fiona Blyth-Kubota (Human Rights Officer, UPR Section, OHCHR).

We refer readers to the HURIDOCs website page for the Conference, where full-text presentations have been posted.² (See also Annex I, Programme of the Conference)

1. UPR background and specificity

The Human Rights Council was created in 2006 to replace the Commission on Human Rights (which met from 1947 to 2005) to tackle some challenges including excessive politicisation, double standards, selectivity and finger pointing. Its founding document speaks about universality, impartiality and centrality of state cooperation. It meets throughout the year in Geneva, in regular sessions, as well as in special sessions.

The HRC:

- Is made up of 47 UN Member States elected for three year terms (they are not eligible for immediate re-election after serving two consecutive terms)
- Is mandated to look at civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights on the same footing and with the same emphasis
- Will review its work and functioning and report on this to the General Assembly in 2011
- Is mandated to work in close cooperation with civil society.

The Universal Periodic Review is the most innovative mechanism adopted by the HRC. Small or powerful countries are treated in equal manner.

The UPR:

- Is state-driven and based on cooperation
- Its first cycle began in 2008 and will finish in 2011

² For further information see : HURIDOCs Website for presentations made at the Conference
http://www.huridocs.org/involved/conference/presentations
• Reviews the human rights records of all 192 UN Member States once every four years
• Is based on voluntary participation (the 64 States scheduled to be considered since its creation in 2008 all participated in the review)
• Is transparent and can be a tool for increased accountability: all debates are public, and webcast so that citizens can observe what governments are doing
• Puts reviewed governments on record for making public statements on their human rights performance and reviewing governments in the spotlight on how they treat human rights in their foreign policy
• Is an opportunity to raise domestic concerns at the international level, while linking this to international obligations
• Can help changes in practice and legislation
• Is an opportunity for NGOs to meet and discuss with their governments
• Provides unique opportunity to look at the human rights record of countries that are never in the spotlight, have a low level of ratification of human rights treaties, and/or do not invite the HRC independent inquiry mechanisms (the special procedures)
• Can also be disappointing and a mockery if States under review and reviewing States only use it for public relations purposes.

2. The UPR process

• The UPR is based on three documents
  o The national report, prepared by the state under review (20 pages)
  o Information contained in the reports of independent human rights experts and groups, known as the special procedures, human rights treaty bodies, and other UN entities; (10-page compilation prepared by OHCHR)
  o Information from “other stakeholders” including non-governmental organizations and national human rights institution (10-page compilation prepared by OHCHR).

Thanks to the UPR, all OHCHR branches and teams have had to systematically work together to produce country related compilations of theirs and other UN information on a scale never achieved since it was created in 1994, following a recommendation from the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna.

All CSOs can submit information ahead of the review (as explained in OHCHR Technical Guidelines for submissions of stakeholders). NGOs in consultative status with ECOSOC can be present but cannot intervene during the review itself by the HRC UPR Working Group. They can make oral statements during the relevant HRC plenary at which UPR outcomes are adopted. NGOs can:
• Comment on the review in the UPR Working Group
• Signal key recommendations for early implementation
• Highlight gaps in the review

A group of 3 States assists the review of each state: the Troika.

3. UN Member States involvement

The UPR provides an opportunity to States to comment publicly on the human rights situation in other States and to engage with them to improve their human rights performance in a constructive and clearly structured way (providing there is political will to do so in an impartial manner).

UN Member States:
• Can involve national CSOs in consultations at three stages
  o Prior to the preparation of the national report
  o To show them the draft report
  o To discuss the UPR outcome and recommendations after the review
• Can make references to CSO consultations at the national level in their report
• Should present information on best practices and challenges in their national report
• Can speak and make recommendations on States under review
• Can formulate advance questions so that their oral statements and recommendations do not come as a surprise to States under review
• Can discuss issues in country under review through their embassies
• Can support States and NGO efforts to raise awareness on UPR
• Should not view participation in the UPR as a public relations or a shoulder-patting exercise.

4. CSOs involvement and strategies for optimizing their input

It is often difficult for States to describe their main problems. NGOs, independent national human rights institutions (NHRI), trade unions, community organisations and social movements know what key human rights problems are. Without them, the UPR would be very one-sided and have little credibility. NGOs can intervene ahead, but also in follow up of the UPR process. They are uniquely placed to anchor the UPR process at the national level.

Submitting information:
• CSOs have to submit information months prior to the Working Group session (in April for the December WG-UPR session, in September for the February session and in November for the May session
• Deadlines for submission by Stakeholders are not the same as those for the State under Review (which is 13 weeks prior to Working Group meeting). Therefore, Stakeholders can not necessarily comment on the national report
• CSOs – including those without ECOSOC status - can submit information individually (5-page limit) or jointly
• CSOs can form coalitions which give an overall view of human rights in a particular country (10-page limit) or focus on a thematic issue
• CSOs can be of great assistance for raising issues of economic, social and cultural rights (ESCR) which often remain underreported, despite the stated indivisibility and interdependence of ESCR and civil and political rights.

The HRC adopted General Guidelines for the preparation of information (UN document A/HRC/DEC/6/102) that include the following elements:
• Description of the methodology and broad consultation process followed, (which can include whether the Government involved SC in a broad consultative process)
• Background and context (for example, recommendations for ratifications, country visits by Special Rapporteurs and establishment or improvement of mandate of NHRI’s)
• Promotion and protection of human rights on the ground
• Achievements, best practices, challenges and constraints
• Key national priorities, initiatives and commitments
• Capacity building and technical assistance

Information submitted by CSOs should be:
• Specific
• Cover a maximum 4-year period
• Presenting evidence
• Recommending concrete, measurable solutions
• Advocating for time-bound and clear actionable recommendations

The role of NGOs in the UPR is not limited to submissions of information: there is a lot of scope in follow-up and awareness and also for pressurising the reviewing governments.
Tactical issues:
- CSOs should undertake broad consultation among national NGOs including local and rural groups, indigenous peoples’ associations, as well as peace, development and environmental groups.
- CSOs can also foster participation of a wide range of stakeholders at the national level including relevant government ministries (Ministry of Justice, defence, budget/finance), law enforcement agencies such as police and immigration, the judiciary (constitutional court, supreme court...) and parliamentarians.
- Submissions can be turned into stand alone advocacy and lobbying documents for use ahead of the UPR with States under review and reviewing States.
- Submissions should also be sent to NHRI, which can also participate in the UPR.
- Submissions can be used to approach diplomatic representations in CSOs own countries.
- CSOs can point to concerns for advance questions by States.
- CSOs should identify the troika members for their countries.
- CSOs can influence the report by their own state.
- NGO recommendations have more chances of being used when they are supported by treaty bodies recommendations.
- NGOs can contact their government in between the review in the UPR Working Group and the HRC plenary to encourage them to accept the Working Group recommendations.
- CSO involvement with the UPR works well when it is part of broader work on HR and foreign policy (as per the experience of the Colombian NGO Coalition).
- CSOs can develop media strategies to stimulate the coverage of the UPR national/local media and bloggers.

Follow up (also see good practices)
- CSOs are strong drivers for monitoring follow up, especially human rights NGOs that are familiar with UN proceedings.
- CSOs can compile recommendations, translate them and circulate them to media, NHRI, parliamentary committees, and, as appropriate, to lawyers and bar associations, human rights defenders, community and religious leaders, child rights organisations, women rights organisations, indigenous peoples, minorities, migrants, refugees, development and environmental NGOs, UN country team and field offices to continue partnerships at the national level for impact.
- CSOs can organise public events and capacity building events.
- CSOs can organise debriefings with different ministries.
- CSOs with experience in their own country’s UPR can facilitate peer-to-peer exchange of experience with CSOs in other countries to be reviewed or form coalitions at the regional and inter-regional levels.

About working at the national level, we realized quickly that it is not enough to come to Geneva as it was usually too late to change Governments’ positions. We also realized that without an official channel of communication with the authorities, no replies were given to our inquiries. This is why Conectas participated actively in the creation of a Brazilian Committee on Human Rights and Foreign Policy - composed of 10 NGOs, a branch of the Federal Public Attorney’s Office, parliamentarian human rights committees and the Ministry of Health - to which the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has to respond. This initiative has been set up as a best practice.”

Malak Poppovic, Executive Director, Conectas

5. Role of National Human Rights Institutions

- NHRIs can play a clear and special role in facilitating connections between the international and domestic levels and between government and civil society.
- The UPR provides an opportunity for NHRIs to raise domestic human rights concerns at an international level whilst linking these to the country’s international obligations.
- NHRIs can organise press events to raise awareness on the review of the country before a UN body.
• NHRI can play an important role in encouraging and facilitating participation by civil society in the UPR processes
• Given their unique position within the country, NHRI can engage with government around issues of government participation in the UPR, follow up to and monitoring of the implementation of the recommendations and ensure that recommendations are mainstreamed into their general work.
• A role for NHRI is to ensure that in advancing participation on the international stage, vulnerable voices at the domestic level are not further excluded and that participation advances social inclusion.

6. Good practices – achievements

UPR process:
• State representation at high level for review
• High participation of reviewing States
• Reviewing States making specific, measurable and time-bound recommendations
• Reviewed States putting a link to the UPR national report and outcome on their website
• Strong and substantive CSO involvement and submission of specific information and action-oriented recommendations
• Broader participation of CSOs as groups not in consultative status with ECOSOC can send submissions
• South-South CSO dialogue, cross regional collaborative advocacy, which is not excluding the North
• National NGO coalition forming
• International NGOs to remind and encourage NHRI to present submission
• At times, the political nature of UPR recommendations can prove more efficient than previous treaty bodies recommendations
• CSOs (NGOs, NHRI) making creative use of the UPR Webcast
• CSOs creating listserv to share information on UPR preparations
• Exercise of coalition forming can be a very good opportunity for CSOs as it enables them and other UPR stakeholders, including the UN, to capture the full gamut of human rights issues in a country
• Public viewing (on-line and off-line) of the webcast session (not only in the capital) organized, facilitated and announced by CSOs including NGOs and NHRI (Colombia and South Africa experiences)
  • One UN Country team used it at their own level
  • Can be used in training and capacity-building activities
• Examples of positive outcomes: in one instance, the UPR allowed for damaging legislation not to be adopted; in another it gave a voice to reformers where there was a debate at the national level.

“On 15 April 2008, the day South Africa appeared before the HRC, the South African Human Rights Commission took advantage of the opportunities presented by the live webcasting of the proceedings. [...] in the Cape Town office, we watched the proceedings via live webcasting projected onto a screen. This was a phenomenal experience. Most participants had never been to Geneva and the Council was something far and distant. By being privy to the web casting on a large screen, it brought the Council into the Commission boardroom. Participants sat and discussed the South African presentation pointing out where they thought the government was not being wholly accurate, lacking in sufficient detail or skirting an issue. When countries asked questions and references were made to an issue that an NGO had raised there were cheers of acknowledgement. Participants could witness first hand now their participation in the process was influencing what was happening at this high level in the UN. Many were taken aback at the formality of the process, the political posturing and the politeness of diplomatic language.”


Read out by André Titus of the Human Rights Institute of South Africa (HURISA) in Judith Cohen’s absence

---

3 See Conectas presentation on HURIDOCs website. For more information, contact conectas@conectas.org.
4 Colombian civil society formed a coalition of eight coalitions, assembling 1000 national and some international NGOs, in order to write a single CS report. They reduced their joint 70-page report to a 10-page summary for submission to the UPR and created a website to post information not included in the summary.
Follow up: For this first cycle of UPR, this part of the work still has to be developed. The HRC will not return to the review for another 4 years and CSOs need to be creative and raising awareness and monitoring UPR follow up. Examples of concrete activities already undertaken include:

- Public hearing in parliament after UPR review (Brazil)
- Use of video conferencing in different cities to discuss UPR process and state review (NHRI, South Africa)
- Letters to government having been reviewed to establish a plan for the implementation of the UPR outcome to monitor progress, and keep the HRC updated of their efforts (under HRC agenda item 6 on the UPR)
- Press conferences after the review in Geneva with international press correspondents, and at the national level
- Encouraging governments to transform UPR recommendations into voluntary commitments.

7. Problem areas

- Lack of knowledge about the UN, lack of interest, belief that it will not make a difference
- The UN and stakeholders compilations are rarely mentioned by reviewing States in their oral statements
- CSOs observe that consultations for the national report process are at time not conducted in a genuine manner by some States
- Disinformation by governmental organisations or government sponsored organisations that pretend that the situation is good and distort facts
- NGOs are at times in competition: national coalitions may find that their input was not adequately represented in the OHCHR compilation as opposed to input by international NGOs
- Regional NGOs coalitions are fundamental and need to be strengthened in some regions (especially Africa)
- CSO information has to be submitted very much ahead of government reports
- NGO summaries do not always cover all sets of rights, depending on the mandate of NGOs, or geographic areas
- For powerful or big States, OHCHR receives many submissions, but when dealing with smaller States information can be scarce or non-existent
- The UPR review is only three hours: it is necessary to communicate the nature of the process to NGOs to avoid disappointment or hasty negative judgments
- The UPR has a four year cycle, it is impossible to change the rules of the game during this cycle: an analysis of weak points and how to address them must take place ahead of 2011.
- As UPR is based on cooperation, there is a need to increase CS capacity to dialogue and cooperate with States.

“At this moment, the UPR is a joke for at least half the countries reviewed. It will work one day. It is not the case at the moment. It is not only a matter of communications or knowledge, but of political will by governments [...]”

Adrien-Claude Zoller, Director, Geneva for Human Rights

8. UPR and new communication tools

New technologies such as the live webcast of HRC proceedings, including the UPR, are reportedly changing the landscape of what happens in Geneva. Advances in communications increase the ability of citizens to assert their claims for rights and the course and direction of their lives in the pursuit of the fulfilment of dignity. This illustrates for NGOs how their information gets to the UN. Web casting and video conferencing of UPR activities provide public insight to remote UN proceedings and increases government accountability. It is the only way to
connect with individual players – those who were able to travel to Geneva, and those who remain at home - and can have a unique multiplier effect. It is not surprising that some States tried to block the UN webcast of the HRC.  

Lack of access to technology may, however, further increase exclusion. Systems are needed to take advantage of the webcast, with good computers and good connections. It could be used by universities for human rights teaching and by trainers.

9. Some lessons learned

CS engagement in the UPR process is costly and time consuming. It is hard to do it alone and calls for cooperation amongst CSOs. Coalition building and use of new information and communication technology can help with this, but financial resources are necessary too.

Civil society engagement has to be strategic, timely, targeted and sustained. CSOs have to focus their limited resources on key opportunities for impact. There is a need for capacity-building and training on the UPR, including for government officials. OHCHR could possibly do some of this through its field presences.

CSOs should not wait four years for the next UPR cycle, but be prepared months ahead of the second review of their country’s situation.

CSOs have to be strategic and decide on the most appropriate forum to take their concerns to, both nationally and at the international level.

International NGOs should intervene where CS has no possibility or capacity to intervene.

UPR is a mechanism of cooperation with States. One of the major challenges to the human rights movement for the coming decade is to continue denouncing while developing cooperation mechanisms.

10. What can HURIDOCS do?

Below is a collection of specific suggestions to HURIDOCS made during the Conference in relation to the UPR:

- It can help develop capacity to investigate, document and denounce
- It can help broaden participation and illustrate the relationship between UPR and other mechanisms
- It needs to encourage ownership by local players to foster a bottom up approach
- It can look at how to elicit submissions from countries where civil society does not usually get involved in UN processes (for instance, small Pacific Ocean island States)
- It can write guidance booklets on the information needs related to the UPR.

11. UPR Tools in a box

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)
http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/UPRMain.aspx
The OHCHR UPR page includes all UPR official information on UPR sessions, a calendar of review for the first cycle (2008-2011), background documents, basic facts about the UPR, information for NGOs and NHRIs (including Technical guidelines for the submission of stakeholders’ information and deadlines for submission), media information and direct webcast links and archived webcasts.

UPR-Info (French and English, soon to be available in Spanish)

---

5 See “Islamic and African States Fail to Block UN Webcast of Human Rights Hearings”, UN Watch, 7 April 2008: http://blog.unwatch.org/?p=148
http://www.upr-info.org/

This new civil society website entirely dedicated to the UPR, contains all the documents available on the UPR, as well as press statements by NGOs and analyses by UPR Info and other NGOs as well as detailed explanations on how to engage in the process. The site also includes a growing list of “issues analyses” on themes such as asylum-seekers and refugees, civil society at the national level, civil society’s participation in the UPR, the death penalty, detention, enforced disappearances, freedom of opinion and expression, freedom of religion and belief, freedom of the press, human rights defenders, human rights while countering terrorism, indigenous peoples, prisons and rights of the child.

Road Map for Civil Society Engagement with the UPR (Portuguese, Spanish and English)6
http://www.conectas.org/en/

The Road Map is the product of a civil society consultation initiated by Conectas (Brazil) in 2008. The objective of the Road Map is to support civil society engagement with the UPR by suggesting actions and strategies for four phases of the review from the elaboration of reports to the follow up of recommendations and preparation for the next review.

International Service for Human Rights (English)
http://www.ishr.ch/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=117&Itemid=178

The Service’s UPR Monitor provides analytical session overviews of the UPR and individual reports on the review of countries. The site offers an option to receive UPR Monitor reports by e-mail by writing to information@ishr.ch with ‘UPR Monitor’ in the subject line.

Alkarama (Arabic, English, French)

The Geneva-based NGO features a special page on the UPR (in French) with its submissions on countries in the Arab World reviewed under the UPR.

Amnesty International (English, Arabic, French, Spanish)
http://www.amnesty.org/

The site contains no specific page for the UPR but UPR information submitted for individual countries can be located by searching for relevant countries.

Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development – FORUM-ASIA (English)
http://www.forum-asia.org/

The membership-based regional human rights organisation in Asia regularly features information related to the Human Rights Council. Search for UPR.

Colombian Commission of Jurists (Spanish)
http://www.coljuristas.org/archivos/infofinalepucol.pdf

Colombian Coalition for the UPR report available in Spanish and English.

Human Rights Watch (English, Arabic, French, German, Spanish, Russian and others)
www.hrw.org

Type UPR in “search”.

HuriSearch
http://www.hurisearch.org/

This HURIDOCS Human Rights Search Engine searches over 4500 human rights websites type UPR (or equivalent term in your language) in “search”

National Human Rights Institutions Forum (English, French, Spanish)

6 At the time of writing Conectas is updating its Road Map page. For more information, contact conectas@conectas.org.

Universal Human Rights Index of United Nations Documents (English, French, Spanish)
[http://www.universalhumanrightsindex.org/](http://www.universalhumanrightsindex.org/)

This is an on-line database for searching the observations and recommendations issued by the UN human rights treaty bodies and the special procedures of the Human Rights Council. It was developed by the Institute of Public Law of the University of Bern, Switzerland, in collaboration with LexUM, the justice system technologies laboratory of the University of Montreal, Canada. The Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) is responsible for updating and further developing the Index.

**Related Media site**

Human Rights Tribune (English, French)
[http://www.humanrights-geneva.info](http://www.humanrights-geneva.info)

Set up by InfoSud Press agency in Geneva in 2006. The site specialises in human rights issues. Every year it puts on line some 2500 articles covering news and analysis of key human rights issues. The site publishes articles written by journalists and accepts contributions from diplomats, victims, experts, NGOs and humanitarian organisations.
IV. CIVIL SOCIETY AND THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

The Conference included a number of panels, labs and workshops that unpacked the ICC. Presentations and analyses by ICC staff, the NGO coalition for the ICC as well as researchers and academics enabled participants to understand the specificity, uniqueness and complexity of the ICC and to hear about the opportunities for civil society’s involvement with it. The format chosen for this report does not attribute statements to speakers and panellists, to provide a reader-friendly and action oriented series of easily digestible bullet points under various headings. Presentations on ICC related themes were made (in chronological order) by Pascal Turlan (International Cooperation Advisor, International Criminal Court), William R. Pace (Convenor of the NGO Coalition for the ICC), Ilia Utmeldize (Project Coordinator, Norwegian Centre for Human Rights) and Prof. Lyal Sunga (Senior Lecturer, Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law). The information presented in plenary was supplemented by a labs/workshops session organised by Morten Bergsmo, (Senior Researcher, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO)). Full-text presentations have been posted on the HURIDOCS Website for the Conference.

1. ICC background and specificity

The International Criminal Court (ICC), governed by the Rome Statute, is the first permanent, treaty based, international criminal court established to help end impunity for the perpetrators of the most serious crimes of concern to the international community. The Rome Statute was adopted in 1998 and came into force in 2002, several years faster than expected. As of 1 June 2008, it had been ratified by 108 countries. It consolidates existing norms and creates new ones. The drafters of the Statute recognised the link between justice and peace as well as the tensions inherent in this linkage.

The ICC is an independent international organisation, and is not part of the United Nations system. Its seat is at The Hague in the Netherlands. Although the Court’s expenses are funded primarily by States Parties, it also receives voluntary contributions from governments, international organisations, individuals, corporations and other entities. The ICC is one building block in a global criminal system and is a 21st century tool for fighting against impunity. It provides a new approach to conflict resolution and an end to impunity by applying the same body of law for all state parties, with the same standards of proof. It prosecutes only if States are unwilling or unable to do it.

The ICC in a nutshell:

- It tries persons accused of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes
- It is a court of last resort: the jurisdiction of the ICC is based on complementarity, which allows national courts the first opportunity to investigate or prosecute and on cooperation of States in its investigation and prosecution of crimes within its jurisdiction
- Proceedings before the ICC may be initiated by a State Party, the Prosecutor or the United Nations Security Council
- It does not have a political role, but a judicial one.

2. CSOs role with respect to the ICC

Civil society is uniquely structured into the NGO Coalition for the International Criminal Court (CICC) which now includes about 2,500 organizations in 150 countries working in partnership to strengthen international cooperation with the ICC. It advocates for a fair, effective and independent ICC. The Coalition played a unique and significant role in the establishment of the ICC; it has been described as one of the most successful human rights and human security initiatives ever. It is widely recognized that the Court would not have emerged in the way it did without the crucial participation of global civil society.
• International NGOs send referrals to the Court via communications to the Office of the Prosecutor
• NGOs can send information directly to the Prosecutor at any stage of the proceedings
• NGOs assist in the identification of witnesses, protection and care
• NGOs can build networks and facilitate interaction between witnesses and the Court
• NGOs play an increasing role in support of victim participation (there are now 93 victims before the ICC in the Lubanga case, which would not have been possible without Congolese civil society)
• NGOs can help gather evidence at the beginning of an investigation
• NGOs can support the Court in requests for state cooperation
• NGOs collect information on crime patterns
• NGOs can represent victims
• NGOs can run campaigns for universality, implementation, cooperation and complementarity
• NGOs make justice visible.

3. CSOs strategies

• NGOs build momentum for ratification by engaging decision-makers, the media and by working with regional organisations
• NGOs assist countries in addressing any possible constitutional and legislative obstacles to ratification, and help redraft constitutional codes and criminal procedure codes
• NGOs provide States with essential implementation tools, including manuals and model laws
• NGOs provide training on advocacy for ratification and implementation at the national level
• CS has a crucial role in promoting local capacity for accountability
• NGOs provide assistance with the ICC operational framework and give opinions and gather evidence during the proceedings
• NGOs are closely monitoring the first steps of the Court:
  o They campaign for fair and transparent elections of the best officials
  o They campaign for a constructive budget process adopted through an informed decision by the States
  o They advocate for the respect of the rights of the accused and principles of fair trial
• NGOs can have a role in support of fact-finding missions by the ICC, in this respect they should:
  o Stay abreast of situations that threaten to degenerate to the point in which crimes under international law are being committed or are likely to be committed
  o Keep aware of the various UN and / or regional intergovernmental human rights monitoring mechanisms that may be in operation with regard to these situations
  o Be prepared to contribute information through the wide range of UN and / or regional human rights monitoring mechanisms that may be active, including human rights field presences.

4. Good practices – achievements

• NGO campaigns and cooperation with like-minded governments and UN have proved essential
• 40 States have adopted implementing legislation
• The Court is fully operational:
  o It has opened 4 ongoing investigations
  o It is monitoring at least 8 other situations in 4 continents
• The ICC holds sessions on strategic thinking and bi-annual meetings with NGOs to address concerns and work on strategies.
• ICC decisions have at times prompted States to adopt new legislation (as for instance the rape and genocide jurisprudence)
• NGOs advocate for signatories of the Rome statute to maintain their commitment by granting the Court the necessary funds for its proper functioning

The ICC can and should rely on human rights fact-finding at different stages of the process. UN human rights treaty bodies expertise and reports could be relevant, as well as the HRC Special Procedures or other UN
investigative mechanisms. For instance, the findings of the UN investigation mechanisms and the HRC Darfur Group of Experts on Darfur paved the way for ICC investigations. The Group was composed of a number of special procedures (on human rights in the Sudan, extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, children and armed conflict, violence against women, human rights defenders, internally displaced persons, and torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment). The UN Security Council International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur and the HRC High Level Mission on the Human Rights Situation in Darfur also documented serious violations of human rights and provided information indicating that the State was unwilling or unable to prosecute. There have been similar processes of cooperation of UN bodies, UN-mandated experts, peace keeping operations and NGOs in other parts of the world leading to an international justice process: for the former Yugoslavia with the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and for Rwanda with the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR).

5. Problem areas

- Tension arises between the need to receive information on a confidential basis and the need to disclose information to defendants
- NGOs have at times been criticized for attempting to put themselves in the prosecutor’s role (by filing an amicus curiae before the Court)
- Due to pressure by the United States of America, there have been few ratifications in Central America and in some other parts of the world (there is a need to work closely with CSOs to overcome obstacles to ratification)
- Some issues have been raised in relation to possible hastily passed amnesties and to cooperation with the ICC.

6. The ICC and security issues

The ICC has had to adopt court mechanisms for voice and face distortion, use of pseudonyms and summaries or reduced versions of information provided by NGOs to protect victims. It also is looking for more States to agree to offer witnesses protection. While all open cases are in Africa, none of the 10 States that accept to welcome and protect witnesses through relocation are in Africa. This creates huge logistical and security problems.

7. The ICC and new communication tools

During the campaign for the creation of the ICC, NGOs and the coalition formed teams, monitored negotiations, produced reports and conducted daily briefings, including a daily internet newspaper (daily Terra Viva publication). Since the establishment of the Court, they have been a major source of accessible information about the “Rome system”, through mailing lists, publications, websites and blogs in diverse languages. They help to generate positive, balanced media coverage through press releases, briefings and media advocacy. NGOs also produce documentaries, movies and radio programmes.

“Globalisation is usually framed exclusively in terms of finance, trade and information, but clearly there has been the globalisation of human rights, democracy, justice and the rule of law in the last 100 years that is almost unbelievable. I doubt that any of these would have occurred without changes in communications. [...] information and communication technologies are at the heart of the human rights revolution of the last century.”

William R. Pace, Convenor of the NGO Coalition for the ICC (CICC)

The ICC has developed pioneering electronic tools for information and case management. The Legal Tools Programme, developed with civil society and academic partners aspires to equip users with the legal information, commentaries and software required to work effectively with international criminal law. It seeks to
serve as a complete virtual library on international criminal law and justice. The Tools comprise at present over 25,000 documents and legal commentaries.

The Case Matrix is a law-driven case management and legal information application representing a significant innovation in how to approach the investigation and prosecution of core international crimes. It can be used for work on cases as well as for training and other capacity building and knowledge transfer purposes. It can be customized for different user groups such as judges, prosecutors and investigators, defence and victims’ counsel, non-governmental organisations and States.

8. Some lessons learned

It is important to develop more precise guidelines on how to work in information gathering as the level of precision required is extremely high. The documentation and preparation of cases for the ICC is quite different from human rights monitoring. Not every NGO and CSO has capacity to do so. In transitional countries, NGOs are not always resourceful and need help to increase professionalism and increase understanding of issues.

Cooperation and developing national mechanisms for prosecuting national crimes is important. National systems are the core concern. The ultimate objective is the transformation of national systems and the ability to address crimes at the domestic level.

9. What can HURIDOCS do?

- It can help develop capacity to investigate, document and denounce
- It can adapt its tools for documenting violations for use by civil society wanting to submit information to the ICC
- It can write guidance booklets on the information needs of the ICC.

10. ICC Tools in a box

International Criminal Court (English, French)
http://www.icc-cpi.int/menus/icc/home?lan=en-GB
It contains information about the Court, its structure, situation and cases, legal texts and tools, reports on activities and outreach, and a section on victims.

The Case Matrix
(See sub-section 8 above.)

Coalition for the International Criminal Court (English, Arabic, French, Spanish)
http://www.iccnow.org/?mod=home
The Coalition was founded in 1995 by a small group of NGOs that coordinated their work to ensure the establishment of an International Criminal Court. It now includes 2,500 members in 150 countries. The site contains information about the coalition and its activities, the Court, and a range of key issues and campaigns identified by NGOs in relation to the fair, independent and effective functioning of the International Criminal Court. It contains numerous documents including audio-visual resources. Below are some specific CICC pages:

CICC page on the Role of NGOs in ICC Investigations and Prosecutions
http://iccnow.org/?mod=roleofngos
CICC page on Manuals and checklists
http://iccnow.org/?mod=browserdoc&type=17
The CICC issues a whole range of electronic and print publications and newsletters in four languages
Human Rights Council and International Criminal Court: the new challenges for human rights communications

The Coalition’s blog endeavours to help bridge the gap between populations affected by the crimes under the Court’s investigation and the ICC’s daily activities at its headquarters in The Hague.

Official website of the Rome Conference (English, French, Russian)
The site contains background information on steps leading to the Conference as well as information on the Conference proceedings including speeches and statements made in Rome.

Amnesty International ICC page (English, Arabic, French, Spanish)
http://amnesty.org/en/international-justice/issues/international-criminal-court
The page includes ten factsheets on the ratification and prosecution, ensuring justice for victims and for women, fair trial guarantees and state cooperation as well as reports on the position of the United States of America on the Court and States Parties activities.

Human Rights Watch (English, Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Russian and Spanish)
http://www.hrw.org/en/category/topic/international-justice/international-criminal-court
The page contains analyses of the Court’s functioning, as well as reports on States Parties activities and documents on relevant country situations.
In particular, see the HRW guide: The International Criminal Court: How Nongovernmental Organizations can contribute to the Prosecution of War Criminals http://www.hrw.org/legacy/backgrounder/africa/icc0904/icc0904.pdf

International Justice Movement
www.ijcentral.org
IJCentral is designed to be a resource for concerned citizens around the world who want an effective International Criminal Court. The site contains information on possible actions, a blog, and video archives in relation to the ICC and its activities.

Norwegian Centre for Human Rights
ICC Legal Tools Programme
http://www.humanrights.uio.no/programmes/icc/
http://www.icc-cpi.int/Menus/ICC/Legal+Texts+and+Tools/Legal+Tools/
In December 2005, NCHR concluded a formal Co-operation Agreement with the International Criminal Court (ICC) in which NCHR committed itself to acting as the lead agency in the maintenance and development of a unique legal information system created by the International Criminal Court known as the Legal Tools. In order to implement the agreement, the ICC Legal Tools Programme was established at NCHR in 2006.
V. COMMUNICATING HUMAN RIGHTS INFORMATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY

Participants were suddenly swept away from their familiar turf into a series of technical exposés - with very vivid visual aids - which drew an avalanche of questions and comments from the floor. This was an occasion to look at opportunities offered by technologies and see how they could be applied to everyday human rights work. The richness of this inter-disciplinary exchange was best illustrated by many mutual expressions of ignorance of each other’s area of expertise, immediately followed by a marked desire either to learn how to use new information techniques, or conversely to learn more about how to help human rights activists maximize their input. Examples of innovative use of modern technologies also came from the floor.

ICT specialists, scientists, researchers, academics, computer specialists and developers pooled together to introduce existing or developing tools, projects and products, emphasising their existing or possible links to human rights work. Presentations (in chronological order) were made by Florence Devouard (Chair Emeritus of the Wikimedia Foundation), Lars Bromley (Science and Human Rights Program, American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)), Dan Brickley (researcher, advocate and developer of Semantic Web technologies), Patrick Meier (Fellow, Harvard Humanitarian Initiative (HHI), Director for Applied Research at DigiActive and editor of iRevolution) and Sam Gregory (Program Director of WITNESS). Some plenary presentations were coupled with well-attended practical demonstrations during the labs/workshops sessions delivered by Lars Bromley and Sam Gregory.

“Eighty percent of information technology (IT) projects in the human rights field fail because of lack of internal and external communications: because IT developers and end users do not speak same language. This is like building a house: we need an architect who sees the needs and designs a response...in some ways this is what HURIDOCS does. ”

James Lawson, Head of Information Unit, Council of Europe

In view of the technicality of the presentations, this section of the report follows the sequential order listed in the Programme (See Appendix I).

1. The “wiki” phenomenon

Knowledge used to be kept in libraries, or in encyclopaedias. If one did not have access to those, one did not have information. Language could also be a barrier to the acquisition of knowledge: some language groups do not have encyclopaedias. Today, one billion persons are connected to the Web and there are 3.5 billion mobile phone users in the world. Computer programmes are getting cheaper, if not free (open source software). Freedom of speech used to be mostly about freedom of the press: it mattered to most people because it helped ensure a diversity of sources of information while most of them did not have the means to publish themselves. With the democratization of computer access, internet access, and new user-friendly, low-cost tools, this is changing fast.

A wiki:

- Is a collaborative website which can be directly edited by anyone with access to it
- Is the simplest online database
- Requires a computer and an internet connection
- Aims originally to make exchanges of ideas easier.

Free wikis can reduce the digital gap, they:

- Help create simple websites (e.g., dissemination of info)
- Allow group authoring (e.g., assignment, report)
• Can be used for data collection / documentation / archiving, project planning and management
• Provide e-learning platforms.

Wikipedia:
This is a free online encyclopaedia created in January 2001. It is available in 250+ languages but entries are not translated. Its distinct characteristic is that it is freely editable and written by thousands of volunteers. It is visited by 20 to 30% of the population in each world region and is the 6th most visited site in the world. It is operated by a charity.

Wikipedia is a platform to share learning from each other and teach each other: nobody knows everything and everybody knows something, say Wikipedia staff, illustrating Article 27.1 in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: “Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits. “ According to Wikipedia, the concept nurtures a respectful and critical mind as:
• Readers and writers are from diverse political, religious and cultural backgrounds
• Content represent all significant views fairly and without bias
• People develop skills for creation, but also work on negotiation, consensus building and conflict resolution
• Contributors have to respect other people’s copyrights
• Contributors build together the rules and values of a community
• Contributors check and cite sources.

Participants were invited by the presenter to add to the existing article on human rights, which is far from comprehensive. A show of hands demonstrated that very few of those present had read it. This was surprising for some, but not for others, who explained that accuracy is of extreme importance in human rights. One suggestion was that articles should provide basic data, but include many external links.

2. Satellite imagery and mapping for human rights

Geospatial imagery and satellites can be used for mapping. Information is assigned to a special place on the earth and is well developed in some sectors. This works very well for human rights and is complementary to other research techniques. The Science and Human Rights Program of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) which operates the project is funded by private foundations. It seeks to engage NGOs primarily and has some UN and ICC interactions. The project’s goals are to deploy satellite imagery and related technologies now, and to develop methods and concepts for future work.

Human rights use of satellite imagery can help find proofs, monitor activities related to human rights violations, and be used in advocacy work. It can and has been used in the following areas:
• Housing and infrastructure demolition and destruction
• New housing/infrastructure construction, such as in forced relocations and dam/pipeline monitoring
• Natural resource extraction
• Defoliation
• Property delineation
• Mass grave mapping
• Military deployments.

High-resolution satellites are generally commercially operated and it costs money to use them. Five are in use by AAAS, four from the United States of America and one from the Dutch Antilles. A few other potentially useful satellites are operated by France, Russia, Taiwan, and South Korea. This variety is interesting for human rights mapping. Buying images from a Russian satellite might be more effective to prove human rights violations in Russia than from a US one (in order to dismiss any accusation that reports could be partisan).

There are several advantages to using satellite imagery in a human rights context:
• International partnerships that increase distribution possibilities through bigger information networks
- Local groups provide information on what happened and where, so that more remote organizations can compile that information, determine coordinates (if needed) and acquire satellite imagery.
- Results can be converted to low-bandwidth pictures, or printed and mailed.

Three main types of projects have been conducted by AAAS:
- Concise analysis of a single location or town
- Large area surveys of many towns and their status over longer periods of time
- Active monitoring of one or more locations using frequently acquired images

There are of course limitations to using satellite imagery. In particular, costs can be excessive, in that many sites requiring new imagery can quickly cost tens of thousands of dollars. In addition, there are ethical concerns in that the satellites are owned by commercial entities, who count militaries and governments are their biggest clients. Also, satellite imagery consists of snapshots bound in time, largely since 2000, and thus imagery for identified possibilities for human rights mapping is often not available as satellites are not surveying the area at the right time, clouds can interfere, precise coordinates may be difficult to acquire, and more. Also, satellite imagery tends to be rather large digital files, and can range from 200 megabytes to 2 gigabytes. Thus, using satellite imagery requires technical capacity, and care in archiving and copying, to avoid totally wasting time and money.

Key points:
- Imagery serves to verify/enhance analysts’ understanding
- Serves to connect advocates with remote events
- Generates great interest (at present)
- GoogleEarth and other free tools provide much capability
- Budget is, unfortunately, necessary for imagery surveys, especially if using new imagery
- Some possibilities for donations
- Networks of partners can produce a lot of relevant information
- There is a great desire to help among geospatial community.

AAAS works with a network of partners in the United States of America and in Europe and is seeking projects in Russia, India, Nigeria and Mexico. UNOSAT based in Geneva, also works along these lines.

3. Crowdsourcing (generating of contents/information by a “crowd” - a group of persons)

A number of “crowdsourcing” technologies exist such as peer to peer mobile phones, Web, radio combined with mobile phones, etc. This was illustrated through the Ushahidi initiative (Swahili for “testimony”). It was started by Kenyan bloggers who set up a website with Google maps of Kenya during the post-election violence. As less than 5% of Kenyans have access to Internet, the organisers set up an SMS number so that people could text in the information. Anybody could go on line if they witnessed a human rights violation. They could communicate the information and point to the place in a city where the violation was taking place, which would become visible to everyone. This started crowdsourcing information from mobile phones to email to the web.

The experience is being extended to other countries: it will be possible to download it and set up one’s own crowdsourcing. It can also be used for environmental issues, etc. It is completely free and open source. It is possible to subscribe to alerts and make decisions about one’s own security. It has now been used in Zimbabwe and Gaza (in collaboration with Al Jazeera).

Maps generated through information received showed that citizen journalists reported on different incidents and at different times (e.g., at time of body count for the mainstream media). The Ushahidi experience is not a criticism of media, or an advocacy for citizen journalists - it is an “ecosystem” of its own.

Accuracy is always a challenge in human rights documenting. Persons may have to be contacted back for clarification. The information coming in was filtered and a “swift river” tool was developed to rank the information. This is still experimental. Issues of security and protection of sources were raised in relation to this experiment.
4. Using video for advocacy

Video for advocacy on policy changes has been used by WITNESS for 15 years. WITNESS was founded by Peter Gabriel and the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights in 1992, shortly after the Rodney King incident in Los Angeles. The objective was to replace accidental observers filming human rights violations by empowering the people who chose deliberately to be in the “wrong place at the right time”, namely the hundreds of locally-based human rights activists worldwide.

WITNESS has experience of using video in traditional advocacy settings including court rooms, legislative chambers and community settings. It has worked with many local groups on the ground in 70 countries on issues from access to education in Bulgaria, to extraordinary renditions, on internal displacement in Burma, in Congo with child soldiers, on the right to water in El Salvador, rural slave labourers in Brazil and juvenile justice in the United States of America. The key element is that advocacy comes from persons in local groups.

Four ideas in using video:

- Not just journalists can shoot video, any concerned citizen can
- Focus on audience: just 1% of videos are traditional documentaries; even if your audience is small, it is worth it if they are the right audience
- Solutions and spaces for action: videos need to present ways forward - not just dramatic, shocking or powerful images and stories; if not people will switch off, turn away or feel disempowered
- Safety, security and ethics are critical.

Video is a tool alongside other campaign elements. Using video as part of a campaign is not necessarily about reaching large numbers of people, it is about reaching the right people – seven members of a review body, 15 members of a government committee, key shareholders in a business or 100 youth organisers. It is about reaching them at the right time.

“The video advocacy starts with the objective and audience, not the issue or story.”

Sam Gregory, Program Director of WITNESS

There is growing saturation of images and stories of despair – so it is necessary to also include concrete solutions, and a clear space for action by the audience. The direct ‘asks’ of the beneficiaries of the advocacy should be communicated in the best way. Using videos for human rights work can help create global loops of accountability, as for Burma in late 2007, but the audience can go away rapidly too. People think in images as much as in text - the challenge is to this translate this fact into video.

Trends affecting human rights advocacy using video:

- Accessibility, more people have the tool – not everyone has Internet, but there are ways to share and technology is getting cheaper – and it is mobile and personal
- Participation/power of networks: mass platforms – like YouTube - are creating new spaces for expression and debate, and making networking between groups working internationally easier
- There is a growing capacity to share images and words, and to document the need for accountability: feedback and action loops jump borders (the way Burma became a focus of attention during the Saffron Revolution of 2007 is a key example). The flip side of this however is that audiences in online networks are increasingly transitory.
- Media literacy is increasing: a new generation of ‘digital natives’ approach video/moving images as everyday tools of communication.

WITNESS has developed a site for video sharing – the Hub - that incorporates some of the elements they believe are critical for some human rights videos online. It provides a safe, secure space, independent and free from government or corporate censorship.

Four other elements have been integrated into the design of the Hub:
The need for context: videos need explanation. Human rights footage can be difficult, complicated, and confusing, particularly when it shows a more subtle violation of human rights than direct violence – which makes adding context important. So space for context is built into the Hub.

Action: abuses need a path to justice. Seeing or hearing about abuses without being given a way to act, to support, and to contribute, somehow is disempowering and disheartening.

Collaboration: to generate sustained action beyond transitory relations, a sense of community and continuity, needs to be built.

Standards: users need guidance for sensitive content. Handling and watching human rights media online is a new phenomenon – no one has ever done it in this way before. It is necessary to apply human rights standards as for instance not re-victimising someone featured in a video, and dealing with informed consent of people being filmed. Further, it is necessary that individuals concerned understand why the video is being taken, how it’s going to be used, and what the potential repercussions might be.

To sum up, people are going to film whether we like it or not. This is a challenge and it is necessary to see how to take advantage of this, to reflect on how to link and aggregate information online and on how to connect video material to targeted offline action.

5. Semantic web technologies

The web is 20 years old. It was developed out of a proposal by Tim Berners-Lee who was working at CERN (the European Organization for Nuclear Research), near Geneva. It was first proposed as an abstraction to make some sense of chaos. An illustration of the web potential is the way HURIDOCS, through HURISEARCH, indexes 4.500 human rights related websites. Over the years a web standards community has been built.

For instance, systems exist for organising information such as Simple Knowledge Organisation System (SKOS) for sharing of thesaurus-like information. Libraries have thesaurus systems dating back a hundred years, which are embedded in social practice in the way researchers think about their field. Web page formats connect those concepts for users. Every concept in the thesaurus has a web page. This is a type of representation similar to Wikipedia. Work has had to be done on technologies to make all of this more explicit to machines and to avoid duplication.

On the Web, one needs to be very precise. This is particularly painful if you get it wrong in the human rights context. The Food and Agriculture Organization wanted to describe geo political entities while describing countries and connections to territorial entities and it created programmes for this. Tools are being developed, such as Yahoo’s BOSS (Build your Own Search Service). This is the direction technology is moving in.

Information linking is getting cheaper; tools get shared; skills can be developed; user accounts can be linked between collaborating sites. Websites can be created so that one knows who is logging on to it (shared communities). Issues of provenance, trust and visibility of data are being taken into consideration.

These five presentations were followed by a flurry of questions on issues of digital images manipulation, victim protection and SMS authentication. Many participants were concerned about accuracy but it was pointed out that, whatever the medium, accuracy always has been an issue in human rights work: cross referencing is very much a need for any type of research. Examples of ICT use were given from Armenia and Ecuador.
6. ICT Tools in a box

AAAS Science and Human Rights Project
http://shr.aas.org/geotech/
The AAAS Science and Human Rights Program is working to expand the applications of geospatial technologies to human rights issues modern tools, such as satellite images, geographic information systems (GIS), and Global Positioning Systems (GPS) that allow for mapping and analysis of multiple layers of geo-referenced data.

Digiactive
www.digiactive.org
DigiActive is an all-volunteer organization dedicated to helping grassroots activists around the world use the Internet and mobile phones to increase their impact. The site explains how to use various digital tools for activism; reviews digital activism guides and resources by other organizations; shares stories of successful digital activism campaigns; hosts virtual events where activists can learn from expert digital activism practitioners; alerts activists to digital actions and fosters community among digital activists.

Global Voices Advocacy
http://advocacy.globalvoicesonline.org
This is a project of Global Voices Online which seeks to build a global anti-censorship network of bloggers and online activists throughout the developing world that is dedicated to protecting freedom of expression and free access to information online. It contains tools for digital advocacy and maps the online censorship and anti-censorship efforts related to the social web and major web 2.0 websites.

GoogleEarth
http://earth.google.co.uk/intl/en_uk/
Allows viewers to view satellite imagery, maps, terrain and 3D buildings anywhere on Earth (with varying detail).

The HUB
http://hub.witness.org/
The Hub is an interactive community for human rights, where viewers can upload videos, audio or photos, or watch, comment on and share what’s on the site.

Info Activism
www.informationactivism.org
The site helps rights advocates tactically utilise information, communication and digital technologies to enhance advocacy work.

Open Net Initiative
http://opennet.net/
This is a collaborative partnership of four leading academic institutions. It Investigates, exposes and analyzes Internet filtering and surveillance practices.

Tactical Technology Collective
www.tacticaltech.org
This site helps human rights advocates use information, communication and digital technologies to maximise the impact of their advocacy work. It provides advocates with guides, tools, training and consultancy to help them develop skills and tactics to increase the impact of their campaigning.

UNOSAT
http://unosat.web.cern.ch/unosat/
UNOSAT is the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) Operational Satellite Applications Programme, implemented in co-operation with the European Organisation of High Energy Physics (CERN). It offers satellite solutions to relief and development organisations within and outside the UN system to help make a difference in the life of communities exposed to poverty, hazards and risk, or affected by humanitarian and other crises.
Ushahidi
http://www.ushahidi.com/
This is a website developed to map reports of violence in Kenya after the post-election fallout at the beginning of 2008. Ushahidi's roots are in the collaboration of Kenyan citizen journalists during a time of crisis. A new Ushahidi Engine is being created to use the lessons learned from Kenya to create a platform for anyone around the world to set up their own way to gather reports by mobile phone, email and the web - and map them.

WITNESS
http://witness.org/
WITNESS is an international human rights organization that provides training and support to local groups to use video in their human rights advocacy campaigns. The site contains video archives, information on training and ongoing campaigns.

Wikipedia – The Free Encyclopedia
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main_Page
Wikipedia is a multilingual, Web-based, free-content encyclopedia project. Wikipedia is written collaboratively by volunteers from all around the world; anyone can edit it. There are more than 75,000 active contributors working on more than 10,000,000 articles in more than 260 languages.

WordPress (English, Bahasa Indonesia, Dutch, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish, Swedish, Turkish etc.)
http://wordpress.com/
This site offers open source blogging software including free and customizable designs for creating public or private blogs.
VI. COMMUNICATING ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS

Feedback gathered by HURIDOCS indicates that smaller human rights NGOs often have difficulties in reporting on violations of economic, social and cultural rights (ESCR). The analysis of these rights calls for the use of indicators and benchmarks. While activists have the skills to collect useful information, they often lack information on how to package it and on appropriate analytical tools for reporting and advocacy purposes. Here too, innovative communication tools help raise awareness and get traction for ESCR campaigns. This last session in the HURICOCS Conference offered hands on presentations by ESCR experts from CS and academia. Presenters and participants congratulated HURIDOCS’ foresight in including the often under reported issues of ESCR in the programme of the Conference. Presentations were made by Prof. Dr. Eibe Riedel, Member of UN Committee on Economic, Social and Rights, Luis Lozano do Porto, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (Centre for Legal and Social Studies, CELS) and Claire Mahon (Joint Coordinator, Project on Economic, Social and Cultural Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights).

1. The enforceability of the right to housing

CELS was created during the Argentinian dictatorship in the late 1970s. When democracy was restored, the organisation decided to look at new human rights issues in the country and soon focused on the enforceability of ESCR, reflecting new concerns in a changing society.

This focus gave rise to two challenges:
- CELS legitimacy for dealing with human rights issues is deeply engrained in Argentinean past and it is being challenged when it deals with contemporary issues
- ESC rights hardly receive any visibility at the national level.

It is worth mentioning that during the review of Argentina in the UPR, UN Member States only commented on crimes committed during the dictatorship while CSOs were advised to only submit information that is four-year old, in keeping with the UPR review cycle. Member States did not raise ESCR although CSO submissions mostly focused on these.

Heavy real estate speculation began in the Buenos Aires area in the early 2000, in the aftermath of the severe economic crisis that hit Argentina. Prices rocketed, both for property owners and tenants, and forced evictions began. Public opinion was slow in identifying the phenomenon. CELS decided to carry out research on this issue and from the outset included a communications person in every meeting where sociologists, anthropologists and others discussed findings.

Strategic choices

Early in the process, communications staff asked for clear indicators. They also wanted informants ready to talk to the press and easily understandable statistical data. This request conflicted with priorities of academic researchers who focused on technical aspects of the problem. Bridging those two sets of demands proved fundamental for the success of the project.

Communication technologies were used to the full, including open source software for creating blogs (such as WordPress), web pages and on-line databases. A real-time blog was maintained during the fact-finding phase: as research covered new neighbourhoods these were described in the blog. CELS now uses blogs for each research project and campaign.

The final report was issued in digital form, as well as on paper, for select distribution to influence targeted civil servants and local authorities. It was sent to opinion leaders and policy makers with executive summaries as this target group often has little time for reading. Op-eds were also written that were picked up by many newspapers. For the first time, CELS used audio testimonies tailored for journalists’ use.
In addition to the strategic use of new communication tools, CELS worked in cooperation with other relevant stakeholders and did a letter campaign in a bid to change the legislation. This initially did not get much visibility, but a serious incident happened (a house fire in which 5 children died) and this was used by CELS to revive the debate.

In sum, much remains to be done in terms of violations of ESCR but this work needs to be supplemented by a robust communication strategy, and requires a mix of denunciation, litigation, confrontation and dialogue with relevant authorities.

2. Indicators for human rights monitoring in UN treaty bodies

Prof. Dr. Eibe Riedel, Member of UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR), highlighted one of the recent initiatives to come up with appropriate ESCR indicators for use in reports to treaty bodies: the Manheim IBSA project, which focuses on human rights indicators for the right to food. (The section below uses extensive excerpts from Prof. Riedel’s 5-page exposé).

Prof. Riedel explained that the traditional approach to facts and figures in the process of monitoring human rights compliance at the universal and domestic levels was not very effective and had given rise to a thorough debate on indicators amongst stakeholders. Prof. Riedel referred to practice in concluding observations of the CESCR and noted that the Committee’s use of indicators has been sporadic, haphazard and unsystematic at best. However, the Committee has been asking States parties to provide disaggregated comparative data, in order to see whether improvements or deteriorations in the realisation of rights have been taking place and why.

OHCHR has developed a conceptual and methodological framework to adopt a structured and consistent approach for translating universal human rights standards into indicators that are contextually relevant and useful at country level. It provides templates and metasheets for 12 rights of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the two main human rights treaties on ESCR and on civil and political rights and NGOs are encouraged to use them.

Problem areas

First, Prof. Riedel explained that political scientists, lawyers, and economists use indicators for different purposes which reveal fundamental differences. Quantitative data as used by an economist or a social scientist usually will serve the purpose of providing comparisons, such as the UNDP human development index, on a cross-country basis, thus providing a hit-or-miss list on a particular state party performance, as compared with other States. In the human rights sphere, he observed, developing countries dislike such comparative data because they may find themselves in the lower echelons of rights realization, as a result of those indices. Further, CESCR recommends the use of country-specific indicators, which further complicates the comparability.

Another difficulty with indicators stems from the fact that the purposes for which they are used may differ considerably. Thus, for example, health data may differ substantially from right to health data said Prof. Riedel, who explained that the inter-disciplinary divide on the factual and normative level of indicator usage can ultimately be overcome, but that it takes an enormous amount of concerted effort.

A third problem area and probably the most besetting problem in relation to the use of indicators, according to Prof. Riedel, is their sheer quantity. One paper analysed 81 concluding observations between 1990 and 2002, in relation to the right to health. The committee had used 278 health indicators during that time which meant an average of 3.4 health indicators per state party: the use of indicators ranged from 23 to 0 per state report. Thus indicators can swell up to formidable size and committee members get bogged down in the wealth of figures required and asked for, and have little time left for proper analysis.

The way forward

In view of this, commented Prof. Riedel, the CESCR has recently begun work on using indicators in a more systematic manner and it is beginning to follow a four-step IBSA procedure (Indicators, Benchmarks, Scoping and
Assessment). The benchmarks are self-set targets by the state parties, which form the basis of subsequent committee assessment. As States generally have the tendency to draw a picture which is positive, thereby bypassing or neglecting real problem issues, the “scoping” stage is equally important to decide which particular and country-specific indicators should be employed. The wealth of indicator material available from specialized agencies, UN programmes and from NGOs could be drawn upon, and assist in finding agreed benchmarks, to be used in the final assessment of the state reports. This scoping seems to be the logical next step in the current indicator debate.

Prof. Riedel concluded that the role of civil society in this process would be very important at every juncture. He suggested that the modalities of cooperation might be discussed at a specialist workshop, focussing on the interaction of national and international indicator findings in more detail and that the HURIDOCS framework would be the evident choice for that.

3. The challenge of communicating ESCR

Claire Mahon, Joint Coordinator for the Project on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights at the Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights, presented a general overview on how to actually communicate about ESCR, and challenges, problems and examples of best practices. One of the challenges is that people often react to images or information relating to economic, social and cultural issues as objects of charity, and do not readily see the link with human rights violations. The role of the media is key in this respect.

Prerequisites for communicating ESCR

- Substantive knowledge of ESCR-understanding of:
  - What the rights are (normative content)
  - What the obligations are (immediate/progressive)
  - How to monitor/implement/enforce progressive obligations

- Data collection
  - Indicators approach
    - OHCHR and others developing indicators
    - Millennium Development Goals (MDG) - utility and limitations
  - Violations approach
  - Violations Databases - e.g. HURIDOCS OpenEvsys
  - Case studies

Make ESCR real through

- Communicating about people: use of case studies, stories, pictures
- Communicating about numbers: linking indicators with data visualization techniques
- Use of images

Link indicators with data visualization techniques such as

- Gap Minder
- Social Watch

Communicate ESCR to

- The general public
- Governments
- UN bodies
- The Human Rights Council (including UPR and Special Procedures)
- Treaty Bodies

Civil society can also feed information in parallel to the State reporting process (or at times feed into State reporting) and by submitting complaints through the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR).
ESCR Communications through the Optional Protocol to the ICESCR
- Individual and groups of individuals can file communications (complaints)
- Committee on ESCR adjudicates - deciding whether violations have occurred
- NGOs can assist in filing complaints - bringing complaints “on behalf” of victims
- Documentation from NGOs can be consulted by the Committee
- See further the work of the International NGO Coalition for the Optional Protocol to the ICESCR.

A vivid exchange with participants included questions and issues from El Salvador (problems of corruption, including in the justice sector and refusal of the government to disseminate CESCR recommendations), Morocco (child labour and right to education) and Senegal (on the paradox of extreme poverty in regions with vast mineral resources).

A participant also signalled that CSOs could supply information to the HRC Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food – and other relevant HRC independent inquiry mechanisms. The Special Rapporteurs produce general reports, can organise information campaigns (for instance on bio-fuels), issue urgent actions and carry out two country visits every year. The visits constitute an excellent means to draw attention on ESCR. The importance of the role of independent NHRIs and ombudsmen was also emphasized in relation to ESCR.

Finally, a call was made to OHCHR to improve its own communication outreach in relation to human rights mechanisms, including on ESCR. It is hard for CSOs to draw attention on the use of UN human rights mechanisms as long as the UN does not itself publicize more widely their very existence and use.

4. ESCR Tools in a Box

CELS – Centre for Legal and Social Studies (Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales) (Spanish, English)
http://www.cels.org.ar/cels/?ids=5&lang=en
CELS has been working since 1979 in the promotion and protection of human rights and to strengthen the democratic system in Argentina. The site includes a page on enforceability of economic, social and cultural rights.

Gap Minder
http://www.gapminder.org/
The site makes data more accessible and easier to use for instant visual analysis. It is designed to fill a gap as decision makers, politicians as well as education specialists at almost all levels lack adequate tools. It contains statistical data combined into innovative videos and a blog.

HURIDOCS OpenEvsys
http://www.huridocs.org/tools/monitoring/openevsys
This is a software tool, currently under development by HURIDOCS and Respere. It will be used for managing information about human rights violations, and interventions made by human rights organisations. Anyone will be able to download it and install it for use in their organisation.

International NGO Coalition for an Optional Protocol to ICESCR (English, Spanish, French)
http://www.opicescr-coalition.org/index.htm
The Coalition brings together individuals and organisations from around the world that support the development of an Optional Protocol for individual complaints to the ICESCR. The Coalition aims to achieve its purpose of promoting the ratification of the Optional Protocol. The site includes background documents and advocacy kits.

Manheim IBSA Project
http://ibsa.uni-mannheim.de/
This is a joint project to find a set of adequate human rights indicators for the right to food for use by governments, national human rights institutions, civil society and human rights treaty bodies.
OHCHR Report on Indicators for Promoting and Monitoring the Implementation of Human Rights, HRI/MC/2008/3, 6 June 2008
http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/icm-mc/docs/HRI.MC.2008.3EN.pdf

The report was prepared at the request of the inter-committee meeting of UN human rights treaty bodies. It contains examples of meta-data sheets on identified indicators across civil and political rights as well as economic, social and cultural rights.

Millennium Development Goals
http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/

The eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) – which range from halving extreme poverty to halting the spread of HIV/AIDS and providing universal primary education, all by the target date of 2015 – were adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2000. The site includes background as well as reports and statistics on progress toward achieving the MDGs.

Social Watch (English, Spanish)
http://www.socialwatch.org

Social Watch is an international network informed by national citizens’ groups aiming at following up the fulfilment of internationally agreed commitments on poverty eradication and equality. These national groups report, through the national Social Watch report, on the progress - or regression - towards these commitments and goals. The site includes information on States commitments and a Social Watch Blog.

Special Procedures (Special Rapporteurs – UN Human Rights Council independent inquiry mechanisms)
http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/chr/special/index.htm

This is the OHCHR web page on independent human rights investigation mechanisms created by the former UN Commission on Human Rights and which now report to the UN Human Rights Council. The site contains information on the different mandates and their activities. In includes information for submitting information on relevant human rights violations of economic social and cultural right (including the rights to adequate housing, health, education, food, issues of extreme poverty and foreign debt, and access to safe drinking water).

Submitting information to the Special Procedures
http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/chr/special/communications.htm
VII. CONCLUSION

Throughout the conference two issues were constantly raised by participants and speakers: the need to cooperate and the issue of security. A striking number of presentations were punctuated by phrases such as “and we realised that we could not do this alone”. For the UPR and ICC alike, coalition forming has been a distinct characteristic of civil society organisation. It is not surprising that faced with such complex international inter-governmental or independent bodies – and with government groupings increasingly structured in opposition to human rights values - civil society organisations need to work in collaboration. They need to share resources and analyses and engage in peer to peer training and capacity building in order to have a bigger impact. In doing so, they need to build safeguards and constantly strive to protect sources, witnesses and human rights defenders, as well as the quality and integrity of information.

The Conference made it clear that a number of considerations come into play when national, regional and international civil society organisations make the strategic choice to submit information on human rights violations and severe gaps in protection before the Universal Periodic Review of the Human Rights Council or the International Criminal Court. Both bodies offer avenues for advocacy and campaign activities of civil society. The work and output of both bodies has been and can be considerably strengthened and at times validated through civil society input. Feeding submissions into the UPR and the ICC, albeit calling for different types of skills and documentation, does require a high level of technical and substantive knowledge. This can be optimized and made more efficient and effective through use of a broad gamut of new information and communication technologies that enable civil society to expand the means of documenting human rights violations. The Conference, thanks to input by leading international, regional and national experts from various disciplines and professional background, provided concrete and action-oriented insights into new tools, new experiments and pilot projects. With this report, HURIDOCS aims to provide a tool box to participants and the broader civil society community as they interact with the UPR and/or the ICC to strengthen respect for human rights and accountability at home. (The report should be read in connection with the HURIDOCS companion website for the Conference and presentations made for the occasion.)

As one participant put it, the main challenge for human rights groups in the 21st century, aside from mustering the necessary human and financial resources for engaging with the UPR and/or the ICC, is to continue denouncing human rights violations while developing cooperation mechanisms.

Mariette Grange, Conference Rapporteur
## APPENDIX I. PROGRAMME OF THE CONFERENCE

### Human Rights Council and International Criminal Court: The New Challenges for Human Rights Communications

**25 to 27 February 2009**  
**Geneva International Conference Centre (CICG), rooms 5 and 6**  
**Geneva, Switzerland**

#### Wednesday 25 February

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 8:45</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 10:30</td>
<td>Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Welcome address:  
| - Judith Dueck, Vice-Chair of HURIDOCS                   |
|  
| Keynote addresses:  
| - H.E. Martin Ihoeghian Uhomoibhi, President of the Human Rights Council  
| - Silvana Arbia, Registrar of the International Criminal Court |
|  
| Chair: Kofi Kumado, Chairperson of HURIDOCS               |
| 10:30 – 10:45  | Coffee break                                              |
| 10:45 – 12:45  | Plenary I: Civil society participation in the Universal Periodic Review |
|  
| Panel discussion:  
| - Eric Tistounet, Chief of the Human Rights Council Branch and Secretary of the Human Rights Council  
| - Bob Last, Senior Human Rights Adviser, UK Mission to the UN, Geneva  
| - Marianne Lilliebjerg, Amnesty International  
| - Kim Giyoun, UN Advocacy Programme Manager, Forum Asia  
<p>| - Thomas Schwarz, Head of Communication and Awareness Raising Department, European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights |
|<br />
| Chair: Aurora Javate de Dios, Coalition Against Trafficking in Women - Asia Pacific |
| 13:00 – 14:30  | Lunch                                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:00 – 14:30</td>
<td>Ideas and resources marketplace: open space for presentations and demonstrations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14.30 – 16.30| **Plenary II: Civil society participation in the International Criminal Court (ICC)**  
Panel discussion:  
  - Pascal Turlan, *International Cooperation Advisor, International Criminal Court*  
  - William R. Pace, *Convenor of the NGO Coalition for the ICC*  
  - Ilia Utmelidze, *Project Coordinator, Norwegian Centre for Human Rights*  
Chair: Adama Dieng, *Registrar of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda* |
| 16:30 – 16:45| Coffee break                                                         |
| 16:45 – 18:00| **Plenary III: Drawing together the common information needs**  
  - The Role of NGOs in UN Human Rights Special Procedures, Treaty Bodies and Field Presences in Relation to ICC Fact-Finding, Prof. Lyal Sunga, *Senior Lecturer, Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law*  
  - UPR Information needs: Julie de Rivero, *Geneva Advocacy Director, Human Rights Watch*  
Chair: Hans Thoolen, *President of the Martin Ennals Award for Human Rights Defenders* |
| 18:00 – 19:30| Reception with drinks, snacks and music, on the second floor of the Conference centre |
| Thursday 26 February |                                                                 |
| 09:00 – 11:00| **Plenary IV: Communicating human rights information through technology**  
Panel discussion:  
  - Florence Devouard, *Chair Emeritus of the Wikimedia Foundation*  
  - Lars Bromley, *Science and Human Rights Program, American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)*  
  - Dan Brickley, *researcher, advocate and developer of Semantic Web technologies*  
  - Patrick Meier, *Fellow, Harvard Humanitarian Initiative (HHI) and Director for Applied Research at DigiActive, editor of iRevolution*  
  - Sam Gregory, *Program Director of WITNESS*  
Chair: James Lawson, *Head of Information Unit, Council of Europe* |
<p>| 11:00 – 11:15| Coffee break                                                          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:15 – 13:00</td>
<td>Labs / Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exploration of information tools:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Case Matrix system for documenting criminal court cases</strong>, Morten Bergsmo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Researcher, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Satellite imagery and mapping</strong>, Lars Bromley, Science and Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program, American Association for the Advancement of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>UPR on the web</strong>, Roland Chauville, editor of upr-info.org and Gunnar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berkemeier, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>OpenEvsys system for documenting violations</strong>, Tom Longley, HURIDOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Human rights and internet search: HuriSearch and TANDIS</strong>, Hanne Stemann,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, OSCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 14:30</td>
<td>Ideas and resources marketplace: open space for presentations and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demonstrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 – 14:30</td>
<td>Lunch, with meetings of thematic networks. Self-organized: suggest themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and sign up on the flipcharts near the registration-information desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30 – 16:30</td>
<td>Plenary V: Building Capacity of civil society vis-a-vis the ICC and UPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panel discussion:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Judith Cohen, <strong>Head of Parliamentary Liaison Programme</strong>, South African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Isabelle Heyer, **Representative to the United Nations, Colombian Commission of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jurists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Malak Poppovic, <strong>Executive Director</strong>, Conectas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adrien Claude Zoller, <strong>Director</strong>, Geneva for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Agnieszka Raczynska, Red Nacional de Organismos Civiles de Derechos Humanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Todos los Derechos para Todas y Todos&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30 – 16:45</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45 – 18:30</td>
<td>Regional meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional meetings for the following regions: Africa, Arab world, Asia and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific, Europe, Latin America and North America, with the purpose to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>find common ground and prepare for inputs to the General Assembly of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HURIDOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Africa</strong>: room 13 (2nd floor), <strong>Arab world</strong>: room 20 (3rd floor), **Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Pacific**: room 19 (3rd floor), <strong>Europe</strong>: plenary room, **Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>America**: room 8 (2nd floor), <strong>North America</strong>: room 7 (2nd floor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Friday 27 February**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 11:00</td>
<td><strong>Plenary VI: Communicating Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panel discussion:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|               | • Prof. Dr. Eibe Riedel, *Member of UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*  
|               | • Luis Lozano do Porto, *Centro de Estudios Sociales y Legales*  
|               | • Claire Mahon, *Joint Coordinator, Project on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights*  
|               | Chair: Caroline Dommen, *Representative, Global Economic Issues, Quaker United Nations Office* |
| 11:00 – 11:15 | Coffee break                                                          |
| 11:15 – 13:00 | **Labs / Workshops**                                                  |
|               | Exploration of information tools:                                     |
|               | • **Video advocacy: Moving images as a tool alongside organizing, lobbying and reporting strategies**, Sam Gregory, *Program Director of WITNESS*  
|               | • **Effective report writing for the Universal Periodic Review**, Fiona Blyth-Kubota, *Human Rights Officer, UPR Section, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights*  
|               | • **Terminologies for human rights**, James Lawson, *Head of Information Unit, Council of Europe*  
|               | • **ICA/AtoM software for accessing human rights archives**, Perrine Canavaggio, *Deputy Secretary General, International Council on Archives*  
| 11:00 – 14:30 | Ideas and resources marketplace: open space for presentations and demonstrations |
| 13:00 – 14:30 | Lunch, with meetings of thematic networks.                            |
| 14:30 – 16:00 | **Closing Plenary**                                                   |
|               | Reflections on the Conference, by Conference Rapporteur, Mariette Grange |
|               | Vote of thanks, by Jonathan Kuttab                                    |
|               | Closing by Kofi Kumado, *HURIDOCS Chairperson*                        |
| 16:15 – 18:00 | **Regional and thematic meetings - continued (as required)**          |
APPENDIX II. SUMMARY OF LABS / WORKSHOPS

Case Matrix system for documenting criminal court cases
Morten Bergsmo, Senior Researcher, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO)

The Case Matrix is an application, service and platform developed at the International Criminal Court (ICC). It is part of the ICC Legal Tools Project. This Project provides free access to information on international criminal law through the ICC website (the Legal Tools Database) and the Case Matrix application. The Case Matrix is a law-driven case management and legal information application representing significant innovation in how to approach core international crimes cases (war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide). It can be used for the documentation of serious human rights violations which may amount to core international crimes; work on such cases in criminal justice contexts; as well as for training and other capacity building and knowledge transfer purposes. It can be customised to different user groups such as judges, prosecutors and investigators, defence and victims’ counsel, non-governmental organizations, and states.

Satellite imagery and mapping
Lars Bromley, Science and Human Rights Program, American Association for the Advancement of Science

The AAAS Science and Human Rights Program is working to expand the applications of geospatial technologies to human rights issues through its Geospatial Technologies and Human Rights Project. Geospatial technologies include a range of modern tools, such as satellite images, geographic information systems (GIS), and Global Positioning Systems (GPS) that allow for mapping and analysis of multiple layers of geo-referenced data. Analysis of such data can provide critical information on the impact of remote, isolated conflicts on civilians, environmental and social justice issues, indigenous rights, and more. Geospatial technologies can broaden the ability of non-governmental organizations to rapidly gather, analyze, and disseminate authoritative information, especially during times of crisis. They can also provide compelling, visual proof to corroborate on-the-ground reporting of conflicts and natural disasters affecting human rights.

UPR on the web
Roland Chauville, editor of upr-info.org

The site www.upr-info.org provides access to all the documents available on the Universal Periodic Review, among which: States and NGOs reports; OHCHR summaries and compilations; summaries of each review; reports of the UPR Working Group; final outcomes with recommendations; webcasts of the UPR sessions; press statements by NGOs and analyses by UPR Info and other NGOs as well as detailed explanations on how to engage in the process.

HURIDOCS’ OpenEvsys system for documenting violations
Tom Longley, HURIDOCS

OpenEvsys is a software tool intended for managing information about human rights violations, and interventions made by human rights organisations. Organisations that monitor and document human rights violations can use OpenEvsys for three main purposes: a) for quantitative analysis of violations, b) for managing actions and interventions, and c) for storing and sharing information. It is intended for organisations that produce advocacy reports, provide services to victims of violations, need a tool to store and manage complaints, need a Web-based tool to share information or want to store their information digitally. It is a free, Open Source and ready-to-use software application, already loaded with the HURIDOCS Events Standard Formats and terminologies. It can be adapted to the needs of particular users. OpenEvsys is developed by HURIDOCS and Respere.
Human rights and internet search: HuriSearch and TANDIS.
Hanne Stemann, Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, OSCE

**TANDIS** (Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Information System) was developed by the Tolerance and Non-Discrimination department of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) of the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe. It aims to share and promote practices and initiatives and to provide information on issues related to tolerance and non-discrimination throughout the OSCE region. TANDIS includes country pages and thematic pages. It also provides access to information produced by NGOs, for which it uses HuriSearch. HuriSearch, developed by HURIDOCS, is the only comprehensive search engine specialised in human rights information. It gives direct access to the content of over 4,500 human rights websites.

At the lab, the presenter showed how HuriSearch has been tailored to meet the specific information needs of ODIHR and how it was integrated into the TANDIS website. There was a brief exchange on what participants would like to be able to do in the future, e.g. better use of meta-data on the Web.

**Video advocacy: Moving images as a tool alongside organizing, lobbying and reporting strategies**
Sam Gregory, Program Director of WITNESS

**WITNESS** uses the power of video to open the eyes of the world to human rights abuses. By partnering with local organizations around the globe, WITNESS empowers human rights defenders to use video as a tool to shine a light on those most affected by human rights violations, and to transform personal stories of abuse into powerful tools of justice. Since its founding in 1992, WITNESS has partnered with groups in more than 60 countries, bringing often unseen images, untold stories and seldom heard voices to the attention of key decision makers, the media, and the general public -- prompting grassroots activism, political engagement, and lasting change.

This workshop focused on the use of video as a tool in advocacy. Participants discussed their own experiences of using video in different human rights advocacy settings, and identified particular strengths and shortcomings of video as a medium for advocacy. Together participants watched and reviewed case studies of using video in human rights advocacy.

Participants discussed the effectiveness of each case study for its advocacy purpose, as well as the importance of targeting particular audiences and of providing a space for action by the target audience. The participants discussed the particular qualities of video, and the importance of creating narrative and meaning from the facts presented, and of sharing representative stories that reflect broader patterns of abuse/violations.

**Effective report writing for the Universal Periodic Review**
Fiona Blyth–Kubota, Human Rights Officer, UPR Section, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

The specific characteristics of the Universal Periodic Review in comparison with other human rights mechanisms is that it cover all human rights, based upon broad consultation, requires cooperation with governments, has a concrete follow-up process, provides opportunities to propose concrete recommendations and can strengthen the human rights movement. The challenges relate to time pressure and the limitation in the number of words for each submission. The key documents for the UPR are the national report, the UN compilation prepared by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Stakeholders Summary prepared by the OHCHR on the basis of submissions by civil society. OHCHR has provided pointers on the dos and don’ts for stakeholders to submit their information. UPR is not only a mechanism - it is also a process and may be characterized as consisting of five stages. Stakeholders have opportunities to work on or follow UPR at different stages, from the preparation of reports, to the review and adoption of the outcome in Geneva and the implementation of recommendations made to States and their commitments to follow-up on them.

**Terminologies for human rights**, James Lawson, Head of Information Unit, Council of Europe

Metadata are ‘data about data’ and metatags are developed for web-publications. Publications and other information can be found by search engines by using the information provided by the publisher in the metadata. Organisations which provide human rights information on the Internet can also use meta-tagging to ensure a
correct description of their publications and to provide search engines with the right information. This is becoming more important because of the ever growing number of websites.

Metadata standards are necessary in order to ensure that different kinds of descriptive metadata are able to interoperate with each other and with metadata of the kind that the data management communities and information creators are generating. The Dublin Core is a metadata element set which is developed to be used as a metadata standard. This standard set can be adjusted for human rights publications. The HURIDOCS Microthesauri can be used for describing documents about human rights.

ICA/AtoM software for accessing human rights archives, Perrine Canavaggio, Deputy Secretary General, International Council on Archives

ICA-AtoM is web-based archival description software that is based on standards of the International Council on Archives. 'AtoM' is an acronym for 'Access to Memory'. It is free, open-source software. It is multi-lingual and supports multi-repository collections.

The purpose of the ICA-AtoM Project is to provide free and open-source software that:

1. enables institutions to make their archival holdings available online, especially those who could not otherwise afford to do so
2. manages archival descriptions in accord with ICA standards
3. provides multi-lingual interfaces and content translation features
4. supports multiple collection types
5. is fully web-based, user-friendly and follows best practices for accessibility
6. is flexible and customizable
7. is useful to both small and large institutions alike
8. supports single or multi-repository implementations
APPENDIX III. PROFILES OF SPEAKERS AND PANELLISTS

Opening

**Ms. Judith Dueck** has been involved in human rights for over 20 years, working for both NGOs and IGOs including the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE); Al Haq (a Branch of the International Commission of Jurists) and the International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA). She is an Amnesty International Canada Board member; an award winning researcher authoring a book on censorship; a speaker on topics such as human rights, education, information access and technology; and co-author of practical books on human rights documentation. She has been involved with HURIDOCs since 1988; first as task force leader and currently on the HURIDOCs board.

**His Excellency Dr. Martin Ihoeghian U homoibhi** is the Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to the United Nations Office and other International Organisations in Geneva and is also accredited as the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to Switzerland. Ambassador U homoibhi is a distinguished career diplomat who has held several high-level positions in the Nigerian diplomatic service. Among his commitments to the international community, he is currently serving his one-year term as President of the Human Rights Council and concurrently, as President of the General Assembly of the World Intellectual Property Organisation since September 2007. Ambassador U homoibhi holds a Masters Degree in History and Political Science from the University of Ibadan, Nigeria. He also earned a D.Phil in Modern History and International Relations from Oxford University in 1982.

**Ms. Silvana Arbia** was elected on 28 February 2008 as the new Registrar of the International Criminal Court for a five-year term. Ms. Arbia has extensive experience in international law, criminal law, and the judicial management aspects of international criminal law. Prior to joining the ICC, she was inter alia the Chief of Prosecutions at the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) and led the prosecution of important cases before the ICTR. Furthermore, Ms. Arbia participated in the drafting of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court as a member of Italian delegation at the 1998 Diplomatic Conference in Rome. Ms. Arbia holds a Laurea in Law from Padova University, Italy, and was a professional judge in Italy. She has published widely on human rights and children’s rights.

**Mr. Kofi Kumado** is a founding member and current Chairperson of HURIDOCs. A Constitutional lawyer and Professor of the University of Ghana, Mr. Kumado is an Honorary Member of the International Commission of Jurists, a member of the International Court of Arbitration and a Consultant for the United Nations, the African Union, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and other IGOs. Mr. Kumado is a former Chair of the Ghanaian National Media Commission and the author of numerous articles on social security, democracy, human rights, information access, the economic, social and cultural rights, and other topics.

Plenary I – Civil society participation in the UPR

**Mr. Eric Tistounet** is a Director of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and Chief of the Office’s Human Rights Council Branch. He also served as Secretary for the Commission on Human Rights and then the Human Rights Council. Prior to joining the OHCHR, Mr. Tistounet worked for the Council of Europe as Administrator in charge of the Council’s Human Rights Documentation Centre.
Mr. Bob Last is a Senior Human Rights Officer of the UK Mission to the UN in Geneva since 2006. From 2002 to 2006 he served as Human Rights Attaché. During this time he has been a member of the UK delegation to 4 sessions of the Commission on Human Rights (2002-2005), all 9 sessions of the Human Rights Council, 4 sessions of UPR and 6 UN treaty body examinations. He was recently the UK Troika representative for Barbados’s UPR in December 2008. He previously worked as a research assistant at the Human Rights Law Centre at the University of Nottingham (2000) and (for 3 months) as a Legal Officer at the Refugee Law Project in Kampala, Uganda. Mr. Last holds an LLM (Human Rights Law).

Ms. Marianne Lillicieberg is Adviser on International Organisations at Amnesty International (AI). As such, she represents AI at meetings of the United Nations and other inter-governmental organisations.

Ms. Giyoun Kim has worked as an International Coordinator for the MINBYUN-Lawyers for a Democratic Society and the network of Korean human rights groups from 1999 to 2005. She later on worked for the Korea Centre for UN Human Rights Policy (KOCUN) and provided consultancy to various institutions including the Ambassador-at-large on Gender Affairs and the National Human Rights Commission of Korea. She is currently UN Advocacy Programme Manager of the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development (FORUM-ASIA).

Mr. Thomas Schwarz was Head of the Sector for Data Collection of the then EU Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia. He currently holds the position of an Interim Head of the Communication and Awareness Raising Department of the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights. In this function he is also responsible for web-based information and documentation of the Agency.

Ms. Aurora Javate de Dios is the President of the Coalition against Trafficking in Women Asia-Pacific (CATW-AP) and its international Board of Directors. She was an Expert member on the United Nations CEDAW Committee from 1994 to 1998 and Chairperson of the National Commission on the Role of Filipino Women in the Philippines. She continues to be active in various human rights-related forums such as CEDAW Watch, the Women’s Crisis Centre and the Philippine Migration Research Network. She is a gender consultant and a trainer on women’s rights, CEDAW, and migrant rights in the Philippines and other Asian countries. An academic, Ms. De Dios is a Professor in International Studies and Migration at Miriam College in the Philippines. She has written numerous articles and papers on women, development, human rights and CEDAW, and migration, among others. She also is a member of the HURIDOCS Continuation Committee since 1998.

### Plenary II – Civil society participation in the ICC

Mr. Pascal Turlan is International Cooperation Advisor at the International Criminal Court.

Mr. William R. Pace has worked in an array of civil society sectors over the span of two decades until 1987. He joined Amnesty International as a director of the “Human Rights Now!” campaign concert tour. He then served as the Executive Director of the World Federalist Movement-Institute for Global Policy, a 59-year old peace movement dedicated to promoting international democracy, global justice and the rule of law. Mr. Pace has also been the Secretary-General for the Hague Appeal for Peace civil society conference in 1999. In 1995, Mr. Pace was asked to serve as the Convenor of the NGO Coalition for an International Criminal Court (CICC). As such, in 2001, he was awarded the William J. Butler Human Rights Medal from the Urban Morgan Institute for Human Rights for being one of the “cardinal figures in the creation of a Permanent International Criminal Court”. From 2002 to 2004, he also served as the President of the Centre for United Nations Reform Education. Mr. Pace is the author of numerous articles and reports on international justice, international affairs and UN issues, multilateral treaty processes, and NGO participation in international decision-making.

Mr. Ilia Utmedidze is Project Co-ordinator, West Balkans Project, of the ICC Legal Tools Programme at the Norwegian Centre for Human Rights. From 2004 until 2008, he was Legal Adviser in the Human Rights Department of the OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina, advising on institution-building in areas such as domestic war crimes prosecution mechanisms (including the development of a national strategy for war crimes prosecution), specialised investigative commissions for Srebrenica and Sarajevo and the establishment of a single state-level ombudsman institution. Before that, he worked with the Norwegian Refugee Council on capacity.
building in Azerbaijan and at the Norwegian Centre for Human Rights on a minority policy and law research project.

**Mr. Adama Dieng** is the Registrar of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda since 2001. He began his career as Registrar of the Regional and Labour Courts in Senegal in 1973, and then served as Registrar of the Supreme Court of Senegal for six years. In 1982, he joined the International Commission of Jurists where he served successively as Legal Officer for Africa, Executive Secretary, and, from October 1990 to May 2000, as Secretary-General. From 1995 to 2001, Mr. Dieng was the United Nations Independent Expert for Haiti. Mr. Dieng is a member of the UNESCO International Advisory Committee on Poverty and Human Rights. He was the first President of the Martin Ennals Foundation and Founder of the Arusha African Union-NEPAD Human Rights Trust Funds.

**Plenary III – Drawing together the common information needs**

**Prof. Lyal Sunga**, a Senior Lecturer at the Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law, is a specialist on international human rights law, international humanitarian law and international criminal law. He has given university courses, lectures, and training or conference presentations in around 45 countries. Before joining the Institute, he taught at the University of Hong Kong Faculty of Law and served as Director of the Master of Laws Programme in Human Rights (2001-2005). From 1994-2001, Dr. Sunga worked for the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in Geneva, first to assist in the investigation of facts relating to the 1994 genocide in Rwanda and draft the Commission’s report recommending the establishment of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, and then on various human rights issues relating inter alia to the establishment of the International Criminal Court, terrorism and human rights defenders. In 2007, he was Geneva-based Coordinator for the UN Human Rights Council’s Group of Experts on Darfur. Mr. Sunga has published widely in various scholarly journals and has authored two books on international criminal law. He holds a Master of Laws in International Human Rights Law (Essex) and PhD in International Law (The Graduate Institute of International Studies).

**Ms. Julie de Rivero** is the Advocacy Director of Human Rights Watch in Geneva. Prior to this position, she worked at OHCHR – Cambodia as head of its protection team. Julie de Rivero also worked as a Verification Officer and Political Affairs Officer for the UN Verification Mission to Guatemala and then joined the OHCHR as Assistant to the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants. She has also worked for the Switzerland-based International Service for Human Rights (ISHR) as manager of its Human Rights Defenders Program.

**Mr. Hans Thoolen** was one of the founders of HURIDOCS and the first Director of the Netherlands Institute of Human Rights (SIM). He was Executive Secretary of the International Commission of Jurists and has worked 15 years for UN High Commissioner for Refugees (inter alia as Chief of the Refugee Documentation Centre, Head of the offices in Stockholm and Kampala and Coordinator of the 50th Anniversary). Mr. Thoolen is founder and President of the Martin Ennals Foundation. Recently he set up a new foundation: True Heroes, films for Human Rights Defenders.

**Plenary IV – Communicating human rights through technology**

**Florence Devouard** is a consultant in Collaborative Media. She served as one of the elected Wikimedia community representative to the Board of Wikimedia Foundation during four years and was Chair of that Board from 2006 to 2008. She is now member of the Advisory Board of Wikimedia Foundation. She is also a founding member of Wikimedia France. Florence is a French citizen and also lived in Antwerp (Belgium) and Tempe (Arizona, United States of America). She holds two masters, one in Agricultural Sciences and the other a postgraduate degree (DEA) in Genetics and Biotechnologies. She has been working in public research, first in flower plant genetic improvement, and second in microbiology to study the feasibility of polluted soil bioremediation. She was employed until 2005 in a French company, to conceive decision-making tools in sustainable agriculture. She joined the Wikipedia adventure in February 2002 and is known as a contributor under the pseudonym Anthere. On May 16 2008, she was made a knight in the French National Order of Merit.
Mr. Lars Bromley is a Project Director at the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). His primary interests are applying information and communication technologies to human rights issues, especially geospatial technologies. For the past three years, Mr. Bromley has been using satellite imagery to help NGOs document atrocities in crisis zones like Darfur, Burma, and Zimbabwe. Using reporting gathered with a variety of methods from the Web and from on-the-ground reporting, Mr. Bromley and his team derive coordinates from the information and gather information on the locations using commercial high-resolution satellite imagery. The imagery helps corroborate and quantify reports of attacks against civilians, the presence of refugees and IDPs, and more. In addition, his project helps human rights groups develop and apply a range of geospatial technologies to their work and utilize mapping tools for advocacy purposes. He has an MA from the Department of Geography at the University of Maryland.

Mr. Dan Brickley is a researcher, advocate and developer of semantic web technologies. He currently combines commercial work with ongoing involvement in Web standards as a Visiting Fellow at the University of Bristol. Dan founded the Bristol University ILRT Semantic Web group in 1997, exploring RDF-based knowledge engineering issues from a digital library, Social Science and e-learning perspective. Dan was Technical Director of the MedCertain (EU Safer Internet) project, on the issues of quality and trust in consumer-facing health/medical Web content.

Mr. Patrick Meier is a Fellow at the Harvard Humanitarian Initiative (HHI) and a PhD Candidate at The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. His applied research at HHI focuses on the changing role of information communication technology (ICT) in conflict early warning, crisis mapping and humanitarian response. His dissertation research explores the intersection between civilian resistance and digital activism in repressive contexts. He is the Director for Applied Research at DigiActive, the only initiative in the world fully dedicated to digital activism. Prior to these responsibilities, Mr. Meier held research positions at the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO) and Columbia University's Centre for International Conflict Resolution (CICR). He also worked on numerous conflict prevention and early warning projects with the European Commission, OSCE, OECD, UN, the International Crisis Group (ICG) and International Alert (IA). Mr. Meier graduated with an MA in International Affairs from Columbia University and is the author the iRevolution blog.

Mr. Sam Gregory is a human rights activist, advocacy trainer and video producer. Since 2000, he has been Program Director at WITNESS (witness.org; hub.witness.org). WITNESS uses video and online technologies to open the eyes of the world to human rights violations. It empowers people to transform personal stories of abuse into powerful tools for justice, promoting public engagement and policy change. In 2005, he was the lead editor on Video for Change: A Guide for Advocacy and Activism. He has worked in collaboration with human rights groups in countries including Indonesia, Philippines, Guatemala, Argentina, Thailand/Burma and the US, co-producing over fifteen videos that have been screened at venues including the UN, US Congress and UK Houses of Parliament, and supporting international advocacy and outreach campaigns. He has led a range of international human rights training workshops and in 2007 led the development of the curriculum for WITNESS' first ever two-week Video Advocacy Institute. He holds a Masters in Public Policy from the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

Mr. James Lawson is currently the Head of Information and Publishing in the Directorate General of Human Rights and legal affairs of the Council of Europe for which he has worked for over 20 years. He used to be the Chair of the European Co-ordination Committee for Human Rights Documentation. Mr. Lawson created the first HuriSearch prototype in 1999. He now carries special responsibility for overseeing the HURIDOCS Tools and Techniques Development Programme. He is a member of the HURIDOCS Continuation Committee since 1992 and Treasurer from 1992 to 1999.

Ms. Judith Cohen is the Head of the Parliamentary Liaison and Legislation and Treaty Body Monitoring Programme of the South African Human Rights Commission. The Programme implies engaging in parliamentary liaison and legislation monitoring at national and provincial levels as well as monitoring and engaging with the UN Treaty Body System. The work of the programme seeks to impact on the promotion and protection of human rights through advocacy and submission writing and conducting research.
Ms. Isabelle Heyer is the Representative of the Colombian Commission of Jurists (CCI) before the United Nations since September 2007. Prior to joining the CCI, she has worked, among others, during four years at the International Commission of Jurists (ICJ) in Geneva as Programme Officer on Colombia and on counter-terrorism and human rights issues worldwide.

Ms. Malak Poppovic is Executive Director of Conectas Human Rights. From 2001 to 2005, she was a Consultant for the UN Foundation’s Peace, Security and Human Rights Program. She served previously as Special Advisor to the President of Brazil’s Comunidade Solidária Partnership Program Against Poverty and Social Exclusion in Brasilia (1995-2000) and as a Senior Researcher at the Centre for the Study of Violence of the University of Sao Paulo (1989-1994). From 1975-1988, she worked in several countries for the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees. She has a B.A. in Economics from Cairo University and a M.A. in International Economics and Political Sciences from the Graduate Institute of International Studies in Geneva. She is author of several articles on refugees, humanitarian law and human rights.

Mr. Adrien Claude Zoller is the President of the training organisation Geneva for Human Rights. Mr. Zoller has had a long-time engagement within the international human rights community. He was the founder of the International Service for Human Rights (1984) and its first Director (October 1987 to March 2003). He was also a co-founder of Organisation Mondiale contre la Torture (OMCT) (1985) and of the Geneva Office of Pax Christi International (1980). He studied law, political science and management. He has produced many publications on human rights-related subjects, including a contribution to the 1997 World Report on Freedoms of Religion and Belief, the history of the UN confidential procedure and the history of the UN Working on enforced disappearances.

Ms. Agnieszka Raczynska works for the Mexican National Network of Civil Organizations of Human Rights “Todos los Derechos para Todas y Todos”. Prior to this engagement, she was Coordinator for the Centro de Derechos Humanos Fray Francisco de Vitoria O.P., A.C. She also has been involved with Amnesty International for more than ten years. She was elected Chair of the Mexican Section on two occasions and has worked as the Campaign coordinator of the Mexico’s office of Amnesty International.

Plenary VI – Communicating economic, social and cultural rights

Prof. Eibe Riedel is a Member of the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; Professor of Comparative Public Law, International and European Law at the University of Mannheim/Germany; and a member of the German Institute for Human Rights (DIMR). He is also a member of the German UNESCO Commission, and a director of the Institute for German, European and International Medical Law, Public Health and Bioethics of the Universities of Heidelberg and Mannheim. His post-doctoral thesis was entitled “Theory of Human Rights Standards”, Berlin, 1986.

Ms. Claire Mahon is an international human rights lawyer. She is the joint Coordinator of the Project on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights at the Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights, and a Research Associate and occasional Senior Lecturer at the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies. She has previously worked for Amnesty International, the International Commission of Jurists, the International Service for Human Rights, the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions, and the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. Ms. Mahon has published on a variety of international human rights law topics, for academic publications and non-governmental organisations. Prior to moving to Geneva, she worked as a corporate lawyer in mergers and acquisitions in Australia. Ms. Mahon is currently completing a PhD on the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

Mr. Luis Maria Lozano is staff member in the Communication department of the Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) in Buenos Aires, Argentina. He has studied Communication Sciences at Buenos Aires University (UBA), and he is a teaching assistant in the Communication, Politics and Planification chair of this university. He has written the 2008 and 2009 chapters about freedom of speech in CELS’ Annual Report on the situation of human rights in Argentina.
Ms. Caroline Dommen recently joined the Quaker UN Office. She was the founder and former Director of 3D - Trade - Human Rights - Equitable Economy. 3D works on trade and human rights, seeking to ensure that trade and trade-related rules are consistent with human rights. From 1998 to 2000, she was the International Law Officer of the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD). Ms. Dommen has a Masters Degree in Law and Development from the University of London.

Closing Plenary

Ms. Mariette Grange is a human rights practitioner and an international advocate. She co-founded the Amnesty International office to the United Nations in Geneva before joining the World Council of Churches in 1992 where she worked on migration and forced displacement, child labour and “child protagonism”, women rights, and the landmines campaign before becoming the WCC’s representative to the UN. She then established an international advocacy programme for refugees, migrants and internally-displaced persons for the International Catholic Migration Commission. In 2006, she headed the Human Rights Watch Office in Geneva. Until recently, Ms. Grange was the External Relations Coordinator of the International Council on Human Rights Policy. She is advisor to various civil society organisations and academic projects on issues of migration and human rights mechanisms and the author of numerous articles.

Mr. Jonathan Kuttab is a human rights lawyer and member of the Israeli, Palestinian and New York Bar Associations. He is Co-founder of Al Haq (International Commission of Jurists Branch); the Mandela Institute for Prisoners; and the Palestinian Center for the Study of Nonviolence. He was Head of the Legal Committee of the Palestinian Delegation negotiating the Cairo Agreement, 1994. He is Chair of the Board of the Bethlehem Bible College and Chair of the Board of the Holy Land Trust. He was member of the Council of HURIDOCs, 1982-1986; International Advisory Council member 1986–1998; and Continuation Committee member since 1998.

Labs/Workshops

Mr. Morten Bergsmo is Senior Researcher, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO) (2006-present); Co-ordinator of the ICC Legal Tools Project outside the ICC (2006-present); formerly Special Adviser to the Office of the Director of Public Prosecution of Norway (2007-08); Senior Legal Adviser and Chief of the Legal Advisory Section, ICC Office of the Prosecutor (2002-05); Legal Adviser, International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) (1994-2002); Legal Adviser, UN Commission of Experts for the Former Yugoslavia established pursuant to Security Council resolution 780(1992) (1993-94); represented the ICTY to the UN negotiation process to establish the ICC (1996-2002). He has advised core international crimes investigation and prosecution processes in several countries, including Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Canada, Denmark, Indonesia, Iraq, Macedonia, Norway and Serbia. He has published extensively in international criminal law and has had several international consultancies in international criminal justice.

Mr. Gunnar Berkemeier is an Associate Human Rights Officer in the Universal Periodic Review Section of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)’.

Ms. Fiona Blyth-Kubota is Human Rights Officer of OHCHR, UPR Section, and Human Rights Council Branch.

Perrine Canavaggio a general conservator of patrimony, is Deputy Secretary General of the International Council on Archives (ICA) since 2002. She was Secretary of the International Conference of the Round Table on Archives (CITRA) from 2000 to 2008 and responsible for the working group Archives and Human Rights of the ICA from 2003 to 2008. Previously, she was Head of Mission at the National archives at the Ministry of the Interior of France (1973- 1980) and Chief of service of the archives of the Presidency of the Republic during the Presidencies of Valéry Giscard d’Estaing and then François Mitterrand (1974-1994). After a brief passage as the head of the Minutier central des notaires parisiens in the National Archives, she was Deputy to the Directeur des Archives de France (1995-1996) and participated in the preparation of the report by Guy Braibant, President of the honorary section of the State Council, les Archives en France, Paris, 1996. She interrupted her professional activities for some years spent in Spain (1996-2001). She has published articles on political archives in La Gazette des Archives and in administrative periodicals.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipfunde-Vava, Rindai</td>
<td>Zimbabwe Electoral Support Network (ZESN)</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td><a href="http://www.zesn.org.zw">www.zesn.org.zw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization or Title</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courchesne, Steven</td>
<td>Human Rights Education Associates (HREA)</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hrea.org">www.hrea.org</a></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guth, John Christopher</td>
<td>Conference of NGO's in relation with the UN (CONGO)</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ngocongo.org">www.ngocongo.org</a></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmeier, Felix</td>
<td>Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES)</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fes-geneva.org">www.fes-geneva.org</a></td>
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<td>Mahon, Claire</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manusyan, Sonata</td>
<td>«Socioscope» Societal Research and Consultancy Center NGO</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>-</td>
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<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
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<td>Harvard Humanitarian Initiative (HHI), Applied Research at DigiActive/iRevolution</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molina Theissen, Lucrecia</td>
<td>Instituto Interamericano de Derechos Humanos and Corte Interamericana de Derechos Humanos</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutupa, Mary</td>
<td>African Women Millennium Initiative on Poverty and Human Rights Zambia (AWOMIZ)</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narvaez Vargas, Rosario</td>
<td>Asociación Pro Derechos Humanos (APRODEH)</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aprodeh.org.pe">www.aprodeh.org.pe</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngawang Choephel</td>
<td>Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organisation (UNPO)</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td><a href="http://www.unpo.org">www.unpo.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noval, Aida Maria</td>
<td>HURIDOCS</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td><a href="http://www.huridocs.org">www.huridocs.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyback, Harriet</td>
<td>Abo Akademi Institute for Human Rights</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>web.abo.fi/institut/imr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyilibakwe, Pascal</td>
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<td><a href="http://www.ldgl.org">www.ldgl.org</a></td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panhölzl, Boris</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Canada</td>
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<td>Human Rights House Foundation</td>
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<tr>
<td>Poppovic, Malek</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raczynska, Agnieszka</td>
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<td>Aim for human rights</td>
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