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119th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

1. Opening of the Assembly

The 119th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union opened its proceedings at the Geneva International Conference Centre in the morning of Monday, 13 October 2008. Mr. P.F. Casini, welcomed the participants and declared the 119th Assembly officially open. He was subsequently elected President of the Assembly, and the Vice-President of the Executive Committee, Mr. A. Radi (Morocco), was elected Vice-President.

2. Participation

Delegations of the following 134 Member Parliaments took part in the work of the Assembly: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palestine, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.


Of the 1,197 delegates who attended the Assembly, 532 were members of national parliaments. The parliamentarians included 37 Speakers, 41 deputy Speakers and 158 women parliamentarians (29.7%).

3. Choice of an emergency item (Item 2)

The Assembly had before it a consolidated request for the inclusion of an emergency item submitted by the delegations of Belgium, Egypt, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mexico and the United Arab

---

1 The resolution and reports referred to in this document and general information on the Geneva session are available on the IPU website (www.ipu.org).
2 For the complete list of IPU Members, see page 18.
Emirates. The item, entitled "The role of parliaments in containing the global financial crisis and its economic impact, both on developing and developed countries", was unanimously adopted by the Assembly and added to the agenda as Item 6 (see page 19).

4. Debates and decisions of the Assembly and of the IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs

(a) Debate on the emergency item

The role of parliaments in containing the global financial crisis and its economic impact, both on developing and developed countries (Item 6)

The debate on the emergency item took place in the afternoon of Monday, 13 October. It was chaired in turn by the President and by Mr. A. Kozlovskiy (Russian Federation), acting as Vice-President. A total of 30 speakers from 29 parliamentary delegations and one observer took part.

During the debate, speakers expressed concern about the current crisis and underlined the serious impact it was having on developing and developed countries. They called for greater transparency of financial markets, for regulation of the financial sector so as to prevent future financial crises, for oversight of financial institutions and for central banks and currency control agencies to implement precautionary policies. They also spoke of the need to reduce the social consequences of the financial crisis and called on the IPU to convene an international parliamentary conference as soon as possible to examine the causes and effects of the international financial crisis, so as to identify ways of dealing with its consequences. These and other concerns and initiatives were reflected in the resolution prepared by a drafting committee made up of members of the delegations of Belgium, Egypt, India, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Russian Federation, United Kingdom and Venezuela. The drafting committee appointed Mr. B. Apte (India) as its president and rapporteur.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously by the Assembly on Wednesday, 15 October (see page 20).

(b) Report of the IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs (Item 4)

The IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs convened on 13 and 15 October 2008 under the chairmanship of Mr. F.M. Vallersnes (Norway). Its Advisory Group met on 14 October to deliberate and draft the conclusions of the Committee’s 2008 session. The Committee’s report was presented to the Assembly on 15 October by Ms. N. Madlalala-Routledge (South Africa) and endorsed by acclamation.

The Committee took stock of the United Nations Secretary-General’s 2008 Report on Cooperation between the United Nations and the Inter-Parliamentary Union contained in UN General Assembly document A/63/228 (see page 24). It welcomed the strong and growing partnership between the two organizations and endorsed the recommendations formulated by the United Nations Secretary-General. It encouraged parliaments to secure the fullest possible support from their foreign ministries for a strong General Assembly resolution, based on his conclusions.

The Committee discussed a draft survey on parliaments’ interaction with the United Nations. The survey proposed to determine the manner in which parliaments related to the UN system, to the special meetings and major negotiating processes under way at the United Nations, and to UN country offices. All parliaments were urged to submit their responses to the survey no later than 30 November 2008. The survey conclusions, including good practices and recommendations for future action, would be discussed at the 120th IPU Assembly, in Addis Ababa.

The Committee received the report of its Advisory Group meeting of 18 July 2008, and expressed strong support for the Group’s work. It encouraged the Advisory Group to continue to give priority to those questions falling within its mandate, such as United Nations reform at the country level, which were conducive to practical activities through which the IPU and national parliaments could make a real difference on the ground.

The Committee welcomed the report on its Advisory Group’s field mission to Tanzania to evaluate the One UN reform and gauge parliament’s part in the process. It endorsed the report’s conclusions calling for parliament to play a more dynamic role in the conception, implementation and oversight of national development plans, which implied increased involvement in the upstream planning of the national budget.

The Committee was convinced that the One UN reform in Tanzania would lead to more efficient delivery of development aid. It therefore urged parliaments also in other countries to encourage a more coherent approach to aid delivery at the country level, where appropriate along the lines of
the One UN principles, and to promote greater effectiveness, transparency and accountability of UN operations at the national level.

The Committee welcomed the results of the Third High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness and the ensuing Accra Agenda for Action. It was particularly pleased at the Forum’s acknowledgement that successful implementation of the Agenda would require national parliaments to play an enhanced role and bear greater responsibility in the preparation of national development plans, the integration of international development assistance into national budgets and the monitoring of development policies, strategies and performance. It urged all national parliaments to follow this process closely and act on the recommendations.

The Committee urged members of parliament, while duly respecting the principle of the separation of powers, to join national delegations to major international events and conferences more systematically, particularly those relating to development cooperation and other major global issues.

As national parliaments and the IPU expanded their work in the area of development cooperation, the Committee called for the IPU to engage in more structured dialogue with international financial institutions, in particular the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

The Committee heard presentations from the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the right to food, the World Food Programme and the World Health Organization on the food crisis and its health implications. It held a debate on the topic, and identified possible avenues for action and cooperation by national parliaments.

(c) Panel discussion (First Standing Committee subject item at 120th Assembly: Advancing nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, and securing the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty: The role of parliaments (Item 3(a))

The panel discussion took place in the morning of 14 October. It was chaired by Mr. T. Boa (Côte d’Ivoire), President of the Standing Committee on Peace and International Security. The co-Rapporteurs, Mr. R. Price (Australia) and Mr. J. Mwiimbu (Zambia), presented their draft report which focused on the current situation, the challenges ahead, and the role and responsibility of parliaments and parliamentarians. Participants also heard keynote presentations from Mr. T. Toth, Executive Secretary of the Preparatory Commission of the Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) and Mr. A. Ware, Global Coordinator of Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament.

A lively discussion followed, with some 50 legislators from as many parliaments taking the floor. Participants recognized that nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation were crucial matters, and that their constituencies expected them, as parliamentarians, to play a more active role in overcoming some of the major impediments to the current nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament regime. As one participant remarked, the abolition of nuclear weapons would not only rid the world of one of the greatest threats to its security and survival, but would also open the doors to the international collaboration required to solve other key global problems.

Inversely, the point was made that in today’s world, marked by dramatic climate change, depleting oil reserves and daunting development challenges, a revival of nuclear energy could not be ruled out. Due to technological advances, making a clear distinction between the development of peaceful nuclear capacity on the one hand and military nuclear capacity on the other was becoming increasingly difficult, and the distinction often became a purely political one. The international community, therefore, needed a clear, comprehensive and non-discriminatory approach, based on a set of common guidelines, safeguards and verification mechanisms.

The gender dimension of nuclear non-proliferation was also raised, as women and children tended to become the weakest link in a brutal economic system where nuclear waste was dumped in poor regions with few or no safeguards in place. That had a devastating impact on the world’s most vulnerable populations.

Participants evoked a series of good practices and bold legislation that might inspire other parliaments to take action. Examples included the establishment of nuclear-free zones, the voluntary renouncement of nuclear capacity, pension fund regulations to prevent investments in nuclear activities, and the leading role played by some parliaments in expediting ratification and implementation of major international treaties. Several delegations stated their intention to contribute to the early entry into force of the CTBT, preferably before the next review conference in 2010.
(d) Panel discussion (Second Standing Committee subject item at 120th Assembly: Climate change, sustainable development models, and renewable energies (Item 3(b))

The panel discussion took place in the afternoon of 14 October 2008, with Mr. P. Martin-Lalande (France), President of the Second Standing Committee on Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade, in the chair. The panel provided an opportunity for IPU Members to deepen their understanding of the subject item to be debated at the 120th IPU Assembly. In addition to the two co-Rapporteurs, Mr. H-J. Fuchtel (Germany) and Mr. Á. Lins (Brazil), who were to prepare a report and a draft resolution on the agenda item for the next Assembly, the panel included two experts, Mr. C. Frei, Senior Director, Energy Industries and Strategy, World Economic Forum, and Mr. C. Nuttall, Director, Centre for Innovative Partnerships, UNDP.

The four panellists’ introductory statements were followed by a lively exchange of views, with a total of 38 delegates taking the floor. While agreeing on the pressing need for concerted global action to mitigate the effects of climate change, delegates offered widely differing views on what sources of energy could offer the best solution in terms of reducing the carbon footprint of human activity. The controversy surrounding the use of nuclear energy and biofuels as alternatives to fossil fuel energy production drew particular attention. It was noted that parliaments bore their share of responsibility for preserving the planet’s natural resources and safeguarding ecological sustainability in the sense of the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The challenge could be met only if industrialized countries, emerging economies and developing countries established a global development partnership and worked together to eradicate poverty and hunger. During the debate, delegates proposed a number of additions to the texts of the draft reports prepared by the co-Rapporteurs.

It was noted that parliaments bore their share of responsibility for preserving the planet’s natural resources and safeguarding ecological sustainability in the sense of the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The challenge could be met only if industrialized countries, emerging economies and developing countries established a global development partnership and worked together to eradicate poverty and hunger. During the debate, delegates proposed a number of additions to the texts of the draft reports prepared by the co-Rapporteurs.

(e) Panel discussion (Third Standing Committee subject item at 120th Assembly: Freedom of expression and the right to information (Item 3(c))

The panel discussion took place in the morning of 14 October 2008. It was chaired by Mr. D. Cánepa (Uruguay), President of the Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights. The co-Rapporteurs, Mr. A. Dismore (United Kingdom) and Mr. P. Rashtrapal (India), replacing Mr. K. Malaisamy, informed participants of progress made in the preparation of their report and draft resolution.

They highlighted the main issues addressed in the draft report and called on the participants to make inputs in order to enrich the final report and inform the draft resolution under preparation. Participants also heard keynote presentations from Ms. P. Tlakula, Commissioner of the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights, and Ms. A. Callamard, Executive Director of ARTICLE 19, a human rights organization. Some 37 delegates also took the floor to address those issues.

Participants stressed the importance of freedom of expression to democracy. While all citizens needed to enjoy this right, they should do so responsibly. Freedom of expression should be exercised with due regard for other people’s rights and reputation. Furthermore, tolerance and respect for religious and cultural beliefs of diverse segments of the population should be encouraged.

Freedom of expression required a strong and independent media that was able to express the diverse views of society. Press censorship was inimical to democracy. Rather, the press should adopt self-regulatory mechanisms and codes of conduct that prevented abuse. State authorities should also refrain from curtailing media freedom in the name of fighting terrorism or invoking emergency measures.

Discussions focused on the need for State-controlled media to implement the necessary transformation to become a full-fledged public service tool in the interest of all. Plurality and diversity of media ownership was also highlighted as essential to freedom of expression.

Participants stressed that access to information was a fundamental right of all citizens and that State institutions were the custodians of information on behalf of the people. It should be mandatory for them to provide such information to enable citizens to make informed choices. Efforts should be made to limit the circumstances under which information could be withheld, for instance, in cases of State secrecy.

Parliaments and their members had an important role to play to ensure transparency of their internal processes but also to promote and protect citizens’ right of access to information. They should adopt and oversee implementation of an appropriate legislative framework. Parliaments were also called on to work towards the removal of other barriers to access, for instance, by combating illiteracy and
promoting new means of delivering information to the public, including the Internet. Citizens should be able to access information in an equitable fashion and every effort should be made to avoid a situation where impediments to access aggravated socio-economic inequalities, especially in respect of women, who were often the victims of stereotyping.

### 5. Amendments to the Statutes and Rules of the Inter-Parliamentary Union (Item 5)

At its first sitting on Monday, 13 October, the Assembly had before it a proposal, previously endorsed by the Governing Council, to amend Article 3 of the Statutes in order to make it possible for the Parliament of Palestine to become a Member of the IPU. It heard the delegate of Israel, who expressed his delegation's opposition to the adoption of the proposed amendment.

The Assembly adopted the amendment (see page 22) by a roll-call vote, in accordance with Article 16.1 of the Statutes of the IPU. The results of the vote were 1,219 in favour, 93 against and 230 abstentions.

---

### 183rd Session of the Governing Council

1. **Election of the President of the Inter-Parliamentary Union**

   The Governing Council elected Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab (Namibia) as President of the Inter-Parliamentary Union for a three-year term ending in October 2011.

2. **Membership of the IPU**

   At its sitting on 13 October, the Governing Council approved the request for affiliation of the Parliament of Oman and the requests for reaffiliation of the parliaments of Comoros and Sierra Leone. At its sitting on 15 October, it approved the affiliation of the Parliament of Palestine. The delegation of Palestine subsequently made a statement thanking the IPU for having accorded its Parliament the status of full Member and setting out its position on that issue. The IPU currently comprises 154 Member Parliaments.

   The Governing Council took note that the Parliament of Kyrgyzstan had accumulated more than three years' arrears in the payment of its contribution and would therefore automatically be suspended on 1st January 2009, unless payment was received before 31 December 2008.

   The Governing Council also approved requests for observer status from the Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean (PAM) and from the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA).

3. **Financial situation of the IPU**

   The Governing Council received a comprehensive written report on the financial situation of the IPU as at 30 September 2008. The Secretary General projected a substantial operating surplus as a result of savings from the weak US dollar and due to the changes in the financial regulations by which contributions from new Members and earnings on the Working Capital Fund were recognized as income. A list of Members' arrears as at 10 October 2008 showed five Members with significant arrears and subject to sanctions under the Statutes.

   The Council was told that the financial crisis had had a deleterious effect on the closed Staff Pension Fund, which had lost 9 per cent of its value since the start of the year. It was noted that the IPU was responsible for any eventual deficit in the Fund, which provided the pensions for 12 retired members of the Secretariat.

4. **Programme and budget for 2009**

   The Council received the budget proposal for 2009 and a summary of planned activities and requirements for 2009-2011. The Secretary General noted that the consolidated budget was results-based and sustainable, in both fiscal and environmental terms. For each area of expenditure the gender effects and the environmental impacts were clearly identified. As in the previous year, the budget proposed to be carbon-neutral by providing funds to offset carbon emissions.

   Mr. R. del Picchia (France) reported on the discussions of the Executive Committee which had unanimously endorsed the budget. The Committee expressed support for the budget presentation, which it commended for its transparency and detail. Mr. R. del Picchia noted that the budget included additional funds for parliamentary activities related to development, such as promoting the MDGs and combating HIV/AIDS, more funding for peace activities, including missions of the Committee on
Middle East Questions, and new funding for security at the second Assembly and for preparations for a Conference of Speakers of Parliament in 2010. The proposed increase in assessed contributions was below inflation and in keeping with the longer term commitment to limit fee increases.

One delegate from each geopolitical group spoke on the budget analysis their group had undertaken. All of the speakers noted the continued improvement in the content and visual quality of the budget that made it easier to understand. They applauded the targeted increases in spending on gender issues, development issues and peace activities. Several speakers welcomed the expenditure on teleconferencing facilities and called for more efforts to reduce travel. The African Group echoed the request of the Executive Committee for measures to facilitate the participation of parliaments that could not afford to join the IPU. Members drew attention to past difficulties in fully executing the budget and in particular looked forward to progress in the implementation of a communication strategy for the IPU.

At the end of the debate, the Governing Council approved the 2009 budget as recommended by the Executive Committee with gross operating expenses of CHF 18,359,000 for 2009, requiring an overall increase of 2.5 per cent in assessed contributions, and capital expenditures of CHF 100,000. The Council authorized carbon emissions of up to 1,709 tonnes in relation to heating and staff travel and agreed to offset those emissions. The Executive Committee was expected to bring forward a proposal for effective offsetting measures to the next session of the Governing Council.

The approved budget and scale of contributions for 2009 are presented on pages 32 and 35.

5. Cooperation with the United Nations system

The Governing Council welcomed the biennial Report of the United Nations Secretary-General on Cooperation with the IPU, in particular its conclusions and recommendations for future action. All Member Parliaments were encouraged to work closely with their foreign ministries to garner strong support for an ambitious resolution of the UN General Assembly. The Hearing will examine the topic Towards effective peacekeeping and the prevention of conflict: Delivering on our commitments. All Member Parliaments were encouraged to participate actively in the event, as well as in other parliamentary meetings organized in New York during the week commencing 17 November: a conference on legislative frameworks for human rights and child protection convened by UNICEF with IPU support, and a panel discussion organized by the IPU on a parliamentary fact-finding mission to Tanzania.

The Governing Council was pleased to note that preparations were under way for the parliamentary hearing to be held on 28 November 2008 in Doha, Qatar, on the occasion of the Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development to Review the Implementation of the Monterrey Consensus. It endorsed a draft parliamentary message to be delivered at that event (see page 41).

The Council also took stock of parliamentary action in support of the MDGs, particularly those related to child and maternal health. The Council heard a presentation by Dr. F. Songane, Director of the Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health, who reported on follow-up action to the Countdown to 2015 Conference held in Cape Town, in parallel with the 118th IPU Assembly. The IPU would be working closely with the Countdown initiative to support the 68 countries currently not on track to meet the relevant MDGs. It would be preparing case studies featuring good practices adopted by at least six parliaments in framing legislation and ensuring adequate budget allocations, and would present those studies on the occasion of the 120th IPU Assembly in Addis Ababa.

The Governing Council took stock of recent developments in IPU–United Nations cooperation, was informed of a variety of activities carried out in collaboration with or in support of the United Nations (see page 39), and approved a calendar of forthcoming initiatives and meetings.

6. Activities in the field of development

In the context of consolidation of the reform of the IPU, the Governing Council was informed of recent IPU activities in the field of development and of efforts under way to start transforming them into a more comprehensive programme of activities (see page 42). The Council gave its general endorsement to the plans to establish a programme to mobilize parliaments on development issues, with special focus on such issues as the attainment
of the MDGs, reduction of child mortality and improvement of maternal health, the fight against HIV/AIDS and other pandemic diseases, poverty reduction, environmental sustainability, and promotion of global partnerships for development. Those priorities were duly reflected in the IPU’s programme and budget for 2009 as well as the Planned Activities and Requirements for Voluntary Funding 2009-2011.

7. IPU Policy on the participation of persons with disabilities

The Governing Council approved a policy to ensure the participation of persons with disabilities in the work of the Organization, whether as delegates, as candidates for employment, as employees or as public interlocutors. The policy, which was premised on the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, set out objectives to raise awareness and promote inclusion. The IPU undertook to make its meetings accessible, provide public information that could be understood by all, provide barrier-free access to facilities, ensure equal employment opportunities and accommodate disabled employees.

The Governing Council stipulated that the policy should be gradually implemented within a reasonable timeframe and without imposing undue burden, financial or otherwise, on the IPU. The Secretary General would report back on the implementation of the policy.

8. Action by the IPU to strengthen democracy and parliamentary institutions

First International Day of Democracy

The Governing Council took note of a report by the Secretary General on activities undertaken by parliaments and the IPU to celebrate the first International Day of Democracy on 15 September 2008. The Day was proclaimed by the United Nations in November 2007 and coincided with the 11th anniversary of the adoption of the IPU Universal Declaration on Democracy in September 1997.

Some 50 parliaments had reported to the IPU on the activities they had organized. They included, among others, the adoption of resolutions marking the Day, television and radio programmes, ‘open days’ and special parliamentary sessions. The IPU President had participated in one such session at the Hellenic Parliament. Other activities included the involvement of the public, in particular young people, in parliamentary proceedings and the organization of democracy-related exhibitions. Many of the parliaments had made use of the information that the IPU had placed at their disposal, which included a poster and leaflet, as well as a redesigned version of the 1997 Universal Declaration on Democracy. Some had translated or intended to translate the material into their national language(s).

At its Geneva Headquarters, the IPU had organized a panel discussion on 15 September 2008, focusing on the challenges to democracy today. Guest speakers included Mr. D. Türk, President of Slovenia; Ms. M. Lagos, Executive Director of LatinoBarómetro, a polling organization in Chile; and Professor B. Barber, a US-based political analyst and writer. Former US President Jimmy Carter had sent a video message and Mr. S. Ordzhonikidze, Director of the United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG) had made a few introductory remarks on behalf of his Organization. The event was attended by ambassadors, journalists, students and representatives of international organizations and non-governmental organizations. It was webcast live and can be seen at: http://www.ipu.org/dem-e/idd/events.htm#videos.

In addition, the IPU had set up an exhibition of caricatural drawings portraying challenges to democracy. The exhibition had also been on display during the 119th Assembly. A special section on the International Day of Democracy was created on the IPU website (http://www.ipu.org/idd/overview.htm). The section contained background information, a list of events organized by the IPU and its Member Parliaments, a series of questions and answers entitled "10 things you should know about democracy", a video extract of the above-mentioned panel discussion, and the exhibition of political caricatures.

The Governing Council took note of the activities. They endorsed the appeal by the Secretary General for an increasing number of parliaments to celebrate the Day in the future.

Promoting and defending democracy

The Council took note of a comprehensive report by the Secretary General on activities carried out recently by the IPU in the area of democracy. The work continued to be inspired by the 1997 Universal Declaration on Democracy and the 2006 handbook on Parliaments and democracy in the twenty-first century: A guide to good practice.

As far as strengthening parliaments was concerned, the IPU continued to give priority to parliaments in post-conflict countries. It had carried out extensive needs assessments of the parliaments in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Sierra Leone and Togo.
Those assessments were currently being converted into assistance projects in cooperation with the United Nations and the parliaments concerned. The IPU continued to assist the parliaments of Afghanistan, Burundi, Equatorial Guinea and Timor-Leste. In Burundi, the IPU had initiated a good offices mechanism to facilitate political dialogue and inclusiveness in the functioning of the parliament.

The IPU’s parliamentary strengthening programmes increasingly focused on capacity-building in substantive areas identified in cooperation with the parliaments and less and less on procedure and processes. They were complemented by thematic regional and subregional seminars on issues where the IPU had developed specific expertise, such as human rights, gender equality and gender budgeting, reconciliation, security sector reform and sustainable development.

Four specific initiatives had been launched recently. The first sought to facilitate the involvement of parliaments in the least developed countries in the implementation of the 2001 Brussels Programme and Plan of Action, which set out a comprehensive poverty reduction strategy tailored specifically to the needs of the LDCs. The second consisted of helping a number of French-speaking African parliaments to promote and ensure implementation of major human rights treaties. A third initiative was aimed at assisting English-speaking African parliaments to promote national reconciliation. The fourth project sought to promote a better understanding of how minorities and indigenous groups were represented in parliaments and on the basis of that knowledge, develop tools for better and more effective representation.

In the area of human rights, the IPU Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians was working to protect an ever growing number of parliamentarians who came under threat merely for exercising their right to freedom of expression. The Committee, apart from one on-site visit carried out under its confidential procedure, had carried out on-site missions to the Philippines, Ecuador and Sri Lanka, observed trial proceedings in one confidential case, as well as trial hearings of a Palestinian legislator imprisoned in Israel and hearings relating to a request for his early release.

The IPU, at the request of the Committee, also intended to carry out an in-depth study on freedom of expression and the ability of members of parliament to freely carry out their popular mandate.

The IPU was building a coalition among parliamentary human rights committees and continued to organize yearly meetings for their members to exchange views with human rights specialists. In 2007, the meeting had addressed the human rights perspective on migration. In Sri Lanka, the IPU also facilitated the work of an International Independent Group of Eminent Persons set up to observe the proceedings of the country’s National Inquiry Commission, which was investigating a number of alleged human rights violations, including the murder of two parliamentarians.

In the area of promoting gender partnership in politics, the IPU continued to track and analyse the evolution of women in parliaments and government and had published a new edition of the world map on Women in politics: 2008. It had carried out research on women in the political arena and had completed a major survey on Equality in politics: a study of women and men in parliaments, which had been launched in April 2008.

The IPU also implemented technical assistance activities for women parliamentarians and mobilized them on specific gender issues. It had organized for the second year running a Conference for women decision-makers from the Gulf Cooperation Council States. It had launched a project in Burundi to provide technical and material assistance to women parliamentarians to enable them to contribute effectively to decision-making in parliament and build strong ties with civil society in support of gender issues. The IPU also brought together members of parliamentary committees dealing with gender equality issues. In 2007, the meeting had focused on Women and Work.

In its work to promote knowledge and set standards for parliaments and democracy, the IPU had undertaken a thorough review of the Chronicle of Parliamentary Elections, which had resulted in several improvements. The IPU had also upgraded information tools available on its website and the PARLINE database had undergone a major overhaul to make it more user-friendly. The IPU worked closely with the Global Centre for Parliaments and ICT (jointly established with the UN Department for Economic and Social Affairs) to promote parliaments’ use of ICT. They had organized a first Global e-Parliament Conference in Geneva late last year and had published the first ever World e-Parliament Report in early 2008.

In view of its increasing work in the area of democracy, the IPU had continued to expand its funding base through support from a growing number of donors. That would enable it to deepen and expand its activities. Future areas of priority included promoting political dialogue and inclusiveness in post-conflict parliaments.
9. Recent specialized conferences and meetings

The Governing Council took note of the results of the seminar on The role of parliaments in Central America in reconciliation and democratization processes (see http://www.ipu.org/splz-e/salvador08.htm), the Conference organized by the African Parliamentary Union in cooperation with the IPU on Africa and migration: Challenges, problems and solutions (see http://www.ipu.org/splz-e/rabat08.htm), the Parliamentary briefing on HIV/AIDS (see http://www.ipu.org/splz-e/aids-brief08.htm), the Stakeholder Forum on The role of national and local stakeholders in contributing to aid quality and effectiveness (see http://www.ipu.org/splz-e/dcf-rome.pdf), the Panel discussion on Parliaments, peace building and reconciliation (see http://www.ipu.org/splz-e/reconcil08.pdf), the Regional Seminar on The role of parliaments in national reconciliation processes in English-speaking Africa (see http://www.ipu.org/splz-e/sierra08.htm), the Parliamentary briefing at the XVII International AIDS Conference (http://www.ipu.org/splz-e/mexico08.htm), the Annual session of the Parliamentary Conference on the WTO (http://www.ipu.org/splz-e/trade08.htm), and the Subregional workshop on special measures for women.

10. Reports of plenary bodies and specialized committees

At its sitting on 15 October, the Governing Council took note of the reports on the activities of the Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians, the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians, the Committee on Middle East Questions, and the Gender Partnership Group (see pages 13 to 15).

11. Future inter-parliamentary meetings

The Governing Council approved a list of future meetings and other activities to be funded by the Union's regular budget as well as by external sources (see page 49). The Council approved a list of international organizations and other bodies to be invited to follow the work of the 120th Assembly as observers. It also approved the venue of Bangkok (Thailand) for the 122nd Assembly.
The Committee heard the customary report on transitional assemblies, welcoming the establishment of the new parliament in Angola. It discussed the question of the role of its six vice-presidents, with suggestions that the responsibilities be shared on a geographical basis, or that each should take care of a different thematic area. It emphasized the importance of ensuring the representation of the organization at times when the President was not able to do so, and decided to resume discussion of the subject in Addis Ababa. The Committee also broached the question of parliamentary networks and asked the Secretary General to prepare a detailed study for their next session. It also discussed applications for observer status from bodies that did not fall within the five categories set forth in the modalities established by the Governing Council, also resolving to revert to the matter at the next Assembly.

The Committee considered the venues for the 122nd and 124th Assemblies. It recommended, following a unanimous vote, that the 122nd Assembly be held in Thailand, the only potential host whose invitation had already been studied by the Executive Committee following completion of the procedure and received the blessing of the Council. It received a delegation from Venezuela to hear the status of that parliament’s invitation, noting that the procedure for the approval of the venue had yet to be completed. Regarding the 124th Assembly, the Committee was informed that the Parliament of Canada had maintained its invitation to host this Assembly in 2011. It expressed continuing misgivings about the question of visas being granted to all participants and decided to resume discussion of the matter at its next session.

The Committee received a report with recommendations for the procedure to be adopted for the appointment of the Secretary General of the organization in 2010. It decided to revert to the matter at its next session.

The Committee heard a report on the fiscal situation of certain staff members residing in France and noted that in 2008, the IPU had reimbursed CHF 53,000 in staff assessment to staff members to cover their tax bills. The Committee was told that the IPU was in close contact with the French IPU Group and was seeking a bilateral solution between the Swiss and the French authorities under the terms of the tax agreement between the two countries.

The Committee heard the report of the ASGP from its President, Mr. A. Forsberg.

The annual revisions to the Staff Rules, incorporating the recommendations of the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) with respect to changes in salary scales and allowances, were submitted to the Executive Committee for information. The changes involved cost-of-living adjustments to the salary scales and a reduction in dependency allowances. The Committee also heard a report on staff movements in the Secretariat. Ms. S. Gigon had resigned after ten years with the IPU office in New York, and Ms. Y. Miranda, who had been assisting the New York office on a temporary basis had completed her contract. In Geneva, Ms. M. Grossini-Welleman, Personnel Officer and Facilities Manager, would be retiring at the end of the year after 34 years with the IPU.

The Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians met on 12 October 2008. The sitting was chaired by Ms. P. Cayetano (Philippines), President of the Committee. The session served to follow up on the previous Meeting of Women Parliamentarians and to prepare the work of the forthcoming Meeting. The Coordinating Committee also discussed women’s contribution to the work of the 119th IPU Assembly.

The Committee was briefed on the work and recommendations of the Gender Partnership Group by one of its members, Ms. Z. Drif Bitat (Algeria). It noted that close to 30 per cent of delegates at the Geneva Assembly were women, and underlined that this was not an improvement over the previous Geneva Assembly in 2007. It called on delegations to pursue their efforts. It applauded the fact that the budget for 2009 included detailed information on gender-specific allocations.

Follow-up by women parliamentarians on the meetings held in Cape Town was also discussed. Committee members reported on recent developments in their respective countries, in the field of women and the media, trafficking of women and women in politics. Many members also reported on follow-up to the survey Equality in Politics: A Survey of Women and Men in Parliaments.
In particular the Parliament of Mexico was thanked for having translated the publication into Spanish.

The Committee went on to discuss its contribution to the 119th Assembly. It discussed the three themes of the Assembly’s panel discussions, highlighting aspects of each topic’s gender dimension, which the respective rapporteurs might wish to take into account.

Preparations for the fifteenth Meeting of Women Parliamentarians were also discussed. It was decided that women would debate agenda item 5 of the 120th Assembly on Climate change, sustainable development models, and renewable energies. It was also agreed that part of the Meeting’s afternoon session would be dedicated to a dialogue between men and women on the role of women in ensuring financial stability and contributing to economic development, in particular as it related to the current financial climate, which posed a threat to women’s livelihoods and the attainment of the MDGs.

Following a presentation by the representative of the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), the Committee proposed that the panel at the 120th Assembly should consider the question of Adolescent girls: the girls left behind?

The Committee was briefed on the IPU’s upcoming activities related to gender issues. It discussed follow-up of the Panel on Child Survival (MDG 4) and Maternal Health (MDG 5). The Committee members committed themselves to following up on action at the national level, to raising the issue in their respective parliaments and to mobilizing parliaments in their region. The Committee also discussed the “Say No to Violence against Women” campaign orchestrated by UNIFEM, which sought to collect one million signatures in support of its cause. That effort would contribute to the UN Secretary-General’s Campaign to End Violence Against Women. All Committee members signed up to the UNIFEM campaign, and called on IPU members to do so in their respective parliaments. Lastly, the Committee renewed its support for the iKNOW Politics initiative (www.iknowpolitics.org).

On 14 October 2008, the Coordinating Committee organized a meeting between women parliamentarians and the two candidates to the presidency of the IPU. Each candidate was received separately for a thirty-minute exchange with the women parliamentarians.
The Committee, of which much of the membership had recently been renewed, discussed its own mandate and objectives. The members agreed that their task was to act as neutral brokers in trying to help build trust between the two sides. The Committee expressed interest in holding meetings outside the context of the IPU Assemblies, to which parliamentarians from the different political parties and factions of the two sides should be invited. The Committee asked the IPU Secretariat to explore avenues for organizing such encounters.

The Committee also agreed that their work would be helped by making missions to the region to learn more about the day-to-day humanitarian situation as it affected Palestinians and Israelis. If possible, such missions should include Israel, the West Bank and Gaza in the itinerary.

3. Gender Partnership Group

The Gender Partnership Group held its 22nd session on 10 October 2008. The participants were Mr. R. del Picchia (France), Ms. Z. Drif Bitat (Algeria), Mr. N. Anh Dzung (Viet Nam) and Ms. E. Papademetriou (Greece). Mr. R. del Picchia acted as moderator.

The Group welcomed the fact that 29.7 per cent of participants at the 119th IPU Assembly were women. Though commendable, the figure showed a small drop in comparison with other Assemblies held in Geneva.

Of the 133 delegations attending the Assembly (as at October 14), 125 were composed of two delegates or more. Of those, 13 (10.4 %) were all-male, up from 9.3 per cent at the previous Assembly in Cape Town. The all-male delegations were from the parliaments of Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Guinea, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Maldives, Malta, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka and Yemen. Two delegations were all-female, namely those of Costa Rica and Iceland. The delegations from the following five countries were sanctioned at the Assembly as they were all-male for the third consecutive time: Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Malta, Qatar and Saudi Arabia.

The Group also discussed the gender sensitivity of the IPU’s budget, which it had been examining from the point of view of gender parity since 2004. In 2005 it had recommended that specific indicators be included in IPU budget proposals. The draft budget for 2009 represented significant progress in that regard, as it contained information on gender-specific allocations, both in absolute and comparative terms for the past five years, a presentation on each sector of activity explaining how that sector helped promote gender equality, and information on women in the Secretariat.

The Group then examined the situation of parliaments with no women members. At 10 October 2008, seven out of 189 parliaments had no women members: the Federated States of Micronesia (single chamber), Nauru (single chamber), Palau (lower and upper chambers), Qatar (single chamber), Saudi Arabia (single chamber), the Solomon Islands (single chamber) and Tuvalu (single chamber). Two of those parliaments had been renewed since the Assembly in Cape Town.

No noticeable progress had been made in the countries in question, with the Pacific Island States remaining most concerned. The Group recommended that greater efforts be made in the form of meetings, hearings and initiatives. It also heard Ms. Mensah-Williams (Namibia), who had led a mission to that region on behalf of the IPU. Women faced many barriers to political participation, and the cultural barrier was one of the highest. Discussions in the region therefore focused on the need to adopt proactive measures. In the face of persistent misgivings, heightened advocacy was needed.

On 15 October 2008, the Group held dialogue sessions with the delegations of Kuwait and Papua New Guinea. Both meetings were informative and constructive. The Group expressed the hope that more women would become members of these two parliaments in the near future.
Other events

1. **Workshop on Ensuring transparency in parliamentary processes**

The Workshop was attended by more than 80 participants. It was led by Prof. D. Beetham and based on a recent IPU publication entitled *Evaluating parliament: A self-assessment toolkit for parliaments*. Professor Beetham introduced the philosophy and aims of the toolkit before inviting participants to answer the questions in the section on Transparency and accessibility. A lively discussion followed, during which participants provided feedback on the toolkit and exchanged experiences on efforts made by their respective parliament to be transparent and to inform citizens of its work. Participants were reminded that the IPU intended to pilot test the toolkit; parliaments interested in carrying out a self-assessment were invited to contact the IPU Secretariat.

2. **Exhibition on the Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO)**

The Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) set up an exhibition consisting of screens depicting the Treaty and providing facts on its verification regime. The exhibition included powerful images of the Treaty, its history and various activities related to its verification regime.

3. **Exhibition on Democracy and Freedom of Expression**

The IPU exhibition of satirical drawings, set up at its Headquarters on the occasion of the first International Day of Democracy, was also on display at the 119th IPU Assembly. Drawings of caricaturists from different regions of the world were selected from the archives of the magazine *Courrier international*.

4. **Say no to Violence against Women campaign**

At the 118th Assembly, the IPU pledged to step up action to combat violence against women (VAW) and support parliaments in making this fight a national priority. This commitment serves to complement, from the parliamentary perspective, the United Nations Secretary-General’s Campaign to End Violence Against Women, which was launched in March 2008.

In 2008, UNIFEM launched its *Say no to Violence against Women* campaign. It was a global Internet-based advocacy effort in which participants added their names to an Internet list as an expression of public support and call for action. The objective was to collect 1 million signatures by the end of 2008.

During the 119th IPU Assembly, participants were invited to sign up to the campaign, thereby expressing the parliamentary community’s commitment to take action against VAW. The Campaign was signed by some 150 members of parliament and parliamentary staff from more than 65 countries. The outgoing President of the IPU, as well as both presidential candidates, also signed. All members of the Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians gave their signatures and committed themselves to disseminating the campaign in their respective countries.
Elections and appointments

1. President of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

At its final meeting, the Governing Council elected Mr. T.-B. Gurirab (Namibia) President of the IPU for a three-year term of office that will expire in October 2011. Mr. T.-B. Gurirab won 200 votes, whereas his opponent, Mr. A. Laksono (Indonesia), won 113; seven ballots were null and void.

The outgoing President, Mr. P.-F. Casini, was named Honorary President of the IPU.

2. President of the 119th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

Mr. P.-F. Casini, President of the IPU, was elected President of the Assembly.

3. Vice-Presidents of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

African Group: (To be announced)

Group of Latin America and the Caribbean: Mr. J.A. Coloma (Chile)

Arab Group: Ms. Z. Drif Bitat (Algeria)

Asia-Pacific Group: Mr. A. Toha (Indonesia)

Twelve-Plus Group: Ms. E. Papademetriou (Greece)

Eurasia Group: Mr. Kozlovskiy (Russian Federation)

4. Executive Committee

The Governing Council elected Mr. R.M.K. Al Shariqi (United Arab Emirates) and Mr. A. Alonso Díaz-Canéja (Mexico) members of the Executive Committee until October 2012.

It also elected Mr. Chin Young (Republic of Korea) until October 2011 to serve out the term of office of Mr. J.-K. Yoo (Republic of Korea), who is no longer a parliamentarian.

5. Vice-President of the Executive Committee

The Executive Committee elected Ms. E. Papademetriou (Greece) as its Vice-President until October 2009.

6. Committee on Middle East Questions

Mr. A. Ponlaboot (Thailand) and Mr. F.-X. de Donnea (Belgium) were elected titular members for a four-year term of office until October 2012. Mr. S. Janquin (France) was elected as a substitute member, also for four years.

At the start of its deliberations, the Committee elected Ms. A. Clwyd (United Kingdom) as its Chair.

7. Gender Partnership Group

The Executive Committee appointed Ms. P. Cayetano (Philippines) to the Gender Partnership Group.

8. Internal Auditors for the 2009 accounts

The Governing Council appointed Mr. D. Reisiegel (Czech Republic) and Mr. C.S. Atwal (India) as internal auditors for the 2009 financial year.

9. External Auditor for 2008-2010

The Committee appointed Mr. L. Møller of Norway as External Auditor for a further three-year term.
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* At the closure of the 119th Assembly
1. Election of the President and Vice-Presidents of the 119th Assembly

2. Consideration of possible requests for the inclusion of an emergency item in the Assembly agenda

3. Panel discussions on the subject items chosen for debate during the 120th Assembly in April-May 2009:
   
   (a) Advancing nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, and securing the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty: The role of parliaments
       (Standing Committee on Peace and International Security)

   (b) Climate change, sustainable development models, and renewable energies
       (Standing Committee on Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade)

   (c) Freedom of expression and the right to information
       (Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights)

4. Report of the IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs

5. Amendments to the Statutes and Rules of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

6. The role of parliaments in containing the global financial crisis and its economic impact, both on developing and developed countries
THE ROLE OF PARLIAMENTS IN CONTAINING THE GLOBAL FINANCIAL CRISIS AND ITS ECONOMIC IMPACT, BOTH ON DEVELOPING AND DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Resolution adopted unanimously by the 119th IPU Assembly
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The 119th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Considering the consequences of the international financial crisis and its negative repercussions on the global economy, in particular its adverse effects on developing countries,

Noting the recent warning issued by the International Monetary Fund that debt-ridden banks are pushing the global financial system to the brink of meltdown, and that it is the responsibility of the wealthy nations to restore investor confidence,

Considering the importance of parliaments’ role, in cooperation with national governments, to contain the effects of the global financial crisis that threaten the world’s stability, security and development,

Recognizing the shared and differentiated responsibility of all countries in dealing with the international economic crisis in order to meet human development needs, eradicate poverty and achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs),

Aware of the threat that the international economic crisis poses to sustainable development - considered essential for human progress - particularly in the context of the Declaration issued by the World Summit on Sustainable Development held in Johannesburg in September 2002,

Considering the need to allocate the necessary resources and to ensure the establishment of a stable, fair and secure global economic system,

Mindful of the interdependence of the national economies and the global economic system, which requires a holistic approach and strong international cooperation to ensure the optimal use of financial resources and the establishment of strong and accountable financial institutions,

Recalling that the report on the outcome of the International Conference on Financing for Development held in Monterrey, Mexico, in 2002, considered that international financial stability in particular was crucial for fostering international economic growth,

Concerned that the international financial crisis has undermined social stability in many countries around the world and threatens the gains made in democracy and human rights,

1. Calls on the Governing Council to organize, as soon as possible, an international parliamentary conference with experts to examine the causes and effects of the international financial crisis on the global economic system and identify ways of dealing with the consequences of this crisis;

2. Urges parliamentary committees dealing with financial, economic and trade-related issues to urgently convene meetings to identify the best ways of protecting financial institutions and mitigating the effects of the international financial crisis, until such time as a global strategy to deal with the crisis is found;

3. Calls on national parliaments to provide a more efficient proactive regulatory framework for national regulatory bodies with a view to preventing future instability in the major financial markets;
4. Encourages implementation of internationally agreed laws and standards on the transparency of financial markets to ensure the clarity of financial transactions, as this would enhance the national and international capacity to assess financial risks;

5. Calls on governments to include parliamentarians in their official delegations to conferences, forums and meetings organized to discuss the international financial crisis so that parliamentarians can express their opinions and ideas as the representatives of the people;

6. Calls for the necessary national and international measures to oversee financial institutions so as to mitigate the impact of this crisis;

7. Calls for action to reduce the potential social consequences of the international financial crisis as they relate to employment prospects, job security, rising prices and poverty, all of which are covered by the United Nations Millennium Declaration;

8. Calls on the central banks and currency control agencies to implement precautionary policies, procedures and measures in order to ensure the stability of the financial and banking sectors;

9. Calls for greater regulation of the financial sector, with particular attention to inter-bank lending and consumer protection, to prevent future financial crises;

10. Calls on all countries to put in place more effective law enforcement measures to deal with financial crime and to cooperate in this field;

11. Requests the governments of the leading industrialized States to assume their responsibility for the developing countries by curbing the negative effects of this crisis on their national economies and to make every effort to prepare the ground for the full participation of developing countries in shaping the global economy;

12. Urges the governments of developed States to promptly honour their commitments vis-à-vis the developing countries in order to help them resolve their domestic economic problems, eliminate poverty, illiteracy and disease and achieve higher growth rates, as recommended in relevant instruments, in particular the UN Millennium Declaration; and, in this context, urges international organizations, within their respective mandates, to contribute to the achievement of the above-mentioned objectives;

13. Urges parliaments to spare no effort in working on ideas and initiatives aimed at promoting a new rules-based financial system that could help to achieve a more just and transparent world economic structure, which in turn could also help to achieve peace and stability.
### Amendments to the Statutes and Rules of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

#### Results of roll-call vote on the proposal to amend Article 3 of the Statutes of the Inter-Parliamentary

**Results**

Affirmative votes.......................... 1219
Negative votes............................. 93
Abstentions................................. 230

Total of affirmative and negative votes . 1312
Two-thirds majority........................ 875

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abst.</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abst.</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abst.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iran (Islamic Rep. of)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lao People’s Dem. Republic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Libyan Arab Republic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The FYR of Macedonia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United Republic of Tanzania</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR of the Congo</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. This list does not include delegations present at the session which were not entitled to vote pursuant to the provisions of Article 5.2 of the Statutes.
AMENDMENTS TO THE STATUTES AND RULES OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION

Adopted by the IPU Assembly at its 119th session
(Geneva, 13 October 2008)

Amendment to the IPU Statutes

Membership

Article 3, add a new Article 3.1bis as follows:

"3bis. The parliament constituted in conformity with the basic law of a territorial entity whose aspirations and entitlement to statehood are recognized by the United Nations, and which enjoys the status of Permanent Observer to that Organization with substantial additional rights and privileges, may also become a Member of the Inter-Parliamentary Union."
DECISION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL ON THE SUBJECT OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE PARLIAMENT OF PALESTINE IN THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION

Adopted by consensus by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

"The Governing Council,

Having examined at its 183rd session (Geneva, 15 October 2008) the question of affiliation by the Parliament of Palestine to the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Noting the opinion of the Executive Committee that the Parliament fulfills the conditions laid down in Article 3 of the Statutes for membership of the Union,

Considering that the Executive Committee’s opinion is predicated on the following elements:

(a) The United Nations has on numerous occasions recognized the aspirations and entitlement to statehood of Palestine;
(b) Palestine enjoys the status of Permanent Observer to the United Nations with substantial additional rights and privileges under UNGA resolution 52/250;
(c) The Palestinian Legislative Council is a Parliament that is constituted in conformity with the basic law of the Palestinian Authority and is endowed with legislative and oversight functions,

Considering also that the current situation on the Palestinian territories impedes the functioning of the Palestinian Legislative Council and that its participation in the work of the Inter-Parliamentary Union may therefore, for the time being, be facilitated by the Palestine National Council,

Decides to admit the Parliament of Palestine as a Member of the Inter-Parliamentary Union;

Annuls, as a consequence, the decisions it adopted at its 117th and 163rd sessions regarding the participation of Palestine as an observer in the work of the Inter-Parliamentary Union".

BIENNIAL REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS SECRETARY-GENERAL ON COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION

(See General Assembly document A/63/228, Security Council document S/2008/531)

A. Overall support by parliaments to the United Nations

1. During the IPU Statutory Assemblies of 2007 and 2008, member parliaments addressed global issues that were also high on the United Nations agenda and adopted resolutions aimed at enhancing parliamentary action in support of major United Nations processes. The resolutions cover, inter alia, climate change, poverty eradication, human trafficking and migration, employment, official development assistance, peaceful coexistence of religions and cultures, and terrorism. They were circulated in the General Assembly in accordance with paragraph 3 of its resolution 57/47 of 21 November 2002. The Assemblies were well attended by UN system representatives. UNICEF
organized field visits in the host country of each Assembly (Indonesia and South Africa) to familiarize parliamentarians with United Nations operations dealing with children’s rights. Thematic debates of the General Assembly in 2007 and 2008, such as on the MDGs, climate change, and human trafficking, benefited from the substantive contribution of leading members of parliament, who also reported on their activities within IPU.

2. IPU established a new plenary Committee on United Nations Affairs, which met for the first time in October 2007. It will elaborate and monitor proposals for developing the IPU-UN relationship and examine major UN issues, including funding and accountability. It will scrutinize reform efforts, particularly the One United Nations strategy, the revitalization of the General Assembly, the strengthening of ECOSOC, and questions relating to funding. In November 2007, the IPU and UNDP signed a memorandum of understanding, which provides a framework for joint activities in areas such as democratic governance, poverty reduction, development cooperation, and women’s empowerment.

3. IPU has been involved in the elaboration of system-wide strategies for consideration by the United Nations system and the Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB). In September 2006, the IPU Secretary General suggested to the CEB’s High-Level Committee on Programmes more structured consultations and coordination between the two organizations. He has pursued the matter with the ILO and WTO Director-Generals, who have since conducted a review of the functioning of the CEB.

B. Contribution of parliaments to major United Nations events

4. The first Joint IPU-UN Parliamentary Hearing took place in November 2007. Letters of convocation to all parliaments, co-signed by the Presidents of the General Assembly and the Inter-Parliamentary Union, received an enthusiastic response. Over 200 members of parliament took part in the hearing, which focused on reinforcing the rule of law in international relations and offered an opportunity for a substantive exchange among legislators, diplomats, United Nations officials, civil society representatives and academics. The event sought to help bridge the implementation gap affecting international commitments in the areas of disarmament, counter-terrorism and the administration of international criminal justice. The hearing’s report was circulated to all Member States by the President of the General Assembly.

5. Acknowledging the role of parliaments in the response against HIV/AIDS, General Assembly resolution 62/178 encouraged Member States to include parliamentarians in national delegations to the High-level Meeting of the General Assembly on HIV/AIDS in June 2008. On the eve of the session, IPU briefed parliamentarians to explore some of the critical issues being discussed, featuring presentations by UNAIDS and UNDP on challenges in implementing effective responses to the epidemic. A Parliamentary Action on AIDS event brought together a select group of parliamentarians, Permanent Representatives, United Nations officials and heads of civil society organizations, who explored options to advance the fight against HIV/AIDS.

6. IPU also participated in the International Labour Organization’s First Forum on Decent Work for a Fair Globalization, in Lisbon in November 2007. IPU held a panel discussion on the parliaments’ role in promoting the accountability and coherence of public policy for decent work and fair globalization. During the Global Forum to Fight Human Trafficking, in Vienna in February 2008, IPU, in cooperation with UNODC, held a parliamentary forum to share experiences and best practices, while examining ways in which parliaments and parliamentarians can be more actively involved in the global fight against human trafficking. At UNCTAD XII, in Accra in April 2008, IPU circulated a Parliamentary Message adopted by the 118th Assembly, reiterating its support for UNCTAD while conveying the parliaments’ views with respect to the social and economic risks of globalization. At the High-Level Conference on World Food Security, in Rome in June 2008, IPU highlighted the need for a new global policy on food based on democratic values.

C. Peace and security

7. IPU held regional workshops for South America (Bolivia, June 2007), Central America (El Salvador, May 2008) and Africa (Sierra Leone, June 2008), aimed at assisting parliaments in post-conflict situations to meet their responsibilities in addressing the wounds of the past and building viable
societies. Mirroring the work of the Peace-building Commission, IPU intensified its efforts in support of new parliaments in Burundi and Sierra Leone. Activities focused on developing and implementing inclusive parliamentary procedures, enhancing dialogue among majority and minority political parties and consolidating capacities for parliament to participate in the national reconciliation processes. IPU organized a thematic panel discussion on "Parliaments, Peace-building and Reconciliation" in New York in June 2008 to share parliamentary experiences in these type of processes.

8. IPU joined the Group of Friends of the Alliance of Civilizations to contribute to allaying common misconceptions regarding cultures and religions and assisting in building common purpose and shared values among peoples. During its 116th Assembly, IPU adopted a resolution on “Ensuring respect for and peaceful coexistence between all religious communities and beliefs in a globalized world”. IPU also followed closely the peace process for a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict along the UN road map. The 118th Assembly adopted a resolution on this subject in April 2008. IPU also conducted a field mission to the region earlier in the year.

9. A regional seminar on the "Roles of National Parliaments and the SADC Parliamentary Forum in Enhancing Security in Southern Africa" was held in Luanda in February 2008. Organized by the SADC Parliamentary Forum Leadership Centre and IPU with the support of the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces and the Institute for Security Studies, it provided members and staff of parliamentary committees from SADC Member States, Burundi and Rwanda with an opportunity to share experiences and make recommendations to improve parliamentary oversight in the security sector. The initiative followed a previous regional seminar on security sector reform for South-East Asia and the wider Asia-Pacific region in Phuket, Thailand, in September 2006.

D. Economic, social and environmental development

10. IPU was involved in shaping the agenda and working procedures of the new Development Cooperation Forum (DCF) of ECOSOC. The IPU Secretary General was a member of the Advisory Group of the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs on the work of the DCF. IPU participated in the preparatory events for the 2008 DCF, including the Vienna and Cairo symposia, and the official launch of the Forum in Geneva in July 2007. IPU was co-organizer of the parliamentary segment of the Stakeholder Forum on the "Role of national and local stakeholders in contributing to aid quality and effectiveness" in Rome in June 2008. Its report was introduced to DCF during its first substantive session in New York in July.

11. Following the 117th IPU Assembly, which took as its general theme "Global warming: ten years after Kyoto", a parliamentary campaign was launched to help sustain the political momentum for the new round of negotiations on a post-Kyoto regime, premised on the recommendations of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. As part of its campaign, IPU surveyed parliaments to prompt a self-assessment of the work and to encourage further action. The Secretary-General was briefed on the campaign during his official visit to IPU in Geneva in July 2007.

12. As part of a joint IPU-UNITAR capacity-building initiative on sustainable development for members of parliaments, IPU, UNDP and the National Assembly of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, held a regional seminar on sustainable development for the parliaments of the Asia-Pacific region in Vientiane in November 2007. The seminar focused on poverty reduction, energy and biodiversity. It concluded with the adoption of recommendations for action by parliaments related to education and sensitization; financial resources and efficient use thereof; effective cooperation at the global, regional, sub-national and community levels; and a research programme on the use of suitable technologies.

13. In partnership with the Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Countries and Small Island States (OHRLLS), IPU has been promoting parliaments’ more active involvement in the implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action. A pilot project involving some ten parliaments was launched in Bagamoyo, Tanzania, in December 2007, which brought together members of parliament, UN Resident Coordinators, and government focal points. The project will be broadened to involve all parliaments of the least developed countries in the next biennium. IPU
has joined the inter-agency consultative group chaired by the High Representative, which will drive the preparations for the fourth UN Conference on the Least Developed Countries.

14. IPU has worked to provide political backing for, and create an effective parliamentary dimension to the Doha Round of trade negotiations. IPU has helped sensitize hundreds of members of parliamentary trade and economic committees to a broad spectrum of international trade issues, including the question of greater WTO transparency and accountability. Two annual sessions of the Parliamentary Conference on the WTO took place in Geneva, in December 2006 and September 2008 respectively, testifying to its utility as a vehicle for dialogue between WTO negotiators and members of parliament. The dialogue continued at the Conference Steering Committee, which has regularly been addressed by the WTO Director-General and the chairpersons of major WTO negotiating groups. As part of the annual WTO Public Forum, in October 2007, IPU organized a parliamentary panel discussion on “Trade and climate change: is trade killing our planet?”

15. The IPU Advisory Group on HIV/AIDS was set up to enlist the full force of the world’s legislatures in the fight against the epidemic. It works in close collaboration with UNAIDS and UNDP. In 2007, the Group made a field visit to Brazil and met with a broad spectrum of people involved in Brazil’s national programme, including the Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies, the Minister of Health, representatives of the UN and non-governmental organizations, and people living with HIV/AIDS. At the year’s end, the first Global Parliamentary Meeting on HIV/AIDS was held in Manila, on the eve of World AIDS Day. Participants discussed stigma and discrimination, affordability of drugs, vulnerable groups, legalization and criminalization issues and budgeting. Another highlight was the launch of a Handbook for Parliamentarians on “Taking action against HIV”, produced by the Advisory Group, UNAIDS and UNDP. The Handbook is a comprehensive reference that legislators and their staff can consult for information and guidance on a wide range of issues relating to the epidemic.

16. In April 2008, IPU mobilized action in favour of MDG implementation through a special session for parliamentarians during the “Countdown to 2015” Conference in South Africa, focusing on parliamentary action to reduce preventable maternal, newborn and child deaths in developing countries. It was agreed that IPU, with the support of “Countdown to 2015” partners, would mobilize and assist parliaments in the countries concerned to take action to reduce child and maternal mortality and report on progress to the 120th IPU Assembly in Addis Ababa in 2009. A panel discussion on maternal and child survival was organized by IPU and UNICEF during the 118th Assembly, where the results of the “Countdown to 2015” report and UNICEF’s 2008 State of the World’s Children were presented. Twenty-two Members of Parliament from diverse geographic regions visited three UNICEF-supported projects that work with vulnerable mothers and children, and reported their experiences at the closing session of the 118th Assembly.

17. In December 2006, the Global Centre for Information and Communication Technologies in Parliament opened in Rome. The Centre is a joint IPU-UN enterprise, supported by the Italian and Dutch Governments and the Inter-American Development Bank. The Centre provides hands-on assistance to parliaments in developing their information and communication technology capacities and promotes parliamentary follow-up on the commitments made at the World Summit on the Information Society. The Under-Secretary General for Economic and Social Affairs sits on the board of the Centre together with the IPU President and a number of Parliament Speakers. In February 2008, IPU and DESA issued the first World e-Parliament Report, representing an effort to establish a baseline of how parliaments are using, or planning to use, information and communications technology to help them carry out their representative, lawmaking and oversight responsibilities and to connect to their constituencies. It also intends to advance a shared knowledge base among parliaments and to facilitate information exchanges among them.

E. Democracy and human rights

18. IPU continued to support parliaments in Afghanistan, Burundi, Cambodia, the Congo, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, the Maldives, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor-Leste and the United Arab Emirates. UNDP has been an important partner in many of the projects aimed at strengthening the capacities of parliamentarians and their staff, modernizing the procedures and services of parliaments, providing assistance to parliamentary committees, improving communications services, and promoting
gender activities. The Burundi project included a series of activities to support women legislators, funded through UNDEF. Needs assessment missions went to the parliaments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Sierra Leone, which are now being considered for multi-year programmes of assistance.

19. The question of minority representation as a cornerstone of democracy was taken up by an IPU-UNDP seminar in March 2007, which brought together a group of experts from parliaments, academia, and international organizations. It laid the foundation for further normative work and a new study on the representation of minorities in politics that IPU is undertaking in cooperation with UNDP, raising awareness and serving as an advocacy tool for greater parliamentary representation of minorities. In Vienna in June 2007, IPU organized a parliamentary forum on "Transparency and accountability as a means of restoring trust in governing institutions". Parliamentarians attending the UN Forum on Reinventing Government came together for an in-depth discussion of the prerequisites and mechanisms for holding government to account in the 21st century. The budgetary process and parliamentary oversight of the security sector were also on the agenda.

20. IPU has been a driving force to advance the UN agenda for new or restored democracies. At a meeting of the Sixth International Conference of New or Restored Democracies (ICNRD) in November 2006, parliamentarians from some 70 countries pledged to help mobilize parliaments in support of democracy worldwide. A joint statement was adopted, where participants committed to strengthening partnerships within the ICNRD process. A special mechanism was created to follow-up on the recommendations contained in the Plan of Action for the period between the sixth and seventh ICNRD. In anticipation of the first International Day of Democracy, on 15 September 2008, IPU has encouraged national parliaments to stage a series of awareness-raising activities on the value of democracy as a political culture and a set of institutional practices.

21. A Handbook for Parliamentarians on the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its Optional Protocol was published jointly by IPU, DESA and OHCHR in 2007. The Handbook is currently available in English, French, Spanish and Arabic and is designed to improve the understanding among parliamentarians and practitioners of how to apply the new Convention. IPU has endorsed the Convention and is currently developing an institutional policy to uphold the rights of persons with disabilities.

22. The 118th Assembly in Cape Town in April 2008 debated and adopted a comprehensive resolution calling for parliamentary action to protect migrant workers, combat human trafficking and xenophobia and uphold human rights. The subject was immediately taken up at an African parliamentary conference in Rabat, organized by the African Parliamentary Union and IPU, with support of ILO, the International Organization for Migration, OHCHR and UNHCR. It discussed African migration challenges, problems and possible solutions. Earlier, in October 2007, IPU in cooperation with OHCHR and ILO had convened a seminar in Geneva for members of parliamentary human rights committees and other committees addressing migration issues to discuss the theme of migration from a human rights perspective.

23. During the same Assembly, OHCHR supplied background documents on human rights, terrorism and counter-terrorism and provided the drafting committee and interested delegations with technical advice and guidance on security and human rights themes. In its resolution on "the role of parliaments in striking a balance between national security, human security and individual freedoms, and in averting the threat to democracy", the Assembly urged national parliaments to enact effective anti-terrorism legislation, in keeping with relevant international instruments and commitments, including the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy and to assess such laws at regular intervals so as to ensure that they are fully compatible with national security and individual freedoms. Parliaments were also called upon to review the adequacy of the legal measures they have in place to protect people from terrorist attacks, bring perpetrators to justice and take such measures as deemed necessary to provide adequate protection.

24. In spring 2007, IPU and UNICEF published a "Handbook for Parliamentarians on Eliminating Violence against Children". The Handbook illustrates measures that parliaments could take to prevent violence from occurring by building a protective environment for children. IPU and UNICEF, within the context of a regional seminar in Pakistan in July 2007, launched a regional guide for South Asian
parliamentarians on the protection of children in conflict with the law. This tool builds upon the findings of a UNICEF survey and includes practical recommendations for parliamentary action.

25. Also in 2007, IPU began implementing a joint project with OHCHR, funded by UNDEF, aimed at enhancing the involvement of parliaments in the work of the United Nations and regional human rights mechanisms, particularly UN treaty bodies. Initially, the project was targeting parliaments in French-speaking Africa. Following a regional seminar held in Burkina Faso in October 2007, national seminars were held in Togo and Mali in February 2008 and in Mauritania in May 2008. Each national seminar will be followed-up by a second event, at the end of 2008, to evaluate the parliamentarians’ strategies for putting into practice the treaty body recommendations which they prepared during the first events.

26. OHCHR, jointly with the Ombudsman’s Office of Azerbaijan and IPU, is planning a workshop on international human rights standards for selected members of the Parliament of Azerbaijan. The workshop will take place in September 2008 and will be based on OHCHR’s “Human Rights: Handbook for Parliamentarians”, translated into Azeri language with OHCHR support. OHCHR has invited IPU to present its human rights work at seminars on UN human rights mechanisms for members of national human rights institutions, civil society and the media.

F. Gender issues

27. IPU and the Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW) organized joint information meetings during the 51st and 52nd sessions of CSW, designed to brief participants on the input of parliamentarians to the Commission’s thematic discussions. IPU also participated in the observance of the International Women’s Day.

28. During CSW’s 51st session, nearly half of the world’s Women Speakers met to explore the part they can play in caring for girls, the next generation of women. The meeting examined some of the prejudices levelled at girls, and agreed on the importance of Women Speakers as role models for future generations. The 2008 meeting of Women Speakers addressed the issue of “Combating poverty: Investing in Women”, which provided an opportunity to discuss the conclusions of the 52nd CSW session. The results of the two meetings were brought to the attention of the CSW by the President of the IPU Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians.

29. At the March 2007 CSW meeting, the International Knowledge Network of Women in Politics (iKNOW Politics) was launched as a project of IPU, UNDP, UNIFEM, the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs and the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. Working primarily as an online facility, iKNOW Politics (www.iknowpolitics.org) is designed to serve the needs of elected officials, candidates, political party leaders and members, researchers, students and other practitioners interested in advancing women in politics.

30. IPU has continued to contribute statistics on women in parliament to the UNDP Human Development Reports and also provided data for the MDG Indicator, measuring progress on gender equality. The 2008 World Map of Women in Politics, a joint IPU-UN product, was issued in February. Based on an annual global survey, it highlights in vivid colours the statistics for women in both legislative and executive branches of governments.

31. In October 2007, a joint IPU-ILO Conference on Women and Work focused on the reasons why women, who account for almost 40 percent of the total workforce, continue to earn less than men in similar jobs and are more vulnerable to discrimination and exploitation. Also in October, IPU and DAW conducted a seminar on “Implementing the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women”. Since 2006, IPU has regularly made written and oral reports on various States to the CEDAW Committee.

32. IPU and UNDP organized two seminars in Algeria for members of parliament and political parties on the promotion of women in politics and mechanisms that facilitate their access to Parliament. IPU also addressed the General Assembly on the question of institutional gender mainstreaming, sharing relevant experiences in the context of informal consultations on United Nations system-wide coherence.
G.  IPU Secretariat

33. In response to the call to international organizations by the Secretary-General to eliminate wasteful practices, IPU has proceeded to map its carbon footprint and made provisions in its operating budget to purchase carbon credits to offset the environmental damage of official air travel. IPU has been a member of the UN Joint Staff Pension Fund since 2005. It regularly attends its Board meetings and benefits from the services of the International Civil Service Commission, the Administrative Tribunal and ILO’s Social Security Department.

H.  Conclusions

34. The Secretary-General welcomes the close and substantive relationship between the United Nations and IPU and supports efforts to forge a strategic partnership between the two organizations in the pursuit of world peace, security, development and democratic practice. He also welcomes the trend of including legislators as members of national delegations to important United Nations meetings and events and hopes that this becomes a more regular and systematic practice.

35. IPU-UN cooperation has sharpened awareness among parliamentarians everywhere of issues of concern to the United Nations in a most cost-effective way. This has secured valuable returns to the Organization in terms of strengthened political awareness and support, enhanced national ownership, and higher probability of effective follow-up action. The General Assembly, therefore, may wish to explore more fully the relationship between the United Nations and national parliaments, through IPU, by devoting a specific agenda item to that relationship.

36. The Secretary-General values the joint UN-IPU Annual Parliamentary Hearing and encourages closer cooperation in establishing the agenda for this important meeting. He recommends that the outcome document of the hearing be circulated as an official United Nations document. He also promotes a regular annual exchange between the Chief Executives Board for Coordination and the senior leadership of the IPU with a view to building greater coherence in the work of the two organizations and maximizing parliamentary support for the United Nations.

DRAFT UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION ON COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION (IPU)

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General of 8 August 2008, 1 which attests to the broad and substantive cooperation between the United Nations and the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) over the past two years,

Taking note of the resolutions adopted by the Inter-Parliamentary Union and circulated in the General Assembly and the many activities undertaken by the organization in support of the United Nations,

Welcoming the annual parliamentary hearings at the United Nations as joint UN-IPU events during the General Assembly, as well as other specialized parliamentary meetings organized by the Inter-Parliamentary Union in cooperation with the United Nations in the context of major United Nations conferences and events,

Taking into consideration the Cooperation Agreement between the United Nations and the Inter-Parliamentary Union of 1996, 2 which laid the foundation for cooperation between the two organizations,

2  A/51/402, annex.
Recalling the United Nations Millennium Declaration, as well as the 2005 World Summit Outcome, in which heads of State and Government resolved to strengthen further cooperation between the United Nations and national parliaments through their world organization, the Inter-Parliamentary Union, in all fields of the work of the United Nations, including the effective implementation of United Nations reform,

Also recalling its resolution 57/32 of 19 November 2002, in which the Inter-Parliamentary Union was invited to participate in the work of the General Assembly in the capacity of observer, as well as resolutions 57/47 of 21 November 2002, 59/19 of 8 November 2004, and 61/6 of 20 October 2005,

Welcoming the growing practice among member States of including legislators as members of national delegations to important United Nations meetings and events,

Welcoming the close cooperation between the IPU and the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission in fostering political dialogue and building national capacities for good governance,

Welcoming the contribution of the IPU in shaping the agenda and work of the new Development Cooperation Forum (DCF) of ECOSOC,

1. Welcomes the efforts made by the Inter-Parliamentary Union to provide for a greater parliamentary contribution and enhanced support to the United Nations;

2. Encourages the United Nations and the Inter-Parliamentary Union to continue to cooperate closely in various fields, in particular peace and security, economic and social development, international law, human rights, and democracy and gender issues, bearing in mind the significant benefits of cooperation between the two organizations, to which the report of the Secretary-General attests;

3. Encourages the IPU to strengthen further its contribution to the work of the United Nations General Assembly, including its revitalization, and in relation to the process of United Nations reform and system-wide coherence;

4. Invites the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission to continue to work closely with the IPU in engaging national parliaments in the countries under consideration by the Commission in efforts to promote democratic governance, national dialogue and reconciliation;

5. Encourages the IPU to continue to work closely with the United Nations Development Cooperation Forum and bring a robust parliamentary contribution to the DCF process and the broader development cooperation agenda;

6. Urges member States to include members of parliament in national delegations to major United Nations meetings and events more systematically;

7. Calls for the further development of the Annual Parliamentary Hearing at the United Nations as a joint UN-IPU event and for the circulation of its report as an official United Nations document;

8. Welcomes the proposal for a regular annual exchange between the Chief Executives Board for Coordination and the senior leadership of the IPU, with a view to building greater coherence in the work of the two organizations and maximizing parliamentary support for the United Nations;

9. Decides, in recognition of the unique role of national parliaments in support of the work of the United Nations, to include "Cooperation between the United Nations, national parliaments and the Inter-Parliamentary Union" as a separate item on the agenda of the 65th session of the General Assembly.
BUDGET OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION FOR THE YEAR 2009

Approved by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 14 October 2008)

Approved 2009 operating budget (gross amount before eliminations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007 actual (CHF)</th>
<th>2008 revised (CHF)</th>
<th>2009 budget (CHF)</th>
<th>2009 budget (Tonnes CO2e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Fees</td>
<td>11,060,266</td>
<td>11,354,900</td>
<td>11,756,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Assessment</td>
<td>1,220,985</td>
<td>1,255,900</td>
<td>1,205,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>117,222</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td>10,267</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Contributions</td>
<td>1,383,395</td>
<td>7,450,000</td>
<td>5,251,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Support Costs</td>
<td>33,395</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>139,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>13,825,530</td>
<td>20,206,400</td>
<td>18,498,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Office</td>
<td>1,169,266</td>
<td>1,190,500</td>
<td>1,429,000</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Voluntary Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>385,000</td>
<td>521,100</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Affairs</td>
<td>2,849,840</td>
<td>2,782,900</td>
<td>2,888,900</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of Democracy</td>
<td>3,528,468</td>
<td>3,713,800</td>
<td>3,807,700</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Voluntary Funds</td>
<td>1,383,395</td>
<td>7,065,000</td>
<td>4,730,800</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Relations</td>
<td>2,041,365</td>
<td>2,356,500</td>
<td>2,410,300</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services</td>
<td>2,214,160</td>
<td>2,366,600</td>
<td>2,363,200</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Reserve Contributions</td>
<td>470,096</td>
<td>346,100</td>
<td>347,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>13,656,590</td>
<td>20,206,400</td>
<td>18,498,000</td>
<td>1709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved 2009 capital budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007 actual (CHF)</th>
<th>2008 revised (CHF)</th>
<th>2009 budget (CHF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>30,320</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td>19,066</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>49,386</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURE ITEM</td>
<td>2007 ACTUAL</td>
<td>2008 APPROVED</td>
<td>2009 PROPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular staff salaries</td>
<td>6,110,704</td>
<td>6,348,200</td>
<td>6,470,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>1,812,333</td>
<td>1,872,700</td>
<td>1,927,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff overheads</td>
<td>31,699</td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td>70,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime payments</td>
<td>71,971</td>
<td>73,600</td>
<td>80,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary staff</td>
<td>345,880</td>
<td>307,200</td>
<td>300,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreters</td>
<td>598,585</td>
<td>659,300</td>
<td>706,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translations and editing</td>
<td>290,691</td>
<td>256,600</td>
<td>273,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other purchased services</td>
<td>105,824</td>
<td>255,500</td>
<td>271,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site technical maintenance</td>
<td>4,179</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>64,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online databases</td>
<td>65,249</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorariums</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>45,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty travel – transportation</td>
<td>603,777</td>
<td>680,700</td>
<td>800,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty travel – allowances</td>
<td>194,332</td>
<td>198,200</td>
<td>267,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty travel – incidentals</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>130,928</td>
<td>145,600</td>
<td>145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>27,968</td>
<td>27,900</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>34,411</td>
<td>36,300</td>
<td>38,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>3,056</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and grounds</td>
<td>14,576</td>
<td>42,400</td>
<td>32,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>41,811</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td>42,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office vehicles</td>
<td>4,598</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office furniture and equipment</td>
<td>2,058</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment maintenance</td>
<td>19,231</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment rental/leasing</td>
<td>59,995</td>
<td>69,700</td>
<td>63,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference venue services</td>
<td>74,368</td>
<td>104,300</td>
<td>98,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td>55,712</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>54,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous office supplies</td>
<td>22,946</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>26,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry expenses</td>
<td>16,052</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Telefax</td>
<td>69,917</td>
<td>77,800</td>
<td>75,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>121,759</td>
<td>133,300</td>
<td>137,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier services</td>
<td>16,442</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>18,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>29,588</td>
<td>28,300</td>
<td>24,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet connection</td>
<td>33,402</td>
<td>31,300</td>
<td>33,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer hardware maintenance</td>
<td>5,396</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer software/supplies/service</td>
<td>32,713</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td>32,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>163,565</td>
<td>182,200</td>
<td>219,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library acquisitions</td>
<td>10,634</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>14,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information activities</td>
<td>20,173</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official hospitality</td>
<td>70,258</td>
<td>96,200</td>
<td>115,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank charges</td>
<td>12,627</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>17,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit costs</td>
<td>3,509</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>134,233</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>350,882</td>
<td>344,500</td>
<td>329,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Doubtful Accounts</td>
<td>277,075</td>
<td>114,900</td>
<td>152,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,273,195</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,756,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,246,100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SPENDING ESTIMATES BY OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE FOR VOLUNTARY FUNDS (CHF) FOR 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE ITEM</th>
<th>2007 ACTUAL</th>
<th>2008 APPROVED</th>
<th>2009 PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular staff salaries</td>
<td>136,149</td>
<td>369,700</td>
<td>966,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>39,715</td>
<td>109,100</td>
<td>279,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff overheads</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>50,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime payments</td>
<td>8,655</td>
<td>46,400</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary and contract employees</td>
<td>56,212</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>126,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreters</td>
<td>170,535</td>
<td>1,188,000</td>
<td>299,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translations and editing</td>
<td>97,189</td>
<td>954,000</td>
<td>280,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other purchased services</td>
<td>117,024</td>
<td>343,000</td>
<td>1,031,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Support Costs</td>
<td>33,395</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>139,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorariums</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty travel - transportation</td>
<td>351,416</td>
<td>1,851,000</td>
<td>977,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty travel - allowances</td>
<td>150,526</td>
<td>990,000</td>
<td>405,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty travel - incidentals</td>
<td>4,636</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>32,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>9,614</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office furniture and equipment</td>
<td>4,909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference venue services</td>
<td>13,850</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>137,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous office supplies</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>7,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry expenses</td>
<td>16,026</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier services</td>
<td>5,130</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>7,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>142,938</td>
<td>875,000</td>
<td>283,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library acquisitions</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information activities</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>93,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official hospitality</td>
<td>29,402</td>
<td>168,000</td>
<td>41,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank charges</td>
<td>5,621</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recoveries/Grants</td>
<td>-22,662</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,383,395</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,450,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,251,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPROVED PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 2009

### TABLE OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE BUDGET OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION FOR THE YEAR 2009

Approved by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session (Geneva, 14 October 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member or Associate Member</th>
<th>UN Scale</th>
<th>Old Scale (2006)</th>
<th>Proposed Scale (2009)</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>CHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.016%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>0.006%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 20 400</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>0.085%</td>
<td>0.33 0.37%</td>
<td>CHF 39 400</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td>0.008%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 20 400</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>0.003%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 19 500</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>0.325%</td>
<td>0.69 0.76%</td>
<td>CHF 84 800</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>0.002%</td>
<td>0.26 0.29%</td>
<td>CHF 23 100</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1.787%</td>
<td>1.50 1.66%</td>
<td>CHF 228 500</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0.887%</td>
<td>0.84 0.93%</td>
<td>CHF 133 700</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>0.005%</td>
<td>0.35 0.39%</td>
<td>CHF 29 500</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>0.033%</td>
<td>0.22 0.24%</td>
<td>CHF 25 400</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>0.010%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>0.020%</td>
<td>0.48 0.53%</td>
<td>CHF 40 800</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1.102%</td>
<td>1.11 1.23%</td>
<td>CHF 164 400</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>0.006%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 20 400</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>0.006%</td>
<td>0.23 0.25%</td>
<td>CHF 22 400</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>0.014%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 21 600</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0.876%</td>
<td>1.57 1.74%</td>
<td>CHF 179 700</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>0.020%</td>
<td>0.30 0.33%</td>
<td>CHF 29 300</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>0.002%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 19 300</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>0.009%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 21 000</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2.977%</td>
<td>2.89 3.20%</td>
<td>CHF 377 800</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>0.161%</td>
<td>0.26 0.29%</td>
<td>CHF 42 600</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2.667%</td>
<td>0.86 0.95%</td>
<td>CHF 232 900</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>0.105%</td>
<td>0.30 0.33%</td>
<td>CHF 39 800</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>0.032%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 24 600</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>0.009%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 21 000</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>0.050%</td>
<td>0.29 0.32%</td>
<td>CHF 33 000</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>0.054%</td>
<td>0.27 0.30%</td>
<td>CHF 32 300</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>0.044%</td>
<td>0.21 0.23%</td>
<td>CHF 26 800</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>0.281%</td>
<td>0.50 0.55%</td>
<td>CHF 68 700</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic PR of Korea</td>
<td>0.007%</td>
<td>0.23 0.25%</td>
<td>CHF 22 400</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>0.003%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 19 300</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0.739%</td>
<td>0.75 0.83%</td>
<td>CHF 118 100</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>0.024%</td>
<td>0.22 0.24%</td>
<td>CHF 24 700</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>0.021%</td>
<td>0.22 0.24%</td>
<td>CHF 24 300</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>0.088%</td>
<td>0.25 0.28%</td>
<td>CHF 34 800</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>0.020%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 22 700</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>0.016%</td>
<td>0.25 0.28%</td>
<td>CHF 25 500</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.003%</td>
<td>0.20 0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 19 300</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member or Associate Member</td>
<td>UN Scale</td>
<td>Old Scale (2006)</td>
<td>Proposed Scale (2009)</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0.564%</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td>CHF 102 500 1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>6.301%</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.97%</td>
<td>CHF 682 700 5.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>0.008%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 20 500 0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.161%</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHF 18 700 0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>CHF 25 100 0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>8.577%</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>8.79%</td>
<td>CHF 932 600 7.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>0.004%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 19 800 0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>0.596%</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>CHF 91 500 1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>0.032%</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>CHF 25 200 0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700 0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0.244%</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>CHF 55 700 0.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>0.037%</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>CHF 26 400 0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.450%</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>CHF 81 800 0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0.161%</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>CHF 47 400 0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Islamic Republic of)</td>
<td>0.180%</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>CHF 83 300 0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>0.015%</td>
<td>0.189%</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHF 22 000 0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.445%</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>CHF 72 000 0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>0.419%</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
<td>CHF 72 300 0.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>5.07%</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.33%</td>
<td>CHF 537 600 4.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>16.624%</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>11.69%</td>
<td>CHF 1 361 900 11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>0.012%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 21 500 0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>0.029%</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>CHF 40 200 0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0.010%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 21 000 0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>0.182%</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>CHF 54 300 0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>CHF 20 000 0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao People’s Democratic Republic</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700 0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>0.018%</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>CHF 27 500 0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>0.034%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 25 300 0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.161%</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHF 18 700 0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700 0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libyan Arab Jamahiriya</td>
<td>0.062%</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>CHF 41 400 0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>0.010%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 21 000 0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>0.031%</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>CHF 31 100 0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>0.085%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>CHF 33 500 0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>0.002%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 19 300 0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>CHF 48 000 0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700 0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700 0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>0.017%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 22 200 0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.161%</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHF 18 700 0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>0.011%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 21 000 0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2.257%</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>CHF 217 700 2.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>0.003%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 19 300 0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700 0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700 0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0.042%</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>CHF 27 000 0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700 0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>0.006%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 20 400 0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>0.003%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 19 300 0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1.873%</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
<td>CHF 232 000 2.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>0.256%</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>CHF 60 000 0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>0.002%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 19 300 0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700 0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.048%</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>CHF 33 400 0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>0.782%</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>CHF 115 800 1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member or Associate Member</td>
<td>UN Scale</td>
<td>Old Scale (2006)</td>
<td>Proposed Scale (2009)</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>0.073%</td>
<td>0.290%</td>
<td>CHF 33 800</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>0.059%</td>
<td>0.263%</td>
<td>CHF 30 600</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.161%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.160%</td>
<td>CHF 18 600</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>0.023%</td>
<td>0.200%</td>
<td>CHF 23 300</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>0.002%</td>
<td>0.165%</td>
<td>CHF 19 300</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>0.005%</td>
<td>0.171%</td>
<td>CHF 19 900</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>0.078%</td>
<td>0.283%</td>
<td>CHF 33 000</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>0.078%</td>
<td>0.288%</td>
<td>CHF 33 600</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0.501%</td>
<td>0.794%</td>
<td>CHF 92 500</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0.527%</td>
<td>0.673%</td>
<td>CHF 78 500</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>0.085%</td>
<td>0.282%</td>
<td>CHF 32 800</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>2.173%</td>
<td>1.745%</td>
<td>CHF 203 300</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.216%</td>
<td>CHF 25 200</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>0.070%</td>
<td>0.330%</td>
<td>CHF 38 500</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>1.200%</td>
<td>3.821%</td>
<td>CHF 445 300</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.161%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.161%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marino</td>
<td>0.003%</td>
<td>0.165%</td>
<td>CHF 19 300</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome &amp; Principe</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.161%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>0.748%</td>
<td>1.167%</td>
<td>CHF 136 100</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>0.004%</td>
<td>0.170%</td>
<td>CHF 19 800</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>0.021%</td>
<td>0.267%</td>
<td>CHF 31 100</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.160%</td>
<td>CHF 18 600</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>0.347%</td>
<td>0.525%</td>
<td>CHF 61 200</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>0.063%</td>
<td>0.292%</td>
<td>CHF 34 100</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>0.096%</td>
<td>0.314%</td>
<td>CHF 36 600</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.161%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>0.290%</td>
<td>0.619%</td>
<td>CHF 72 200</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2.968%</td>
<td>2.697%</td>
<td>CHF 314 400</td>
<td>3.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>0.016%</td>
<td>0.190%</td>
<td>CHF 22 200</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0.010%</td>
<td>0.180%</td>
<td>CHF 21 000</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.161%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1.071%</td>
<td>1.413%</td>
<td>CHF 164 700</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1.216%</td>
<td>1.516%</td>
<td>CHF 176 700</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>0.016%</td>
<td>0.207%</td>
<td>CHF 24 100</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.166%</td>
<td>CHF 19 300</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>0.186%</td>
<td>0.402%</td>
<td>CHF 46 800</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FYR of Macedonia</td>
<td>0.005%</td>
<td>0.171%</td>
<td>CHF 19 900</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.160%</td>
<td>CHF 18 600</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.161%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>0.031%</td>
<td>0.221%</td>
<td>CHF 25 800</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0.381%</td>
<td>0.620%</td>
<td>CHF 72 300</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0.003%</td>
<td>0.166%</td>
<td>CHF 19 300</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>0.045%</td>
<td>0.446%</td>
<td>CHF 52 000</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>0.302%</td>
<td>0.533%</td>
<td>CHF 62 100</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>6.642%</td>
<td>5.505%</td>
<td>CHF 641 600</td>
<td>6.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Republic of Tanzania</td>
<td>0.006%</td>
<td>0.175%</td>
<td>CHF 20 400</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>0.027%</td>
<td>0.222%</td>
<td>CHF 25 800</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>0.200%</td>
<td>0.598%</td>
<td>CHF 69 700</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>0.024%</td>
<td>0.201%</td>
<td>CHF 23 500</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>0.007%</td>
<td>0.176%</td>
<td>CHF 20 500</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.161%</td>
<td>CHF 18 700</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>0.008%</td>
<td>0.176%</td>
<td>CHF 20 500</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andean Parliament</td>
<td>0.002%</td>
<td>0.013%</td>
<td>CHF 1 500</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American Parliament</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.010%</td>
<td>CHF 1 200</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member or Associate Member</td>
<td>UN Scale</td>
<td>Old Scale (2006)</td>
<td>Proposed Scale (2009)</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East African Legislative Assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.011%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Parliament</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.081%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American Parliament</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.019%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.055%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAEMU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.008%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.009%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101.18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COOPERATION WITH THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

List of activities undertaken by the IPU between 19 April and 12 October 2008

Noted by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

United Nations

- Work began on the second joint IPU-UN Annual Parliamentary Hearing, due to take place on 20-21 November under the title "towards effective peacekeeping and the prevention of conflict: delivering on our commitments".

- Consultations were held in New York regarding the content of the biennial report of the UN Secretary-General on cooperation between the United Nations and the IPU. The report was released in September in all six languages of the United Nations. It provides the background to a draft resolution on cooperation between the two organizations that will be circulated to member states of the United Nations later in the year.

- In cooperation with the UN Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), the IPU held a panel discussion on "Parliaments, Peacebuilding and Reconciliation" in New York on 13 June. Presentations focused on some of the challenges facing newly established post-conflict parliaments and their dramatic impact upon the peacebuilding and reconciliation process. The panel’s findings were included in the annual report of the Peacebuilding Commission.

- On 9 June, the IPU held a briefing in New York for parliamentarians attending the High-level Meeting of the General Assembly on HIV/AIDS (10-11 June). It was followed by a working luncheon on 11 June co-hosted by the IPU, UNAIDS and UNDP. The two events addressed some of the critical issues under discussion at the UN, such as stigma and discrimination, including travel restrictions against persons living with AIDS.

- The IPU worked with the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs to organize a Stakeholders Forum on aid quality and effectiveness in Rome, Italy, on 12-13 June. The conclusions of the meeting were presented to the first Development Cooperation Forum (DCF) of the Economic and Social Council on 1st July in New York.

- The IPU contributed input to the draft Agenda for Action in discussions with UN and OECD, in preparation for the review meeting on the High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness held on 2-4 September in Accra, Ghana.

- Preparations began over the summer for a Parliamentary Hearing on the occasion of the Review Conference on Financing for Development to be held in Doha, Qatar, from 29 November to 2 December. A draft Parliamentary Message to the UN conference was prepared.

- The Advisory Group of the IPU Committee on UN Affairs met in Geneva on 18 July. Following that meeting, a survey on parliament’s involvement in UN affairs was distributed to IPU Members in early September. On 8-10 September, members of the Advisory Group undertook a field mission to Tanzania to monitor how the UN is retooling at the country level in order to streamline operations and improve their overall impact.

- The IPU participated in the celebrations of the first International Day of Democracy (IDD) on 15 September. It held a special panel discussion at IPU Headquaters to mark the occasion, attended by the Director General of the UN Office in Geneva, and it participated in the event organized by the United Nations in New York. The IPU launched a dedicated IDD webpage which was cross-linked with that of the United Nations. A large promotional effort of IPU materials prepared on the occasion of IDD was undertaken vis-à-vis the UN community in both New York and Geneva.

- Members of parliament attending the annual general debate that opens the new session of the General Assembly have been invited to participate in an IPU briefing on 26 September, on recent developments in the cooperation between the United Nations and the IPU.
• In September, the resolutions of the 118th IPU Assembly were duly circulated to the UN General Assembly in all six official languages.

**OHRLLS**

• Cooperation with the Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries (OHRLLS) continued on the basis of the project begun last year to enable parliaments in Least Developed Countries to better integrate the Brussels Programme of Action (BPOA). In September the project entered its second phase with the finalization of a joint IPU-OHRLLS Guide to Parliamentary Practice. Invitations to join the project were sent to the thirty-nine parliaments outside the initial pilot group.

**UNDP**

• As part of efforts to strengthen relations between IPU and UNDP, particularly following the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding between the two Organizations late last year, the UNDP Administrator was invited to address the 119th IPU Assembly in Geneva.

• IPU and UNDP launched a joint project to promote the representation of minorities and indigenous peoples in parliament. The project will establish a database and identify relevant good practice for dissemination. An expert group of leading academics and parliamentarians was established to provide guidance in this project. The Group met for the first time in Geneva on 16-17 September 2008.

**UN Committee on Discrimination against Women**

• The IPU presented a report to the United Nations Committee on Discrimination against Women, meeting in New York in July for its 41st session. The report provided information on women in parliament in the respective countries considered at the session, as well as on the level of parliamentary involvement in the CEDAW reporting process.

**UNCTAD**

• The IPU participated in UNCTAD XII (Accra, 20-25 April 2008), where it circulated a Parliamentary Message adopted by the 118th IPU Assembly a few days earlier. The Message was introduced by the Speaker of the Parliament of Ghana.

**World Trade Organization (WTO)**

• The 2008 annual session of the Parliamentary Conference on the WTO took place in Geneva on 11-12 September. It provided parliamentarians with an opportunity to obtain first-hand information on recent developments at the WTO and consider the trade liberalization agenda in the face of the recent collapse of Doha Round negotiations.

**Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and United Nations Democracy Fund (UNDEF)**

• The UNDEF funded joint IPU-OHCHR project, aimed at familiarising parliaments with the work of United Nations treaty bodies and regional human rights mechanisms and at enhancing their involvement in that work, continued with the holding of national seminars in Mauritania from 12 to 14 May 2008 and in Congo from 23 to 25 July 2008. The parliaments of both countries adopted a plan to implement a number of treaty body recommendations and a strategy to ensure their involvement in the preparation of national reports and follow-up to the recommendations. A second seminar will be held in a few months’ time to evaluate the strategy and achievements.

**World Bank**

• The IPU and the World Bank Institute met in late July to review their co-operation in the context of strengthening parliaments. They agreed on a number of new initiatives, including the development of video-conference programmes of training for parliaments in post-conflict countries.
PARLIAMENTARY MESSAGE TO THE FOLLOW-UP INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON FINANCING FOR DEVELOPMENT TO REVIEW THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE MONTERREY CONSENSUS

Doha Review Conference, 29 November - 2 December 2008

Approved by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The results of the international community’s efforts over the past six years to implement the Monterrey Consensus are a mixed bag. There have been positive developments with regard to almost every aspect of the Consensus, but there have also been negative trends. Overall, progress has been far too slow. And collectively, we have failed to place the emphasis on key priorities within the overall development agenda.

We spend staggering amounts of money on building military might. Yet, we know full well that no amount of military power can ensure peace and security, the real threats to which are lack of development, poverty and exclusion.

The current forecast for the global economy, with the global financial system on the brink of meltdown and food and energy prices rising sharply, negatively affects the Financing for Development (FfD) agenda. Governments must resist the temptation of resorting only to short-term emergency solutions at a time when deeper systemic and institutional reforms are urgently required.

The FfD agenda needs to be targeted more explicitly to the people and their needs of today, tomorrow and the future. We need to shift the agenda to address growing inequality and environmental sustainability. Too much attention has been given to supporting development in the aggregate, particularly by boosting economic growth, and too little to extending the benefits of development to the poor and the most vulnerable.

The success of the FfD agenda will ultimately be defined by how development resources are spent. Priorities need to be adjusted and greater attention paid to three core areas: (i) agriculture, (ii) women, and (iii) productive employment and decent work. Underfunding in these key areas explains to a large extent why many countries have become dependent on unaffordable food imports, women are still deprived of fundamental economic rights and opportunities, and hundreds of millions of people languish in exploitative work or no work at all.

We cannot stress enough the need for the Doha outcome document to include a strong gender perspective, which was almost entirely absent from the original Monterrey Consensus. In this regard, particular attention must continue to be given to gender-sensitive budgets until such time as they are applied universally.

The new FfD agreement reached in Doha must also better integrate environmental concerns such as climate change. One approach to this, which has been neglected for too long, may be to adopt national "green budgets". We also hope that the Doha Review Conference will mobilize resources to help developing countries implement effective adaptation and mitigation measures against climate change.

We are committed to the governance component of the FfD agenda. We regret that the "systemic issues" of the Monterrey Consensus have been the most neglected in the ensuing years. Weak economic governance has ushered in a period of global financial instability and speculation, undermining the productive economy and social stability on which livelihoods depend.

As the most recent financial crisis has shown, more stringent regulation and oversight of international finance, together with more effective coordination of domestic economic and monetary policies, is required. In particular, internationally agreed laws and standards on the transparency of financial markets should serve to ensure the clarity of financial transactions, enhancing the national and international capacity to assess
financial risks. More also needs to be done to give a greater voice to developing countries in the international financial institutions as a way of helping to build confidence in the international partnership for development.

Nationally, improving governance will require more decisive action against corruption and financial crime, but also, at a deeper level, more democratic decision-making to enhance ownership of the development process. We reiterate that parliaments have fundamental constitutional responsibilities in this area as well.

We call on governments, multilateral organizations and the international community at large to ensure that national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, debt relief agreements, loans and bilateral and multilateral development assistance agreements are adopted with the full involvement of parliament. In the same vein, we stress the need for elimination of policy conditionality.

We call for more official development assistance (ODA) to be given in the form of budget support. This will greatly enhance transparency, accountability and overall effectiveness. We also call on donors to directly support capacity-building of parliaments so that they can carry out their legislative and oversight functions more effectively, particularly in relation to their scrutiny and adoption of the national budget.

We are concerned that total ODA volumes are once again stagnant and that donors’ commitments appear to be off-track. We support scaling up existing innovative schemes of development financing and giving further consideration to proposals such as a currency transaction tax on short-term financial movements. Debt relief schemes must also be more directly linked to a country’s ability to achieve its own development goals regardless of its income level, and more effective measures are required to avoid debt relapse. Debt relief should not count as aid.

Foreign direct investment (FDI) has had mixed results in supporting development. We therefore call for greater attention to be paid to this issue to ensure that such investments are more evenly distributed and actually benefit local communities as well as the economic and social fabric of host countries. Strengthening corporate governance and putting in place more effective law enforcement measures to deal with financial crime should also be part of this endeavour.

As parliamentarians, we are committed to playing a greater role in overseeing the activities of the World Trade Organization and promoting the fairness of trade liberalization. We remind our government negotiators of the commitments they made at the launch of the Doha Round of multilateral trade negotiations. What is now needed is real leadership and courage. We urge our governments to close the WTO deal that has been on the table since July, before the end of the year, so that the Doha Development Round can be concluded in 2009, with an outcome that gives real meaning to development and secures a balance of benefits to all members.

We commend the United Nations for its leadership in all these critical issues and pledge to help build more political will at home for further reforms.

REPORT ON QUESTIONS RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT

Approved by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 14 October 2008)

Introduction

1. Development issues have always been part of political debates and activities at the IPU. In the last five years alone, IPU Assemblies and the Second Standing Committee on Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade have debated issues relating to foreign aid, development finance, employment, poverty reduction, environment, biodiversity, trade, migration, public goods and natural disasters.
2. During the same period, the IPU has contributed to the evolving international debate on development by reflecting the views of parliaments on issues as diverse as development goals, poverty reduction, climate change, social development, decent work, the information society, migration, innovative sources of financing for development, and the HIV/AIDS pandemic. It has done so by taking the floor at the United Nations, at its conferences and in its specialized agencies. On some occasions it has organized panel discussions; on others it has mobilized a parliamentary presence and held parliamentary meetings.

3. The IPU has organized several capacity-building seminars for African, Asian and Arab parliaments on sustainable development. The IPU also mobilizes parliaments in least developed countries in support of their country’s special development needs as reflected in the Brussels Plan of Action for LDCs.

4. Since 2000, the IPU has been implementing an extensive programme on trade and development issues. It organizes, together with the European Parliament, an annual Parliamentary Conference on the World Trade Organization (WTO). The latest in the series of meetings will take place in Geneva in early September this year. The IPU also mobilizes parliaments in support of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and contributes to its discussions, most recently in April 2008 at UNCTAD XII in Ghana.

5. Taken together, these activities cover a wide range of development issues in several ways. What is different today, however, is the desire expressed by many members of parliament, governments and international organizations for the IPU to promote parliamentary action in the area of development along the lines of its ongoing activities in relation to democracy.

6. Moving in this direction will necessarily take time and resources. It requires a gradual approach, an active involvement of IPU Members and parliamentarians who deal with these issues on a daily basis, and support from donors on a voluntary basis. Provisions have been included for this purpose in the 2009 programme and budget and are reflected in greater detail in the comprehensive programme document for 2009 to 2011.

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

7. The MDGs are eight Goals with a target date of 2015 that respond to the world’s main development challenges. The eight Goals aim to (1) eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, (2) achieve universal primary education, (3) promote gender equality and empower women, (4) reduce child mortality, (5) improve maternal health, (6) combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases, (7) ensure environmental sustainability, and (8) develop a global partnership for development.

8. From the very outset, the IPU has been closely associated with Goal 3: promote gender equality and empower women. The IPU, through its gender partnership programme, provides statistical information, analysis, advice and support to the United Nations in promoting the attainment of this goal. This action is deeply embedded in IPU’s work and requires no additional impetus at this stage.

9. Over the past two years, the IPU has started to pay greater attention to five of the other MDGs: those relating to child mortality, maternal health, HIV/AIDS, environmental sustainability, and global partnership for development. In addition, it has focused on part of the poverty reduction agenda. The current situation is summarized below.

Child mortality and maternal health

10. On the occasion of the 118th Assembly held in Cape Town, South Africa, the IPU joined efforts with the Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health (PMNCH) to promote parliamentary action in support of maternal, newborn and child health in 68 priority countries where 97 per cent of the global maternal and child deaths occur. At a special parallel session, members of parliament from sixty-one countries attending the IPU Assembly engaged in discussion with the PMNCH. They agreed several recommendations for parliaments to help reduce substantively the number of deaths by improving the living conditions of mothers and children.
11. Following up on the discussions, the IPU and PMNCH have jointly written to the parliaments of the
countries concerned to encourage them to follow up on the debate and to take concrete action in support of
Goals 4 and 5. Each parliament has been given a complete dossier containing a report on the situation in
their respective country together with policy recommendations and examples of good practice for improving
the situation. The two organizations are now starting to assist several parliaments in this field. They will
monitor developments during the coming months and will report on progress at the 120th Assembly, to be
held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, next year.

12. This activity will be incorporated into IPU’s programme of work for the coming years. From a purely
managerial point of view, it is being handled within IPU’s child rights programme. The IPU works closely
with the PMNCH and its constituent partners in implementing this activity, in particular with WHO, UNICEF
and The Lancet medical journal.

HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases

13. The IPU launched a programme in 2006 to mobilize parliaments in the fight against HIV/AIDS. With
funding from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), the IPU set up an Advisory
Group composed of several members of parliament with extensive experience in working on HIV/AIDS issues
in parliament. The Advisory Group assisted the IPU in developing a programme of activities which has
included field missions to examine how countries address the HIV/AIDS pandemic, the production of a
comprehensive guide for parliamentarians, Taking Action against HIV, and the convening of the first Global
Parliamentary Meeting on HIV/AIDS late last year.

14. This year, the Governing Council approved the revised and expanded composition of the Advisory
Group and adopted modalities for its functioning. In June, several of the members of the Group briefed
members of parliament attending the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on AIDS and
took part in a working luncheon organized for the MPs by the IPU, UNAIDS and UNDP. It was followed up
in August with a further working session for members of parliament attending the XVII International AIDS
Conference in Mexico.

15. Future activities will build on the recommendations contained in the Handbook. Training seminars,
Advisory Board field visits and a second global parliamentary meeting for parliamentarians on HIV/AIDS are
envisaged. A first field visit will take place in South Africa later this year and will be combined with a training
seminar for members of parliament from the SADC region. The IPU has also been asked to develop a
parliamentary and political track for the XVIII International AIDS Conference that will be convened in Vienna
in 2010.

Environmental sustainability

16. Global warming and climate change provided the overall theme for the political debates that took
place at the IPU during much of 2007. The IPU issued a presidential statement to promote a campaign in
parliaments to address the issue and reinforce climate change policy and legislation. The IPU received a
progress report from the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) on the international community’s
efforts to get to grips with climate change. It also developed an institutional policy on climate change, after
mapping its carbon footprint for the first time.

17. In early 2008, the IPU took part in the UN General Assembly thematic debate on climate change. In
May, the IPU was represented at a high-level dialogue in Bonn between parliamentarians and parties to the
Convention on Biological Diversity. Currently, the IPU is preparing for the panel discussion in Geneva (and
subsequent debate during the 120th Assembly) on climate change, sustainable development models and
renewable energies. It is also making plans for an Advisory Group that could assist the Organization in
designing a comprehensive and sustained programme of activities involving regional parliamentary meetings,
development of tools for parliamentarians, training activities and political campaigns to raise awareness in
parliament. Special attention should be paid to mobilizing parliaments in support of an international
agreement to replace the Kyoto Protocol on greenhouse gas emissions, which expires at the end of 2009.
Global partnership for development

18. The IPU has devoted considerable attention to development cooperation issues since 2007. Two parliamentary rapporteurs prepared a substantive report on parliamentary oversight of State policies on foreign aid which was debated during the 118th Assembly. Based on the recommendations of the outcome document, the IPU will undertake case studies in several African countries later this year to review the level of parliamentary involvement in planning and assessing national development plans and programmes and identify obstacles to parliaments' full engagement. The first case study will be carried out in the Parliament of Zambia.

19. The IPU also participated in preparations for the first formal session of the Development Cooperation Forum (DCF), recently launched by the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). The IPU was represented at two preparatory meetings in Vienna and Cairo in 2007 and 2008 respectively, was a member of the Advisory Group set up by the UN Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs, and helped the United Nations organize a 'stakeholders' meeting with members of parliament, local government and civil society in Rome in May to prepare input to the DCF. Subsequently, the IPU moderated a panel discussion held during the DCF meeting in New York in early July.

20. The IPU has provided input and advice to governments as they prepare for the OECD meeting in September in Accra to evaluate progress in implementing the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. The Declaration was adopted by more than 100 countries in 2005 and aims to reform the way in which development aid is delivered and managed. The draft outcome document of the Accra meeting recognizes more explicitly than the original Paris Declaration the significant responsibilities of parliament in relation to aid effectiveness.

21. In following up on all of these activities, the IPU should now ideally initiate a capacity-building programme for parliaments that includes the production of information materials and/or a handbook for parliamentarians, training seminars and advice. Continued advice should also be given to bilateral and multilateral donors and other actors on how they can help improve national ownership by engaging parliaments in the development process.

22. The global partnership foreseen in Goal 8 goes far beyond the development cooperation issues outlined above and includes actions to facilitate development and its financing. The IPU took part in the early debate on financing for development, made a contribution to the first Financing for Development (FfD) Conference in Monterrey, Mexico, in 2002 and its follow-up, and it is encouraging parliaments to be represented at the second FfD conference that will take place at the end of this year in Doha, Qatar. The IPU will also deliver a political statement at that meeting.

23. Trade and development is also part of the global partnership. The IPU has a separate mechanism in this area which focuses principally on facilitating parliamentary awareness of and involvement in the current Doha Development Round of international trade negotiations (see paragraph 4 above).

Poverty reduction

24. The debate during the 118th Assembly under the theme Pushing back the frontiers of poverty provided ample proof of the importance of the subject to parliaments everywhere. Target one aims to reduce by half the proportion of people living on less than a dollar a day, achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people, and reduce by half the proportion of people who suffer from hunger.

25. In recent years, the IPU has addressed productive employment and decent work. On several occasions, most recently at the 116th Assembly, the IPU debated job-creation and employment security. In 2007, in Lisbon, the IPU participated in the ILO Forum on Decent Work for a Fair Globalization. Earlier it had also contributed to the report of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization which was prepared under the auspices of the ILO.
26. The Governing Council agreed in 2006 that the IPU should pay greater attention to employment and decent work issues. It endorsed a plan for increased cooperation with the ILO that includes the organization of seminars and workshops, the production of training materials for members of parliament, and the creation of a parliamentary Advisory Group that can drive the process forward. So far, however, this programme has not been implemented for lack of human and financial resources.

Conclusions

27. IPU Members want to see their organization become more effective in its work on development issues and of greater use to them. Their views coincide with those of many governments and international organizations which now realize more clearly the crucial responsibilities parliaments have in reaching internationally agreed development goals.

28. Achieving that will require considerable work. It means moving from debates and panel discussions to action in parliaments, learning from positive experiences, sharing knowledge, providing training, and monitoring results. The experience gained thus far from the HIV/AIDS programme has been positive and can provide inspiration for the future development of a programme of activities.

29. That experience demonstrates that a relatively small yet representative group of members of parliaments who work on a daily basis on HIV/AIDS issues in their respective parliaments, have the necessary knowledge to advise the IPU on its future programme of activities and to help the Organization carry them out. They also have the stature and legitimacy that make them powerful spokespersons for the IPU and can help mobilize their colleagues in other parliaments.

30. Largely as a result of their commitment, the IPU has been able to harness and develop the beginnings of a working relationship with close to 300 members of parliament who all have important responsibilities in their parliament and country in relation to HIV/AIDS. With their continued participation, the IPU should be able to meet its objectives of helping parliaments address the HIV/AIDS pandemic and, as a result, assume its responsibility of providing a parliamentary dimension to the work of the United Nations.

31. IPU’s gender partnership programme was developed along very similar lines and it is suggested that this practice guide the IPU as it sets out to establish a comprehensive programme of activities in the area of development.

IPU POLICY TO ENSURE THE PARTICIPATION OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES IN THE WORK OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION
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Policy statement

1. The Inter-Parliamentary Union will implement practical measures to create and maintain inclusive, barrier-free environments to enable the participation of persons with disabilities in the work of the Organization. The IPU will put disabilities in the mainstream so that accessibility and the duty to accommodate are incorporated in all relevant policies and programs, by all those normally involved in policy-making and programming. Accessibility involves providing equal access to facilities and services to all, including persons with disabilities, and reasonable accommodation means making necessary and appropriate modifications and adjustments for disabled persons without imposing a disproportionate or undue burden on the IPU.

2. The IPU will encourage member parliaments to take action so that persons with disabilities can achieve the transition from exclusion to equality.
3. The IPU will seek a representative Secretariat that is open to persons with disabilities, where opportunities in work are based on merit and all employees feel included and valued. This policy is to be implemented, up to the point of undue hardship taking into consideration issues of health, safety and cost by:

- Facilitating the participation of people with disabilities in the various programs of the Union, including Assemblies, meetings, seminars and other events;
- Building accommodation into relevant policies, standards, systems, processes and facilities;
- Employing a variety of ways and means to communicate, and providing information in multiple formats to accommodate diverse needs;
- Identifying and removing barriers to employment, career development and promotion of persons with disabilities, and accommodating individuals when such barriers cannot be removed.

Definition

4. Persons with disabilities are persons who have a long-term or recurring physical, mental, sensory, psychiatric or learning impairment and who declare themselves disadvantaged by reason of that impairment.

Policy requirements

5. The IPU shall:

As an advocate, with member parliaments, supporting democracy and the institution of parliament:

- Raise awareness of the convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its optional protocol;
- Encourage States to ratify or accede to the Convention and its optional protocol;
- Encourage law makers to translate the convention into national law;
- Promote and protect the rights of persons with disabilities;
- Encourage parliamentarians to make society more accessible;
- Encourage parliamentarians to demand periodic reporting;
- Include a perspective on disability in technical assistance projects;

As a convenor of meetings

- As much as possible, choose physically accessible venues;
- Offer live assistance and intermediaries to assist persons with disabilities;
- Remove communications barriers by offering:
  - Sign language interpreters;
  - Assistive listening devices;
  - Transcripts of speeches; or
  - Alternate formats of meeting materials and other information;
- Modify policies, practices and procedures to accommodate disabilities;
- Use publicity and pre-registration for planning and ask participants to identify their special needs;
- Ensure staff awareness and sensitivity;
- Enlist cooperation and support of third parties, including host parliaments.

As a provider of public information

- Ensure that the website conforms with the W3C Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 1.0 Priority 1 checkpoints and set a longer term goal to reach a higher standard by 2010;
- Promote the availability of publications in multiple formats on request:
  - Audio;
  - Availability on portable electronic storage media;
  - Large Print;
  - On screen Text.
- Familiarize all order desks with multiple formats and prepare them for requests;
- Create a full-text template for all publications as publications are first developed;
- For inaccessible exhibitions, another version of the exhibition, such as a video display, shall be provided in an accessible area.
As a facility manager,

• Provide barrier-free access to the Union’s facilities in Geneva and New York;
• Ensure sufficient conditions to guarantee health and safety for all users;
• Document any exemption from accessibility requirements and the rationale for the exemption.

As a potential employer,

• Ensure that the selection process does not discriminate against persons with disabilities, unless the requirement is a bona fide occupational requirement;
• Ensure that employment opportunities are advertised in an accessible format;
• Ensure that assessment methods, including tests and interviews, accurately assess the qualifications required, do not constitute barriers and assess candidates fairly;
• Accommodate individual candidates with disabilities up to the point of undue hardship; and
• Inform all candidates of this policy and the procedure for obtaining accommodation during the staffing process.

As an employer,

• Create and maintain an inclusive, barrier-free work environment that is accessible;
• Identify any barriers to employees with disabilities, and remove those barriers;
• When barriers cannot be removed, efforts will be made to accommodate individual employees with disabilities up to the point of undue hardship, by:
  - providing and paying for technical aids, equipment and services for employees with disabilities as well as repairs to such aids and equipment;
• Consult employees with disabilities, including employees with learning disabilities, with respect to:
  - any design, changes or upgrades to physical structures, new or existing systems or equipment so that the workplace is accessible to employees with disabilities, and
  - the planning and design of work-related events and conferences so that all events and opportunities are accessible to employees with disabilities;
• Inform all employees of this policy and the procedure for obtaining accommodation.

Implementation and Monitoring

6. The Secretary General is responsible for ensuring the implementation of this policy, assessing and evaluating its effectiveness and reporting thereon to the Governing Bodies.
Future meetings and other activities
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IPU/ASGP/IFLA Meeting on parliamentary information
16 October 2008

Parliamentary seminar on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
GENEVA
16 October 2008

Seminar for members of parliamentary human rights committees
GENEVA
3-5 November 2008

Regional training seminar on HIV/AIDS for the parliaments of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the East African Community (EAC), followed by a meeting of the IPU Advisory Group on HIV/AIDS
KAMPALA (Uganda)
10-11 November 2008

Information seminar on the structure and functioning of the Inter-Parliamentary Union (for French-speaking participants)
GENEVA
10-14 November 2008

Joint IPU/UN Parliamentary Hearing at the United Nations
NEW YORK
20-21 November 2008

Seminar on Maternal Health and Child Survival
The Netherlands
26-28 November 2008

Parliamentary Hearing at the Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development to Review the Implementation of the Monterrey Consensus (29 November - 2 December)
DOHA (Qatar)
28 November 2008

Conference on the parliamentary response to violence against women for members of parliamentary gender committees and other committees dealing with gender equality
GENEVA
2-4 December 2008

Third Conference of Women Parliamentarians and Women in Decision-making Positions in the GCC States
MUSCAT (Oman)
21-22 December 2008

Regional seminar on children’s rights for European/CIS countries
Venue to be decided
December 2008

124th session of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians
GENEVA
January 2009

Regional Seminar for francophone Africa on women and children’s rights
LOME (Togo)
January/February 2009

Regional meeting for Twelve Plus parliaments on the rights of persons with disabilities
LONDON (United Kingdom)
24-25 February 2009

Parliamentary Day on the occasion of the CSW
NEW YORK
End February/early March 2009
19th session of the Steering Committee of the Parliamentary Conference on the WTO

Regional seminar for parliaments of Latin America and the Caribbean on violence against women

Regional seminar for French-speaking African parliaments, concluding the first cycle of the treaty body project

Regional seminar for ASEAN parliaments on reconciliation

120th Assembly and related meetings

Meeting of Women Speakers of Parliament

Regional seminar for the Arab region on the rights of persons with disabilities

Regional seminar on child protection

First Preparatory Meeting of the Third Conference of Speakers of Parliament

Second Global Parliamentary Meeting on HIV/AIDS

126th session of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

20th session of the Steering Committee of the Parliamentary Conference on the WTO

Conference on representation of minorities and indigenous peoples

Regional meeting for Twelve Plus parliaments on HIV/AIDS

Seminar for the Great Lakes Region on parliamentary involvement in security sector reform

Parliamentary Conference on Democracy in Africa (with a special focus on the African Charter on Democracy, Elections and Governance)

Conference of iKNOW Politics Partners on the contribution of media and information technology to the number and effectiveness of women in politics

121st Assembly and related meetings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASGP-IPU joint event</td>
<td>GENEVA</td>
<td>22 October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary seminar on the Convention on the Elimination of All</td>
<td>GENEVA</td>
<td>22 October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms of Discrimination against Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference for women parliamentarians of the GCC States</td>
<td>Venue to be decided</td>
<td>October/November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Preparatory Meeting of the 3rd Conference of Speakers of</td>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar for members of Parliamentary Human Rights Committees</td>
<td>GENEVA</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting for members of parliamentary gender committees</td>
<td>GENEVA</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information seminar on the structure and functioning of the</td>
<td>GENEVA</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Parliamentary Union (for English-speaking participants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint UN-IPU Parliamentary Hearing at the United Nations</td>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122nd Assembly and related meetings</td>
<td>BANGKOK (Thailand)</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA OF THE 120th ASSEMBLY

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 5-10 April 2009

Approved by the 119th IPU Assembly
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1. Election of the President and Vice-Presidents of the 120th Assembly

2. Consideration of possible requests for the inclusion of an emergency item in the Assembly agenda

3. General debate on the political, economic and social situation in the world

4. Advancing nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, and securing the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty: The role of parliaments
   (Standing Committee on Peace and International Security)

5. Climate change, sustainable development models, and renewable energies
   (Standing Committee on Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade)

6. Freedom of expression and the right to information
   (Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights)

7. Approval of the subject items for the 122nd Assembly and appointment of the Rapporteurs

8. Amendments to the Statutes and Rules of the Inter-Parliamentary Union
LIST OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND OTHER BODIES INVITED TO FOLLOW THE WORK OF THE 120th ASSEMBLY AS OBSERVERS
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United Nations
United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)
International Labour Organization (ILO)
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
World Health Organization (WHO)
World Bank
International Monetary Fund (IMF)
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW)
Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO)
World Trade Organization (WTO)

African Union (AU)
Council of Europe
International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Latin American Economic System (LAES)
League of Arab States
Organization of American States (OAS)

ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly (JPA)
African Parliamentary Union (APU)
AMANI Forum - The Great Lakes Parliamentary Forum on Peace
Amazonian Parliament
Arab Inter-Parliamentary Union
ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Assembly (AIPA)
Asian Parliamentary Assembly (APA)
Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie
Assembly of the Western European Union (WEU)
Association of Senates Shoora and Equivalent Councils in Africa and the Arab World (ASSECAA)
Baltic Assembly
Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA)
Confederation of Parliaments of the Americas (COPA)
European Parliamentarians for Africa (AWEPA)
Indigenous Parliament of the Americas
Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of the Commonwealth of Independent States
Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of the Eurasian Economic Community (EURASEC)
Interparliamentary Assembly on Orthodoxy (IAO)
Inter-Parliamentary Commission of the Economic and Monetary Community of Central Africa (CEMAC)
Inter-Parliamentary Council against Antisemitism
Maghreb Consultative Council
Nordic Council
Pan-African Parliament (PAP)
Parliamentary Assembly of the Black Sea Economic Co-operation (PABSEC)
Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean (PAM)
Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization of the Collective Security Treaty (OCST)
Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)
Parliamentary Assembly of the Union of Belarus and the Russian Federation
Parliamentary Association for Euro-Arab Co-operation (PAEAC)
Parliamentary Union of the Organization of the Islamic Conference Member States (PUOICM)
Southern African Development Community (SADC) Parliamentary Forum
Transitional Arab Parliament (TAP)

Centrist Democrat International (CDI)

Amnesty International
Human Rights Watch
International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA)
International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)
World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA)
CASE No. AFG/01 - MALALAI JOYA - AFGHANISTAN

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Ms. Malalai Joya, a member of the House of the People of Afghanistan, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Noting that the Committee met with the Deputy Speaker of the House of Representatives and two other members of the Afghan delegation at the session it held during the 119th Assembly, and taking account of the information the delegation provided,

Taking account of the information provided by various sources on 5 September and 10 October 2008,

Recalling that on 21 May 2007 the House of the People of Afghanistan (Wolesi Jirga) decided to suspend the parliamentary mandate of Ms. Joya, member of parliament for Farah province, until the end of her term for violating Article 70 of the Standing Orders in respect of a television interview in which she had spoken disparagingly of members of parliament, apparently in the context of her staunch criticism of the former warlords; noting that the recording of the television interview in question was reportedly edited intentionally to discredit her and to provoke her suspension and that she herself, despite requests, has not been given a recording of the interview,

Considering that, according to Article 70 of the Standing Orders (Rules of Procedure), the Speaker of the House of the People can apply as a disciplinary measure advice, warning, publishing the name of the offender in the official Gazette of the Jirga and depriving the offending member from attending the session of that day, but that a member can be suspended for a period of longer than one day only at the request of the Administrative Board and with the subsequent approval of Parliament; however, this procedure was not followed in Ms. Joya’s case as the Administrative Board was not seized and did not issue any recommendation,

Considering in this respect that, according to a report published on 25 September 2008 in the Pajhwok Afghan News Agency, the Chairman of the parliamentary Committee on Immunity and Privileges of Members of Parliament, Mr. Gul Padshan Majedi, stated that Ms. Joya’s expulsion was unlawful, of which statement the Afghan delegation was unaware; that, however, while affirming that Ms. Joya’s words were highly insulting, the Deputy Speaker stated that her suspension was against parliamentary norms and should not have happened; that Ms. Joya should contact the Speaker or himself to ensure a smooth restoration of her mandate; and noting that he affirmed that every effort would be made to restore Ms. Joya’s mandate before the end of the current parliamentary session, which would be in one and a half months’ time,

Recalling that Ms. Joya had immediately protested against her suspension and the procedure followed to secure it; but that only in February 2008, after she had collected the money to pay for legal counsel and found a lawyer willing to take up her case, was she able to file a petition with the Supreme Court; that, according to the sources, the Supreme Court has, however, taken no action so far, claiming to be awaiting a response from parliament; that the efforts of Ms. Joya and her lawyer to obtain such a response have been to no avail and that she and anyone representing her have been banned from going to parliament; noting nevertheless that, according to the Deputy Speaker, she was not banned and should have written a letter to the Speaker or himself,
Recalling that, according to the sources, members of parliament have regularly criticized one another, but that no one else has been suspended on such grounds, not even those who have called Ms. Joya a "prostitute" and a "whore" and have reportedly called for her to be raped and killed; noting that, according to the Deputy Speaker, no one has been suspended as no one else had used such disparaging language and that any member who had indisputably called Ms. Joya a whore or prostitute should also be punished,

Bearing in mind lastly that Ms. Joya has constantly been receiving death threats and that her safety in Afghanistan is at risk, in common with that of many other members of parliament,

1. Thanks the Afghan delegation for its cooperation and for the information and observations provided;

2. Stresses that suspension is a disciplinary measure usually applied as a last resort only and necessarily limited in time, normally one day and only in extreme cases and for recidivist members can it, in some parliaments, amount to a maximum of 30 days, and that a suspension for the entire term is in fact tantamount to a revocation of the parliamentary mandate, wholly unlawful in this case as insulting language is not a proper cause for the dismissal of a member of parliament; points out therefore that the parliament is not entitled to pronounce a suspension for the entire term of a member of parliament;

3. Deeply regrets that Ms. Joya has been prevented from exercising her mandate for 17 months and her electorate deprived of representation in parliament on the basis of an unlawful decision by parliament;

4. Is therefore very pleased to note that the parliamentary authorities recognize that Ms. Joya's mandate should be restored as quickly as possible, and earnestly hopes that this will indeed happen before the end of the current parliamentary session;

5. Calls once again on the authorities to do everything in their power to identify and bring to justice those making the death threats against Ms. Joya; reaffirms in this respect that the Parliament of Afghanistan has a special responsibility when the security of its members is at stake and that preventing impunity is in the last analysis the best means of protecting the safety of members not only of parliament but also of the people; would appreciate information as to the steps the parliamentary authorities have taken or envisage taking to this end;

6. Requests the Secretary General to convey this resolution to the parliamentary authorities and to the source;

7. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009), when it hopes to be able to close the case following its satisfactory settlement.

CASE No. BGL/14 - SHAH AMS KIBRIA - BANGLADESH

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session (Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Shah Ams Kibria, a member of the National Parliament of Bangladesh who was assassinated in January 2005, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Recalling that the investigation into the grenade attack of 27 January 2005 that took Mr. Kibria's life was closed in April 2006 despite petitions by Mr. Kibria's family for further investigation, but reopened in March 2007 on the grounds that additional and significant information had emerged suggesting the involvement of other persons who had yet to be investigated; after a new investigating officer took over in
May 2007 three Islamist militants belonging to the Horkatul Jihad al Islami (Huji), including their leader Mufti Abdul Hannan, were shown arrested in this case, as they had confessed to having collecting several grenades to eliminate Awami League leaders, including Mr. Shah AMS Kibria,

Considering that, according to media reports of August 2008 forwarded by one of the sources in this case, Mufti Abdul Hannan and two of his co-accused have retracted their statements, affirming that they had been obtained under torture; the court reportedly accepted their retraction petitions,

Recalling also that 10 suspects were initially arrested in this case; four of whom were allowed to retract their statements as they had been obtained under torture; the initial main accused, Mr. Quayum, who had not been allowed to retract his statement, was released on bail in September 2008 and made public statements about how the Criminal Investigation Department (CID) had tortured him to extract a false confession,

Noting lastly that Mr. Kibria’s family has received no further information on the investigation and is unaware of any scheduled court proceedings,

Bearing in mind finally that Bangladesh is a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment,

1. Deeply regrets that the authorities have failed to provide any information on the proceedings under way in this case;

2. Recalls that the Bangladeshi authorities have a duty to identify and bring to justice those responsible for Mr. Kibria’s murder and to this effect to conduct a thorough, independent and diligent investigation; is led to consider that the failure of the authorities to provide official information on progress made in the investigation, in particular to Mr. Kibria’s family, coupled with the persistent allegations of torture in this case, sheds a harsh light on the administration of justice in this case;

3. Invites therefore the authorities once again to provide information on the current stage of the investigation and the prospects that the case will be brought to trial within a reasonable time;

4. Stresses once again that, under the international human rights treaties which Bangladesh has ratified, the authorities have an obligation to institute a prompt and impartial investigation whenever there are reasonable grounds for believing that an act of torture has been committed; consequently wishes to ascertain whether the authorities have now instituted an investigation into the alleged torture of suspects in this case, including Mr. Quayum and Mufti Abdul Hannan;

5. Requests the Secretary General to inform the authorities and the sources of information accordingly;

6. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

CASE No. BGL/15 - SHEIKH HASINA - BANGLADESH

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Sheikh Hasina, a member of the Parliament of Bangladesh and Leader of the Opposition at the time the communication was submitted, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),
Recalling that the initial line of investigation into the grenade attack of 21 August 2004 against Sheikh Hasina and other Awami League leaders, which claimed the lives of 25 people and injured hundreds, proved to be based on the “confession”, reportedly obtained under duress, of a petty criminal, Joj Miah, who admitted to carrying out the attack with a criminal gang, and that several persons were arrested; noting in this respect that Joj Miah's family has reportedly been provided with a long-term government subsidy,

Recalling that the Caretaker Government ordered a new investigation which, through the confession of Mufti Abdul Hannan, leader of the Horkatul Jihad al Islami (Huji) and others, revealed that the attack had been carried out by Huji elements and enabled the police to arrest more suspects and to recover grenades, rifles and a large quantity of explosives; according to media reports, the investigation also revealed that one of the suspects who was, however, on the run, Moulana Tajudin, a brother of former deputy minister and Bangladesh National Party (BNP) leader Abdus Salam Pintu, had supplied the grenades used in the attack; and that Mr. Salam Pintu himself had been arrested; noting also that a new charge sheet has reportedly been drawn up and the Police Chief has assured the public that those responsible for diverting the course of the investigation would be taken to task,

Considering that, according to media reports of August 2008, forwarded by one of the sources, Mufti Abdul Hannan and two of his co-accused have retracted their statements, affirming that they had been obtained under torture; the court reportedly accepted their retraction petitions,

Recalling that: four criminal cases, three based on charges of extortion and one on corruption, have been brought against Sheikh Hasina; two of the extortion cases and the corruption case were brought under the Emergency Power Rules 2007 (EPR), which have been criticized as infringing fundamental fair trial guarantees; Sheikh Hasina challenged her trial under the EPR with regard to one of the extortion cases; on 17 February 2008 the High Court ruled on her application, concluding that "the case in question … cannot proceed under the EPR" and "any action taken and/or initiated and continuation of any proceeding or trial of any case arising out of the case in question under the EPR, "in any court of law or authority, is declared to be without lawful authority and stands quashed"; however, on 17 March 2008 the Chief Justice stripped the High Court division bench which had issued the above ruling of its writ jurisdiction; one of Sheikh Hasina's fellow accused, Sheikh Fazlul Karim Selim, has reportedly given testimony under duress,

Recalling that Sheikh Hasina was arrested on 17 July 2007 and was refused bail; noting in this respect that she has meanwhile been released on parole and allowed to go abroad for medical treatment,

Bearing in mind that Bangladesh is a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Articles 14 and 15 of which stipulate fair trial guarantees and Article 9, paragraph 5, of which provides for an enforceable right to compensation in the event of unlawful arrest and detention,

1. Regrets that the authorities have failed to provide information on the current stage of the investigation into the grenade attack of August 2004 and the criminal proceedings under way against Sheikh Hasina;

2. Can only express deep concern, in the absence of official information, at reports alleging that the current investigation into the grenade attack is based on testimony extracted under torture, particularly in view of the initial attempt to divert the investigation in what can only be called a travesty of justice;

3. Reiterates its wish to ascertain the current stage of the investigation, to receive a copy of the charge sheet and to ascertain whether those responsible for diverting the case in the first place have been held responsible; believes in this respect that the conclusions of the judicial inquiry commission should now be published;

4. Is deeply concerned at the alleged torture of suspects in the grenade attack case and of one of Sheikh Hasina's fellow accused; recalls that, under international human rights law, a prompt and impartial investigation must be instituted wherever there are reasonable grounds for believing that an act of torture has been committed, and wishes to ascertain whether the authorities have instituted any such investigation in this respect;
5. Is pleased to note that Sheikh Hasina has been allowed to go abroad for medical treatment; stresses that the prevailing impunity in the grenade attack against her may constitute a serious risk for her safety when she returns to Bangladesh after her medical treatment, and trusts that the authorities will take the necessary measures to ensure her security, as it is their duty to do so; reiterates its wish to receive information on the stage of the criminal proceedings brought against her, with respect in particular to the justification for applying the EPR in this case;

6. Requests the Secretary General to invite the competent authorities to provide the requested information;

7. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

CASE No. BLS/05 - VICTOR GONCHAR - BELARUS

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session (Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Victor Gonchar, a member of the Thirteenth Supreme Soviet of Belarus who disappeared in September 1999, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Noting that legislative elections took place in Belarus on 28 September 2008,

Requests the Committee to contact the newly elected parliamentary authorities and to report to it at its next session (April 2009) in the light of any new information it may have obtained in the meantime.

BURUNDI

CASE No. BDI/01 - S. MFAYOKURERA       CASE No. BDI/07 - L. NTAMUTUMBA
CASE No. BDI/05 - I. NDIKUMANA          CASE No. BDI/29 - P. SIRAHENDA
CASE No. BDI/06 - G. GAHUNGU            CASE No. BDI/35 - G. GISABWAMANA

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session (Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of the above-mentioned Burundian parliamentarians, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Taking account of the letter of the President of the National Assembly of 8 October 2008 and of the information provided on the occasion of the hearing with the Committee by the Burundian delegation to the 119th IPU Assembly,

Recalling that: the parliamentarians concerned were killed between 1994 and 1999 and that only in the case of Mr. Gisabwamana has the perpetrator - a military officer - been identified and brought to justice, although the victim’s family has received no reparation; in 2004 one of the sources reported the arrest of Mr. Parfait Mogenzi, one of the suspects in the murder of Mr. Mfayokurera and the attempted murder of
Mr. Ndihokubwayo, albeit in connection with the murder, in November 2001, of Dr. Kassy Manlan, the representative of the World Health Organization in Burundi, and the return from Rwanda, where they had fled, of two suspects in the case of Mr. Ndikumana, Mr. Ivan Bigendanko and Mr. Désiré Banuma, who were in hiding in Burundi; in the case of Mr. Sirahenda, a member of the military at Mabanda camp who subsequently deserted stated that he could one day testify to the horrendous manner of Mr. Sirahenda's killing at the camp,

Noting that Mr. Mugenzi is reportedly no longer in detention but on the run, his escape from prison having allegedly been organized by the former Prosecutor General, who is said to have provided him with a passport,

Recalling that the National Assembly set up a parliamentary working group to examine the cases in question and noting in this respect that, since its first meeting in October 2006, at which it worked out a strategy to obtain information on the cases in question, the working group has held no further meetings; considering that the President of the National Assembly, in his communication of 8 October 2008, stated that "after a whole year of crisis in the National Assembly, the Bureau intends to reactivate the working group on human rights to enable it to monitor how all these cases evolve judicially",

Recalling also that the President of the National Assembly has stated that the cases would be dealt with by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission; considering that, according to his letter of 8 October 2008, a Tripartite Commission (United Nations, Government and Civil Society) had been in place to conduct popular consultations on the questions not having produced consensus between the United Nations and the Government and had recently produced a memorandum laying down the basic principles of the consultations; the commission reckoned that these field consultations and the drafting of the report could take a year; the Human Rights Committee of the National Assembly would continue to monitor this matter,

Bearing in mind the work of the IPU, under its technical cooperation programme, to assist the Parliament of Burundi in playing its role as an important facilitator of reconciliation in the country and the difficulties encountered in this task,

1. Thanks the President of the National Assembly and the Burundian delegation for the information provided;

2. Is nevertheless deeply disappointed that, despite the parliamentary authorities' repeatedly stated commitment to the working group, it has been totally ineffective since it first met two years ago and that, as a result its strategy to provide the much needed fresh impetus to these cases, it has only gathered dust; is confident that the President of the National Assembly's latest expression of support for the working group will bear fruit, and wishes to be kept informed in this respect;

3. Is dismayed that the National Truth and Reconciliation Commission, as provided for under the 2000 Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement for Burundi, has yet to be established after years of discussion; trusts that the Tripartite Commission will carry out its consultations diligently and efficiently and set a clear timetable for the establishment in the near future of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission; would greatly appreciate receiving information in this respect;

4. Reaffirms that neither the existence of the parliamentary working group nor the future establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission relieves the authorities of their duty to do their utmost to dispense justice at all times; reiterates that there are sufficient leads and evidence available in several of the cases to permit the authorities to make substantive progress in this respect; therefore once again calls on the authorities to take the necessary steps to reactivate the investigations in these cases;

5. Notes with concern that Mr. Mugenzi is reportedly no longer in custody, and would appreciate receiving detailed information as to whether or not Mr. Mugenzi has ever been questioned regarding his implication in the murder of Mr. Mfayokurera and, if so, the results of the questioning, and if not, why not; and what steps are being taken to locate and apprehend him;
6. Requests the Secretary General to convey the present resolution to the competent authorities and to the source;

7. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

CASE No. BDI/02 - NORBERT NDIHOKUBWAYO - BURUNDI

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Norbert Ndihokubwayo, a member of the Parliament of Burundi, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Taking account of the letter of the President of the National Assembly of 8 October 2008 and of the information provided on the occasion of the hearing with the Committee by the Burundian delegation to the 119th IPU Assembly,

Recalling that Mr. Ndihokubwayo was the target of two attempts on his life in 1994 and 1995, one of which left him severely injured, and that in 2004 one of the sources reported the arrest of Mr. Parfait Mugenzi, one of the alleged attackers, albeit in connection with the murder, in November 2001, of Dr. Kassy Manlan, the representative of the World Health Organization in Burundi,

Noting that Mr. Mugenzi is reportedly no longer in detention, his escape from prison having allegedly been organized by the former Prosecutor General, who is said to have provided him with a passport,

Recalling that the National Assembly set up a parliamentary working group to examine this and other cases, and noting in this respect that since its first meeting in October 2006, at which it worked out a strategy to obtain information on the cases in question, the working group has held no further meetings; considering that the President of the National Assembly, in his communication of 8 October 2008, stated that "after a whole year of crisis in the National Assembly, the Bureau intends to reactivate the working group on human rights to enable it to monitor how all these cases evolve judicially;"

Recalling also that the President of the National Assembly has stated that the cases would be dealt with by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission; considering that, according to his letter of 8 October 2008, a Tripartite Commission (United Nations, Government and Civil Society) had been in place to conduct popular consultations on the questions not having produced consensus between the United Nations and the Government and had recently produced a memorandum laying down the basic principles of the consultations; the commission reckoned that these field consultations and the drafting of the report could take a year; the Human Rights Committee of the National Assembly would continue to monitor this matter,

Bearing in mind the work of the IPU, under its technical cooperation programme, to assist the Parliament of Burundi in playing its role as an important facilitator of reconciliation in the country and the difficulties encountered in this task,

1. Thanks the President of the National Assembly and the Burundian delegation for the information provided;

2. Is nevertheless deeply disappointed that, despite the parliamentary authorities' repeatedly stated commitment to the working group, it has been totally ineffective since it first met two years ago and that, as a result its strategy to provide the much needed fresh impetus to this case, it has only gathered dust; is confident that the President of the National Assembly's latest expression of support for the working group will bear fruit, and wishes to be kept informed in this respect;
3. **Is dismayed** that the National Truth and Reconciliation Commission, as provided for under the 2000 Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement for Burundi, has yet to be established after years of discussion; **trusts** that the Tripartite Commission will carry out its consultations diligently and efficiently and set a clear timetable for the establishment in the near future of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission; **would greatly appreciate** receiving information in this respect;

4. **Reaffirms** that neither the existence of the parliamentary working group nor the future establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission relieves the authorities of their duty to do their utmost to dispense justice at all times; **reiterates** that there are sufficient leads and evidence available in this case to permit the authorities to make substantive progress; **therefore once again calls on** the authorities to take the necessary steps to reactivate the investigation in this case;

5. **Notes with concern** that Mr. Mugenzi is reportedly no longer in custody, and **would appreciate** receiving detailed information in this respect, in particular whether he has ever been questioned regarding his implication in the attempt on Mr. Ndihokubwayo’s life and, if so, the results of the questioning, and if not, why not; and what steps are being taken to locate and apprehend him;

6. **Requests** the Secretary General to convey the present resolution to the competent authorities and to the source;

7. **Requests** the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

---

**BURUNDI**

CASE No. BDI/36 - MATHIAS BASABOSE  
CASE No. BDI/42 - PASTEUR MPAWENAYO  
CASE No. BDI/44 - HUSSEIN RADJABU  
CASE No. BDI/45 - ALICE NZOMUKUNDA  
CASE No. BDI/46 - ZAITUNI RADJABU  
CASE No. BDI/47 - PASCALINE KAMPAYANO  
CASE No. BDI/48 - MARGUERITE NSHIMIRIMANA  
CASE No. BDI/49 - NADINE NZOMUKUNDA  
CASE No. BDI/50 - BÉATRICE NIBIMPA  
CASE No. BDI/51 - MARIE GORETH NIYONZIMA  
CASE No. BDI/52 - MOUSSA SAIDI  
CASE No. BDI/53 - THÉOPHILE MINYURANO  
CASE No. BDI/54 - OMAR MOUSSA  
CASE No. BDI/55 - JOSÉPHINE MUKERABIRORI  
CASE No. BDI/56 - DÉO NYABENDA  
CASE No. BDI/57 - GÉRARD NKURUNZIZA  
CASE No. BDI/58 - JEAN FIDELE KANA  
CASE No. BDI/59 - MARIE SINDARUSIBA  
CASE No. BDI/60 - DEO NSHIMIRIMANA  
CASE No. BDI/61 - F. XAVIER NSABABANDI  
CASE No. BDI/62 - JEAN MARIE NGENDAHAYO  
CASE No. BDI/63 - ALINE NITANGA

**Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session**  
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

**Having before it** the case of the above-mentioned members of parliament of Burundi, who lost their parliamentary seats on 5 June 2008, which has been the subject of a study and report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians following the Procedure for the treatment by the Inter-Parliamentary Union of communications concerning violations of the human rights of members of parliament,

**Taking note** of the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians, which contains a detailed outline of the case (CL/183/12(b)-R.1),

**Taking account** of the hearing the Committee held with the President of the CNDD-FDD to the 119th IPU Assembly,
Considering the following information on file:

- The parliamentarians in question were elected in July 2005 on the CNDD-FDD list, which obtained the majority of seats in the National Assembly; as time passed the party experienced internal dissent, which became more pronounced after the party convention of 7 February 2007, during which Mr. Hussein Radjabu was ousted as party leader; as a result, one wing was formed that backed the party’s new president, Mr. Jérémie Ngendakumana, while another backed Mr. Radjabu; the persons concerned belong to the latter wing; except for Ms. Nzomukunda,¹ the former Vice-President of the National Assembly, and Mr. Basabose, both of whom were expelled from the party, and Mr. Kana and Ms. Sindarusiba, the other members of parliament resigned from the party and continued to sit in the National Assembly as independent members;

- Other political parties, in particular FRODEBU, also met with dissidence, which encouraged some of its members to join the dissenting members of the CNDD-FDD in abstaining from (regular) participation in the work of the National Assembly, as a consequence of which the National Assembly failed to reach the quorum needed to adopt decisions, and its work was blocked;

- The IPU, under its programme of assistance to the Parliament of Burundi, made every effort, in common with the parliamentary authorities, to find a solution to the stalemate and, after consultations with all the parties concerned during a working mission in May 2008, submitted a possible solution for resolving the ongoing stalemate;

- On 30 May 2008, the President of the National Assembly sent a letter to the President of the Constitutional Court concerning an “Application relating to unconstitutional occupation of seats at the National Assembly”; in justification of his application that the Court “rule on the unconstitutional occupation” of the seats held by the members of parliament concerned, the President cited Articles 98 and 169 of the Constitution and a letter from the President of the CNDD-FDD asking him to bring the cases of those persons, who were no longer members of the party, before the Court; the President further argued that “certain people consider that a member of parliament who has resigned from his party automatically loses his right to sit in parliament, since that right is only recognized in respect of elected officials who can prove they are on either a list of independents or the list of a political party having obtained two per cent or more of all the ballots cast”;

- In its decision RCCB 213 of 5 June 2008, the Court declared the application admissible by virtue of its competence to ensure respect for the Constitution, including the Charter of Fundamental Rights, by State bodies and other institutions (Article 228 [2]) and ruled that the members of parliament concerned held their seats unconstitutionally; in so doing, the Court based its arguments in particular on Article 169 of the Constitution, which stipulates that “candidates presented by the political parties or lists of independents can only be considered to have been elected and sit in the National Assembly if, nationwide, their party or their list has obtained two per cent or more of all the votes cast”; it pointed out that members of parliament “are elected before the parliament’s term and sit during the parliament’s term”; consequently, according to the Court, the members of parliament concerned no longer fulfilled any of the conditions of the article: they could not sit as independents because the list of independents had not obtained two per cent of votes, and they could not sit as members of the party on whose list they had been elected because they were no longer members of it,

Noting the following constitutional and statutory provisions:

- Article 149 of the Constitution stipulates: “The mandate of deputies and senators is national in character. There shall be no imperative mandate. The deputies and senators vote in their own name”;

- Article 156 (section 1) of the Constitution stipulates: “The term of office of a deputy or a senator ends if the deputy or senator in question dies, resigns, is permanently incapacitated or unjustifiably fails to attend over one quarter of the meetings in a session or when the deputy or

¹ Ms. Nzomukunda was excluded from the party during the CNDD-FDD convention held on 26 January 2008 in Muyinga.
senator finds himself in one of the cases of disqualification provided for in statutory law” (such as the Electoral Code and the Standing Orders);

- Article 132 of the Electoral Code stipulates: “The term of office of a deputy may end prematurely if his seat is vacant as a result of death, resignation, physical incapacity, permanent disability, unjustified absence at more than one quarter of a session’s meetings, or disqualification following loss of a criterion for eligibility or the occurrence of a case of ineligibility ...”;

- Article 15 of the Standing Orders of the National Assembly stipulates: “The term of office of a deputy ends if his seat is vacant as a result of death, resignation, physical incapacity, permanent disability, unjustified absence at more than one quarter of a session’s meetings, or disqualification following a penal sentence of more than twelve months. However, there shall be no disqualification if the deputy is convicted of unintentional offences”; Article 16 stipulates: “The vacancy is confirmed by decision of the Constitutional Court ruling at the request of the Bureau of the National Assembly”;

_Bearing in mind_ that, according to information received, the preparatory work on the Constitution shows that a proposal to disqualify members of parliament if they change political party was expressly rejected and replaced by the present constitutional provisions on the termination of the parliamentary mandate, which do not provide for such termination in the case of expulsion or resignation from the political party on whose list the parliamentarian was elected,

_Considering further_ that four of the parliamentarians concerned, namely Mathias Basabose, Pasteur Mpawenayo, Alice Nzomukunda and Zaituni Radjabu, were the target of grenade attacks in August 2007 and March 2008 respectively, which have remained unpunished to date; _noting_ that, moreover, according to one of the sources, arrest warrants have been issued for Mr. Nkurunziza, Mr. Nsababandi, Mr. Nshimirimana, Mr. Nyabenda, Mr. Basabose and Mr. Mpawenayo; _noting_ that the latter was arrested on 4 July 2008, that Mr. Nkurunziza was arrested by the Deputy Director of Police on 15 July 2008, reportedly without a warrant, and that Mr. Minyurano was arrested on 1 October 2008 reportedly on an accusation of assault and battery and public insult which, according to the sources, originated in the failure of Mr. Minyurano’s tenant, a magistrate, to pay his rent,

_Notting_ that a dissenting group within FRODEBU has set up a new party and that the President of FRODEBU has requested the President of the National Assembly, on the same basis as referred to above, to ask the Constitutional Court likewise to declare the occupation of the seats of the dissenting parliamentarians unconstitutional, but that the President of the National Assembly has so far taken no such action; _noting_ also that a leading member of this new party has asked the President of the National Assembly to dismiss 15 members of the FRODEBU party from parliament on the grounds that they were absent from parliament for more that a quarter of the current session and can therefore be dismissed by virtue of Article 156 of the Constitution and Article 15 of the Standing Orders; that an application of that provision would affect not only the 15 members of the FRODEBU in question but a certain number of parliamentarians belonging to the CNDD-FDD and UPRONA, who likewise boycotted a large number of parliamentary sittings,

_Considering_ that, according to the President of the CNDD-FDD to the 119th IPU Assembly, the aim of the parliamentarians concerned was to block the National Assembly and they succeeded as other opposition parliamentarians joined them in this effort, a total of more than 40 members, so that the quorum for adopting legislation was no longer reached; that, however, major problems would have been created had the Assembly sought the expulsion of all of them, for which reason only the expulsion of the 22 members who no longer belonged to the CNDD-FDD was sought; that, in any event, had it not been for the Constitutional Court’s interpretation of Article 169, they would have lost their mandate by virtue of Article 156 of the Constitution; that since their expulsion the Assembly functioned normally, having meanwhile adopted 29 of the 35 bills proposed by the Government; _noting_ also that the President of the CNDD-FDD welcomed the assistance of the IPU insofar as capacity-building in the field of democracy, human rights and the participation of women in politics are concerned as this contributes to the stabilization of the country,
1. Thanks the President of the National Assembly for his cooperation; also thanks the President of the CNDD-FDD for having shared his view with the Committee;

2. Recognizes that Burundi has faced a critical situation owing to the virtual inability of the National Assembly to muster the necessary quorum, and that as a result, parliamentary and governmental business came to a halt early this year; acknowledges, therefore, that there was an urgent need to find a solution enabling the National Assembly to resume its work;

3. Commends the IPU for its efforts to work with all the parties concerned in Burundi to identify a negotiated, comprehensive and agreed solution to the problems faced in parliament that would allow all political parties and factions to participate effectively in the work of the National Assembly; regrets that this process was interrupted before it came to fruition;

4. Recalls that the revocation of the parliamentary mandate is a serious measure, as it irrevocably deprives the members of parliament concerned of the possibility of carrying out the mandate entrusted to them by the people, and that it must therefore be decided in full accordance with the law and only for serious reasons stipulated in the law;

5. Expresses therefore deep concern at the Constitutional Court ruling, as it takes account neither of the provisions in the Constitution dealing explicitly with the loss of the parliamentary mandate, nor of the relevant provisions in the Electoral Law and the Standing Orders; nor does it refer to the preparatory work of the Constitution or to the views and legal arguments of the parliamentarians concerned;

6. Notes in this respect that, in his report to the United Nations Human Rights Council at its 9th session, the independent expert on the situation of human rights in Burundi expressed deep concern at this decision, stating as follows: “the Court appears to have been enlisted by the executive to serve a specific political objective, thereby bringing into question its independence and credibility. By acting in this compliant manner, the Court has lent credence to the widely-held belief that the whole machinery of justice in Burundi is beholden to the executive”;²

7. Expresses, moreover, deep concern at the reported issuing of arrest warrants for the six persons mentioned above, and the arrest of four of them on reportedly arbitrary grounds and in violation of procedural rules; and wishes to ascertain as a matter of urgency the legal and factual grounds to justify the issuing of such warrants, as well as the arrest and detention of the persons concerned;

8. Urges the National Assembly and the competent authorities to return to the negotiating table, and requests the Assembly to receive urgently the planned IPU follow-up mission so that it can resume its good offices function in support of political dialogue, which alone can provide a lasting solution to the problems that have arisen and contribute to the stabilization and democracy-building called for by the Burundi parliamentary authorities;

9. Requests the Secretary General to convey this resolution to the Presidents of the National Assembly and of the Senate;

10. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session (Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case concerning the murders between 1986 and 1994 of Mr. Pedro Nel Jiménez Obando, Mr. Leonardo Posada Pedraza, Mr. Octavio Vargas Cuéllar, Mr. Pedro Luis Valencia Giraldo, Mr. Bernardo Jaramillo Ossa and Mr. Manuel Cepeda Vargas and the death threats against Mr. Motta, which forced him into exile in October 1997, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Recalling that all these persons were Colombian congressmen and members of the Unión Patriótica (Patriotic Union) party and that none of the murderers of five of the six then congressmen nor the perpetrators of the death threats against Mr. Motta, who still lives in exile, have been held to account,

Recalling that the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights decided in 2006 to examine the merits of the petition lodged in March 1997 pertaining to the persecution of the Unión Patriótica and the crimes committed against its members, which includes - directly and indirectly - the parliamentarians concerned, and had already decided in 2005 to do so with respect to the petition lodged in the case of Mr. Cepeda's assassination,

Considering that the Inter-American Commission adopted its confidential preliminary report in mid-August 2008 on the case of Mr. Cepeda, which it subsequently sent to the Colombian authorities, and that it is likely to adopt its report on the Unión Patriótica case shortly; that the petitioners in the case of Mr. Cepeda have already stated their wish to the Commission that the case be referred to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, which, if this occurs, is expected to consider the case before the end of 2009 or early in 2010; recalling that the Committee has been requested to act as amicus curiae in each of these cases should they come before the Court,

Recalling that, in her February 2008 report on the human rights situation in Colombia (A/HRC/7/39), the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights stated that “structural problems persist in the administration of justice” and that there was “a need for further progress in the fight against impunity”,

1. Recalls that the Inter-American Convention on Human Rights, to which the State of Colombia is a party, and the jurisprudence developed by its supervisory bodies firmly guarantee the right to justice, truth and reparation for victims of human rights violations;

2. Reaffirms its conviction that a full and swift examination of the case of Mr. Cepeda and that of the Unión Patriótica by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and, if necessary, the Inter-American Court is essential to helping effectively protect these rights in both cases;

3. Notes therefore with satisfaction that the Inter-American Commission has presented its preliminary report in the case of Mr. Cepeda; trusts that the authorities have given it full consideration and acted on any recommendations that the Commission may have made; would greatly appreciate receiving information on developments in the consideration of the case of Mr. Cepeda by the Inter-American system, if and when this becomes publicly available;
4. Trusts that the Commission will soon adopt its report on the Unión Patriótica case; would greatly appreciate being kept informed in this respect;

5. Is confident that, through its oversight role, the Colombian Congress is doing everything in its power to ensure that the competent authorities take the necessary action to comply with Colombia's obligations under the Inter-American Convention in the cases at hand; would greatly appreciate receiving information on this point;

6. Requests the Secretary General to inform the competent authorities and the source of this resolution;

7. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

CASE NO. CO/121 - PIEDAD CORDOBA - COLOMBIA
Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session (Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Ms. Piedad Córdoba, a member of the Senate of Colombia and vocal critic of the Colombian Government, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Taking into account the communication from the Prosecutor General's Office of 16 July 2008,

Recalling that Senator Córdoba was abducted and held by the paramilitary group Autodefensas Unidas de Colombia (AUC) between 21 May and 4 June 1999, and that a suspect has been identified, detained and heard in this case,

Recalling that an attempt was made on Ms. Córdoba's life in January 2003 and that the three persons arrested in that connection were all acquitted on 5 March 2005,

Considering that Ms. Córdoba is regularly threatened in connection with her vocal criticism of the Colombian Government and outspoken denunciation of human rights violations in Colombia, and enjoys a security detail,

Noting that, despite the Committee's many requests, no substantive information has been forthcoming from the source in this case,

1. Remains deeply concerned at the de facto impunity of those who have shown, in either word or deed, their intention to kill Senator Córdoba;

2. Stresses that her only effective protection ultimately combines an appropriate security detail with resolute and effective action to identify the culprits and bring them to trial;

3. Calls on the authorities, under their obligation to make a determined effort to hold perpetrators of human rights abuses to account, to pursue this matter with the utmost urgency and diligence; reaffirms in this respect that, through its oversight role, the Colombian Congress has a responsibility and is indeed provided with an opportunity to help ensure that such an effort is made at all times;

4. Considers that, although the concerns in this case are very serious, the prolonged silence of the source prevents it from examining the case effectively any further;
5. Decides therefore to close its examination of the case, while reserving the right to reopen it should any information be forthcoming to warrant such action;

6. Requests the Secretary General to convey this resolution to the competent authorities and to the source

**CASE No. CO/122 - OSCAR LIZCANO - COLOMBIA**

*Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session*  
*(Geneva, 15 October 2008)*

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Oscar Lizcano, former member of the Congress of Colombia, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Recalling that Mr. Lizcano was kidnapped by the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) on 5 August 2000 and that in early April 2008 a video was circulated in which he appeared seriously weakened,

Considering that on 9 October 2008 the Colombian High Commissioner for Peace confirmed before the Colombian Congress that Mr. Lizcano's health was precarious, stating that the President of Colombia had authorized two persons to maintain contact with the FARC section holding Mr. Lizcano and that those contacts had been in place for three weeks,

Considering that the Colombian Armed Forces liberated Ms. Ingrid Betancourt and fourteen other hostages held by FARC on 2 July 2008; recalling that five former congressmen and Ms. Clara Rojas, Ms. Betancourt’s former assistant, were released by FARC in early 2008, and that FARC continues to hold an estimated 700 persons in captivity,

Recalling furthermore that the Colombian Congress set up the parliamentary Ad Hoc Committee on Peace and a Humanitarian Agreement to promote the conclusion of a humanitarian agreement,

1. Welcomes with deep satisfaction the fact that Ms. Betancourt and fourteen other hostages have recovered their freedom after years of captivity by FARC and agonizing uncertainty for them and their families;

2. Is encouraged by the wave of releases that have taken place since the beginning of the year and the efforts made to obtain the liberation of Mr. Lizcano, whose precarious health requires urgent medical attention;

3. Trusts that the Government of Colombia and FARC will act with resolve to obtain the release of Oscar Lizcano and the swift conclusion of a humanitarian agreement leading to the release of all hostages held by FARC;

4. Is confident that the parliamentary Ad Hoc Committee on Peace and a Humanitarian Agreement is keeping up its important work to this end, and wishes to ascertain the steps it has recently taken in this respect;

5. Recalls that the abduction of persons who play no active part in hostilities is explicitly prohibited under international humanitarian law, and calls on FARC to release its civilian hostages immediately and unconditionally and to refrain from the unlawful practice of kidnapping;

6. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).
CASE No. CO/130 - JORGE TADEO LOZANO OSORIO - COLOMBIA

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Jorge Tadeo Lozano Osorio, a former member of the Colombian Congress, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Taking account of the information provided by the Coordinator of the Human Rights and Hearings Committee of the Colombian Senate, dated 17 September 2008,

Taking account also of the information regularly provided by the source,

Recalling that: Mr. Lozano was convicted and given a heavy prison sentence following fundamentally flawed proceedings without being afforded the possibility of challenging them as, under Colombian law, members of Congress are tried in single instance; in 2001 he submitted a petition to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights regarding the flawed judicial proceedings; despite assurances that the case would be re-examined after it was first considered inadmissible, no information to this effect has been forthcoming to date,

Considering that by Decision C-545/08 of 28 May 2008, the Colombian Constitutional Court recognized for the first time that the constitutional procedure applicable to criminal proceedings against members of the Colombian Congress, such as Mr. Lozano at the time, in which the Supreme Court Penal Chamber acts as both prosecutor and judge, was not in keeping with respect for the right to a fair trial and had to be modified accordingly; that a bill of law is now pending before the Colombian Congress to change the procedure accordingly along with introducing the possibility of appeal,

Considering that on 23 July 2008, Mr. Lozano's son, Mr. Ivanovich Lozano, was murdered in the streets of Medellin; that four weeks before his death, Mr. Lozano received direct and indirect extortionist threats, which were brought to the attention of the city's competent police authorities (Gaula), who nevertheless reportedly took no action; recalling that, in the past, several attempts have apparently been made to silence Mr. Lozano and that his security and that of his family had been at risk for some time as a result of his critical attitude towards those who acted against him and who hold political, military or paramilitary power in Colombia,

1. Is shocked at the killing of Mr. Lozano's son and the apparent inaction of the authorities in the face of the threats communicated to them; calls on the authorities, in keeping with their duty, to do everything in their power to conduct a full investigation into the murder with a view to identifying and bringing to trial the culprits and to provide Mr. Lozano and his family with the necessary protection; would greatly appreciate receiving information on what steps have been taken to this end;

2. Reiterates its call on the Inter-American Commission to give full and swift consideration to Mr. Lozano's petition so as to help redress the injustice he has suffered; considers that the decision by Colombia's Constitutional Court lends the petition further weight as it constitutes a public and official acknowledgement by the Colombian courts at the highest level that, on an essential point, the legal procedure followed in his case was flawed; anxiously awaits the Commission's decision, which it hopes, in the light of precedents and the latest Colombian jurisprudence, will be positive;

3. Notes with satisfaction that the Colombian Congress is reviewing the procedure applicable to criminal cases against its members; trusts that a new procedure which ensures full compatibility with fundamental fair trial standards, including the right to appeal and non-discrimination of members of parliament, will soon be in place; would greatly appreciate being kept informed of progress in this respect;
4. Requests the Secretary General to inform the Colombian Congress, the Inter-American Commission and the source of this resolution;

5. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

CASE No. CO/138 - GUSTAVO PETRO URREGO - COLOMBIA

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session (Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Gustavo Petro Urrego, a member of the Colombian Senate and vocal critic of the Colombian Government, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Taking into account the communication from the Prosecutor General’s Office of 16 July 2008,

Recalling that Mr. Petro has constantly received death threats and that, with respect to one such threat, the Commander of the Bloque Tolima of the Autodefensas Unidades de Colombia (AUC), a paramilitary group disbanded on 22 October 2005, was identified as a suspect and heard in court on 22 January and 12 February 2007; the investigation has been at the preliminary stage since 2004 and the prosecuting authorities have requested further evidence-taking,

Noting that, despite its many requests, no substantive information has been forthcoming from the source in this case,

1. Remains deeply concerned that, with possibly one exception, those behind the numerous death threats against Mr. Petro have enjoyed de facto impunity;

2. Stresses that ultimately his only effective protection combines an appropriate security detail with resolute and effective action to identify the culprits and bring them to trial;

3. Calls on the authorities, under their obligation to make a determined effort to hold perpetrators of human rights abuses to account, to pursue this matter with the utmost urgency and diligence;

4. Considers that, although the concerns in this case are very serious, the prolonged silence of the source prevents it from further examining the case effectively;

5. Decides therefore to close its examination of the case, while reserving the right to reopen it should any information be forthcoming to warrant such action;

6. Requests the Secretary General to convey this resolution to the competent authorities and to the source.

CASE No. CO/140 - WILSON BORJA - COLOMBIA

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session (Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Wilson Borja, an incumbent member of the Colombian Congress and vocal critic of the Colombian Government, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),
Taking account of the information provided by the source on 11 August 2008,

Considering the following information on file:

- Mr. Wilson Borja suffered an attempt on his life on 15 December 2000, after he had received repeated death threats; on 26 August 2005, an indictment was brought against five accused who had not yet been apprehended following the sentencing of four persons to prison terms ranging between 28 and 60 years; one of the convicts, Army Major César Alonso Maldonado Vidales, escaped from the Military Police Battalion 13 detention centre in November 2004, even though he was being guarded by some 30 prison officers, but was captured again on 15 July 2008; two army officers were punished - one for a disciplinary offence leading to his suspension for 80 days and the other to a two-year suspended prison sentence - for their responsibility in the escape; two of the other convicts, former Sergeant Evangelista Basto Bernal and Mr. Regulo Rueda Chávez were reportedly included by the Colombian Government in the list of those enjoying the privileges offered under the Justice and Peace Law, which is applicable exclusively to demobilized members of illegal armed groups, on the grounds that they belonged to the Bloque Centauros of the Autodefensas Unidad de Colombia, even though no such claim had been made by this group itself; given the time already spent in detention, these persons may soon be released; the alleged masterminds of the attack, paramilitary leaders Salvatore Mancuso and Evert Veloza Garcia (alias "HH"), will reportedly stand trial in the United States of America, but only on drug-related charges;

- There have reportedly been deficiencies on several occasions (starting in May 2006) in Mr. Borja's protection scheme, in particular with respect to his security vehicles, about which he has regularly complained to the Ministry of Interior and Justice without any action being taken; Mr. Borja has therefore felt obliged on several occasions, most recently at the end of March 2008, to stay at home until his security was fully ensured;

- Following the killing on 1 March 2008 by the Colombian military of high-ranking FARC member Raúl Reyes and the discovery of reportedly compromising material in his computers, on 22 May 2008 the Attorney General requested the Colombian Supreme Court to investigate Mr. Borja, along with others, for his alleged links with the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC); on 4 July 2008, the Supreme Court opened a preliminary investigation in this respect; the source affirms that the documents found are written by others in which Mr. Borja's name appears, as do those of many others, and described his public activities as a parliamentarian and previously as a labour union leader; the source affirms that the authorities passed the collected information to selected media even though the investigation was ongoing; when Mr. Borja was publicly linked to FARC in a radio interview on 20 February 2007, he lodged a complaint with the Committee on Accusations of the House of Representatives, whose investigation is under way,

Recalling that Mr. Borja has been a strong and persistent advocate for a peaceful solution to the conflict in Colombia,

1. Is deeply concerned at the reportedly recurring problems in Mr. Borja's security detail; can but consider that the failed attempt on his life shows that his protection has to be taken extremely seriously and that, by not addressing his complaints diligently and swiftly, the authorities are responsible for putting him at great and unnecessary risk; urges the Colombian authorities to ensure, as is their duty, that an effective security arrangement is in place for Mr. Borja at all times; wishes to receive confirmation on this point;

2. Expresses deep concern about the actual enforcement of prison sentences in the case of the attack on Mr. Borja's life; considers that the escape in suspicious circumstances of the army Major bearing chief responsibility for the crime and the limited action to hold those responsible to account, together with the proposed reduction of sentence for two convicts on highly contested grounds, raise doubts about how sincerely the authorities are seeking to ensure full justice in this case; considers that, as the main convicts were serving or former members of the armed forces, the authorities have an even greater responsibility to ensure that they are indeed serving their sentences, and urges them to take all necessary measures to this end; would greatly appreciate receiving further information in this respect;
3. Is deeply concerned that the criminal investigation instituted against Mr. Borja is taking place in a climate in which, along with other vocal opponents to the current government, he is publicly discredited and, in disregard of the presumption of innocence, is labelled a FARC associate before any court of law has ruled on these serious accusations; calls on the authorities to refrain from making such statements and to let justice take its course; trusts that the investigation and proceedings are carried out diligently and independently and that they fully respect Mr. Borja's rights; wishes to be informed of the precise accusations, and the facts underpinning them, against Mr. Borja and the stage reached in the proceedings before the Supreme Court;

4. Considers that the Congress of Colombia has a special responsibility to ensure that its members can exercise their parliamentary mandate free of any threat or intimidation, and therefore calls upon Congress to do everything in its power to ensure due administration of justice in all proceedings relating to Mr. Borja, and the provision of appropriate security arrangements for him; would greatly appreciate receiving information on any steps taken in this respect, including by the Committee on Accusations of the House of Representatives, on Mr. Borja's complaint;

5. Requests the Secretary General to convey this resolution to the competent authorities and to the source;

6. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

**DEMONCIRIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO**

CASE No. DRC/30 - PIERRE DIBENG TSHIBUNBI
CASE No. DRC/31 - FRANCK DIONGO SHAMBA
CASE No. DRC/32 - PIERRE JACQUES CHALUPE
CASE No. DRC/33 - KAMBA MANDUNDU
CASE No. DRC/34 - LIÉVIN LUMANDE MADA
CASE No. DRC/38 - BLAISE DITU MONIZI
CASE No. DRC/39 - JOSEPH MBENZA THUBI

CASE No. DRC/40 - CHARLES MAKENG
CASE No. DRC/41 - EDMOND LOFONDE BOSENGA
CASE No. DRC/42 - JOSEPH UC MI MONEBE
CASE No. DRC/43 - JUSTIN KARHIBAHZA MUKUBA
CASE No. DRC/44 - MULENDA MBO
CASE No. DRC/45 - MILOLO TSHANDA
CASE No. DRC/47 - RENE ISEKEMANGA

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session (Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Having before it the case of the above-mentioned parliamentarians, all elected members of the National Assembly of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) whose mandates were invalidated, which has been the subject of a study and report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians following the Procedure for the treatment by the Inter-Parliamentary Union of communications concerning violations of the human rights of members of parliament,

Taking note of the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians, which contains a detailed outline of the case (CL/183/12(b)-R.1),

Taking into consideration the information and observations provided to the Committee by members of the Congolese delegation to the 119th IPU Assembly on the occasion of a hearing organized for it,

Also taking into consideration the information provided on that occasion by Mr. Chalupa and Mr. Diongo,

Considering the following information on file:
- the mandates of the persons in question, all declared elected in the first multiparty elections held in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (July 2006), were invalidated by Judgment R.E. 007 delivered by the Supreme Court of Justice on 5 May 2007; given the considerable criticism voiced of how the Court ruled on the electoral appeals, and in particular the fact that it handed down most of those rulings outside the two-month time limit set by the electoral law and allowed third-party objections, not provided for under that law, the National Assembly decided to establish a “Special Committee to examine follow-up to be taken on the rulings of the Supreme Court of Justice with respect to the electoral disputes of the national deputies”; in its final report of 24 May 2007, the Special Committee finds many irregularities committed by the Court, including the removal from office of non-existent deputies, modification of the method of voting, removal of the deputies for whom no appeal had been lodged and their replacement with candidates having received fewer votes, the absence of any recount of votes under cross-checking conditions despite an interim order issued by the Court on 9 February 2007 directing such a recount, and despite the legal provisions on the subject, inflating of the number of votes in some constituencies beyond the real number of voters; the Special Committee submitted two proposals to the Assembly, namely (a) rejection of the rulings given outside the time limit on the grounds of excess of jurisdiction, and (b) application of Judgment R.E. 007 of 5 May 2007;

- in its resolution of 17 July 2007, the National Assembly adopted a resolution on this case denouncing the rulings of the Supreme Court of Justice as being “marred by serious irregularities and abuse of rights”; the resolution requests the President of the Republic: (i) urgently to convene an inter-institutional meeting of various authorities in order “to draw all relevant conclusions from the dysfunction of our justice and to lay down the major policy lines for a reform of our judicial system”, and (ii) “to contemplate any possible political solution in favour of the victims of the injustice of the Supreme Court of Justice, in a context of reconciliation and national solidarity and in order to preserve civil peace in the country”; the resolution further requests the Higher Council of Magistrates “to assume its responsibilities and institute disciplinary proceedings against the offending magistrates of the Supreme Court of Justice. Magistrates found guilty should be disbarred and banned from any judicial and legal professions”; with respect to the rulings under consideration, the National Assembly, in order not to “go from irregularity to irregularity”, recommended their application in keeping with Articles 151 and 158 of the Constitution, while nevertheless demanding that all material errors committed by the Supreme Court of Justice be corrected by the Court itself;

- following that resolution the parliamentarians concerned were replaced by persons declared to have been elected by the Supreme Court of Justice and, according to the sources, close to the President of the Republic;

- the parliamentarians concerned, who constituted the “Group of Deputies victims of injustice and discrimination (G 18)”, argue that, although Articles 151 and 168 establish the immediate enforceability of the rulings of the Constitutional Court/ Supreme Court of Justice, that body is nevertheless subject to the authority of the law and bound to respect it (Article 150 of the Constitution): that had not happened as the Court had breached several provisions not only of the electoral law but also of the Constitution, a state of affairs determined by the National Assembly itself;

- the inter-institutional meeting recommended in the National Assembly was held on 23 July 2007 under the direction of the President of the Republic, and at the meeting the First President of the Court agreed to the correction of two cases of material error in Judgment R.E. 007; however, according to the sources, the results of the meeting were not made public;

- following a request for the correction of material error, the Supreme Court of Justice, by judgment delivered on 14 December 2007, reinstated two of the parliamentarians concerned, Ms. Dembo and Mr. Kingotolo, and two other parliamentarians concerned accepted posts on boards of directors of public enterprises and one parliamentarian concerned, standing in a by-election, was not re-elected;
In the judgment it delivered in the case of Ms. Dembo, the Supreme Court noted, inter alia, that "it is accepted that the judge cannot refuse to rectify a material error … , that the electoral magistrate is judge of the accuracy and genuineness of the result and that, in the case under consideration, the rectification of such errors, to the extent that they concern figures, is such as will restore the genuineness of the ballot",

Considering that the invalidation of the election of the other persons concerned is also due to material errors, as evident from the documents on file; but that the Supreme Court refused to receive the applications for rectification of material error submitted by Mr. Chalupa and Mr. Diongo, apparently by order of the Office of the President of the Republic, and that when Mr. Chalupa and Mr. Diongo sent their applications by DHL, the Court simply returned them by DHL after an interval of 20 days, proof of which was provided to the Committee,

Considering that, in its meeting with the Committee, the Congolese delegation contended that, owing to the separation of powers and the fact of the final character of Supreme Court judgments and the obligation of all State institutions to apply them, the National Assembly would have caused a grave institutional crisis had it refused to apply Judgment R.E. 007; that the National Assembly was conscious of the need not only to reform the judicial system, but also to find solutions for repairing the injustices done to the parliamentarians concerned, and noting that the National Assembly invited the Committee in this respect to carry out an on-site mission to contribute to the settlement of this matter,

Considering lastly that the Democratic Republic of the Congo is a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Articles 25 and 26 of which establish the right to vote and be a candidate in elections ensuring the free expression of the will of the electors, and the right to equality before the law, respectively,

1. Thanks the delegation of the Democratic Republic of the Congo for its cooperation;

2. Emphasizes that the arbitrary invalidation of election results, by distorting the truth of the ballot box, violates not only the right of the persons concerned to exercise the parliamentary mandate entrusted to them by the people, but also the right of their electors to be represented by persons of their choice; commends the fact that the National Assembly has clearly voiced its disapproval of the arbitrary invalidation of the parliamentarians concerned and has stated its readiness to repair the injustice done to them;

3. Is alarmed at the refusal of the Supreme Court to rule on the applications for rectification of material error duly filed, and affirms that such refusal constitutes a grave fault denying the persons concerned their fundamental right of access to justice and throws unflattering light on how the highest jurisdiction of the country administers justice;

4. Therefore urges the authorities immediately to redress this state of affairs, which is an affront to a fundamental principle of democracy, namely that the results of free and fair elections must be respected;

5. Welcomes the invitation extended to the Committee to carry out an on-site mission with a view to contributing to the rapid settlement of this case, and requests the Secretary General and the Committee to take the necessary steps to this end;

6. Requests the Secretary General to convey this resolution to the President of the National Assembly;

7. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).
Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Jaime Ricaurte Hurtado González and Mr. Pablo Vicente Tapia Farinango, member and substitute member, respectively, of the National Congress of Ecuador, who were murdered in broad daylight in the centre of Quito on 17 February 1999 along with a legislative assistant, Mr. Wellington Borja Nazareno, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Taking account of the information provided by the President of the Special Commission of Inquiry and the Commission's legal adviser at the hearing held with the Committee on 15 July 2008,

Recalling the following:

- the Special Commission of Inquiry (CEI) set up immediately after the murder to help elucidate the crime has from the outset sharply criticized the conduct of the investigation authorities, in particular the line of inquiry that the police presented in their preliminary report and as announced on 19 February 1999 by the then President of the Republic, namely that the motive for the killing was Jaime Hurtado's links with the Colombian guerrilla movement, which conclusion has subsequently never been elaborated or substantiated;

- the CEI has pointed to numerous inconsistencies in the police investigation and concluded that deliberate efforts were made by some police officers to thwart its conduct; the CEI also expressed its strong disapproval of the inactive attitude of the prosecuting authorities and the courts when it came to shedding full light on the murder, in particular that they took the preliminary police conclusions at face value;

- the CEI conducted an extensive inquiry that took account of Mr. Hurtado's critical stance on the then Government and his investigations into corruption cases, which are said to have led him to unravel a web of drug trafficking featuring high-profile figures from both banking and political circles; none of the serious leads presented in this regard in the CEI's extensive reports has so far been seriously investigated or taken into account by the prosecuting authorities;

- on 23 October 2003, the judge in the case declared the plenary phase of the trial open against six accused, while ordering a stay of proceedings against 21 other persons, mainly police officers; on 20 December 2005, Mr. Freddy Contreras Luna was sentenced to 16 years in prison for his involvement in the triple murder; he started serving his sentence on 20 January 2006; an appeal against the ruling is pending before the Supreme Court; on 3 February 2007, Mr. Steven Ponce was arrested in the United States of America, extradited to Ecuador and subsequently sentenced to 16 years in prison for his part in the crime; the CEI affirms that neither of the judgments takes into consideration any of its findings; the proceedings against the four accused who are at large remain suspended and those against the 21 other persons continue to be stayed,

Considering that the CEI has completed its inquiry and is now concentrating on ensuring that the full truth is ascertained about the triple murder and its mastermind(s), and that in this respect it is participating in the appeal proceedings in the case of Mr. Contreras, arguing that the basis for his conviction in fact invalidates the preliminary findings of the police on the motive of the murder, and in order to ensure that the Court takes full account of its conclusions,

Considering that the CEI is preparing a submission to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to obtain a ruling that the State of Ecuador has failed to comply with its duty to advance the cause of justice in this case and to provide the victims' families with reparation,

Considering that in Ecuador the offence of murder is subject to a ten-year statute of limitations,
1. Urges the authorities to take full account of the CEI’s findings since its thorough investigation has provided substantive leads and revealed serious contradictions and omissions in the conduct of the competent authorities in this case, which, if not taken seriously, can only lend credence to the allegation that a deliberate effort has been made to prevent the full truth from emerging;

2. Trusts that, at this crucial juncture, the authorities are doing their utmost to ensure that the accused who remain at large are apprehended and can still be prosecuted, particularly since such proceedings would offer a fresh opportunity to give critical consideration in court to all the material on file in this case, in particular the work of the CEI;

3. Is confident that in the meantime the appeal proceedings concerning Mr. Contreras are taking due account of the findings of the CEI, and wishes to be kept informed in this respect;

4. Would also appreciate being kept informed of developments regarding the submission of the petition to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights;

5. Requests the Secretary General to inform the competent authorities, the CEI and the source of this resolution and to seek the requested information from them;

6. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of the former members of the Parliament of Ecuador listed above, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),
Taking account of the information provided by the Vice-President of the Supreme Electoral Court at the hearing held with the Committee on 15 July 2008 and of his letter of 7 September 2008,

Taking account also of the information provided regularly by the source,

Recalling the following undisputed information on file:

- On 7 March 2007, the Supreme Electoral Court (TSE) dismissed 56 Congress members and debarred them for one year from participating in political life, declaring that they had interfered with the electoral process by voting in favour of the two National Congress resolutions calling for the dismissal and replacement of the TSE President, for lodging with the Constitutional Court an application for annulment of the resolution by the TSE to call for the referendum on the establishment of a Constituent Assembly as being unconstitutional, and for proposing impeachment proceedings against the four TSE members who had approved the resolution for a referendum; the dismissed members of Congress, who constituted more than half of its total membership, continued to meet in Quito, though outside of the parliamentary premises, as the Parliament of Ecuador;

- On 23 April 2007, the Constitutional Court ruled that the revocation of the mandates of the Congress members was unlawful, whereupon the TSE filed a request for clarification and amplification; on 24 April 2007, the National Congress, which had meanwhile replaced most of the dismissed parliamentarians with their substitutes, decided to dismiss the judges of the Constitutional Court on the grounds that their mandate had expired in January 2007;

- On 25 July 2007, the newly-designated Constitutional Court overturned their predecessor’s decision of 23 April 2007, finding constitutional breaches and procedural flaws, the new decision being unappealable and hence final;

- On 12 October 2007, the dismissed parliamentarians presented a formal petition regarding their situation to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights;

- On 10 January 2008, the Pichincha District Attorney General reactivated a previous request that criminal proceedings be instituted against 24 of the dismissed deputies for compromising State security and for overstepping their functions by setting up an unlawful parallel congress, which proceedings, if pursued, may again affect their political rights, the suspension of which - as part of the decision by the TSE to revoke their parliamentary mandate - expired in March 2008,

Considering that, on 28 September 2008, the people of Ecuador approved the draft Constitution; that elections for the newly created National Assembly, to replace the Congress, are expected to be held in early 2009,

1. Thanks the Vice-President of the Supreme Electoral Court for his cooperation and the extensive information provided in this complex case;

2. Remains nevertheless convinced that the case raises fundamental concerns regarding a breach of parliamentary immunity and the unlawful revocation of the parliamentary mandate of more than half of the members of the Ecuadorian Congress;

3. Notes that since then significant developments have taken place in Ecuador, the most notable and recent being the adoption of a new Constitution by the people setting out a new institutional framework for the country;

4. Trusts that the 56 dismissed deputies can all stand in the forthcoming legislative elections should they so wish; calls therefore on the authorities to shelve any legal action that may be under way against 24 of the dismissed deputies in connection with activities directly linked to their parliamentary mandate and its revocation; would greatly appreciate receiving information on this point;

5. Requests the Secretary General to convey this resolution to the competent authorities and to the source;

6. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).
CASE No. EGY/02 - AYMAN NOUR - EGYPT

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Ayman Nour, a member of the People's Assembly of Egypt at the time that the communication regarding him was submitted, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Taking account of the letter from the Speaker of the People’s Assembly of 29 May 2008 whereby he conveyed the Attorney General's response to its request for a Committee delegation to be authorized to visit Mr. Nour; also taking account of his letter of 31 August and of his letter of 13 October 2008, which was hand-delivered to the IPU Secretariat,

Considering that Mr. Ayman Nour, founder of the opposition Al-Ghad party, who stood in the presidential elections of September 2005 in which he came second to president Mubarak, had his parliamentary immunity lifted on 29 January 2005, and was forthwith arrested on charges of forgery and counterfeiting for the purpose of founding his party; on 24 December 2005, he was found guilty and sentenced to a five-year prison term, which was upheld at final instance and which he is now serving; Mr. Nour's state of health is said to be poor; a petition for release on medical grounds which Mr. Nour filed in August 2006 was rejected on the basis of an official medical report conveyed to the prison authorities in January 2007 to the effect that Mr. Nour's continuing imprisonment did not endanger his life; appeals against that decision were rejected, on 31 May 2007 by the Cairo Felonies Court, on 31 July 2007 by the State Council and at final instance, on 17 March 2008, by the High Administrative Court; in mid-May 2007, Mr. Nour was assaulted by security officers in court where he had to attend a hearing in connection with another case; on 6 September 2007, one of Mr. Nour's co-accused, Mr. Ayman Hassan Ismail El-Refa'ay, who had retracted his statement against Mr. Nour, was found hanged in his cell, which he shared with three other prisoners; the authorities claim he committed suicide,

Noting more particularly the following details, as outlined in the Committee's report:

- Mr. Nour's parliamentary immunity was lifted in less than one day, the Speaker having received the request for the lifting on Friday, 29 January 2005 at 1 a.m., the Committee on Constitutional and Legislative Affairs having met from 11 to 11.35 a.m. to discuss the case and the plenary from 12.20 to 2 p.m. when it voted in favour of the lifting of Mr. Nour's immunity; the sources have pointed out that procedures for the lifting of immunity normally take several months, even years, and mentioned in this context the cases of Mr. Fa'ek El Tenneihi, Mr. Ragab Helal Hemeida, Mr. Hany Serour, Mr. Emad El-Gelda and Mr. Mamadou Ismail (a member of the Upper House), accused, respectively, of falsifying powers of attorney, furnishing contaminated blood to hospitals, corruption and manslaughter;

- Mr. Nour was accused, and later convicted, for having forged signatures to obtain the registration of his political party for which, according to Article 7 of the Law on Political Parties, 50 signatures are required; the Speaker stated in this respect that Mr. Nour, who had already gathered more than the 50 signatures, required more than 50 signatures because previous applications for registration had been rejected and a greater number of signatures would be "a proof of the popularity of the party" and have a stronger impact on the decision by the Political Parties Affairs Committee; however, according to the sources, Mr. Nour's previous applications were rejected not owing to a lack of signatures but because the party’s programme, in the view of the Political Party Affairs Committee, did not differ from other political parties' programmes;

- Ayman Hassan Ismail, one of Mr. Nour's co-accused, retracted his statement against Mr. Nour in court, claiming that it had been extracted from him under pressure; the Court concluded that no evidence as to such coercion had been adduced; while in prison, Hassan Ismail asked to be authorized to make new statements regarding the Nour case. Mr. Nour informed the prosecutor of that on 21 August and again on 1 September 2007, forwarding to him a report which he had received from Ayman Hassan Ismail and requested - to no avail - that he be heard by the
Prosecutor. On 6 September 2007, Mr. Ayman Hassan Ismail was found hanged in his cell, which he shared with three other prisoners. According to the authorities, he had hanged himself with his bed sheet at the cell door, his cellmates having noticed nothing and found him dead at the time of the morning prayers. The authorities affirm that Mr. Ayman Hassan Ismail had committed suicide. The Prosecutor has refused repeated requests by Mr. Nour to be heard in this respect; he reportedly also refused to answer Mr. Nour's reiterated petitions for a retrial;

- Mr. Nour has not been granted a full review of the merits of his case, since the Cassation Court is competent only to oversee the proper application of the law but not to look into the merits of a case;

- On 12 May 2007, while in court attending a labour lawsuit, Mr. Nour was reportedly assaulted and beaten by security officers because, owing to his state of health, he refused to walk up several flights of stairs and had requested use of the lift, complaining of joint problems; the authorities shelved his complaint against the officers in question stating that testimony gathered proved the accusations against them to have been false; according to the sources, the case has never been submitted to court;

- Mr. Nour suffers from various ailments, in particular diabetes and high blood pressure; he has a heart condition and has stents implanted, for which reason he lodged a petition for his early release on health grounds pursuant to Article 36 of Law No. 396/1956, which provides for the early release of prisoners suffering from a disease endangering their life or causing permanent incapacitation; in the course of the proceedings, the Attorney General/South Cairo Prosecution established a tripartite committee to examine the matter; in January 2007, that committee concluded that "the condition of the convict is but a disease, as per the diagnosis, shown in high blood sugar and hypertension that produced neither congested cardiac failure nor stiffness of knees" and that keeping him in detention constituted "no danger to his life if placed under medical care and supervision through frequent admissions to the prison specialized hospital for follow-up and treatment"; at the request of Mr. Nour, medical doctors and university professors at Al-Qasr El-Ain University, Ain Shams University and Alexandria University drew up reports in which, on the basis of the medical data gathered by the tripartite committee, concluded that Mr. Nour's conditions were life-threatening, that continued imprisonment would render him disabled and that, moreover, some expressed doubt about how far the required treatment could be provided in prison hospitals; in its decision of 31 July 2007, the Administrative Judiciary Court concluded that it was established that Mr. Nour's ailments affected the kidneys and could narrow heart coronary blood vessels, but that it trusted the tripartite committee's report that Mr. Nour's ailments did not constitute at the time of his examination any life-threatening complication; it has been consistently alleged that Mr. Nour is not provided with the necessary medical treatment, and information provided by the authorities to the contrary has been contradicted by information from the sources;

- According to the sources, Mr. Nour is not given special meals for diabetics and medication, although a court decision of 4 September 2007 ordered the authorities meet that requirement,

Considering that several requests by the Committee to carry out a mission and gather first-hand information from the competent authorities and from Mr. Nour, his family and his lawyer to clarify the sometimes conflicting information on file were rejected despite the Speaker's efforts to organize the mission and, more particularly, to secure a visit to Mr. Nour, which the Attorney General, however, deemed contrary to Egyptian law and interference with the Egyptian judiciary,

Considering that, in May 2008, the Attorney General reiterated his previous position and stressed that there was no precedent for a foreign body or representative thereof to visit an Egyptian prisoner; noting in this respect that the international non-governmental organization Human Rights Watch/Middle East Watch (HRW/MEW) had been authorized to conduct a fact-finding mission to Egypt in January and February 1992 to investigate arrest and detention practices and allegations of torture of individuals held in the custody of the security forces, that the HRW/MEW delegation, composed only of foreign nationals, had been able to visit six Egyptian prisons, including Tora Liman prison, over an eight-day period, and that the public report on the mission, issued in March 1992, clearly indicates that the HRW/MEW representatives were authorized to interview prisoners in their prisons; that, however, the Prison administration, in a letter forwarded by the Speaker stated that it had no information in this respect; that, furthermore, Egyptian sociologist Professor Saad
Eddin Ibrahim, founder of two important human rights organizations, when incarcerated in Tora Farm Prison from 2000 to 2003 was visited by former Canadian Foreign Minister Flora McDonald, Ambassadors of various European Union countries, the President of the American University in Cairo, a US citizen as well as representatives of Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch,

Noting that in late May 2008 Mr. Nour reportedly suffered from food poisoning which severely affected his health and left marks on his skin, that he was apparently not taken to hospital until a week later; that, in his letter of 31 August 2008 the Speaker provided documents indicating that, according to the authorities, on 8 June 2008 Mr. Nour was taken to the hospital because of a suspected heart attack and received the necessary treatment before being taken back to prison,

Bearing in mind lastly that on 23 July 2008 President Mubarak, by Presidential Decree No. 200 pardoned over 1,500 prisoners having, like Mr. Nour, served half of their sentences; that, however, forgery was exempted from the Decree while, according to the sources, crimes such as murder, torture, corruption, espionage and state security crimes along with 60 other crimes were included and that Mr. Nour consequently was not covered by the pardon; that another pardon decree of October likewise excluded forgery from its scope; that, according to the Speaker, all presidential pardon decrees since 2002 have excluded forgery; that, however, according to the source, the majority of pardon decrees issued in the past by President Mubarak did not exclude forgery from their scope,

1. Thanks the Speaker of the People’s Assembly for his consistent cooperation, in particular his letters of 31 August and 13 October 2008, and regrets that the Committee was unable to meet with him at the session it held during the 119th IPU Assembly;
2. Deeply regrets that the Attorney General has not authorized the Committee to visit Mr. Nour, although permission to visit Egyptian prisoners was granted in the past to foreigners, including to non-governmental human rights organizations;
3. Remains deeply concerned at Ayman Nour’s state of health, which, as stated by the tripartite committee, requires constant medical check-ups and frequent admissions to hospital; stresses in this context that, in its ruling of July 2007, the Administrative Judiciary Court specified that, at the time of the examination by the tripartite committee in January 2007, there was no life-threatening condition and that since then more than 18 months have elapsed without another thorough examination of his state of health;
4. Deeply regrets that Mr. Nour was not covered by the pardon decrees issued in July and October this year, and calls on the President to pardon Mr. Nour,
5. Believes that it is not only Mr. Nour’s state of health which would justify a pardon but also the fact that the forgery of which the Egyptian courts found him guilty did not affect the rights or life of anyone and appears to have been immaterial since Mr. Nour had gathered far more than the 50 signatures necessary in order to register the Al-Ghad Party;
6. Recalls that Egypt, as a member of the United Nations Human Rights Council, has pledged to uphold the highest standards in the field of human rights, and believes that pardoning Mr. Nour would be consonant with that commitment;
7. Sincerely hopes that a meeting between the Speaker of the People’s Assembly and the Committee can be arranged on the occasion of the next IPU Assembly with a view to their continued dialogue, and requests the Secretary General to take the necessary steps to this end;
8. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009), when it hopes to be able to close the case following its satisfactory settlement.
ERITREA

CASE No. ERI/01 - OGBE ABRAHA
CASE No. ERI/02 - ASTER FISSEHATSION
CASE No. ERI/03 - BERHANE GEBREGZIABEHER
CASE No. ERI/04 - BERAKI GEBRESELASSIE
CASE No. ERI/05 - HAMAD HAMID HAMAD
CASE No. ERI/06 - SALEH KEKIYA
CASE No. ERI/07 - GERMANO NATI
CASE No. ERI/08 - ESTIFANOS SEYOUM
CASE No. ERI/09 - MAHMOUD AHMED SHERIFFO
CASE No. ERI/10 - PETROS SOLOMON
CASE No. ERI/11 - HAILE WOLDETENSAE

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the cases of the parliamentarians listed above, former members of the Parliament of Eritrea who have been held incommunicado since 18 September 2001, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Recalling the following:

- the parliamentarians concerned were arrested on 18 September 2001 after publishing an open letter criticizing President Issayas Afwerki's policies and have been held incommunicado ever since, accused of conspiracy and attempting to overthrow the legal government without ever being formally charged or tried;

- in November 2003, upon examination of a complaint concerning their situation, the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights found that the State of Eritrea had violated Articles 2, 6, 7(1) and 9(2) of the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights, which address the right to liberty and security of person, the right to a fair trial and the right to freedom of expression, and urged the State of Eritrea to order the immediate release of the former parliamentarians and to compensate them,

Recalling that since September 2004, when the Ambassador of Eritrea to the European Union, Belgium, Luxemburg, Portugal and Spain reported that "anyone from outside or a member of their family has recently visited them and observed their conditions of detention", no further reply to any request for information has been received from the Eritrean authorities, and that no other source has been able to provide any information on the current situation of the former parliamentarians,

1. Is appalled by the continued silence of the Eritrean authorities to its persistent pleas to end the prolonged incommunicado detention of the former parliamentarians in flagrant breach of their fundamental rights under the Constitution of Eritrea and under the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights;

2. Urges them once again to put an end to this shocking situation, which flies in the face of all respect for human dignity, by releasing the former parliamentarians forthwith;

3. Considers that, in the 60th anniversary year of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the international community, in particular the global parliamentary community, cannot remain silent in the face of such a violation, and requests the Secretary General to make every effort to draw international attention to this case; invites in particular those parliaments in the region that have strong ties with Eritrea to intervene with a view to securing the release of the persons concerned;

4. Appeals once again to the authorities of the African Union, the African Parliamentary Union and the Pan-African Parliament to do everything in their power to reach this objective and thus to ensure Eritrea’s compliance with the decision of the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights in this case, and so prevent the Commission’s authority from being undermined by the attitude of a party to the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights;
5. Maintains its wish to conduct an on-site visit, since it remains convinced that such a visit would help resolve this case;

6. Requests the Secretary General to take any other action that may lead to the release of the persons concerned;

7. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

CASE No. LEB/01 - GIBRAN TUENI ) LEBANON
CASE No. LEB/02 - WALID EIDO )
CASE No. LEB/03 - ANTOINE GHANEM )
CASE No. LEB/04 - PIERRE GEMAYEL )

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Gibran Tueni, Mr. Walid Eido, Mr. Antoine Ghanem and Mr. Pierre Gemayel, members of the National Assembly of Lebanon, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Recalling the following:
- Mr. Tueni, Mr. Eido, Mr. Ghanem and Mr. Gemayel were all outspoken critics of the Syrian Arab Republic and its allies in Lebanon and were all killed between 2005 and 2007 in car-bomb attacks, except for Mr. Gemayel, who was gunned down;
- after Mr. Tueni's assassination, the National Assembly associated itself with the court action taken by the public prosecutor in his case,

Recalling that: the International Independent Investigation Commission set up under United Nations Security Council resolution 1644 (2005) to investigate former Lebanese Prime Minister Hariri's murder was subsequently also entrusted with devoting part of its capacity to giving technical assistance to the Lebanese authorities with respect to several cases of attempted assassination, assassination and bombing carried out in Lebanon since 1 October 2004, including the murders of the four members of the National Assembly; its investigations have since confirmed the hypothesis of operational links between some of the possible perpetrators of these various crimes; the Commission has held regular meetings with each of the investigating judges in Lebanon in charge of the cases and with the Prosecutor General to discuss investigative leads, evaluate the status of each investigation, and identify areas where it could provide additional technical assistance,

Recalling that the Commission has started preparing for the transition to the Office of the Prosecutor of the Special Tribunal for Lebanon, which will have concurrent jurisdiction with the national courts and will try those alleged to be responsible for Mr. Hariri's assassination and for any other attacks since October 2004 which are "connected in accordance with the principles of criminal justice and are of a nature and gravity similar to the attack of 14 February 2005", and that on 13 November 2007 the United Nations Secretary-General appointed a new Commissioner to head the Commission and subsequently act as the Prosecutor of the Tribunal; considering that the mandate of the Commission has been extended until the end of 2008,

Considering that, in the light of the political deadlock in Lebanon during which the National Assembly failed to meet and ratify the agreement between the United Nations and Lebanon to set up the Special Tribunal, the United Nations Security Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, adopted resolution 1757 on 30 May 2007, establishing the Special Tribunal and providing for the automatic entry into force of the aforesaid agreement on 10 June 2007, unless the Lebanese National Assembly agreed to ratify it before that date; considering that the political stalemate was only resolved after an agreement was reached by the main Lebanese political stakeholders in Qatar on 21 May 2008 and that the said agreement subsequently led to the election of a new President of Lebanon by the National Assembly and the creation of a government of national unity,
Bearing in mind that Lebanon is a State party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and is thus bound to guarantee the right to life,

Considering that Mr. Sheik Saleh Aridi, a senior member of the Lebanese Democratic Party, was assassinated in a car-bomb attack in the hills east of Beirut on 10 September 2008,

1. Is deeply concerned that the string of assassinations of prominent politicians in Lebanon continues to this day;

2. Remains convinced that the - as yet unresolved - murder of four members of the National Assembly of Lebanon strongly dissuades other members from speaking out on critical issues, and is thus a threat to the institution of parliament and ultimately to the people it represents; reaffirms therefore that the National Assembly has a special responsibility and interest to ensure that these crimes do not go unpunished;

3. Trusts that the National Assembly is making every effort to monitor and facilitate action and cooperation between the Commission and the national judicial system in these cases and a smooth transition to the prompt establishment of the Special Court; also trusts that, as in the case of Mr. Tueni, it has associated itself with the court action taken by the public prosecutor in the other three cases; would greatly appreciate receiving further information on these points;

4. Requests the Secretary General to convey this resolution to the Speaker of the National Assembly of Lebanon;

5. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

CASE No. MON/01 - ZORIG SANJASUUREN - MONGOLIA

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session (Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Zorig Sanjasuuren, a member of the State Great Hural of Mongolia who was murdered in October 1998, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Taking account of a communication from the Executive Committee of the Mongolian Inter-Parliamentary Group, dated 7 October 2008, and of information provided by the Japanese House of Representatives and by one of the sources,

Recalling that, during an on-site visit to Mongolia by the Committee in August 2001, the Mongolian investigative authorities stated that technical assistance with some aspects of the investigation into Mr. Zorig’s murder would help them to make progress; in August 2007, the then Prime Minister of Mongolia sent an official request for technical and other assistance to the Governments of Germany and Japan,

Considering that, following a favourable answer by the German Chancellor, technical assistance is being provided by the German authorities, who have inter alia conducted an analysis of certain pieces of evidence; that the Mongolian authorities have now to ascertain whether such expertise can be used as evidence under Mongolian criminal procedure; considering further that the Japanese Government has not as yet responded to the request for technical assistance since it has so far not received a request in due form,

Noting finally that elections took place in Mongolia in June 2008 and that it is envisaged that the Subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Legal Affairs will re-establish a working group to follow the investigation into Mr. Zorig’s murder,

1. Thanks the Mongolian Inter-Parliamentary Group for its cooperation; looks forward to receiving confirmation of the establishment by the Standing Committee on Legal Affairs and its Subcommittee on Human Rights of a working group regarding the Zorig case, thus pursuing efforts by the previous legislature to help elucidate this case;
2. *Is pleased* to note that the German offer to provide technical assistance has materialized, and *looks forward* to receiving further information as the investigation advances; *hopes* that the new Mongolian Government will vigorously pursue efforts to elucidate this case, inter alia by pursuing efforts to obtain technical assistance from those States, in particular Japan, to which a request was already addressed a year ago;

3. *Requests* the Committee to keep itself informed of any developments in this case and to report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

---

**MYANMAR**

Parliamentarians reportedly still serving their sentences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MYN/04</td>
<td>Khin Maung Swe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/13</td>
<td>Saw Naing Naing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/35</td>
<td>Saw Hlaing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/60</td>
<td>Zaw Myint Maung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/104</td>
<td>Kyaw Khin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/118</td>
<td>Than Nyein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/119</td>
<td>May Win Myint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/215</td>
<td>Aung Soe Myint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/236</td>
<td>Khun Htun Oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/237</td>
<td>Kyaw San</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/238</td>
<td>Kyaw Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/241</td>
<td>Khin Maung Win</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/242</td>
<td>Kyaw Kyaw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parliamentarians arrested during and since the government crackdown on mass protests in the autumn of 2007 and at present in detention:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MYN/254</td>
<td>Than Lwin*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/256</td>
<td>Hlaing Aye*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/257</td>
<td>Kyaw Maung*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/258</td>
<td>Myint Kyi*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/259</td>
<td>Saw Lwin*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/260</td>
<td>Ohn Kyaying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/261</td>
<td>U Nyi Pu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/262</td>
<td>Tin Min Htut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parliamentarians who died in custody or soon after their release:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MYN/53</td>
<td>Hla Than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/55</td>
<td>Tin Maung Win</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/72</td>
<td>Saw Win</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/83</td>
<td>Kyaw Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/131</td>
<td>Hla Khin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/132</td>
<td>Aun Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/245</td>
<td>Myint Thein*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parliamentarians assassinated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MYN/66</td>
<td>Win Ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYN/67</td>
<td>Hla Pe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session (Geneva, 15 October 2008)*

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

*Referring* to the cases of the above-mentioned members-elect of the Pyithu Hluttaw (People's Assembly) of the Union of Myanmar, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

---

3  He remains in detention and is being tried.
4  On 2 April 2008, MPU-Burma stated that Mr. Myint Thein had died following his release, as his health had seriously worsened during his detention.
Referring also to the resolution adopted by the 117th IPU Assembly (Geneva, October 2007) entitled “The urgent need to immediately stop the widespread human rights violations and to restore the democratic rights of the people of Myanmar”,

Recalling its long-standing concerns about:

- the complete disregard for the results of the election of 27 May 1990, in which the National League for Democracy (NLD) won 392 of the 485 seats;

- the continuous removal from the political process of many parliamentarians-elect by various means, as a result of which numerous parliamentarians-elect have been imprisoned, in some instances their detention having been continuously extended without their ever having appeared in court, as in the cases of Dr. May Win Myint and Dr. Than Nyein, whose health, together with that of U Kyaw San, remains highly precarious;

- the violent repression by the military regime of the widespread protests in Myanmar in August and September 2007; the repression was denounced on many occasions by the international community, inter alia by the IPU at its 117th Assembly (Geneva, October 2007); between 3,000 and 4,000 protestors, including 17 parliamentarians-elect, were arrested; while 12 have since been released, the remaining five, except for Mr. Saw Lin, whose trial is pending, have been sentenced on account of their participation in the peaceful demonstrations; one of those parliamentarians-elect, Mr. Than Lwin, was ill-treated with total impunity by the regime's paramilitary group;

- the National Convention, an assembly chiefly consisting of members hand-picked by the authorities; the National Convention completed its work to draft a new Constitution, which gives the military sweeping and overriding powers, in early September 2007 without allowing a free exchange of opinions and ideas and criminalizing any criticism of its work; the authorities announced that the document would be put to a public referendum on 10 May 2008 and turned down a United Nations offer to provide international monitoring for the referendum,

Considering that, despite the serious concerns about the drafting exercise performed by the National Convention and the fact that the devastating cyclone that hit Myanmar in early May 2008 made parts of the country inaccessible, the authorities went ahead with the referendum, which, according to official reports, overwhelmingly endorsed the new Constitution; that serious and detailed reports exist indicating that voters were pressured or blackmailed into voting ‘yes’ on the day of the referendum, which had become an entirely military-run exercise, and the night before, when local authorities went from house to house to collect people's votes, and that the authorities then decided to close the polling stations hours before the time originally scheduled,

Considering that on 23 September 2008, the military authorities released some 9,000 prisoners, including parliamentarians-elect Than Nyein, May Win Myint, Khin Maung Shwe and Aung Soe Myint; on 12 August 2008, parliamentarians-elect U Nyi Pu and Tin Min Htut were arrested at their houses; they were both signatories of a letter to the United Nations Secretary-General Mr. Ban Ki-moon at the end of July 2008, in which they declared their opposition to the 2010 elections and expressed concern about the United Nations stance on Myanmar; on 2 October 2008, parliamentarian Ohn Kyaing was arrested by the police,

Considering that the United Nations Secretary-General is scheduled to travel to Myanmar before the end of 2008,

1. Recalls that, as a result of the abominable prison conditions and treatment in Myanmar, six parliamentarians-elect have died in custody or soon after their release and that the health of several of the parliamentarians-elect still in detention is highly precarious; remains deeply concerned that 17 parliamentarians-elect are languishing in prison on the basis of legal provisions that blatantly disregard their most basic rights;

2. Is deeply concerned that even when parliamentarians-elect are released, as in the case of the recent and long-awaited release of four of them, similar numbers of parliamentarians-elect are detained, often rearrested, by the authorities; considers that this situation, rather than giving weight to the claim by the authorities that they genuinely wish to move towards political change, merely adds to the state of fear and arbitrariness in Myanmar;
3. **Urges** the authorities to release all 17 parliamentarians forthwith and to refrain from any further political harassment;

4. **Reaffirms its long-standing conviction** that the National Convention, owing to how it was set up and functioned, was illegitimate from the start and bound to produce a text that would fail to reflect the democratic values to which the people of Myanmar have long aspired; **considers** that the widespread and grave irregularities which have been reported with respect to the referendum on the draft Constitution have only confirmed initial concerns that it would take place in a climate of fear, repression, distrust and total lack of transparency, thus turning the whole exercise into a deliberate attempt to erect a democratic façade for sustained military power;

5. **Stresses once again** that any transition to democracy will fail so long as it is not genuinely free and transparent, does not reflect the people’s will, and is not preceded by the unconditional release of all political prisoners and the lifting of all restrictions on human rights and political activity;

6. **Urges again** the authorities to engage in a meaningful dialogue with Aung San Suu Kyi and all concerned parties and ethnic groups for the purpose of initiating a genuine democratic transition in Myanmar; **calls on** the authorities to take the necessary steps without further delay and to cooperate fully in this respect with the United Nations;

7. **Appeals** to the international community to persevere in its united stand to promote change in Myanmar and publicly to express its rejection of the referendum process and outcome in the current circumstances, and **appeals especially** to the Member Parliaments of the IPU, in particular China and India as neighbouring countries, to lend their full support in this respect;

8. **Appeals more particularly** to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), through its Secretary-General, Dr. Surin Pitsuwan, to take any measures that may lead to the restoration of democracy in Myanmar, and **refers in this respect to the 117th IPU Assembly’s recommendation that ASEAN consider suspending Myanmar’s membership until such time as the process of reconciliation with the forces of democracy gains momentum**;

9. **Requests** the Secretary General to convey this resolution to the authorities and to all other parties concerned;

10. **Requests** the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

---

**CASE No. PAL/02 - MARWAN BARGHOUTI - PALESTINE / ISRAEL**

**Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session**

(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Marwan Barghouti, an incumbent member of the Palestinian Legislative Council, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Referring also to the expert report on Mr. Barghouti’s trial by Mr. Simon Foreman (CL/177/11(a)-R.2),

Taking account of the letter from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations in Geneva, dated 13 May 2008, which he addressed to the IPU Secretary General on behalf of the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel,
Recalling that, in response to its as yet unfulfilled wish to pay a private visit on Mr. Barghouti, the Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs, at the meeting she had with the IPU President and the Secretary General during their visit to Israel in early February 2008, stated that such a visit could be arranged; noting, however, that in his letter the Permanent Representative stated that the matter was still being processed by the authorities,

Recalling that on numerous past occasions the authorities have allowed Palestinian friends and political associates of Mr. Barghouti to visit him and even allowed Al Jazeera and Al Arabia television crews to interview him in prison,

Recalling also that there have been calls from within Israel for the release of Mr. Barghouti, most recently by Mr. Amir Peretz in March 2008 when he stated that Mr. Barghouti could be a key element in achieving stability and helping the Palestinian National Authority (PNA) assume responsibility,

Bearing in mind also the prisoner exchange between Israel and the Lebanese group Hezbollah which took place on 16 July 2008, a move which the United Nations Secretary-General welcomed, expressing the hope that it might soon be followed by action for the release of Corporal Gilad Shalit and of Palestinian prisoners,

1. **Reaffirms**, in the light of the compelling legal arguments put forward in Mr. Foreman’s report, on which the Israeli authorities have not provided observations, that Mr. Barghouti’s trial did not meet the fair trial standards which Israel, as a State party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, is bound to respect;

2. **Reaffirms further**, in the light of the expert report, that Mr. Barghouti was transferred to Israel in breach of the Fourth 1949 Geneva Convention and the Oslo Accords; consequently once again urges the Israeli authorities to transfer Mr. Barghouti to the custody of the Palestinian authorities;

3. **Deeply regrets** that it has still received no answer to its request to visit Mr. Barghouti and fails to understand why it should take so long to process this long-standing request when even television crews have obtained such authorization;

4. **Expresses the earnest hope** that Mr. Barghouti and the other detained Palestinian legislators will be included in any prisoner exchange, which it hopes will take place soon;

5. **Requests** the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

---

**CASE No. PAL/04 - HUSSAM KHADER - PALESTINE / ISRAEL**

**Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session (Geneva, 15 October 2008)**

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Hussam Khader, a former member of the Palestinian Legislative Council, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Referring also to Mr. Simon Foreman’s report on Mr. Khader’s trial (CL/177/11(a)-R.2) and to Mr. Sadakat Kadri’s report on the proceedings relating to Mr. Khader’s application for early release (CL/182/12(b)-R.2),

Taking account of the letter from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations in Geneva, dated 8 October 2008, which he addressed to the IPU Secretary General on behalf of the Speaker of the Knesset; also taking account of the information provided by one of the sources on 5 September 2008,
Recalling the following:

- Mr. Hussam Khader was convicted and sentenced in September/November 2005 on the basis of a plea bargain regarding both the conviction and the sentencing; the IPU trial observer, Mr. Simon Foreman, concluded in his report on the trial of Mr. Khader that he "has not, since his arrest [in March 2003], had the benefit of compliance with the international rules of fair trial"; in his report, Mr. Foreman also referred to the cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment inflicted on Mr. Khader while in detention, on which no convincing evidence to the contrary has been submitted by the Israeli authorities; the IPU has been consistently calling for his release;

- Mr. Khader’s petition for early release was dismissed on 17 February 2008; in his report on the proceedings before the release committee, Mr. Kadri concluded that "the serious concerns Mr. Foreman expressed in his report about the fairness of Mr. Khader’s trial have been compounded by the release committee’s refusal to grant him early release. Although the adjournments that preceded the committee’s final decision suggest that its members were concerned not simply to rubber-stamp the security service’s views about Mr. Khader, their eventual reliance on the Shabak’s secret report ultimately left him in a hopeless position. The committee’s ruling was founded on allegations made by unidentified people for unidentifiable reasons, which Mr. Khader and his lawyer were not permitted to know, let alone test. The only additional input came from Mr. Khader himself, and the release committee’s insistence that he satisfactorily explain his ‘ideology’ to obtain release effectively turned his offence into a thought crime - imposing a demand for mental capitulation that his vocalized support for peace could not satisfy."

Considering that Mr. Khader was among the 200 Palestinian prisoners released on 25 August 2008 by the Israeli authorities as a goodwill gesture to the Palestinian Authority,

1. Thanks the Israeli authorities, in particular the Speaker of the Knesset and the Minister for Foreign Affairs, for their assistance in this case;

2. Is pleased that Mr. Khader has finally been released and decides to close his case;

3. Nevertheless reaffirms its conviction, in the light of Mr. Foreman’s and Mr. Kadri’s reports on Mr. Khader’s trial and the proceedings before the release committee, that Mr. Khader did not enjoy a fair trial.

CASE No. PAL/05 - AHMAD SA'ADAT - PALESTINE / ISRAEL

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session (Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Ahmad Sa’adat, elected in January 2006 to the Palestinian Legislative Council, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Referring also to the study of the Israeli non-governmental organization Yesh Din (Volunteers for Human Rights) on the implementation of due process rights in Israeli military courts in the West Bank, entitled “Backyard Proceedings”,

Taking account of the letter from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations in Geneva, dated 8 October 2008, as well as of information provided the same day by one of the sources,
Recalling that on 14 March 2006, Mr. Sa’adat, whom the Israeli authorities had accused of involvement in the October 2001 murder of Mr. R. Zeevi, the Israeli Minister of Tourism, was abducted by the Israeli Defence Forces from Jericho jail and transferred to an Israeli jail; that in late April 2006, in the absence of sufficient evidence, the Israeli authorities dropped the charge of involvement in Mr. Zeevi’s murder and subsequently brought 19 other charges against Mr. Sa’adat, all of which arise from his leadership of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) and none of which allege direct involvement in crimes of violence, although seven (dating from 1998 or earlier) allege preparatory or secondary involvement in such acts, and that Mr. Sa’adat has refused to accept the court’s jurisdiction since the start of his trial,

Noting that a hearing in Mr. Sa’adat’s case was scheduled for 28 July 2008, at which the court intended to ascertain whether Mr. Sa’adat was prepared to present his defence regarding the prosecution evidence, and that the judge prolonged his imprisonment without adducing any grounds,

Recalling that, at the meeting the IPU President and the Secretary General had with the Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs during their visit to Israel in early February 2008, she stated that there was no reason why information on the judicial proceedings in this and other cases of Palestinian Legislative Council members should not be provided and undertook to ensure that such information was provided; noting, however, that no such information has been provided,

Noting in this respect that, in his letter of 8 October, the Permanent Representative of Israel stated that the “Palestinian parliamentarians detained in Israel for their connection to terrorist activities continue to enjoy rights stipulated under Israeli law with due respect paid to humanitarian concerns” and noted that “this is in stark contrast to the depraved conditions of detention that the Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit endures under the Palestinian authorities. He continues to be denied even the most basic humanitarian assurances, including visits by the ICRC”,

Bearing in mind also the prisoner exchange between Israel and the Lebanese group Hezbollah, which took place on 16 July 2008, a move which the United Nations Secretary-General welcomed, expressing the hope that it might soon be followed by action for the release of Corporal Gilad Shalit and of Palestinian prisoners,

1. Thanks the Permanent Representative of Israel for his letter of 8 October 2008; nevertheless regrets that it does not provide the requested information on Ahmed Sa’adat’s conditions of detention, his state of health and the judicial proceedings brought against him;

2. Reaffirms that Mr. Sa’adat’s abduction and transfer to Israel was not related to the murder charge but rather to his political activities as PFLP General Secretary and that the proceedings against him are therefore based on considerations alien to the law;

3. Reiterates its wish to be authorized to pay Mr. Sa’adat a private visit; and reiterates its wish to receive official information regarding Mr. Sa’adat’s conditions of detention and the judicial proceedings against him;

4. Requests the Secretary General to take steps with a view to ensuring international observation of Mr. Sa’adat’s trial;

5. Earnestly hopes that Mr. Sa’adat and the other detained Palestinian parliamentarians will be included in any prisoner exchange, which it hopes will take place soon;

6. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).
PALESTINE / ISRAEL

CASE No. PAL/16 - OMAR MATAR

(aka OMAR ABDEL RAZEQ)

CASE No. PAL/17 - NAYEF AL-ROJOUB

CASE No. PAL/18 - YASER MANSOOR

CASE No. PAL/19 - HUSNY AL-BURIENY

CASE No. PAL/20 - FATIHY QARAWI

CASE No. PAL/21 - IMAD NAWFAL

CASE No. PAL/22 - ANWAR ZBOUN

CASE No. PAL/23 - MAHMoud AL-KHateeb

CASE No. PAL/24 - ABDULJABER AL-FUQAHAA

CASE No. PAL/25 - KHALEd YAHYA

CASE No. PAL/26 - KHALEd SULAIMAN

CASE No. PAL/27 - NASER ABDULJAWAD

CASE No. PAL/28 - MUHMMAD ABDUL-TEIR

CASE No. PAL/29 - AHMAD ‘ATTOUN

CASE No. PAL/30 - MUHMMAD TOTAH

CASE No. PAL/31 - IBRAHIM SAED ABU SALEM

CASE No. PAL/32 - BASEM AHMED ZAARER

CASE No. PAL/33 - IBRAHIM MOHAMED DAHOOR

CASE No. PAL/34 - MOHAMED MAHER BADER

CASE No. PAL/35 - MOHAMED ISMAIL AL-TAL

CASE No. PAL/36 - FADEL SALEH HAMDNA

CASE No. PAL/37 - ALI SALEEM ROMANIEN

CASE No. PAL/38 - SAMEER SAFEH AL-KADI

CASE No. PAL/39 - REYAD ALI EMLEB

CASE No. PAL/41 - REYAD MAHMOUD RADAD

CASE No. PAL/42 - KALI MUSABBAE

CASE No. PAL/43 - M. MOTLAK ABU JHEASHEH

CASE No. PAL/44 - WAEL MOHAMED ABDEL RUMAN

CASE No. PAL/45 - MAHMOUD IBRAHIM MOSLEH

CASE No. PAL/46 - AHMED ABDEL AZIZ MUBARAK

CASE No. PAL/47 - HATEM QFEISHEH

CASE No. PAL/48 - MAHMOUD AL-AMAHI

CASE No. PAL/49 - ABDERRAHMAN ZAIDAN

CASE No. PAL/51 - KHALEd ABU ARAFEH

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of the above-mentioned parliamentarians, all of whom were elected to the Palestinian Legislative Council in January 2006, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Referring also to the study of the Israeli non-governmental organization Yesh Din (Volunteers for Human Rights) on the implementation of due process rights in Israeli military courts in the West Bank, entitled "Backyard Proceedings", which reveals the absence of due process rights in those courts, as well as to the study of B’tselem - the Israeli Information Center for Human Rights in the Occupied Territories - entitled "Barred from Contact" on violations of the right to visit Palestinians held in Israeli prisons, published in September 2006,

Taking account of the letter from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations in Geneva, dated 8 October, as well as to the information provided by sources on 17 September and 8 October 2008,

Recalling the following information on file:

- the parliamentarians concerned, elected on the Change and Reform list in the January 2006 elections to the Palestinian Legislative Council, were arrested on or after 29 June 2006 in the occupied West Bank; on 25 September 2006, a military appeal court in the West Bank overturned an order for their release on bail issued on 12 September 2006 by the Ofer military tribunal, and they have since been held in several prisons inside Israel; they have been charged with membership of, leadership in and action on behalf of a terrorist organization, namely Hamas; the parliamentarians concerned argue that the Change and Reform list differed significantly from Hamas and that their participation in the Palestinian elections was not an offence even under Israeli law at the time;

- on 30 June 2006, the Israeli Interior Minister revoked the East Jerusalem residence permits of Mr. Muhammad Abu-Teir, Mr. Ahmad Attoun and Mr. Muhammad Totah and Mr. Khaled Abu Arafah, who is also Palestinian Minister of Jerusalem Affairs, on account of "breach of trust" or owing to membership in a foreign parliament; they lodged an appeal against that decision in the Israeli Supreme Court;
- the arrests and withdrawal of residence permits came in the context of Israeli military operations in the Gaza Strip to obtain the release of Gilad Shalit, an Israeli soldier kidnapped on 25 June 2006 in a cross-border attack on Israeli military installations that the Israeli Government blames on Hamas and the Palestinian Authority;
- Mr. Abderrahman Zaidan, who had been released, was rearrested approximately one month after he had testified to the Committee at the session it held during the 116th IPU Assembly (Nusa Dua, Bali, May 2007),

Considering that, in the case of Mr. Wael Mohamed Abdel Ruman, the court accepted the defence argument that not every candidate of the Change and Reform list was a member of Hamas and therefore acquitted him of the charge of membership of a terrorist organization, but found him guilty on account of having accepted a senior position in and carried out activities on behalf of an organization which he knew to be a terrorist organization, sentencing him to 23 months in prison, 12 months' suspended imprisonment and a fine; that, however, the appeal court accepted the prosecution’s arguments and found Mr. Wael guilty of membership of Hamas and increased the sentence to five years’ imprisonment of which one and half years are suspended,

Considering that on 17 September 2008 the Supreme Court, ruling on the petition of Mr. Muhammad Abu-Teir, Mr. Ahmad Atoum, Mr. Muhammad Totah and Mr. Khaled Abu Arafeh against the revocation of their East Jerusalem permanent residency status, decided to give them the opportunity to submit applications to the Israeli Minister of the Interior to reinstate their residency status and that doing so would not be considered to be a retraction of their principal arguments, and asked the two parties to inform it of developments that occurred in the case within 60 days, after which it would decide how to proceed with the case,

Recalling that, at the meeting that the IPU President and the Secretary General had with the Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs during their visit to Israel in early February 2008, she stated that there was no reason why information on the judicial proceedings in this and other cases of Palestinian Legislative Council members should not be provided and undertook to ensure that such information was provided; considering in this respect that, in his letter of 8 October, the Permanent Representative stated that "Palestinian parliamentarians detained in Israel for their connection to terrorist activities continue to enjoy rights stipulated under Israeli law with due respect paid to humanitarian concerns" and noted that "this is in stark contrast to the depraved conditions of detention that the Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit endures under the Palestinian authorities. He continues to be denied even the most basic humanitarian assurances, including visits by the ICRC";

Bearing in mind the prisoner exchange between Israel and the Lebanese group Hezbollah which took place on 16 July 2008, a move which the United Nations Secretary-General welcomed, expressing the hope that it might soon be followed by action for the release of Corporal Gilad Shalit and of Palestinian prisoners,

1. Thanks the Permanent Representative of Israel for his letter of 8 October 2008; nevertheless regrets that it provides information neither on the conditions of detention and state of health of the parliamentarians concerned nor on the proceedings under way against them; regrets in particular the absence of any information on the situation of Mr. Abderrahman Zaidan, who was rearrested shortly after testifying to the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians;

2. Reaffirms its conviction that the arrest and detention of the members of parliament concerned is quite unrelated to any criminal activity on their part and is linked to their election on the Change and Reform list in a free and fair election whose outcome, however, the Israeli authorities did not welcome, and that their arrest and detention and prosecution therefore constitute a violation of their right to freedom; consequently calls on the authorities to release them forthwith;

3. Reiterates its wish to receive official information on the conditions of detention of the parliamentarians concerned, and the proceedings brought against them and, in particular, on the reasons for the rearrest of Mr. Zaidan;

4. Would appreciate receiving a copy of the judgment handed down by an appeal court on Mr. Wael Mohamed Abdel Ruman;
5. Earnestly hopes, in the light of the Supreme Court decision, that Mr. Muhammad Abu-Teir, Mr. Ahmad Attoun, Mr. Muhammad Totah and Mr. Khaled Abu Arafeh will recover their East Jerusalem residency permits as soon as possible;

6. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

CASE No. PAL/40 - ABDEL AZIZ DWEIK - PALESTINE / ISRAEL

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Dr. Abdel Aziz Dweik, Speaker of the Palestinian Legislative Council, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Referring also to the study of the Israeli non-governmental organization Yesh Din (Volunteers for Human Rights) on the implementation of due process rights in Israeli military courts in the West Bank, entitled “Backyard Proceedings”, as well as to the study of B’tselem - the Israeli Information Center for Human Rights in the Occupied Territories - entitled “Barred from Contact” on violations of the right to visit Palestinians held in Israeli prisons, published in September 2006,

Taking account of the letter from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations in Geneva, dated 8 October 2008, as well as of information provided by one of the sources on 8 October 2008,

Recalling that Dr. Dweik has remained in detention since his arrest during the night of 5 to 6 August 2006 by the Israeli Defence Forces, which came in the context of the kidnapping of Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit, and that he is reportedly being held in deplorable conditions and denied access to the medical care he needs as a diabetic with a gall bladder condition; noting that he is apparently accused of having stood as a candidate on the Change and Reform list and assumed the function of Speaker on behalf of a terrorist organization, namely Hamas; that the hearing of witnesses finished four months ago and that the judge has yet to return the verdict,

Recalling that at the meeting the IPU President and the Secretary General had with the Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs during their visit to Israel in early February 2008, she stated that there was no reason why information on the judicial proceedings in this and other cases of Palestinian Legislative Council members should not be provided and undertook to ensure that such information was provided; noting in this respect that, in his letter of 8 October, the Permanent Representative of Israel stated that the “Palestinian parliamentarians detained in Israel for their connection to terrorist activities continue to enjoy rights stipulated under Israeli law with due respect paid to humanitarian concerns” and noted that “this is in stark contrast to the depraved conditions of detention that the Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit endures under the Palestinian authorities. He continues to be denied even the most basic humanitarian assurances, including visits by the ICRC”,

Bearing in mind the prisoner exchange between Israel and the Lebanese group Hezbollah which took place on 16 July 2008, a move which the United Nations Secretary-General welcomed, expressing the hope that it might soon be followed by action for the release of Corporal Gilad Shalit and of Palestinian prisoners,

1. Thanks the Permanent Representative of Israel for his letter of 8 October 2008; nevertheless regrets that it does not provide the requested information on Dr. Dweik’s conditions of detention, his state of health and the judicial proceedings brought against him;
2. Can only rely, in the absence of any official information, on the details provided by other sources, according to which he does not receive the medical care he requires and is held in harsh conditions, as well as on general reports on the conditions of detention of Palestinian prisoners such as B’tselem’s study on the violation of the right to visit Palestinians held in Israeli prisons;

3. Notes that there is nothing to incline it to change its position that Dr. Dweik’s arrest, detention and prosecution are unrelated to any criminal activity on his part - as being elected in a free and fair election cannot be considered a crime, as neither can assuming the role of Speaker in a duly elected parliament; that his detention is therefore arbitrary and violates his fundamental right to freedom and his prosecution is based on considerations alien to the law;

4. Reiterates its wish to be permitted to pay Dr. Dweik a private visit;

5. Requests the Secretary General to take steps with a view to ensuring international observation of the remaining hearings in Dr. Dweik’s trial;

6. Earnestly hopes that Dr. Dweik and the other detained Palestinian parliamentarians will be included in any prisoner exchange, which it hopes will take place soon;

7. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

CASE No. PAL/50 - MARIAM SALEH - PALESTINE / ISRAEL

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session (Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Ms. Mariam Saleh, a member of the Palestinian Legislative Council and Minister for Women's Affairs from March 2006 to March 2007, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Recalling the following:

- Ms. Mariam Saleh was arrested on 13 November 2007 and accused of: (i) membership in the Change and Reform bloc; (ii) membership in the Huda Society for Women; (iii) travelling abroad while Minister for Women's Affairs and meeting with Prime Minister Ismail Haniyeh and Khaled Mashaal; and (iv) other acts which the prosecution classified as confidential and refused to disclose to the defence; however, the prosecution was unable to adduce any evidence to sustain the accusations and to charge her;

- On 17 December 2007, the Ofer military court ordered her release on payment of 7,000 shekels, but gave the prosecution the right to appeal, which it did; the next day Ms. Saleh was transferred to administrative detention; on 30 December her administrative detention was prolonged to six months at the request of the Israeli Intelligence Service, but this period was reduced by the court to three months; on 30 March 2008, the Appeal Court prolonged the administrative detention order until June 2008 without adducing any grounds,

Considering the source’s report of 8 July 2008 that Ms. Saleh has been released,

Decides in the light of Ms. Saleh’s release to close this case while deploring her arrest and detention for seven months, which it can only consider to have been arbitrary since the authorities had no valid charges or grounds for such detention as would have been admissible under the international human rights norms to which Israel, as a State party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, has subscribed.
Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Crispin Beltran, Mr. Saturniño Ocampo, Mr. Teodoro Casiño, Ms. Liza Maza and Mr. Rafael Mariano, who, apart from the latter, are incumbent members of the House of Representatives of the Philippines, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Referring also to the Committee’s report on its mission to the Philippines carried out from 18 to 21 April 2007,

Taking into account the communication sent by the Executive Director/Inter-Parliamentary Relations and Special Affairs Department of the House of Representatives, dated 14 July 2008, as well as the information provided by one of the sources on 16 July and 2 October 2008,

Noting that Mr. Crispin Beltran died on 20 May 2008 following an accident and that Mr. Rafael Mariano, who had not been re-elected in the March 2007 elections, has assumed Mr. Beltran’s mandate,

Recalling that on 1 June 2007 the Supreme Court dismissed the rebellion charges brought in February 2006 against the parliamentarians concerned as being politically motivated; that those charges had been brought by the Inter-Agency Legal Action Group (IALAG), set up by President Gloria Macapagal Arroyo in January 2006 to ensure effective handling of investigative and prosecutorial aspects of the fight against threats to national security, and that the political parties to which the parliamentarians concerned belong and they themselves are regarded as such by that Group,

Recalling further that, on 16 February 2007, a multiple murder case was brought against Mr. Ocampo and others, that he was arrested on 16 March 2007 and subsequently released on bail by the Supreme Court on 3 April 2007 pending the Court’s decision on his petition for certiorari and prohibition; noting that the Supreme Court has not yet ruled on the petition,

Recalling that, in January 2007, a disqualification case was brought against the political parties of the parliamentarians concerned on the basis of yet another murder case (Nueva Ecija case) whereby Representatives Ocampo, Casiño, Maza and Mariano (the “Batasan Four”) allegedly conspired together and planned the elimination of the supporters of another political party, Akbayan, which accusation they strongly refute; that while the Commission on Elections (COMELEC) dismissed the disqualification petitions for “lack of merit”, the murder case is proceeding; that, according to the sources, the due process rights of the defendants have been seriously violated in the preliminary investigation insofar as the prosecutors denied their request for a clarification hearing, which was necessary in their view to establish the identity of the complainants, who appeared with covered faces throughout the investigation phase, to clarify inconsistencies in their statements, and to check whether their statements were voluntary since they are in the custody and under the control of the military; noting that the cases were submitted for resolution by the prosecution on 14 November 2007 and that on 18 April 2008 two counts of murder (having allegedly conspired in the murder of one Carlito Bayudang and one Jimmy Peralta) were filed in the Regional Trial Court of Palayan City, and one count of kidnapping and murder of one Danilo Felipe in the Regional Trial Court of Guimba; that, on 21 April 2008, the parliamentarians concerned filed a motion for judicial determination of probable cause with prayer to dismiss the case outright, pointing to the grounds warranting the dismissal of the case; that on 5 August 2008

5 Mr. Beltran died on 20 May 2008.
the Regional Trial Court of Guimba ordered the dismissal of the charge of kidnapping with murder, having found the extrajudicial confessions of prosecution witnesses to be inadmissible evidence; that, however, the Regional Trial Court of Palayan City did not dismiss the two murder charges pending before it even though they are based on the same evidence adduced in the kidnapping with murder case and ordered the provincial prosecutor to conduct a new preliminary investigation; on 26 September 2008, the court denied a motion for partial reconsideration of that order,

Recalling that, on 17 May 2007, Mr. Casiño was charged with obstruction of justice for allegedly preventing the arrest of a presumed Communist Party of the Philippines/New People’s Army (CPP/NPA) member, Mr. Vincent Borja; that, however, according to the sources, given the incidence of extrajudicial executions and abductions in which the military are involved, Mr. Casiño wanted to ensure respect for the right to liberty and security of the person concerned for whom the soldiers, who were not in uniform, had no arrest warrant, by asking the soldiers to present a warrant and accompanying the arrested person to a military camp until he was transferred to the police; that Mr. Casiño filed his counter-affidavit on 27 June 2007, after which a clarificatory hearing was conducted; however, the prosecution has still not given its conclusions on the case,

Recalling lastly that on 17 March 2008 a petition for Writ of Amparo—a extraordinary and peremptory writ to safeguard the constitutional rights of the people to life, liberty and security—promulgated by the Supreme Court in October 2007, was filed against top officials of the CPP and Mr. Ocampo, which is pending at the Regional Trial Court of Basey, Western Samar, Branch 30, in connection with the alleged abduction of Ms. Elizabeth Gutierrez and one Dennis Gutierrez by communist rebels on 24 October 2007; noting that Rep. Ocampo filed his answer to the petition on 9 March 2008 and that the hearing of the case, initially set for 27 August 2008, was postponed to 4 November 2008,

Considering that, in a meeting she had with the Committee in July 2008, the Permanent Representative of the Philippines to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations in Geneva stressed that, since the cases in question were pending before the court, the Mission would not comment on them; that, however, one should bear in mind that the rights of the victims also had to be respected and that some of the cases in question, such as the triple murder case (Nueva Ecija case), were not filed by the State but by the widows of the slain persons; that, moreover, the parliamentarians concerned had filed perjury cases in this respect; that, as regards the report of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, to which the IPU referred in its resolution of April 2008, it was in the Government’s view highly biased; and noting in this respect that the “Consolidated Reply of the Government of the Philippines to the Alston Report”, a copy of which the Permanent Representative provided, states in paragraphs 104, 105 and 107 that IALAG is guided by the policy 'that all of its initiatives and tasks shall at [all] times be conducted with utmost respect for the fundamental human rights of due process, equal protection, and the rule of law',

Considering lastly that the House of Representatives has adopted a series of resolutions to inquire into politically motivated killings, summary executions and enforced disappearances, urging the Government inter alia to immediately sign and ratify the United Nations International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance; that in Resolution 118, it directed the House Committee on Civil, Political and Human Rights inter alia to "conduct an investigation into the various forms of human rights violations and attacks against members and leaders of Anakpawis Party-list and other progressive parties and organizations … and to put an end to political repression of the party lists they belong to",

1. Thanks the House of Representatives and the Permanent Representative of the Philippines to the United Nations Office in Geneva for their cooperation;

2. Recalls that the rebellion charges, which were initially filed against the parliamentarians concerned by IALAG after nine months of preparation, were finally dismissed by the Supreme Court as clearly being politically motivated, which casts doubt on IALAG’s ‘utmost respect for the fundamental human rights of due process, equal protection, and the rule of law’; recalls that, likewise, a petition to bar the political parties to which the parliamentarians concerned belong from standing in the last elections was dismissed by the Commission on Elections for lack of merit;
3. Has therefore grounds to remain concerned at the new criminal cases brought against the parliamentarians in question, especially in the light of the serious allegations that the charges have been fabricated and due process is not being observed, as these proceedings may well be part of an ongoing effort to remove them and their political parties from the democratic political process;

4. Expresses particular concern at the considerable delay in the prosecution’s efforts to resolve the “obstruction of justice” case against Representative Casiño, which was filed more than one year ago and has not proceeded at all; fears that such delay may well denote the absence of a case, and urges the authorities either to drop the charges forthwith or to try Representative Casiño diligently with due respect for all fair trial guarantees;

5. Is, moreover, concerned at the differing views of the courts on the admissibility of extrajudicially obtained confessions as evidence; would appreciate receiving information as to the rules on the admissibility of evidence in Philippine law;

6. Strongly recalls that, in dealing with these cases, the prosecution and judicial authorities have a duty not to proceed with any case on the basis of political considerations; once again recalls in this respect the Supreme Court ruling in the rebellion case in which the Court reiterated “the importance of maintaining the integrity of criminal prosecutions in general and preliminary investigations in particular” and stated the following: “We cannot emphasize too strongly that prosecutors should not allow, and should avoid giving the impression that their noble office is being used or prostituted, wittingly or unwittingly, for political ends”;

7. Reiterates its wish to be kept informed of the proceedings in the cases in question, including, where appropriate, through the intermediary of a trial observer;

8. Sincerely hopes that the initiatives taken by the House of Representatives to ensure respect for human rights and the rule of law will succeed, and would appreciate receiving information on the inquiry entrusted to the House Committee on Civil, Political and Human Rights to investigate the various forms of human rights violations targeting progressive party list representatives;

9. Notes finally the accidental death of Mr. Crispin Beltran and decides to close his case;

10. Requests the Secretary General to convey this decision to the competent authorities, including the National Human Rights Commission, and to the other parties concerned;

11. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

CASE No. RW/06 - LEONARD HITIMANA - RWANDA

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Léonard Hitimana, a member of the Transitional National Assembly of Rwanda, dissolved on 22 August 2003, who disappeared in April 2003, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Recalling that Mr. Hitimana disappeared in the night of 7 to 8 April 2003, the day before he was due to refute in parliament the accusations of spreading the ideology of ethnic division brought by a
parliamentary commission of inquiry in a report against his party, and in which his name was mentioned; while the sources fear that Mr. Hitimana may have been abducted by the Rwandan intelligence service and executed extrajudicially, the authorities have always affirmed that Mr. Hitimana, in common with other persons, fled to a neighbouring country and that they were going to locate them rapidly, which has nevertheless not so far happened,

Recalling its growing concern that Mr. Hitimana may have been the victim of a forced disappearance, which is a serious violation of human rights, and noting in this respect that Rwanda has not yet ratified the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in December 2006,

Considering that legislative elections were held in Rwanda in September 2008 and that the new Chamber of Deputies was recently inaugurated,

1. Requests the Secretary General to convey its concerns in this case to the new parliamentary authorities, inviting them to notify the Committee of their views on the subject;

2. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).
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CASE No. SRI/56 - K. PATHMANATHAN
CASE No. SRI/57 - THANGESWARI KATHIRAMAN
CASE No. SRI/58 - P. ARIVANETHIRAN
CASE No. SRI/59 - C. CHANDRA NEHRU
CASE No. SRI/61 - THIYAGARAJAH MAHESWARAN
CASE No. SRI/62 - MANO GANESAN
CASE No. SRI/63 - D.M. DASSANAYAKE
CASE No. SRI/64 - KIDDINAN SIVANESAN
CASE No. SRI/65 - GAJENDRA KUMAR PONNAMBALAM

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the cases of the parliamentarians listed above, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolutions adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008) on the above cases, and having before it the case of Mr. Mano Ganesan, which has been the subject of a study and report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians following the Procedure for the treatment by the Inter-Parliamentary Union of communications concerning violations of the human rights of members of parliament,

Having before it the written report of its delegation on the mission to Sri Lanka carried out in February 2008, including the observations provided on it by the authorities and the parliamentarians concerned,

Taking account of the letter by the Acting Secretary General of Parliament of 8 August 2008, forwarding a progress report on the cases in question established by the Police Headquarters, as well as of a further progress report forwarded by the Permanent Mission of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations in Geneva on 13 October 2008,

Also taking account of the information provided by Dr. Jayawardena on the occasion of the 119th IPU Assembly,
Considering the following new information and allegations on file:

- regarding Dr. Jayawardena: on 10 June 2008, the Appeal Court allowed Dr. Jayawardena’s application for a Writ of Mandamus, directing the police authorities to provide him with a jeep or other suitable vehicle for as long as was warranted; according to the progress report established by the Police Headquarters, as of 2 July 2008 the police have provided Dr. Jayawardena with “a brand new vehicle from the fleet of the Police fleet”, which, according to Dr. Jayawardena, is a Tata Cab that cannot exceed 40 km/h; the Police Department has reportedly launched a malicious campaign to tarnish Dr. Jayawardena’s reputation and depict him as a pro-LTTE parliamentarian, which puts his life at great risk; he submitted a complaint to the National Police Commission and Parliament’s Privileges Committee, which is nevertheless without a Chairman at present and meetings have been indefinitely postponed; in addition, in August 2008, Dr. Jayawardena was prevented from performing a religious retreat at the Madhu Shrine for which permission had been granted to him since 1994; on 14 August 2008 he was ordered by Major General Lalith Daulagalla to leave the Church immediately as the Secretary of Defence had not granted permission for him to stay there, adding that he was an opposition member of parliament; the matter is now pending before the National Human Rights Commission;

- regarding Mr. Mano Ganesan: the back-up vehicle provided to Mr. Ganesan following the Committee’s mission had technical defects but, according to the authorities, has been repaired in the meantime; moreover, a State-sponsored campaign of slander has reportedly been launched against Mr. Ganesan to discredit him and his work on enforced disappearances in Sri Lanka and, on 2 September 2008, he was summoned for questioning by the Director of the Terrorist Investigation Division, who questioned him for nearly seven hours in connection with peace visits to Kilinochi he carried out during the period of the Cease Fire Agreement from 2002 to 2005 and questioned him about an alleged special relationship with the LTTE; that since then, stories in relation to the questioning which was conducted in private in the absence of even Mr. Ganesan’s lawyer, are reportedly being planted in the media very systematically, and that the Sinhala media were carrying news items on him which were of a criminal nature, increasing the risk to his security, and that he feels singled out as a human rights defender, an ethnic Tamil parliamentarian and a democratic political party leader belonging to the opposition alliance;

- regarding Mr. Chandranehru: according to Mr. Chandranehru, the person who attacked him during a visit to his constituency in June 2007 was Mr. Iniyabarathy, alias Kumasarsuwamy Pushpakumar; he reported that that person was appointed coordinator for President Rajapakse in Ampara District and received his credentials from the President on 25 May 2008; Mr. Iniyabarathy and his group reportedly continue to threaten Mr. Chandranehru’s supporters and constituents in an attempt to have them break off contact with him; according to the source, Mr. Chandranehru can indeed no longer travel to his constituency for fear of his safety; Mr. Chandranehru has raised the matter as a privilege issue and complained to the Inspector General of Police, the Attorney General and the Speaker, reportedly to no avail; according to the police progress report, Mr. Chandranehru has been provided with additional security; the police investigation points to one “Parathy” as the likely culprit; an identification parade took place before the Akkaraipattu Magistrate Court on 16 September 2008 when a suspect was indeed identified; however, the court ordered him to appear upon notice;

- regarding the cases of Mr. Raviraj and Mr. Maheswaran, killed on 10 November 2006 and 1 January 2008, respectively: according to the police progress report, the case of Mr. Raviraj was to be called on 16 September 2008, and in the case of Mr. Maheswaran, the Attorney General filed an indictment and the case was to be called on 19 August 2008 for the service of indictment and listing for hearing; no information regarding the outcome of the hearings in either case has been provided;

- regarding the case of Mr. Dassanayake, killed on 8 January 2008: according to the police progress report, police inquiries have led to the arrest on 10 June 2008 of a suspect with links to the LTTE who divulged vital incriminating material relevant to Mr. Dassanayake’s assassination; the case is registered before the Magistrate Court of Kanuwana and will be called again on 5 November 2008;
- regarding the case of Mr. D.M.S.B. Dissanayake: on 22 July 2008, the Human Rights Committee set up by virtue of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights expressed the view that the State of Sri Lanka had violated Mr. Dissanayake’s rights under Article 9 (1), Article 19, and Article 25 (b) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and was therefore under an obligation to provide him with an adequate remedy, including compensation and the restoration of his right to vote and stand for election and to make such changes to the law and practice as necessary to avoid similar violations in the future.

Considering, with regard to the abduction of family members of four TNA parliamentarians shortly before the vote on the budget last year, that, according to the police, no nexus appeared between the abductions and the budget vote, noting lastly that Colonel Karuna, whose paramilitary group has often been accused of being behind the threats and murder of TNA parliamentarians and that he himself has been accused by international human rights organizations of war crimes, has recently been sworn in as a member of parliament on the United Party Freedom Alliance (UPFA) list,

1. Thanks the Sri Lankan authorities for the information and observations provided and for their cooperation;

2. Endorses the concluding remarks of the Committee’s on-site mission to Sri Lanka in February 2008;

3. Notes with satisfaction that since the mission took place an indictment has been filed in the case of the murder of Mr. Maheswaran and that a person suspected of Mr. Dassanayake’s murder has been identified, although not arrested, and earnestly hopes that trial proceedings will soon reveal the full truth in both cases;

4. Nevertheless deplores the lack of any progress in the investigation regarding the murder of Mr. Raviraj and particularly of Mr. Pararajasingham as no action seems to have been taken to examine the implication of a possible suspect whose name is known to the authorities;

5. Is deeply concerned that, with the exception of Mr. Chandranehru, in none of the other cases of threats and attacks against TNA parliamentarians has there been any progress although, at least in one instance, the name of the person who made death threats is known to the authorities; is particularly alarmed at the absence of effective action to identify and punish those responsible for abducting family members and staff of TNA parliamentarians when there are clear leads as to the group behind those abductions and their motive; urges the authorities seriously and promptly to investigate these abductions, which are crimes, and to punish the culprits;

6. Is concerned at the continuing intimidation of outspoken opposition members of parliament, the attempts made to link them to the LTTE and the inadequacy of the security measures afforded to them, as well as at the inaction of parliament’s Privileges Committee, which can only hamper parliament’s ability effectively to protect the rights of its members and ensure that they can exercise their mandate without fear of harassment;

7. Affirms that freedom of expression and respect for the rule of law must remain a cornerstone of democracy, even in such troubled situations as that affecting Sri Lanka, since otherwise authoritarian rule may take root;

8. Can only reaffirm the conclusion of the mission report that there can be no better deterrent against violence targeting members of parliament and indeed the public at large than combating impunity and ensuring that those responsible for assassinations and other crimes are identified, apprehended and brought to justice, and urges the authorities to take firm action to this end;

---

9. Calls on the Government of Sri Lanka to comply with its obligations under the First Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to which it is a party, and to implement without delay the recommendations by the Human Rights Committee in the case of Mr. D.M.S.B. Dissanayake;

10. Requests the Secretary General to convey this resolution to the authorities and to other parties concerned;

11. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session
(Geneva, 15 October 2008)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Ms. Leyla Zana, Mr. Hatip Dicle, Mr. Orhan Dogan, Mr. Selim Sadak and Mr. Mehmet Sinçar, former members of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Taking account of the letter from the President of the Turkish Inter-Parliamentary Group, dated 12 October 2008,

Recalling the following: Ms. Zana, Mr. Dicle, Mr. Dogan and Mr. Sadak were sentenced in December 1994 to a 15-year prison term for being members of an armed organization; on 26 June 2001, the European Court of Human Rights ruled that they had not enjoyed a fair trial; the retrial before the Ankara State Security Court, which upheld the conviction, was quashed by the Court of Cassation, which ruled that their right to a fair trial had again not been respected and ordered a second retrial; at the closure of this second retrial in March 2007, the 11th High Criminal Court of Ankara sentenced Ms. Zana, Mr. Dicle, Mr. Dogan and Mr. Sadak to seven years and six months in prison under Article 5 of Anti-Terrorism Law 3713 (prohibition on praising terrorism) and Article 314 (2) of the Turkish Penal Code (punishing membership of an illegal organization) as opposed to the original 15-year prison sentence, of which they had served 10 years; the second retrial was reportedly also flawed, in particular owing to the destruction of important exonerating evidence, and an application was therefore filed in the Court of Cassation; noting that on 27 February 2008 the Court handed down its ruling upholding the verdict of the 11th High Criminal Court of Ankara,

Recalling the following: Mr. Sinçar was assassinated in September 1993 in circumstances suggesting an extrajudicial execution; in January 2005, the then Turkish Minister of Justice affirmed that the killing had been carried out by members of the Hezbollah terrorist organization, an accusation which that group reportedly refuted; in October 1993 twelve persons were accused, two of whom were at large; in November 1994, all but those two suspects were acquitted for want of evidence; in April 1996, the then Minister of Justice stated that the identity of the murderer had been established but that he was living in the Islamic Republic of Iran; according to the information provided by the President of the Turkish IPU Group in January and April 2008, a criminal case regarding the murder of Mr. Sinçar was pending before the 6th Assize Court in Diyarbakir and hearings had been scheduled for 21 February and 8 May 2008; Mrs. Sinçar is, however, reportedly unaware of those proceedings; noting in this respect that, in his letter of
12 October 2008, the President of the Turkish IPU Group reported the following: the indictment prepared by the Diyarbakir State Security Court dated 24 May 2000 (2000/59) contains no information about a complainant; the review of the investigation documents and documents pertaining to the legal proceedings show that neither Mr. Sinçar’s wife nor any relative was consulted as witness, that no notice was sent to Mrs. Sinçar, and that neither she nor any relative was informed of the proceedings or applied as “intervener” (civil party),

1. Thanks the President of the Turkish Inter-Parliamentary Group for the information provided and for his cooperation;

2. Would appreciate receiving a copy of the final ruling of the Court of Cassation in the case of Leyla Zana, Hatip Dicle, Selim Sadak and Orhan Dogan;

3. Understands from the information provided by the President of the Turkish IPU Group that in May 2000 an indictment was issued regarding the murder of Mr. Sinçar and proceedings conducted; would appreciate receiving information as to who was indicted and the result, if any, of the criminal proceedings;

4. Is concerned that neither Mrs. Sinçar nor any other member of Mr. Sinçar’s family was informed of the indictment and proceedings, still less called as witness, and that they were thus prevented from associating themselves as civil party to the case and from contributing, by providing testimony, to elucidating the murder; would appreciate receiving information as to why the authorities failed to inform Mr. Sinçar’s family of the proceedings in question;

5. Requests the Secretary General to seek the requested information from the parliamentary authorities and the sources;

6. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).

---

**ZIMBABWE**

**CASE No. ZBW/19 - ROY BENNETT**

**CASE No. ZBW/20 - JOB SIKHALA**

**CASE No. ZBW/21 - TICHAONA MUNYANYI**

**CASE No. ZBW/25 - TENDAI BITI**

**CASE No. ZBW/27 - PAUL MADZORE**

**CASE No. ZBW/37 - TUMBARE MUTASA**

**CASE No. ZBW/38 - GILBERT SHOKO**

**CASE No. ZBW/44 - NELSON CHAMISA**

**Resolution adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 183rd session (Geneva, 15 October 2008)**

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the cases of Mr. Roy Bennett, Mr. Job Sikhala, Mr. Tichaona Munyanyi, Mr. Tendai Biti, Mr. Paul Madzore, Mr. Tumbare Mutasa, Mr. Gilbert Shoko and Mr. Nelson Chamisa, opposition members of the Parliament of Zimbabwe at the time of the submission of the complaint, as outlined in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/183/12(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 182nd session (April 2008),

Recalling that the persons in question either were victims of arbitrary and politically motivated prosecution and forced to flee the country for fear of their safety, as the targets of assaults, or were tortured and that the perpetrators of such criminal acts have not so far been brought to justice,

---

8 Mr. Mutasa and Mr. Shoko are deceased.
Considering that Mr. Biti was rearrested on 12 June 2008 on his return from South Africa and, according to the Zimbabwe Police spokesperson, charged with treason “for publishing a document that was explaining a transitional strategy around March 26” and for proclaiming victory in the elections before the publication of the official results, and that he has been released on bail in the meantime,

Considering that parliamentary elections were held in March 2008 and that Mr. Biti, Mr. Chamisa and Mr. Madzore were re-elected, that the new parliament held the Opening Ceremony on 25 August 2008, and that the House of Assembly resumed its sittings on 14 October 2008,

Noting that none of the information it has requested in its resolution of April 2008 has been provided by the authorities,

1. Is alarmed at the treason charges brought against Mr. Biti on grounds which cannot be construed as treason and should be dismissed forthwith;

2. Requests the Secretary General to contact the new parliamentary authorities and to seek their assistance in addressing the concerns that it has consistently expressed in these cases, in the hope that the new parliament and government will act as promptly as possible;

3. Requests the Committee to continue examining this case and report to it at its next session, to be held on the occasion of the 120th Assembly of the IPU (April 2009).