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Background

On 20-23 February 2016, No Peace Without Justice, with the financial support of the European Commission, the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Open Society Foundation, organised a workshop on “Promoting Accountability through UN Mechanisms with a focus on women and children,” which was held in Istanbul, Turkey. The overall goal of the workshop was to build the capacity of civil society groups and human rights activists from Syria to inform, advise and discuss how to use UN Mechanisms for accountability for Syria, with a focus on women and children.

The conflict in Syria has claimed a staggering numbers of lives and the range of violations of international humanitarian law, war crimes and crimes against humanity continues to grow. Against this backdrop, it is crucial to bolster the resilience of Syrian civil society and democratic activists and to support their ongoing work for justice and redress. Syrian CSOs have done incredible work in documenting and advocating against widespread breaches of international law committed for the last five years in Syria, including torture, sexual and gender-based violence and illegal war tactics such as siege, starvation, barrel bombs and indiscriminate shelling of civilian neighbourhoods. The workshop aimed to bolster the resolve of human rights activists in favour of a future Syrian system of accountability and transitional justice that responds to the scale of the violence and the needs of the population. It was designed to help equip human rights activists with the technical capacity to act at the international level, particularly through the UN system, to prioritise justice and accountability as an integral part of any strategic planning for the political solution of the Syrian conflict.

The workshop focused on the possibility for concrete advocacy in several parts of the UN system, both with UN agencies and mechanisms and its member States, specifically the Human Rights Council (HRC), Universal Periodic Review (UPR) and the UN Special Procedures, with a look at ethical considerations and a roundtable discussion on the International Court of Justice led by the Open Society Justice Initiative. Practical exercises and case studies were also provided during the workshop in order to enable participants to contextualise these mechanisms and to plan and practise advocacy strategies. Finally, participants were encouraged to enhance their capacities in national and transnational collaboration through information sharing and coordination of efforts and to utilise the experts and the knowledge gained during the workshop for future advocacy work.

Facilitators

Facilitators during the 4-day workshop included Flavia Pansieri, former Deputy of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights; Alison Smith, Legal Counsel and Director of the International Criminal Justice Program for No Peace Without Justice; Jeremy Sarkin, Professor of Law and previous Special Rapporteur for United Nations Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances; Bihter Moschini, research officer at the Arab NGO Network for Development; and Enrica Barago, NGO Capacity Building Consultant.

During the fourth day of the workshop OSJI led a roundtable looking at the ICJ. The members of OSJI who led the roundtable were Jim Goldston, Executive Director; Betsy Apple, Advocacy Director; Eric Witte, Senior Project Manager on national trials of grave crimes; Christian Devoss, Advocacy Officer; Steve Kostas, Legal Officer; and Ammar Abu Zayyad, Executive Director of Open Society Foundation’s Arab Regional Office.

The presenters were joined by the NPWJ Syria team; Rami Nakhla -Syria Project Coordinator - Nicola West, Alaa Abed, Mustafa Ghashim and Gianluca Eramo, NPWJ’s MENA Coordinator.
Participants
The workshop engaged 19 participants (5 female and 14 male participants) who are members of various Syrian Civil Society and Humanitarian organisations based in Syria, Turkey, Qatar and Sweden. Participants were chosen based on a scoping assessment that NPWJ conducted in November and December 2015, which identified key Syrian organisations who work on topics related to the work of NPWJ and relevant to the topic of the workshop (Transitional Justice, Child Protection, Documentation, Human Rights Advocacy, and SGBV). Additionally, Syrian organisations working on the UPR process and other UN mechanisms were invited to the workshop. Two additional participants joined the roundtable on 23 February for the OSJI-led discussion on the ICJ.

Day 1
- Opening remarks, introductions and expectations

NPWJ Syria Project Coordinator Rami Nakhla opened the workshop by welcoming all the participants and thanking them for taking the time to attend the workshop. He highlighted the importance of the work they are all doing and urged the participants to use what they learn to keep using advocacy to help the fight for accountability in Syria. As the current negotiations take place in Geneva there is little talk of accountability and therefore Syrian Civil Society actors must fill this gap and ensure their voices are heard by the international community. For some organisations there are question on how to do this – the aim of this workshop was to help with this by focusing on certain UN Mechanisms that we can use for advocacy and accountability. Another goal of the workshop was to strengthen links between organisations, for practical steps and outcomes to tackle violations in Syria issue together.

The program for the next four days of the workshop was explained and Mr Nakhla introduced himself and his work as an activist for the last ten years. The facilitators and participants then introduced themselves, briefly describing their organisation and the work they do on documentation, advocacy, women’s right and various other sectors.

- Review of UN Mechanisms and General Discussion – Flavia Pansieri

Ms Pansieri started by highlighting the Universality of Human Rights and they are not just a western concept. She also acknowledged that the UN has many flaws and holes, especially to do with Syria.

Ms Pansieri gave a brief overview of key UN Mechanisms, namely; the Human Rights Council (HRC), Treaty Bodies, Special Procedures and the Universal Periodic Review (UPR). She recounted the formation of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and highlighted the importance of its dual mandate - to be normative and to be operational, and that it has a relatively independent voice.

Human Rights Council: the HRC and the UPR, created in 2006, was an important step in developing an institutional structure to move forward with human rights. It is not always easy to make progress in the HRC; no country wants to have attention brought to it as it means they have problems. It is always a very complex and political issue that creates many challenges. On the other hand, the HRC is the friendliest body for NGOs to speak in. Saying that, NGOs will only have a very little time to speak and communicate a message but they are treated more equally with States who will also have their microphones cut off after a couple of minutes.
Treaty Bodies: The committees are composed of legal experts and very knowledgeable people and when they give an opinion it is binding. Countries report to these committees regularly, which shows their importance. They are an entry point to bring attention to issues that countries do not want to be open about and an entry point to bring stronger legal clout to issues.

Special procedures: They have not been invited to Syria, but despite this they are still important as they can bring attention to issues in the HRC and for the international community.

UPR: Started in 2006, the UPR has seen every country bring a report to the HRC and be subject to review. One very good point about the UPR is that every country is subject to it. Even countries with strong Human Rights records get nervous about going which shows that no country wants to be criticised by the other ones for the rights it has not upheld. It is noteworthy and important that Syrian CSOs have been very involved in collecting data and writing reports for the UPR.

Complaints procedure: The Complaints Procedure is another way for Syrians to get their voices heard. Victims of violations, who weren’t listened to nationally, or regionally have the opportunity to reach out to an international body.

Ms Pansieri went on to talk about accountability in the Syrian context. She highlighted examples of other countries that experienced conflict and horrendous crimes such as Colombia and Sri-Lanka and although the cause for justice looked hopeless for a long time – there were eventual peace agreements and steps towards accountability. These examples helped to show how fundamental Transitional Justice is. The Commission of Inquiry have documented a lot and although not much has happened from this yet - one day justice will come. All the documentation being done by Syrian originations could be used and is vitally important for justice.

Despite challenges, there are practical ways to bring the voices of Syrian civil society to the UN:

- If you have 2 minutes you have to make point in first minute;
- You need to be prepared;
- If you are not accredited to the UN – touch base with NGOs that have a presence in Geneva and negotiate to work with them when an item comes up with Syria to get that slot;
- Come together with other Syrian organisations – the more united you are the better chance you have;
- Distribute and divide work;
- Get involved and work with a variety of UN Mechanisms;
- Need to keep Syria in the news; on the front page, don’t let the conscience of world off the hook for Syria;
- Continue with documentation the best way you can – this will be essential for when the moment for justice will come;
- Don’t ever lose hope.

UN Mechanisms do listen to NGOS, this is highlighted by the fact that many people are always trying to stop the voices of NGOs being heard.
Discussion

Participants wanted to better understand the value of submitting reports to the UPR. Ms Pansieri explained that the value of the UPR is that it is a peer reviewed mechanism – therefore it is harder to be criticised as being political. This nature of peer review makes it powerful as there is an issue of common legitimacy. There is also a risk that when a country is expecting severe criticisms and they ask allies to go the floor and protect them. Some countries won’t accept some recommendations but others will, as they feel the peer pressure. However, there is a strong value in the UPR. Every country has shown up for their review so far.

Participants expressed their frustration and anger at the inability of UN and its mechanisms to make things better in Syria, especially in stopping the high number of civilian deaths. Despite the reports and data received, including the latest report by the Commission of Inquiry, it is difficult to understand why there is no action. The EU has been so focused on the ‘refugee crisis’ and those who are leaving Syria that they are not focused enough on the challenges of those who stay behind. The Security Council functions as the biggest barrier to this. While there have been efforts to change the structure for a long time, currently there is no alternative. The UN is made up of member States and therefore things become political. However there are some avenues that can be pursued within the UN which can be used to try and achieve accountability.

- Focus on the Human Rights Council – Enrica Barago

Ms Barago briefly introduced the HRC, explaining that the mandate of the HRC is to address situations, establish international standards, develop instruments and promote human rights. The HRC is a fully-fledged UN body that is composed of State representatives. It holds both regular and special sessions; there have been Special Sessions on Syria and other relevant actions including the Commission of Inquiry and its reports, notably the ‘Out of Sight, Out of Mind: Deaths in Detention in the Syrian Arab Republic’ report. Ms Barago went over the mechanism, procedures and resolutions.

Ms Barago then focused on civil society involvement in the HRC. The HRC has adopted several resolutions of particular importance for civil society, such as freedom of expression, freedom of association and peaceful assembly, intimidation and reprisals, and human rights defenders. In 2013 and 2014, it adopted resolutions 27/31, and 24/21 on civil society space, acknowledging the “crucial importance of the active involvement of civil society, at all levels, in processes of governance and in promoting good governance, including through transparency and accountability, at all levels, which is indispensable for building peaceful, prosperous and democratic societies.”

Some of the areas CSOs and NGOs can follow up on are; recommendations issued by UN Special Procedures as contained in reports on country visits, thematic reports and communications on individual cases, recommendations stemming from the UPR, HRC resolutions and decisions, the recommendations of commissions of inquiry, fact-finding missions and other ad hoc human rights investigative mechanisms, appeals to States or the international community by the High Commissioner for Human Rights or by human rights independent experts in public statements.

One place Syrian CSOs can have an impact is when a resolution is being drafted. It is not necessary to wait until the resolution has been drafted to comment on it: CSOs can come in before to make sure that the correct language is used in a resolution. This is important as people who are not human rights experts are often those deciding on the text. The adoption of a resolution is also a stage of the process to be aware of as when the sponsor or co-sponsor submit their resolution, it often won’t
be the case that all States agree on it and the core group who wrote it will have to defend it. It is important to be aware of what other negotiations and initiatives are currently taking place with particular States to know if people are directly responding to the resolution or if they are reacting in a particular way due to political issues or agreements with States. Before going to vote, amendments can still be included. On the last day of the Council session, States can give general comments and others can provide a statement. After the vote and once the text has been adopted, there is also an opportunity for CSOs to be involved as monitors that report on whether the resolution is being followed.

Some of the ways NGOs can plan ahead before attending the Council are by holding national meetings, defining achievable objectives, designing a timeframe, developing a strategy towards States and UN agencies and by arriving in Geneva before the session starts if possible. Recommendations for conducting advocacy at the HRC included planning meetings ahead, holding cluster meetings, providing information in UN languages, using text from previous resolutions, practising in advance, maximising human resources, combining advocacy at the HRC with other relevant Human Rights bodies and being comprehensive by sharing best practices and considering joint events and statements.

Discussion

It is often political and difficult to get resolutions through, therefore it is important to know which countries are friends and which ones could be swayed to support. It is useful to focus on ‘middle-road’ countries that civil society may be able to influence. For example some countries may not have a ‘Syria expert’ and therefore they need Syrian CSO’s help and knowledge. OHCHR cannot go and do this type of lobbying but they might know which countries could play a supporting role and can share this with CSOs, highlighting the importance of coordinating and working together.

Some participants wanted to know if there was an opportunity for the UN to suspend their work with the Syrian Government if they do not adhere to resolutions. It would be very difficult to make a joint decision on something like that as the different parts of the UN have different governing bodies and the HRC does not have the authority to say to other UN groups that they should pull out of Syria.

Exercise

Participants were asked to work in groups, choose a right and explain how it is being violated in the Syrian context, then to choose a State to conduct advocacy towards, explain how they would do so and why they chose that State. Violations discussed were torture, besieged cities, detained women and some of the countries chosen to advocate towards were USA, France, UK and Canada.

Day 2

- Focus on the UPR - Bihter Moschini

Ms Moschini went over the characteristics of the UPR, describing its universality – that all countries are obliged to produce a report and come to the HRC. The fact that it is periodic and is redone every four years makes it more of a coherent system as countries should respond to the recommendations of the first report. It is also comprehensive and has a holistic approach to human rights. The UPR is an opportunity to hold governments accountable, to challenge the government, to use documentation their organisations have collected and try to achieve something with it, to bring different civil society groups together and improve dialogue – providing a space for diverse
groups to come together, coordinate more, complement work and be more visible. It is also a tool for countries for better self-reflection and self-improvement.

Ms Moschini then reflected on past experiences of the UPR in the Arab world. For the first cycle some Arab countries were trying to restrict CSOs to distribute reports. They also did not want to have open sessions, to ban the web casting of the session and to have only the OHCHR report posted online rather than the full reports from CSOs. Luckily none of this happened. From the first cycle to the second cycle, there were informal consultations on how to make the process better for CSOs. They allowed CSOs to send videos if they were not allowed to or could not go to Geneva (security risk for some activists) and they made the session longer. They also changed it so that CSOs can reserve a speaking slot online, making it fairer for NGOs without a presence in Geneva.

Engagement of CSOs increased between the first and second cycle and there are more submissions and more joint submissions now, which reflects better coordination. There has been an increase in recommendations to countries the second time round. For Syria, there are more local Syrian NGOs planning to submit reports then the first review, when it was mostly international organisations.

There are important considerations when writing a UPR report;

- Make the first page a summary, with bullet points and attractive colours, as many people will not read the whole thing;
- NGO reports can only be 5 to 10 pages long but if you have more relevant information or special cases you want to include, you can put them in an annex;
- If you are writing a report in Arabic – consider submitting it in English as it may draw more attention and be more effective;
- Be sensitive with your language. Definitely do not be abusive and maybe even measure your language for some specific things for example maybe say government and not regime;
- Prioritise issues and coordinate with other NGOs: if many organisations bring up one issue or place in Syria in many reports, it will force OHCHR to put it in the report;
- Compare what you are writing compared to what UN reports are saying – they should not be so different;
- Call on the government to focus on specific tasks/issues that can be tackled;
- Use media throughout the process to create pressure;
- Advocate to all UN member States who could achieve something, not just the 47.

Advocacy opportunities for the UPR were looked at for each stage of the process. Before the review, it is useful to contact Troika countries with a few critical issues such as data or key cases. The Troika for Syria are Botswana, Paraguay and Bangladesh. (Botswana is the most Human Rights friendly of these countries so maybe the best to approach). There is potential value in attending pre-sessions as they are a copy of what will happen in the real session. Sometimes there are some State representatives there and it helps to create a dialogue. At the review, the key thing is for the statement to be well prepared and make sure it fits into the two minute timeslot. In addition this, for the upcoming Syria UPR, CSOs should use the whole week for advocacy if possible. The review is on Monday then on Friday they do the report – so there is a whole week to do advocacy. For example for the Bahrain UPR, Bahraini CSOs organised a lot of side events and they coordinated with each other well. They prioritised the issue of freedom of expression and they called for the
release of Nabil Rajab and pushed countries to make this a recommendation for Bahrain. In the end he was released which was a real achievement.

After the review there is still a lot of advocacy to be done. In its recent UPR, Lebanon received 211 recommendations and left the room without commenting on 209 recommendations. So CSOs had to continue to work to make the government submit a document that offered a response to each recommendation. Syrian CSOs must put the pressure on too. In the HRC that follows the Syria UPR, the Syrian Government will get 20 minutes to speak, UN Member states and CSOs will also each get 20 minutes to speak. Participants should prepare for this now and if they cannot attend they can send video statements. As follow-up, CSOs should also engage the media, hold post UPR consultations with member States to make sure they follow up on the recommendations they gave, translate recommendations and reports into Arabic, and initiate campaigns on specific recommendations.

Other advice for the upcoming Syria UPR included:

- Do a lot of advocacy before the governments write their statement;
- If you need funds, you can turn your involvement in the UPR into a proposal where your project is to follow the whole UPR process;
- OCHCR has some fund available for CSOs to work on some of the recommendations that came out of the UPR, which is useful when governments say they don't have resources to implement the recommendations;
- Leverage the contacts that you have. Go through people who are already connected;
- Help member States differentiate between GONGO’s (a non-governmental organisation that may have been set up by a government to look like an NGO) and real CSOs. You need to build trust with these member States and help them know who is advocating in front of them and who they are funded by;
- The critical thing is to get the right recommendations – the way to do that is to lobby specific States to give specific recommendations that you think are important and provide them with reports of what the country should do to achieve these recommendations;
- Make a recommendation which is asking for a referral to the ICC;
- You can contribute the other countries UPR’s about violations in Syria – e.g Russia or Iran’s UPR.”

Discussion

Some participants were concerned that addressing the Syrian Government in the UPR would provide them with legitimacy. They felt that recommendations sent to the Syrian Government is somewhat problematic as States or the media may congratulate Syria for accepting several recommendations which would give legitimacy to the government. Participants made clear that they did not want to be part of a process that legitimises the government. Ms Moschini reassured that there is space for the participants to engage in the way they feel comfortable, by putting their political stance in the beginning of the report.

Others asked about how crimes committed in Opposition held areas could be dealt with in the UPR as they expect that the Syrian Government will say that they are not responsible for them. Ms Moschini affirmed that in state of conflict the armed group controlling the area is responsible for the
population. The Commission of Inquiry is distinguishing the different levels of responsibility. CSOs can develop recommendations for all the actors they think are accountable of HR violations, however in the end it is the Syrian Government who will be in Geneva for the review.

**Exercise**

Groups were given the first page of an Egyptian UPR report as an example for their own reports. They were asked to decide on an area of focus, proof they would use, questions they would ask and recommendations and to explain how they would present them on the first page.

Group 1 focus: killing under torture. They said they would use the Caesar photos as their main proof, using documents form international and forensic experts showing these photos were real. The question they would ask were; will the Syrian Government allow a fact finding mission into the prisons? What are the conditions in the prisons? Will they allow families to see them? Recommendations: Expose the names and fates of people in the photos. Make a fact finding mission to see what happened there.

Group 2 focus: enforced disappeared persons. On the front page of their report they would use timelines and gender aggregated data. They would describe the varying types of detention centers and highlight that there are not only known and identified prisons, but prisons in universities, in sports stadiums and training centers. Recommendations: To know the numbers and destiny of these people. Allow committees to visit the centers to see if basic rights of people are being upheld there.

Group 3 focus: detained journalists, political detainees, women detainees and Syrians in besieged areas. Recommendations: release the journalists, revoke courts of terrorism and extra ordinary security rules, lift siege of civilians.

Group 4 focus: detainees and stopping torture. Questions: what are they methods you use against detainees especially women? What do you do the interrogators when they break standards? Is it possible to visit centers? What are you doing to enhance situation of detainees?

Group 5 focus: use of starvation as a means of warfare. The data they would use would come from statistics form international and local organisations about health and lack of access. They would also highlight that the High Commissioner of Human Rights said that this is a war crime. Questions: Why is the Syrian Government preventing help to these areas? Recommendation: immediate lift of siege and access of services to worst areas and allow humanitarian aid workers to have access.

Ms Moschini shared the UPR, OHCHR and ANND website with the best practices and a step by step guide.

- **Focus on UN Special Procedures – Jeremy Sarkin**

Professor Sarkin went over some details about the Special Procedure position explaining that the position is given to a person for 3 years and can be renewed for another 3 years to focus on a particular area of work. They can be called Special Rapporteurs, Independent experts, special representatives, members of a working group. He then went over some of the specific traits Special Procedures have.

On the positive side, they are probably the most independent part of the UN system which can have some negatives but broadly this gives Special Procedures much more power over what they can do and what they are willing to do. They have unique roles within the UN system; sometimes these is overlap with other mechanisms but this is not a problem. You can go to a treaty body and the ICJ
and still go to Special Procedures, who have a unique nature of cooperation. They have the potential to be innovative and the ability to react quickly, they could be contacted today and do something tomorrow. For example they can write press releases or hold workshops. That innovation can also come from CSOs; Special Procedures may be able to do interesting if unusual things. It is important to form relationships with Special Procedures for more long term work. They can often be more responsive than other UN systems and they can respond to complaints.

Some Special Procedures are more independent than others, although the process has moved away from appointing former bureaucrat’s for these positions and now there are more lawyers, academics, people from NGO sector etc. This independence can be a problem as being a Special Rapporteur is not a full time job and it is unpaid therefore they need another job at the same time, which means they cannot always devote enough time to the position. Challenges include a lack of resources, no enforcement powers and limited exposure outside of UN system, which can limit their effect. However CSOs can help with this by getting more people to focus on them.

There are several Special Procedures that are relevant for the Syrian context, including torture, summary executions, disappearances, violence against women, arbitrary detention, education, Syria-COI, freedom of expression, human rights defenders, independence of judges and lawyers, IDPs and mercenaries. These Special Procedures can play an entry point into the system and help get the issues on the table. They conduct expert consultations and develop human rights standards. They can be useful for advocacy, good for public awareness, provide advice and support, visit countries and bring things up, shed light on how States comply with norms, CSOs can meet them, they can convene meetings and they can provide HR awareness. Even if it is not possible to visit Syria currently, Special Procedures can still go to neighbouring countries.)

He also urged the participants not to give up hope, understanding that sometimes it feels like nothing is being done and so little comes from all the work people are putting in, but that they need to see it as creating a record to make people accountable in the future.

Discussion

One question was whether there were benefits in having joint statements between different Special Procedures and how easy this it. Mr Sarkin affirmed that the Office of the High Commissioner wants SRs to collaborate and that it is very beneficial for them to work together. Participants also wanted to know if CSOs had a role in the election of the mandate holders. Mr Sarkin explained that the UN tries to get good geographical and gender diversity when they choose people but CSOs have no formal role apart from lobbying States and making suggestions.

There was a disheartened feeling from some participants that all the UN mechanisms are weak. Mr Sarkin acknowledged that a big issue with the UN is lack of enforcement. He reiterated that the UN is made up of States and these States decide things including whether to give the UN system resources or power. The UN does not have an army, police or guns. The Security Council can be a block in the System. The long term aim should be a reform of the system but in the meantime this is the best we have and we have to use it. The alternative is to do nothing.

There was an intense conversation about chemical weapons in Syria. While some people felt there had been an improvement in the situation because a huge amount of chemicals have been removed, others felt that discussing the situation of chemical weapons in Syria as any kind of success is totally wrong and it is actually one of the biggest failures of the UN and the international community.
This led to a discussion about the Security Council, its veto rights and if CSOs can have any influence on it at all. The only way to change this is through votes by the members of the Security Council, which is extremely unlikely.

Another participant asked about how to ensure Special Procedures are not biased. Mr Sarkin explained that they cannot work in their own countries and the UN is very sensitive to being biased. Special Procedures are very conscious of this and value their independence and this helps to limit bias. There was also a discussion on whether Special Procedures can or should release the names of detained people if they have access to them. They will always try and do what is best for the victim, sometimes they release them if the family agrees but other times they do not in case the location of detained people then gets targeted. The conversation also looked at how Special Procedures can mobilise public opinion and media. Some of the ways to do this are to develop press reports; CSOs can help lead the attention of the media to areas on which Special Procedures are working. When a Special Procedure writes a report they don’t automatically send it to the media but CSOs can take this role.

**Exercise**

Mr Sarkin then led an exercise where given the following issues; torture, arbitrary detention, disappearances, people from other countries who are fighting in Syria. Participants had to explain which Special Procedures they would approach and what they would ask them to do.

**Day 3**

- **Mainstreaming Children in UN Mechanisms and Accountability Processes – Alison Smith**

Ms Smith first went over developments in respect the rights of children. There has been the case of Thomas Lubanga at the ICC who was tried and convicted for the recruitment and use of children as soldiers. There is the entry into force of the optional protocol of the rights of the child in armed conflict which raised the age of recruitment to 18 putting the age range in link with the rights of the child convention. Previously it was 15, but now for States Parties to the optional protocol it was raised to 18. Another significant development is the monitoring and reporting mechanism (MRM) at the UN which lists 6 grave violations against children. If someone has committed one of these crimes they are listed in the report of the UN Secretary General. One violation is attacks against schools and hospitals and another is recruitment of child soldiers. When this happens the listed actor has to go through an action plan with UNICEF, implementing that plan to get off the list. Syria and other armed groups in Syria have been listed by the UN Secretary General through the MRM, which was adopted by the Security Council. There is now a Nobel Prize winner under the age of 18, which serves as an example that children have a role in protecting their own rights and that we should support them. These are small victories over the last 15 years that show there is hope in the type of work participants are doing and that they should keep going.

The innovative aspect of the Convention on the Right of the Child 1989 (CRC) was the re-conceptualisation of children from being objects that need protection to humans who have rights. The fundamental principle that underpins the CRC, in article 3, is ‘in all actions effecting children the best interest of the child shall be the primary consideration’; CSOs also need to take this into consideration. In 2014, the CRC issued a comment about what ‘best interest’ means, there was long discussion when developing the CRC whether best interest of child should be ‘the’ primary consideration or ‘a’ primary consideration. Ms Smith explained her preference for the latter
understanding as children are not ‘the’ society but part of society. However we do need to help children realise and achieve their rights according to their ‘evolving capacities’.

There are two specific rights that are important to work on accountability and Syria. Article 12: the right of children to take part in judicial decisions that affect their lives. She acknowledged that a 14 year old can articulate their views however a child of 5 cannot do so, however they have a right to participate. For example children can contribute to the UPR process, it is great to get recommendations on the rights of children that are informed by children themselves, or having children as part of truth commissions. This is important because children are the future, therefore should have a role in what their future will look like and secondly because they have views right now that are important to hear. The second right was article 39 ‘physical and psychological recovery of a child victim, and social reintegration, should be promoted.’

The Committee on the Rights of the Child is one of the treaty bodies and that it is therefore binding to all States who signed up to it (all countries apart from USA and Somalia). The committee has 18 members selected by states but who act in personal capacity. They have a 4 year term and can be re-elected once. Ms Smith encouraged participants to try to get to know some of these members. All States submit periodic reports to the Committee, which examines these reports, raises concerns and makes recommendations to States. The Committee reports once a year to the Third Committee of the general assembly; the Third Committee deals with human rights, they negotiate throughout the year and recommend draft resolutions to the General Assembly. The Sixth Committee of the General Assembly, the legal committee, can also be very useful. The Committee can be an entry point for the work of Syrian CSOs on children.

Discussion

Some participants spoke about the work they have done with children such as drawing projects which led to a discussion on whether children should stay away from political environments or if we should help them to be part of it. Ms Smith expressed the view that she sees no problem with children being part of politics and commented that drawing projects such as the one described are positive as children can express themselves in line with their evolving capacity. It should be clear from the outset that exercises like this should be to let children express themselves without trying to use or manipulate what they did for political purposes.

Questions also arose about what useful and tangible outcomes can come from engaging with treaty bodies and what happens to countries that do not abide to the treaties which they sign. Treaty bodies will note that a country has violated rights. In some cases this promotes accountability, it makes a difference to some countries but not for others. The UN cannot force things on States but belonging to treaty bodies has brought about positive change in some instance accountability and ultimately compliance. There was change in Sri Lanka because of pressure and attention from international community.

Putting political pressure on States that are part of the Geneva talks and insisting accountability is on the table by using reports that come out of UN Mechanisms, such as the Committee on the Rights of the Child, can be another use of the treaty bodies. If there is some kind of criminal jurisdiction that comes out of Syria situation they will look at these reports to build a picture of the crimes and to analyse who is responsible for the crimes. Syrian CSOs could try to have bombing schools discussed at the General Assembly. They can write reports and meet with Committee members so that they can bring attention to this issue. Attacks on schools can get into a CRC report and the Third Committee in New York could put this in a draft resolution.
Mainstreaming Women in UN Mechanisms and Accountability Processes – Salma Jalkhi

Ms Jalkhi explained how it has been difficult for women to be in decision making positions during the uprising and before, but how the revolution started changing stereotypes of women. However there is still not enough support for women to be in decision making positions. Regarding the recent Geneva negotiations, the women who were present there did not have enough support from women on the ground. One issue that can affect women negatively is the image that women are inherently peaceful and impartial, which often means that their opinions and views get disregarded.

In terms of transitional justice, community engagement is important, because without this peace will not be sustainable. It is vital that women are engaged with this process. Women can also provide a lot of proof in regards to documenting violations. Many people believe it is important to have women participate but there are more who just treat women as a decoration. CSOs are the ones who will create the State in the future and they need to ensure real participation of women will take place and not just for the donors but because they understand the need of true equality.

Discussion

Some participants noted that women are not only excluded politically but that also there are not enough women inside Syria who get invited to participate in trainings and workshops. There is not enough of a link between those inside Syria and those outside. This participant also noted how more conservative women are marginalised.

When asked for recommendations of how to not marginalise women by the participants, Ms Jalkhi suggested understand the needs of women correctly, better communication with women in Syria, the feminist movement should not be kept away from these groups, all groups, CSOs, NGOs, political groups should include women, and not to do superficial projects imposed from outside but ones that really reflect the needs.

Focus on Ethics of Engagement – Alison Smith

Ms Smith led this session as a practical exercise where 6 situations were stuck on the walls around the room. Participants worked in small groups and moved around the room discussing the ethical considerations of each situation. The group then sat down together and gave their views on and had further discussion on each situation.

One ethical consideration was about a video which showed a rape of a male prisoner and both the perpetrator and victim could be identified. The discussion focused on privacy, on consent of releasing the footage, who to release footage to, identifying who did the filming, do you release it publicly or just to authorities. This also led to a discussion on the release of the Caesar photos as they were published without the consent of the families of the victims. Some people thought this was necessary as it allowed people to finally find and identify their loved ones and know what had happened to them. Others disagreed saying that there should have been consent from the families.

Other discussion focused on networks of organisations and the use of evidence collected by NGOs who are part of these networks; buying evidence and whether this is right or wrong or can affect the credibility of evidence; and releasing the names of torturers.
Practical Exercise – Jeremy Sarkin

Mr Sarkin introduced the main practical exercise of the workshop. Participants were divided into three groups; one who would address the HRC, another who would present at the UPR and the last who would meet with a Special Procedures Working Group. They were given instructions on the questions they had to answer and what they needed to prepare for a mock session of each of these mechanisms the following morning. Groups had to answer the following question on one page:

1. What are the issues that you wish to raise before your mechanism?
2. How will you approach the mechanism?
   - What questions will you ask, how will you present your issues, etc
3. What do you want the mechanism to do?
   - e.g. draft recommendations, draft text for a resolution, draft letter of allegation etc
   - What is the outcome you want to achieve and how will you achieve it?
4. Who else will you engage and how?
   - e.g. States, NGOs - which ones, why, when, where and how?
5. How will you ensure the participation of women and children and how will you ensure their views are represented?
6. What is your plan for follow-up?

Then at the mock session they would appoint three members of your group to present the following:

- a 2 minute statement
- a 2 minute question and answer session (the mechanism will ask questions and you will respond)
- a 2 minute response

The participants spent the rest of this session preparing for the mock sessions the following day.

Panel discussion ‘Restoring Faith in International Mechanisms for achieving Justice for Syria’ – Rami Nakhlal, Reem Salabi, Flavia Pansieri, Jeremy Sarkin and Mustafa Haid

NPWJ hosted a panel discussion to address the best course of practical action that needs to be taken by Syrian Civil Society Organisations and the International Community to restore the faith of Syrians in International Mechanisms for achieving Justice for Syria.

The panellists discussed the fact that one of the major drivers perpetuating the conflict in Syria is the sense of impunity for those committing crimes and human rights violations, due in part to the paralysis of international justice mechanisms in holding perpetuators accountable. In turn, this fuels the feeling of a sense of abandonment by the Syrian people and promotes the idea that ‘Victors Justice’ is currently the only real option for Syria – repeating the cycle of revenge and violence. This has made reaching a political solution through negotiation near to impossible. They discussed whether it was possible to restore Syrians’ faith in international mechanisms to facilitate a political solution by restoring their trust in the capabilities of international mechanism to facilitate justice.
Day 4

- **Continuation of Practical Exercise – Flavia Pansieri and Jeremy Sarkin**

Each group presented their case and spoke, getting cut off if they went over the time limit as in the real context. Some of the final remarks were that people needed to prepare even better if they were doing this in real life. They should make their 2 minute speech calm and informative and not try to jam as much information in and speak as fast as they can in two minutes as they will lose the interpreters and not get the message across. Other feedback, especially for engaging with Special Procedures, was to prepare what they want to get out of a meeting beforehand and make sure they ask them for clear deliverables when they meet. Participants also needed to be ready for criticism and confrontation from other parties such as the Syrian Government who will challenge what they say. Experts took on these roles during the exercise and had positive feedback mentioning that all speakers stayed calm, were polite and were not overly emotional to States who were trying to provoke them.

Experts recommended that if participants were organising side events at the HRC they should have good sponsors, a catchy title, interesting topics, choose the right time in the week and day to make sure people will come, have a good agenda, be balanced but touch people too, try to get as many State sponsors as possible, try and get ambassadors to be on the panel as this increases the chance of other States coming and print a lot of flyers.

- **Roundtable focused on the ICJ led by OSJI – Jim Goldston**

Mr Goldston and his team introduced themselves and the idea of getting an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice (ICJ) as one of a number of paths that Syrian CSOs are working on.

Mr Goldston explained the two ways the ICJ could be approached regarding Syria. One being ‘Contentious Case’, saying that for this option they would want to look at Syria for the crime of Torture. Syria has ratified the Convention Against Torture therefore it is possible for another State who ratified the treaty to bring Syria to the ICJ and say they broke their treaty. This method needs a State to take on this role and no one has said they will do that so far. The second method is to get an advisory opinion. The UN General Assembly has the ability to ask the ICJ a specific question. It could take a long time to render an opinion but for other examples it has acted quickly for example it took 7-9 months to get an opinion on the wall in Israel and Palestine. It would not be easy to get the General Assembly to make a request, if they did and if the court agreed to hear the case, they have no way to guarantee what the Advisory Opinion would be. It could say the Syrian State has engaged in a number of crimes, maybe just ‘torture’ or could see if other Human Rights violations have taken place, crimes against humanity, or that international law has been breached. It could say that the perpetrators of the crime have an obligation to stop. This would not make them stop but it would be coming from the highest legal advisory opinion in the world. It could say the crimes that have taken place must be prosecuted. It could also say that reparations should be given to victims.

As the Advisory Opinion is not binding, one question is whether there was a value in trying to achieve an opinion. There could be three positive outcomes. First, the highest court in the world would say crimes had been committed in Syria which could maybe make it harder for the countries who are denying these crimes to continue to act such as Russia. A lot of important people have
already say that, but we have yet to have an authoritative court ruling on this. Second, there may be a potential for Syrian groups to use the evidence they have been documenting to be shown in court. It would show the scale of evidence and would provide an opportunity for that evidence to be tested in a court of law. Third, if the ICJ ruled there were crimes, this may give impetus to national courts who are trying to try crimes. They wouldn't just have reports to work with but an ICJ ruling behind them.

Discussion

The presentation was followed by a rich and thorough discussion. For some participants this was the first time they had heard about the possibility to use the ICJ for Syria. OSJI noted that one of the reasons that this had not been pursued yet was it is a very difficult route without guaranteed outcomes. The ICC would certainly be better, but that door is not open to Syria right now. The group discussed the possibility of not getting enough votes in the General Assembly and what the message would be for Syria if that was the case and there was also a concern about whether the opinion would actually be in favour of the Syrian people.

Going to the ICJ may be a large effort with a small benefit; risks would be more than the potential benefits. The States that support the Syrian Government would water down the question to the ICJ a lot. For the contentious pathway a State would need to take on Syria and Russia which would be very complicated regarding the current Geo-political balance. There is also a possible risk to international law itself, particularly in terms of head of State immunity, jurisdictional issues and international criminal law principles. Other participants felt however that if there was any chance it could be good for Syrians, that they would be interested in pursuing the idea.

OSJI stressed that it would not be able to proceed unless there was a united Syrian voice calling for it. Therefore participants should consider what role they would want to play in this, such as bringing it up when they speak to various States and whether they would be happy to use their documentation for this.

The group discussed the issue of the question and how best to construct the question to court. How broadly or narrowly they should define the violations? OSJI felt that the benefit of looking at torture is that it is very well documented and maybe the best chance of keeping a unified court whereas questions of war crimes might divide the court.

Some States may be reluctant to participate in engaging the ICJ for fear of it having an effect on peace negotiations. There is a need to think tactically about which countries to engage.

The roundtable concluded with the acknowledgment that this is one possible initiative and that all the participants would need to make a decision about if they would be interested in investing in the process. For example, how to do research on which States they could work with. They also suggested engaging experts to gauge questions of fact and of law and checking peoples’ evidence. OSJI invited the group to consider the idea and continue the discussion. OSJI feel it is worth exploring further and they will continue to do so.
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Enrica Barago

Enrica Barago is an NGO Capacity Building Consultant. She most recently contributed to the establishment of “I Am Libya”, a national platform of Libyan NGOs and conducts educational programmes on Human Rights and CSO empowerment. She has Master's Degrees of Politics/International Relations and Social Science from the University of Pisa and the Scuola Superiore Sant’Anna as well as a B.A. in International and Diplomatic Science from the University of Bologna. She has engaged in the fields of advocacy and project management. Her previous postings included diplomatic hubs and field missions. In Geneva, she worked for governments as well as CSOs and was able to contribute to the decision making process at the highest level and engage with prominent human rights defenders. In Tunisia, with NPWJ, she brought together Libyan civil society actors and institutional stakeholders while working for accountability and transitional justice in the Libyan democratic transition. With Creative Learning and the World Federation of United Nations Associations, she trained members of Libyan CSO’s effectively creating a network of partners that is still active to date.

Bihter Moschini

Bihter Moschini is a research officer at the Arab NGO Network for Development, a regional network, working in 12 Arab countries with an extended membership of 250 CSOs from different backgrounds. ANND aims at strengthening the role of civil society in monitoring and advocacy for economic and social rights. ANND advocates for more sound and effective socio-economic reforms in the region, which integrate the concepts of sustainable development, gender justice, and the rights-based approach. At ANND, Bihter has been working on monitoring and advocacy of EU policies directed to the region and programming work in relation to the UN human rights monitoring mechanisms, particularly the Universal Periodic Review.

Since the first cycle review in 2008, she has worked for UPR of Egypt, Lebanon, Palestine, Sudan, Yemen, Jordan, Bahrain, Tunisia and Syria at various steps open for civil society including research and data collection and submitting reports and midterm reviews, coordination, coalition-building and advocacy at national level and international level.

She has contributed to the publication of two UPR publications by ANND:

A _step by step brochure on the practicalities of the process with highlights specific to reporting on Economic and Social Rights_


_UPR and Civil Society | Best practices from the Arab region_
Rami Nakhla

NPWJ’s Syria Project Coordinator, Rami Nakhla is Syrian pro-democracy activist and a Yale World Fellow who has worked to advance political, social, and security sector reform in Syria since 2006. Mr. Nakhla has served as Executive Director of The Day After Association and as Syria Program Specialist at the US Institute of Peace (USIP), coordinating “The Day After” project on the Institute’s behalf. At the start of the uprising, Nakhla was a founding member and spokesperson for the Local Coordination Committees (LCCs), a nation-wide network of activists who organized early protests and continue to keep the world informed about the unfolding conflict in Syria. Later, in 2011, Nakhla became a member of the Syrian National Council, the first internationally recognized umbrella organization for the Syrian opposition. In 2013, Nakhla resigned from his position to focus his efforts on non-partisan conflict mitigation with international organizations working in the country.

Nakhla’s work been featured by all major media outlets such as the New York Times, The Guardian, Washington Post, Al-Jazeera En and others.

Flavia Pansieri

Flavia Pansieri was appointed United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights on 15 March 2013.

In the past 30 years she has held a number of increasingly responsible positions in a number of UN system agencies and in various countries and headquarters locations. Most recently, Ms. Pansieri served as the Executive Coordinator of the UN Volunteers (UNV) Programme, from February 2008 to December 2012. Prior to joining UNV, she served as the United Nations Resident Coordinator and Resident Representative of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Yemen (September 2004 – January 2008).

Ms Pansieri started her UN career in 1983 with UNDP in China, where she was responsible for the UNV and TOKTEN (Transfer of Knowledge Through Expatriate Nationals) programmes, as well as for projects in the energy sector. She continued with UNDP in Bangladesh (1987 – 1990) and Myanmar (1990 – 1993), followed by a posting to Laos as Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), and thereafter from 1995 to 1998 at UNODC Headquarters in Vienna directing, planning and evaluating activities.

As the Deputy Executive Director of the United Nations Fund for Women (UNIFEM) in New York (1998 – 2001), she engaged in promoting women’s economic, social and political participation and in raising awareness about gender equality issues. Before taking up the Resident Coordinator / Resident Representative position in Yemen, she was in charge of the Country Division of the Regional Bureau for Arab States at UNDP, providing guidance and support to programme activities in the various countries of the Arab region.
Ms. Pansieri is an Italian national with a doctoral degree in Philosophy from Milan University, and one in Chinese Language and Literature from Venice University. She is a fluent speaker of English, German, French, Spanish, Chinese and Italian.

Ms. Pansieri retired from the UN in December 2015 and is living in Italy alternating the care for her farmhouse and olive grove with consulting engagements in the areas of human rights, women's empowerment and development.

Prof Jeremy Sarkin

Professor of Law, University of South Africa (UNISA) and Distinguished Visiting Professor of Law Nova University, Lisbon, Portugal; Member 2008–2014 (Chair-Rapporteur 2009–2012), United Nations Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances

Professor Jeremy Sarkin has undergraduate and postgraduate law degrees from South Africa, a Master of Laws from Harvard Law School and a Doctor of Laws degree on comparative and international law. He is admitted to practice as attorney in the USA and South Africa. He practiced at the New York bar during 1988 and 1989. He then spent time working at the International Commission of Jurists in Geneva, Switzerland. He is Professor of Law at the University of South Africa (UNISA) and Distinguished Visiting Professor of Law, Nova University Law School, Lisbon, Portugal. He was a member (2008-2014), and was Chairperson-Rapporteur (2009-2012), of the United Nations Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances. He served as an acting judge in 2002 and 2003 in South Africa. He served as National Chairperson of the Human Rights Committee of South Africa from 1994-1998. He has worked on transitional justice issues recently in Argentina, Uganda, Zimbabwe, the Maldives, Nepal, Burundi, Morocco, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Timor-Leste, the DRC, Libya, Tunisia, Indonesia, Philippines, Bangladesh, Syria, Bahrain, and Lebanon. He is a co-editor of the book series on Transitional Justice at Intersentia Publishers. He is a member of a number of journal editorial boards, including Human Rights Quarterly, Human Rights and International Legal Discourse and the International Review of Criminal Law. He serves on the boards of a number of NGOs, including the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation (IJR). He has published 14 books and more than 200 articles. His recent books are “Germany’s Genocide of the Herero” (2011); Reparations for Colonial Genocides (2009); Human Rights in African Prisons (2008); Reconciliation in Divided Societies: Finding Common Ground (2007); Carrots and Sticks: The TRC and the South African Amnesty Process (2004); The Administration of Justice: Comparative Perspectives (2004); Social, Economic, and Cultural Rights – An Appraisal of Current International and European Developments (2002); Resolving the Tensions Between Crime and Human Rights: European and South African Perspectives (2002); The Principle of Equality (2001).
Alison Smith, NPWJ Legal Counsel and International Criminal Justice Program Director

Alison Smith is the Legal Counsel and Director of the International Criminal Justice Program for No Peace Without Justice, having formerly worked as NPWJ’s Country Director in Sierra Leone. In addition, she served as the chief legal adviser to the Vice President of Sierra Leone on the Special Court and international humanitarian law. At NPWJ, she has worked on several areas of policy and practice relating to international criminal law, including on documentation and outreach in several countries.

Ms Smith has acted as international legal adviser to a number of clients including the Tibetan Government in Exile, Kosovar politicians and worked as a legal adviser to the Government of Thailand during the United Nations Preparatory Commissions for the establishment of an International Criminal Court and during the first sessions of the Assembly of States Parties. She worked with No Peace Without Justice and UNICEF on the production of a book on international criminal law and children, has consulted with UNICEF and other organisations and written several articles on children and on international criminal justice more broadly. Ms Smith worked in Kosovo as an international legal officer for the International Crisis Group’s Humanitarian Law Documentation Project, which gathered statements from victims and witnesses of violations international humanitarian law in Kosovo. Prior to that, she was a researcher at the Kennedy School of Government’s Carr Centre for Human Rights Policy at Harvard University. From March to June 2013, she was on temporary special leave of absence, as acting Head of Office and Senior Legal Adviser to the Special Court for Sierra Leone, to assist with the completion and wrap-up of its work.

Ms Smith is an Australian barrister and holds a Masters Degree in International Law from the Australian National University.
Annex 2 – Workshop Concept Paper

Workshop on Promoting Accountability through UN Mechanisms with a focus on women and children

Concept paper

The conflict in Syria continues to claim staggering numbers of lives, with attacks against civilians having further intensified in recent weeks. An immediate result of the conflict is also the ongoing destruction of people’s livelihoods and property. With each passing day, the goal of regaining ordinary life is increasingly distant and exponentially harder to reach. Although the creation of the International Syria Support Group (ISSG) in the fall of 2015 and the on-going efforts of the UN Special Envoy for Syria, the range of violation of international humanitarian laws and war crimes is widening and the number of parties involved in the conflict allegedly involved in the violation of international norms continues to grow.

Against this backdrop, it is crucial to bolster the resilience of Syrian civil society and democratic activists. These organisations have done incredible work in addressing and documenting the widespread breaches of international law committed for the last five years in Syria, including torture, sexual and gender-based violence and illegal war tactics such as siege, starvation, barrel bombs and indiscriminate shelling of civilian neighborhoods. They have firsthand experience of these violations and their consequences, including through their tremendous work in bringing relief for the victims, in particular women and children.

The “Workshop on Promoting Accountability through UN Mechanisms with a focus on women and children” aims at bolstering the resolve of human rights activists in favour of a future Syrian system of accountability and transitional justice that responds to the scale of the violence and the needs of the population and at equipping human rights activists with the technical capacity to act at the international level, also through the UN system, to prioritise justice and accountability as an integral part of any strategic planning for the political solution of the Syrian conflict.

Ensuring there is a strong and shared political vision in favour of fair, effective and independent transitional justice mechanisms increases the likelihood of those mechanisms being established and of their being an accepted and useful part of Syria’s ultimate transition to democracy and the rule of law.
Annex 3 – Workshop Program

**Day One – Saturday 20 February 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.00–10.30</td>
<td>Welcome remarks</td>
<td>Rami Nakhla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30–11.15</td>
<td><strong>Introduction of participants and workshop orientation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Identification of expectations</td>
<td>Rami Nakhla and Alison Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30–12.30</td>
<td><strong>Brief review of UN Mechanisms</strong>&lt;br&gt;General discussion</td>
<td>Flavia Pansieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Light lunch</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30–15.00</td>
<td><strong>Focus on the Human Rights Council</strong></td>
<td>Enrica Barago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30–17.00</td>
<td><strong>Discussion on upcoming Human Rights Council</strong></td>
<td>Enrica Barago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00–22:00</td>
<td><strong>Welcome Dinner</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Day Two – Sunday 21 February 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.00–09.15</td>
<td>Review of previous day and expectations</td>
<td>Rami Nakhla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.15–10.45</td>
<td><strong>Focus on the UPR</strong></td>
<td>Bihter Moschini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00–12.30</td>
<td><strong>Discussion on upcoming UPR process</strong></td>
<td>Bihter Moschini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30–15.00</td>
<td><strong>Focus on UN Special Procedures</strong></td>
<td>Jeremy Sarkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Coffee Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30–17.00</td>
<td><strong>Discussion on engaging UN Special Procedures</strong></td>
<td>Jeremy Sarkin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Day Three – Monday 22 February 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.00–09.15</td>
<td>Review of previous day and expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.15–10.45</td>
<td><strong>Mainstreaming children in UN mechanisms and accountability processes</strong></td>
<td>Alison Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00–12.30</td>
<td><strong>Mainstreaming women in UN mechanisms and accountability processes</strong></td>
<td>Salma Jalkhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30- 15.00</td>
<td>Focus on Ethics of Engagement</td>
<td>Alison Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30 – 17.00</td>
<td>Practical exercise</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00 – 20:30</td>
<td>Evening event – Izmir Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Day Four – Tuesday 23 February 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Organizer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.00 – 09.15</td>
<td>Review of previous day and expectations</td>
<td>Rami Nakhla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.15 – 10.45</td>
<td>Practical exercise</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 – 12.30</td>
<td>Practical exercise continued, including presentations</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00- 17.15</td>
<td>Roundtable discussion on the International Court of Justice</td>
<td>OSJI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Including coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-18:00</td>
<td>Review and closure of workshop</td>
<td>Rami Nakhla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Organizer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.00 – 22:00</td>
<td>Closing Dinner hosted by OSJI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>