



Inter-Parliamentary Union
For democracy. For everyone.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page(s)</u> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Meetings and other activities | |
| 132nd Assembly | |
| 1. Inaugural ceremony | 4 |
| 2. Election of the President | 5 |
| 3. Participation | 6 |
| 4. Choice of an emergency item | 7 |
| 5. Debates and decisions of the Assembly and its Standing Committees | 7 |
| 6. Concluding sitting | 12 |
| 196th session of the Governing Council | |
| 1. Membership and Permanent Observers of the IPU | 13 |
| 2. Financial results for 2014 | 13 |
| 3. Financial situation | 13 |
| 4. Cooperation with the United Nations system | 14 |
| 5. Implementation of the IPU Strategy for 2012-2017 | 14 |
| 6. Recent specialized meetings | 15 |
| 7. Reports of plenary bodies and specialized committees | 15 |
| 8. Future inter-parliamentary meetings | 15 |
| 9. Amendments to the Statutes and Rules | 16 |
| 271st session of the Executive Committee | 16 |
| Meeting and Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians | 17 |
| Subsidiary bodies of the Governing Council | |
| 1. Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians | 18 |
| 2. Committee on Middle East Questions | 19 |
| 3. Group of Facilitators for Cyprus | 19 |
| 4. Committee to Promote Respect for International Humanitarian Law | 19 |
| 5. Gender Partnership Group | 20 |
| 6. Advisory Group on HIV/AIDS and Maternal, Newborn and Child Health | 20 |
| 7. Forum of Young Parliamentarians | 21 |

Other events

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Meeting of the Presidents of the Geopolitical Groups | 21 |
| 2. 30 th anniversary of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians | 22 |
| 3. Launch of the <i>Common Principles for Support to Parliaments</i> | 22 |
| 4. <i>Achieving the vision of Beijing: The views of men</i> | 22 |
| 5. <i>Consultation on the updated Global Strategy for Women's, Children's and Adolescents' Health</i> | 23 |
| 6. <i>Eliminating risks of nuclear war by accident, cyber-attack or conflict escalation</i> | 23 |
| 7. Field trip on nutrition and young child feeding | 23 |
| 8. Open consultation on the next <i>Global Parliamentary Report</i> | 24 |

Elections, appointments and membership of the IPU

Elections and appointments

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Executive Committee | 24 |
| 2. Sub-Committee on Finance | 24 |
| 3. Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians | 24 |
| 4. Committee to Promote Respect for International Humanitarian Law | 24 |
| 5. Advisory Group on HIV/AIDS and Maternal, Newborn and Child Health..... | 24 |
| 6. Bureaux of the Standing Committees | 25 |
| 7. Rapporteurs to the 133 rd and 134 th Assemblies | 25 |
| 8. Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians | 26 |

| | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Media and communications | 26 |
|--------------------------------|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------|----|
| Membership of the IPU | 27 |
|-----------------------------|----|

Agenda, resolutions and other texts of the 132nd Assembly

| | |
|--------------|----|
| Agenda | 28 |
|--------------|----|

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| The Hanoi Declaration - outcome document of the General Debate on <i>The Sustainable Development Goals: Turning Words into Action</i> | 29 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|

Subject items

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| · Resolution: <i>Cyber warfare: A serious threat to peace and global security</i> | 32 |
| · Resolution: <i>Shaping a new system of water governance: Promoting parliamentary action on water and sanitation</i> | 37 |
| · Resolution: <i>International law as it relates to national sovereignty, non-intervention in the internal affairs of States and human rights</i> | 40 |

Emergency item

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| · Results of the roll-call vote on the requests for the inclusion of an emergency item in the agenda of the Assembly | 44-47 |
| · Resolution: <i>The role of parliaments in combating all terrorist acts perpetrated by organizations such as Daesh and Boko Haram against innocent civilians, in particular women and girls</i> | 48 |

Amendments to the Statutes and Rules of the IPU

- Text of the amendment to Rule 6 of the Rules and Practices of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians 50

Reports, decisions and other texts of the Governing Council

Reports, decisions and other texts

- Cooperation with the United Nations system: List of activities undertaken by the IPU between 15 October 2014 and 15 March 2015 51
- Call for Action, *My Power for Women's Power* 56

Future meetings

- Future meetings and other activities 57
- Agenda of the 133rd Assembly 58

Decisions concerning the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

- Mr. Melitus Mugabe Were, Kenya 59
- Mr. Léonard Hitimana, Rwanda 60
- Twenty parliamentarians from Zambia 63
- Mr. N. Surendran, Ms. Teresa Kok, Mr. Khalid Samad, Mr. Rafizi Ramli, Mr. Chua Tian Chang, Mr. Ng Wei Aik and Mr. Teo Kok Seong, Malaysia 66
- Ms. Nurul Izzah Anwar, Malaysia 69
- Thirty parliamentarians from the Maldives 71
- Mr. Zorig Sanjasuuren, Mongolia 74
- Mr. Riaz Fatyana, Pakistan 76
- Mr. Saturnino Ocampo, Mr. Teodoro Casiño, Ms. Liza Maza and Mr. Rafael Mariano, Philippines 78
- Mr. Victor Gonchar, Belarus 80
- Thirty-three parliamentarians from Palestine 83
- Mr. Aziz Dweik, Palestine 85

132nd Assembly

1. Inaugural ceremony

The inaugural ceremony took place in the plenary chamber of the National Assembly of Viet Nam on Saturday 28 March 2015 at 8 p.m. with H.E. the President of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, Mr. Truong Tan Sang, in attendance.

In his opening address, **the President of Viet Nam** said that it was an honour for his country to host the 132nd IPU Assembly in its capital, Hanoi, for the first time since its admission to the IPU some 36 years previously. The Assembly would be the greatest event in multilateral diplomacy ever held in his country. He welcomed the delegates representing the IPU's Member Parliaments, Associate Members and Observers, as well as representatives of international organizations. He encouraged them to explore the historical and cultural traditions of Viet Nam, as well as the beauty of the land and people.

Mr. Truong Tan Sang praised the IPU for making positive and remarkable contributions to peace, cooperation, development, democracy, social progress, social equality and human rights. The world today was undergoing swift, profound and unpredictable changes. Increasing instability, religious and ethnic conflicts, disputes over territories, natural resources, seas and islands, the arms race and problems related to climate change, epidemics, water security and non-compliance with international law were all cause for concern.

Viet Nam had been doing its best to join hands with other countries to build a peaceful world on the foundations of stability, cooperation and prosperity. From a war-devastated country Viet Nam had become a development partner with a dynamic economy and an open-door policy, as well as a promising destination to foreign investors.

He hoped the 132nd Assembly would be one of actions, in which ideas and recommendations would be turned into practical outcomes, enhancing the role of parliaments in efforts to address urgent global issues.

Ms. A.J. Mohammed, United Nations Secretary-General's Special Adviser on Post-2015 Development Planning, commended the choice of theme for the Assembly. She brought greetings from and delivered the message of the UN Secretary-General.

The United Nations had consulted with civil society, the private sector, parliamentarians, academia and others in shaping the post-2015 development agenda. National consultations with local actors had been held in more than 60 countries. The work of the Open Working Group on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) had yielded a draft that currently contained 17 goals and 169 targets.

The proposed goals would fully integrate economic, social and environmental dimensions, with poverty eradication as a central theme. The economy and productive capacity, climate change, health and well-being, women's empowerment and redressing inequalities were addressed in stand-alone goals. The goals also covered ways to build peaceful and inclusive societies, with provisions for financial and non-financial means of implementation. Most importantly, the proposed SDGs were based on the premise that no one would be left behind.

She underscored the pivotal role of parliaments, which served as a bridge between citizens and governments. They could and must lead the way, galvanizing action and fostering accountability and implementation. Parliaments' first role was to create an enabling environment for the implementation of the post-2015 agenda through legislation. They could also ensure that State budgets reflected their governments' commitment to achieving the agenda in line with their development priorities. A third role was exercising oversight through monitoring and evaluation and holding governments to account.

She concluded by stating that parliaments would be at the forefront of efforts to make those ambitious goals a reality and deliver them to the people. The United Nations looked forward to continued cooperation with the IPU on that important dossier.

Mr. S. Chowdhury, President of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, said that it was his first time attending an IPU Assembly as President and he was delighted to do so in Viet Nam, land of the ascending dragon. It was a nation of diverse and rich ethnic, religious and cultural heritage. He had

been touched by the host Parliament's warm hospitality and meticulous arrangements. Viet Nam had surpassed all expectations in organizing the first truly global gathering in the new National Assembly and in the country.

As the longest-standing political multilateral organization in the world, the IPU predated even the League of Nations. Established in 1889, the IPU's membership currently counted 166 parliaments, representing some 45,000 members of parliament around the world. The Organization continued to strive for universal membership.

The IPU President praised the choice of theme for the General Debate, which was both timely and topical. He expressed the hope that the outcome document, the Hanoi Declaration, would feed into the UN process on the post-2015 development agenda. Three new global processes – sustainable development, disaster risk reduction and climate change – would be emerging; ensuring their coherence and convergence would be critical to their success.

2015 would be a pivotal year: the United Nations would celebrate its 70th anniversary, which would provide an opportunity for stock-taking and review. 2015 would also mark 20 years since the adoption of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and would mark the 30th anniversary of the IPU's Meeting of Women Parliamentarians. Those landmarks in the promotion of women's participation had laid the foundations for progress. It was in 1921 that women had first attended an Inter-Parliamentary Conference, and they had numbered only two, whereas some 200 were expected to attend the Assembly in Hanoi. He hoped that the 132nd IPU Assembly would be remembered not only for the warmth and friendliness of the Vietnamese people, but also for the depth and clarity of the substance it would generate by way of the Hanoi Declaration and other outcomes.

Mr. Nguyen Sinh Hun, President of the National Assembly of Viet Nam, said that the ideal of peace through dialogue advocated by the IPU's founding fathers 125 years earlier remained relevant and valuable even today. From only nine Members at its inception in 1889, the IPU currently embraced 166 Member Parliaments, making it truly the world organization of parliaments. Along with its growing membership, the IPU's profile and importance were ever increasing, as it made its voice heard in many forums.

The theme of the General Debate was of great significance in view of the imminent expiry of the MDGs. Apart from that, the 132nd IPU Assembly would be setting aside time for the discussion of many important topics such as cyber warfare, water governance, international law, national sovereignty, human rights, gender equality, HIV/AIDS and maternal and child care. Convened in the year of the 70th anniversary of the United Nations, the 30th anniversary of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians, the 25th anniversary of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the 20th anniversary of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, the Assembly would provide an excellent opportunity to consider progress made and challenges ahead, and in particular to hold in-depth discussions on the role of parliaments in implementing the new development agenda.

He was confident that the Hanoi Declaration, to be adopted by the Assembly, would send a clear message about parliament's place in the post-2015 process and would serve as a practical contribution to the new development era for the international community.

The new National Assembly building overlooked Ba Dinh Square, where, 70 years previously, President Ho Chi Minh had read the historic Declaration of Independence, announcing to the world the birth of a new, independent Viet Nam. Soon after the restoration of peace in Indochina in 1954, the National Assembly had applied for membership of the IPU.

Over the past 70 years, inspired by a spirit of peace, national independence, democracy, cooperation and development embraced by President Ho Chi Minh, the nation of Viet Nam had struggled for peace and carried out reforms, striving to achieve "wealthy people, a strong country and a democratic, just and advanced society". He declared the 132nd IPU Assembly officially open.

2. Election of the President

The 132nd Assembly opened at the National Convention Centre in Hanoi in the morning of Sunday 29 March, with the election by acclamation of Mr. Nguyen Sinh Hung, Speaker of the National Assembly of Viet Nam, as President of the Assembly.

Over the course of the Assembly, the President was assisted by the following Vice-Presidents: Lord Faulkner (United Kingdom), Ms. S. Mahajan (India), Ms. B. Bishop (Australia), Mr. P.-F. Veillon (Switzerland), Ms. A.A. Lemos (Brazil) and Ms. B. Mbete (South Africa).

3. Participation

Delegations from 128 Member Parliaments took part in the work of the Assembly¹:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Palestine, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The following Associate Members also took part in the Assembly: the Arab Parliament, the Central American Parliament, the East African Legislative Assembly (EALA), European Parliament, Inter-Parliamentary Committee of the West African Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU), Parliament of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the Latin American Parliament (Parlatino), and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE).

The following three parliaments participated as Observers with a view to future affiliation: Brunei Darussalam, Fiji and Nauru.

Other Observers comprised representatives of: (i) the United Nations system: the United Nations, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health (PMNCH), the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), UN Women, the World Health Organization (WHO); (ii) the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI), the International Organization for Migration (IOM); (iii) the League of Arab States; (iv) the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly (JPA), the African Parliamentary Union (APU), the Arab Inter-Parliamentary Union (AIPU), the Asian Parliamentary Assembly (APA), the Global Organization of Parliamentarians against Corruption (GOPAC), the Maghreb Consultative Council, ParlAmericas, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (PABSEC), the Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean (PAM), the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE PA), Parliamentary Assembly of the Union of the Mediterranean (PA-UfM), the Parliamentary Assembly of the Union of Belarus and Russia, the Parliamentary Union of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation Member States (PUIC); (v) the Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria; (vi) Socialist International; (vii) the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA).

Of the 1,370 delegates who attended the Assembly, 678 were members of parliament. Those parliamentarians included 45 Presiding Officers, 46 Deputy Presiding Officers and 189 women (27.8%).

¹ For the complete list of IPU Members, see page 27

4. Choice of an emergency item

On 29 March, the President informed the Assembly that eight requests had been received to include an emergency item on the agenda, as follows:

- *Ensuring enhanced protection for the cultural heritage of humanity threatened with destruction or pillage by terrorist groups in the Middle East and North Africa: The role of the IPU and national parliaments*, proposed by Morocco;
- *Respect for religions and religious symbols, and for freedom of opinion and expression*, proposed by Jordan;
- *Addressing the criminal activity of Boko Haram: The role of parliamentarians*, proposed by Chad;
- *The role of the Inter-Parliamentary Union in addressing the terrorism and extremism of the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Al-Nusra Front and other terrorist groups*; proposed by the Syrian Arab Republic;
- *The role of the IPU in the face of attempts to violate the sovereignty and right to self-determination of Venezuela*, proposed by Venezuela;
- *The role of parliaments in combating the negative effects of climate change*, proposed by Kenya;
- *The role of parliaments in combating all terrorist acts perpetrated by organizations such as Daesh and Boko Haram against innocent civilians, in particular women and girls*, proposed by Australia and Belgium;
- *The role of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and Member Parliaments in combating terrorism and protecting the common heritage of humanity*; proposed by the Islamic Republic of Iran with the support of the Asia-Pacific Group.

The delegations of Morocco, Jordan and Venezuela withdrew their proposals before the vote. The delegation of Kenya withdrew its proposal and asked that it be referred to the Standing Committee on Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade.

The Assembly held a roll-call vote on the final list of four items (see pages 44-47). The proposal put forward jointly by Australia and Belgium, which had received the required two-thirds majority and the highest number of votes in favour, was adopted and added to the agenda as Item 9.

5. Debates and decisions of the Assembly and its Standing Committees

(a) General Debate: *The Sustainable Development Goals: Turning words into action*

The General Debate was introduced with keynote addresses by Ms. Tong Thi Phong, Vice President of the National Assembly of Viet Nam, Ms. A.J. Mohammed, Special Adviser to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on Post-2015 Development Planning, and Mr. S. Chowdhury, IPU President.

Ms. Tong Thi Phong said that, despite multiple difficulties and challenges, Viet Nam had achieved important results in implementing the MDGs, in particular those related to poverty reduction, gender equality and education. In order to attain the SDGs, to be adopted later in 2015, the role of parliaments in promulgating, amending and supplementing relevant national laws must be strengthened. At the same time, more effective cooperation would be required between the IPU and the United Nations, including on peace and security as a prerequisite for sustainable development. She called for the adoption of an outcome document from the 132nd Assembly, to be entitled “The Hanoi Declaration”, which would reflect the positions of parliaments with regard to post-2015 development objectives.

Ms. A.J. Mohammed said that the eventual agreement of Heads of State on the SDGs would afford a unique opportunity for a paradigm shift in international development. The breadth and depth of the set of 17 goals and 169 associated targets was unprecedented. They were designed to reinforce commitment to the unfinished business of the MDGs. New ground was being broken with goals on inequalities, economic growth, jobs, urbanization, energy, sustainable consumption and production patterns, climate change, environment, and peaceful society. The role of parliamentarians was crucial to ensure that the post-2015 development agenda would become a reality. In addition to being entrusted with the “power of the purse”, parliaments were key determinants in mobilizing means of implementation and enhancing accountability through legislative oversight. She expressed the hope that the 132nd IPU Assembly in Hanoi would be an occasion to renew the IPU's commitment to contributing to a stronger and more effective post-2015 development agenda.

The President of the IPU said that the SDGs should be seen as a response to multiple global problems that were inextricably interlinked and could be solved only if all actors worked together. Failure to overcome those problems would mean an inhospitable, overheated planet where only the rich could

afford to live comfortably, the economy would be driven into the ground because it would lose its resource base, and unimaginable inequality and human suffering would prevail. The SDGs were a roadmap to where the global community aspired to be in 15 years' time. Each country had a responsibility to identify ways and means to get there. The job of parliaments was to hold governments to account for their global commitment, and make sure that laws and budgets to be adopted were in line with national sustainable development plans. The Hanoi Declaration would feed into the Declaration of the Fourth World Conference of Speakers of Parliament, which in turn would be presented to the United Nations Summit.

The General Debate took place over the course of three days. Representatives of 101 Member Parliaments, two Associate Members and seven Permanent Observers took the floor.

In the morning of 30 March, Mr. Le Luong Minh, Secretary General of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) addressed the Assembly. In the afternoon of the same day, the Assembly heard Mr. Pham Binh Minh, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Viet Nam.

(b) Standing Committee on Peace and International Security

The Standing Committee on Peace and International Security held four sittings from 29 to 31 March, with its President, Mr. R. Tau (South Africa), in the Chair. The Standing Committee had before it an explanatory memorandum and draft resolution, entitled *Cyber warfare: A serious threat to peace and global security*, jointly prepared by the co-Rapporteurs, Mr. N. Lazrek (Morocco) and Mr. J.C. Mahía (Uruguay). It also had before it 149 proposed amendments to the draft resolution, submitted by 18 Member Parliaments and the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians.

At its first sitting, the Standing Committee discussed the explanatory memorandum and draft resolution, which were presented by the co-Rapporteurs. A total of 32 speakers took the floor during the discussion. The Standing Committee then went on to consider the proposed amendments to the draft in two plenary sittings. About 60 per cent of the proposed amendments were approved.

At its morning sitting on 31 March, the Standing Committee adopted the consolidated draft by consensus. Reservations were expressed by the delegations of Cuba and Venezuela. The Committee agreed that Ms. S. Taqawi (Bahrain) would present the draft resolution to the Assembly.

The draft resolution was submitted to the Assembly at its plenary sitting in the afternoon of 1 April, and adopted by consensus. Reservations were expressed by the delegation of Venezuela on account of the use of the term "cyber warfare".

Elections to the Bureau were held at the Standing Committee's second sitting, to allow the two newly elected Bureau members to attend the Bureau meeting the following day.

The Bureau met on 30 March to discuss the Standing Committee's next subject item and its work plan. Two potential subjects for discussion were considered, one on the global drug problem, proposed by Sweden and Mexico, and the other on terrorism, proposed by India. The Bureau opted to leave the choice of the next subject item to the plenary Committee, which decided, by a large majority, to address the issue of terrorism. That proposal was subsequently approved by the Assembly.

The Bureau agreed to focus on two activities during the 133rd IPU Assembly: an expert hearing on the subject item chosen for discussion by the Standing Committee, and a panel discussion on the one that had not been selected.

(c) Standing Committee on Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade

The Standing Committee on Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade held sittings on 29, 30 and 31 March with its President, Mr. R. León (Chile), in the chair. In addition to the explanatory memorandum and draft resolution prepared by the two co-Rapporteurs on the item, Mr. I. Cassis (Switzerland) and Mr. J.J. Mwiimbu (Zambia), the Committee had before it 70 proposed amendments to the resolution, presented by 15 Member Parliaments and nine submitted by the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians.

The Standing Committee's deliberations culminated in the acceptance of some of the proposed amendments and the approval of the consolidated draft resolution in its entirety.

Having approved the resolution, the Standing Committee held a discussion on *Follow-up on the IPU water governance resolution: Taking it forward*. Delegates from 21 countries took the floor, highlighting the importance of the IPU resolution as an important trigger for parliamentary action on the issue of water in the context of a global push to manage water supplies in a more responsible and sustainable manner. They agreed that the resolution provided a solid framework for each parliament to build on. Delegations were urged to bring the resolution to the attention of their parliaments and thereby further enhance awareness of the important points covered in that document.

At its final sitting on 31 March, the Standing Committee agreed on the proposal for its next subject item, *Ensuring lasting protection against destruction and deterioration for the tangible and intangible cultural heritage of humanity*. Belgium, which had proposed the subject item, nominated Mr. A. Destexhe as a co-Rapporteur. The Standing Committee asked the IPU President to carry out consultations with the Member Parliaments on the nomination of a second co-Rapporteur.

Due to a lack of quorum, the Standing Committee did not hold elections to fill the vacancies on its Bureau.

(d) Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights

The Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights held four sittings between 30 March and 1 April, with its President, Ms. F. Naderi (Afghanistan), in the chair.

At its first sitting, the Committee finalized the resolution on *International law as it relates to national sovereignty, non-intervention in the internal affairs of States and human rights*, resuming its work on the basis of the text as it had stood at the end of the 131st Assembly in October 2014. The President, accompanied by the co-Rapporteurs, Mr. A.J. Ahmad (United Arab Emirates) and Mr. P. Mahoux (Belgium), noted that the Standing Committee had held an extensive debate and examined the amendments to the draft resolution at the 131st Assembly. Consequently, no new amendments could be introduced and the debate that had taken place at the previous Assembly would not be reopened.

The Committee first voted on the procedure for finalizing the resolution. By 32 votes to 13, it decided to consider the resolution as a whole, rather than paragraph by paragraph.

The Committee subsequently voted on the substance of the resolution, and approved the text by 37 votes in favour and three against. Ten delegations abstained and five expressed reservations. The delegation of Cuba expressed reservations on operative paragraphs 14 and 19. The delegation of India expressed reservations on preambular paragraphs 6, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20 and 22 and operative paragraphs 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17 and 18. The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran expressed reservations on preambular paragraphs 5, 8 and 22 and operative paragraphs 7, 11, 16 and 21. The delegation of the Russian Federation expressed a reservation on operative paragraph 19. The delegation of Sudan expressed a reservation on operative paragraph 18.

At the final sitting of the Assembly on 1 April, the President of the Standing Committee presented the resolution for adoption by the Assembly. She informed the Assembly of the reservations formulated by the five delegations in the Standing Committee, and proposed that those reservations be reflected in the official records of the Assembly.

The delegations of Venezuela and Cuba took the floor to express concerns about the Committee's procedure, arguing that there should have been more time for debate and more opportunities to review the decisions taken by the drafting committee at the 131st Assembly. The delegation of India hoped that the resolution could be improved in the future.

The delegation of Sudan said that it rejected operative paragraph 18 because of its reference to the International Criminal Court, whose jurisdiction Sudan and the African Union did not recognize. Due to the inclusion of that paragraph, it was opposed to the resolution as a whole, and therefore questioned whether the resolution could be adopted "by consensus". The IPU Secretary General explained that resolutions could be adopted "unanimously" if no delegations voiced their opposition or reservations or otherwise "by consensus". The President of the Assembly therefore declared that the resolution had been adopted by consensus.

Concerning the other work of the Committee, the President informed the Committee at its first sitting on 30 March that, following consultations, the President of the IPU had nominated Mr. H. Jhun (Republic of Korea) as the second co-Rapporteur for the Committee's next resolution, *Democracy in the digital era and the threat to privacy and individual freedoms*. He would share that role with Ms. B. Jónsdóttir from Iceland, who had been appointed as co-Rapporteur at the 131st Assembly. The Committee approved the nomination of Mr. Jhun.

A preparatory debate for the next resolution took place on 1 April, moderated by Ms. Jónsdóttir and Mr. Jhun. Eighteen delegations took the floor. The President invited all members to submit their written contributions for the text of the resolution by 15 May.

On 31 March, the Committee held a debate to review progress since the adoption of the 2012 IPU resolution on *Access to health as a basic right: The role of parliaments in addressing key challenges to securing the health of women and children*.

At its last sitting on 1 April, the Committee also held an interactive debate to mark the 25th anniversary of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, entitled *The Convention on the Rights of the Child 25 years on: Are children's lives better?*

A report on those three interactive debates was presented to the Assembly by Mr. D. Pkosing Losiakou (Kenya), a member of the Committee's Bureau.

The Bureau met on 28 March to discuss the Standing Committee's agenda for the 132nd and 133rd Assemblies. The President informed the Committee that the 133rd Assembly would take place in Geneva in October 2015, rather than in Cartagena (Colombia) in November, as had been originally planned. That change might have an impact on the Committee's schedule. Two items had been foreseen for the agenda of the 133rd Assembly: the preparation of a resolution on *Democracy in the digital era and the threat to privacy and individual freedoms*, and an interactive debate on human trafficking and migration. Depending on decisions taken regarding the format of the Assembly, it might be necessary to postpone the interactive debate to the following Assembly.

Elections to the Bureau of the Committee were held at the Committee's sitting in the morning of 1 April. Two vacant posts were filled by the Arab Group and GRULAC respectively. The Committee was informed that two Bureau members from the Arab Group and one from the Twelve Plus Group would no longer be able to participate in the work of the Bureau, because they were no longer members of parliament or would no longer be part of the delegation to the IPU. Those members were therefore replaced by other parliamentarians from the same countries to serve the remainder of their term. One vacant post for the Eurasia Group remained unfilled. As the term of the Vice-President of the Committee expired at the 132nd Assembly, an election to fill that position from among the Bureau members would need to take place at the 133rd Assembly.

The Bureau also discussed potential themes for the next *Global Parliamentary Report* and was informed that an open consultation would be held on 1 April to garner a wider range of views from parliamentarians.

(e) Standing Committee on United Nations Affairs

The Standing Committee on United Nations Affairs held three sittings, one on 29 March and two on 31 March 2015, with its Vice-President, Mr. El Hassan Al Amin (Sudan), in the Chair.

At its first sitting, the Standing Committee held an interactive debate to mark the 70th anniversary of the United Nations. The session was opened with a keynote address by Mr. L. Montiel, Assistant Secretary-General, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, and contributions from two panellists, Ms. B. Bishop, Speaker of the House of Representatives of Australia and Mr. M. Tommasoli, Permanent Observer of International IDEA to the United Nations. The Standing Committee discussed whether the United Nations remained as relevant today as when it had been founded in 1945. It concluded that it was, in fact, more important than ever, given the many challenges facing the world, which could not be overcome by individual States acting in isolation.

At the Standing Committee's second sitting, Mr. D. Dawson (Canada) moderated a review of IPU field missions to examine interaction between United Nations country teams and national parliaments. Ms. S. Beavers, Policy Adviser, Inclusive Political Processes Team, UNDP, explained the new United Nations country team configurations and processes. Ms. S. Lyimo (United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. O. Kyei-Mensah-Bonsu (Ghana) presented the situation in their countries, and Standing Committee members shared their experiences.

At its third sitting, the Standing Committee heard from Ms. C. Roth (Germany), Ms. E. Nursantz (Indonesia) and Ms. L. Rojas (Mexico), how their parliaments would mainstream the SDGs. Mr. A. Motter, Senior Adviser, IPU, moderated the session in which participants held a lively discussion on the benefits and drawbacks of various initiatives to ensure that parliaments were fit for purpose to implement the post-2015 United Nations development agenda.

There were six vacancies on the Bureau of the Standing Committee, one each for the African, Twelve Plus and Arab Groups and three for the Eurasia Group. The Standing Committee accepted the following candidatures: Mr. D.G. Boko (Botswana), Mr. A. Avsan (Sweden), Mr. A.K. Azad (Bangladesh) and Mr. K. Kosachev (Russian Federation). Two vacancies remained for the Eurasia Group. Mr. Avsan was nominated by the Committee Bureau as President of the Standing Committee for election at the next session.

The Bureau met on 31 March to discuss the Standing Committee's work at the 133rd IPU Assembly in October 2015, and other potential work over the coming year. Bureau members agreed to seek to be included in their national delegations to the Fourth World Conference of Speakers of Parliament, which would be held in New York from 31 August to 2 September 2015, and to the UN Summit to adopt the post-2015 development agenda later in September. They were briefed on developments with regard to the post-2015 development agenda and the IPU's work with the United Nations. The Bureau agreed to meet during the 133rd Assembly in October 2015 in Geneva to mark the 10th anniversary of the UN Peacebuilding Commission, and discuss the universal jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. They were informed that the annual Parliamentary Hearing at the United Nations would take place early in 2016.

(f) Debate on and adoption of the emergency item

The role of parliaments in combating all terrorist acts perpetrated by organizations such as Daesh and Boko Haram against innocent civilians, in particular women and girls (Item 9)

The debate on the emergency item was held in the morning of Monday 30 March, with Mr. P. Burke (Ireland) in the chair.

After a brief presentation by the item's co-sponsors, the delegations of Australia and Belgium, 12 delegations took the floor. They were unanimous in reaffirming the urgent need to counter terrorism, which was affecting the lives of many innocent people, in particular women and children. Many expressed horror at the mass murders, kidnappings and brutal executions carried out by terrorist groups. Others lamented that young children were being deprived of their right to education. Many repeated that more international cooperation was needed to deny resources – money, arms and combatants – to terrorists. In that regard, they also underscored the urgent need to stop terrorist groups from recruiting young people via social networks. Some delegates, while calling for enhanced international cooperation on the exchange of information, also stressed the need to protect each citizen's right to privacy.

Various delegations recalled the important role of parliaments and parliamentarians in the fight against terrorism. Many young people, for example, continued to join terrorist organizations, and parliamentarians therefore had to take urgent action to address issues of concern to the younger generation and the root causes of terrorism. Ensuring good governance and eradicating corruption were other key factors in combating terrorism. Legislation had to be adopted so as to ensure those who were responsible for terrorist acts were held accountable and brought to justice.

Representatives from Muslim countries strongly condemned terrorist groups, particularly those invoking Islam as justification for their acts. They stressed that the acts and ideologies advocated by such groups were not recognized by Muslims, who pursued peace.

Participants from countries directly affected by terrorist groups called for international support to help them fight terrorism, emphasizing that they were ill-equipped to do so on their own. It was also proposed that the IPU share the resolution with the UN Security Council.

The Assembly adopted unanimously the resolution on the emergency item at its sitting on 31 March. Afterwards, several delegates took the floor on two issues: terminology and insufficient references to young people.

The delegations of Algeria, Chad, Qatar, Saudi Arabia (also speaking on behalf of Morocco), United Arab Emirates and Venezuela wished to clarify that the term “Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL)”, which was used in preambular paragraph 6 of the resolution, was not accurate and had far-reaching negative connotations for Islam, in particular for young Muslims. Moreover, ISIL was not a State, nor should it be acknowledged in any way that the group had any links to Islam. The delegations asked that the group’s self-proclaimed name of “Islamic State” be avoided, to prevent any misunderstandings. Furthermore, future IPU discussions on terrorism should endeavour to bring humanity together in the fight against terrorism.

The IPU President thanked the delegations for the clarification and confirmed that neither the resolution nor the IPU acknowledged that the groups concerned were in any way linked to Islam.

The delegations of Cambodia, Uganda and the United Arab Emirates regretted that the resolution did not refer sufficiently to young people, who were the social group most vulnerable to recruitment by terrorist groups. They suggested that a consultative mechanism be established to ensure that the Forum of Young Parliamentarians make inputs to future resolutions.

6. Concluding sitting

At its final sitting in the afternoon of 1 April, the Assembly had before it the results of the work of the Standing Committees, as well as the Hanoi Declaration – the outcome of the General Debate, *Sustainable Development Goals: Turning words into action*.

After the adoption of the resolutions and the presentation of the reports of the Standing Committees, the President of the Assembly invited the IPU President to present the Hanoi Declaration.

The President of the IPU highlighted the comprehensive and inclusive nature of the Assembly’s General Debate, as well as the key messages that had emerged from it, which were now included in the Hanoi Declaration. Those messages included the importance of a people-centred approach to sustainable development, the need for stronger parliaments with the capacity to ensure accountability, the need for global partnerships and common but differentiated responsibilities, as well as the critical importance of strong interaction between the United Nations, parliaments and the IPU in the implementation of the post-2015 development agenda.

The President added that the Hanoi Declaration, adopted unanimously by the Assembly (see page 29), would constitute a significant contribution to both the Fourth World Conference of Speakers of Parliament and the UN Summit in September 2015. He called on all parliaments to translate the Hanoi Declaration into action, by committing to take measures to attain the SDGs.

The Assembly took note of a report presented by Mr. F. Gutzwiller (Switzerland) on the field visit that had been organized to four infant and young child feeding centres in Viet Nam the previous day, 31 March, in which over 30 members of parliament had participated. A short video of the visit was then screened.

The Assembly concluded with statements from the following representatives of the Geopolitical Groups: Mr. M.C. Biadillah (Morocco) on behalf of the Africa Group, Mr. A. Al Tarawneh (Jordan) on behalf of the Arab Group, Ms. N. Marino (Australia) on behalf of the Asia-Pacific Group, Ms. I. Passada (Uruguay) on behalf of the Group of Latin America and Caribbean, and Mr. P. Mahoux (Belgium) on behalf of the Twelve Plus Group. They expressed their satisfaction with the Assembly, which had culminated in tangible and significant outcomes, as well as their deep appreciation for the warm hospitality and excellent arrangements provided by the host country, Viet Nam.

The President of the IPU reiterated his thanks to the Vietnamese hosts for ensuring the success of the Assembly.

The President of the National Assembly of Viet Nam, summing up the results of the Assembly, thanked all participants for their active involvement and declared the 132nd IPU Assembly closed.

196th Session of the Governing Council

1. Membership and Permanent Observers of the IPU

At its sitting on 29 March, the Governing Council was informed that there were no new applications for membership and no requests for observer status. The total membership therefore remained unchanged at 166.

On 1 April, the Council heard and endorsed a recommendation of the Executive Committee regarding the transitional parliaments in Burkina Faso and Thailand. It urged the two countries to adhere to their roadmap on the return to democracy and looked forward to welcoming the new parliaments by the time of the 134th Assembly.

2. Financial results for 2014

The Governing Council considered the Financial Report and Audited Financial Statements for 2014. For the third year running, the Financial Statements had been prepared in full compliance with the International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS). The accounts of the IPU and the closed Pension Fund had once again been consolidated into a single set of financial statements.

The financial results for 2014, introduced by Mr. R.M.K. Al Shariqi (United Arab Emirates) in his capacity as Chair of the Sub-Committee on Finance, showed that the IPU had recorded a total operating surplus of CHF 643,295. Savings of CHF 315,000 had been made in staffing and administrative costs, and IPSAS adjustments required for the closed Pension Fund and reserves had increased the surplus by a further CHF 328,000. As a result, the balance of the Working Capital Fund had increased to CHF 9 million at year-end, of which CHF 6.5 million represented available funds and the balance represented IPSAS accounting adjustments. Voluntary funding of CHF 2.6 million had been utilized for programme activities in 2014, representing an increase of 24 per cent compared to the previous year.

The Chair of the Sub-Committee on Finance also conveyed a request made by the Twelve Plus Group to reduce Members' assessed contributions by 10 per cent in 2016, a request which was reiterated by the French delegation. The request was duly noted by the Council and would be examined by the Sub-Committee on Finance during its work to prepare the 2016 consolidated budget of the IPU.

The Internal Auditor's report was presented by Mr. K. Örnfjäder (Sweden). He noted that the financial situation of the IPU was sound and the results positive, and that the Working Capital Fund had increased in 2014. In his opinion, the accounts accurately reflected the financial situation of the IPU and complied with all current legal rules. The External Auditor had expressed no reservations on the Financial Statements and was satisfied that the IPU had implemented all previous recommendations. Three recommendations were made relating to closing the Global Parliamentary Foundation for Democracy, the handling of a small advance payment by the Marshall Islands and the careful implementation of book-keeping controls. The Secretary General had confirmed his agreement to each of those recommendations and was already taking steps for their implementation.

The Internal Auditor noted that the IPU's revenues had increased significantly thanks to the voluntary funds mobilized and used in 2014. He was encouraged to see that arrears of contributions had been reduced, both in value and age.

On the recommendation of the Internal Auditor, the Governing Council approved the Secretary General's financial administration of the IPU and the financial results for 2014.

3. Financial situation

The Governing Council received an overview of the IPU's financial situation at 31 January 2015 and noted that the financial position remained sound. The overall level of expenditure was on track at 101 per cent of the year-to-date budget. Arrears in assessed contributions amounted to only CHF 268,000, the lowest for many years, with only a very few Members having overdue accounts.

4. Cooperation with the United Nations system

The Council took note of activities undertaken in cooperation with the United Nations system since the 131st Assembly (see list on page 51). The Secretary General drew attention to the IPU's systematic interaction with the United Nations and its Member States in the context of the global talks on the post-2015 development agenda and the accompanying political Declaration. The outcome document of the 132nd IPU Assembly, the Hanoi Declaration, would constitute a major contribution to the Fourth World Conference of Speakers of Parliament and to the UN Summit in September 2015.

The IPU had continued to promote a robust parliamentary contribution to other major global processes, such as through preparatory work for and parliamentary meetings during the Second International Conference on Nutrition (Rome, November 2014), the United Nations Climate Change Conference (Lima, December 2014), the Third International Conference on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons (Vienna, December 2014), and the Third United Nations World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction (Sendai, March 2015).

The Council was also informed of progress in drafting the new Cooperation Agreement between the United Nations and the IPU, as requested by IPU Members and the UN General Assembly (resolution 68/272). Further to work done by the Sub-Committee on the future IPU-UN Cooperation Agreement, a first draft had been circulated to all Member Parliaments in advance of the 132nd Assembly. Amendments and other inputs from several parliaments (Australia, Bahrain, Burundi, Croatia, Germany, Lithuania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand and Sudan) had been reviewed by the Sub-Committee, and subsequently endorsed by the Executive Committee. At its last sitting on 1 April, the Council endorsed the new text, which would henceforth serve as the basis for consultations with the United Nations. Members would be briefed on further progress in negotiations on the Cooperation Agreement at the 133rd IPU Assembly in October 2015.

5. Implementation of the IPU Strategy for 2012-2017

In the context of discussions on the implementation of Strategic Objective 1, *Strengthen democracy through parliaments*, the Council took note of the fact that about 45 parliaments, three parliamentary assemblies and 12 partner organizations had formally endorsed the *Common Principles for Support to Parliament* by 1 April 2015. (See page 22 for the formal launch). The Council was also apprised of consultations underway on possible themes for the next *Global Parliamentary Report* and Members were invited to contribute actively to its preparation. It further received information about the IPU's efforts to involve young people in democracy through parliament. The ultimate objective was to boost the representativeness and inclusiveness of parliaments and work against age discrimination.

With regard to the implementation of Strategic Objective 2, *Advancing Gender Equality*, the Council reviewed achievements made between September 2014 and February 2015. Two publications had been issued for the Beijing+20 review: *Women in Parliament: 20 years in review* and the *Map on Women in Politics 2015*, produced jointly with UN Women. Capacity-building activities had been organized in Côte d'Ivoire and Tunisia for women parliamentarians. In order to advance implementation of the IPU Plan of Action for Gender-sensitive Parliaments, assistance had been provided to the Mexican Senate for a gender-sensitivity self-assessment. Together with the Parliament of Bangladesh, the IPU had organized a regional seminar for Asia-Pacific parliaments on ending violence against girls. It had also helped organize a parliamentary training workshop in Mali on addressing violence against women and girls.

The Council was informed of plans to examine from a parliamentary perspective the implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action 20 years after their adoption. In March 2015, together with UN Women, the IPU had organized the annual Parliamentary Meeting on the occasion of the 59th session of the Commission on the Status of Women, devoted to Beijing+20. Activities during the 132nd IPU Assembly included an event on the views of men on achieving the vision of Beijing (see page 22) and the celebration of the 30th anniversary of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians (see page 22). In order to galvanize political support for gender equality and the commitments to the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, the Council had also decided to support UN Women's global campaign to mark Beijing+20, *Empowering Women – Empowering Humanity: Picture It!*

The Council also decided to endorse the Call to Action adopted at the meeting of women leaders convened jointly by the President of Chile and UN Women.

Under Strategic Objective 6, *Contribute to peacebuilding and conflict prevention*, having noted the Secretary General's report on his mission to Syria, the Governing Council authorized a fact-finding parliamentary mission to be dispatched to Syria and the continued provision of capacity-building assistance to the Syrian Parliament. The Council also authorized the Secretary General to pursue consultations with a view to promoting inter-Korean dialogue and parliamentary cooperation.

6. Recent specialized meetings

The Governing Council took note of the results of the nine specialized meetings organized by the IPU between 15 October 2014 and 15 March 2015. Seven of those meetings were global in scope and two regional. They addressed a wide variety of issues, including security, human rights, children's rights, gender equality, nutrition, climate change, international trade and disaster risk preparedness. The meetings were held in eight different countries. The full texts of the relevant reports are available on the IPU website:

- Regional Seminar on *Promoting child nutrition in Asia* (4-6 November 2014, Vientiane, Lao People's Democratic Republic) - [http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7\(a\)-r1.pdf](http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7(a)-r1.pdf)
- Parliamentary Meeting at the Second International Conference on Nutrition (18 November 2014, Rome, Italy) - [http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7\(b\)-r1.pdf](http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7(b)-r1.pdf)
- Annual Parliamentary Hearing at the United Nations (19-20 November 2014, New York, USA) - [http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7\(c\)-r1.pdf](http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7(c)-r1.pdf)
- Parliamentary Meeting on the occasion of the United Nations Climate Change Conference (8 December 2014, Lima, Peru) - [http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7\(d\)-r1.pdf](http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7(d)-r1.pdf)
- Parliamentary Roundtable during the Vienna Conference on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons (9 December 2014, Vienna, Austria) - [http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7\(e\)-r1.pdf](http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7(e)-r1.pdf)
- Annual 2015 session of the Parliamentary Conference on the WTO (16-17 February 2015, Geneva, Switzerland) - [http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7\(f\)-r1.pdf](http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7(f)-r1.pdf)
- Regional Seminar for Asia-Pacific parliaments on *Translating international human rights commitments into national realities: The contribution of parliament to the work of the United Nations Human Rights Council* (26-27 February 2015, Manila, Philippines) - [http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7\(g\)-r1.pdf](http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7(g)-r1.pdf)
- Parliamentary Meeting on the occasion of the 59th session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women, *Parliaments for gender equality: Priorities for Beijing+20 and beyond* (11 March 2015, New York, USA) - [http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7\(h\)-r1.pdf](http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7(h)-r1.pdf)
- Parliamentary Meeting at the Third UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction (13 March 2015, Sendai, Japan) - [http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7\(i\)-r1.pdf](http://www.ipu.org/cnl-e/196/7(i)-r1.pdf)

7. Reports of plenary bodies and specialized committees

At its sitting on 1 April, the Governing Council took note of the reports on the activities of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians (see page 17), the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (see page 18), the Committee on Middle East Questions (see page 19), the Group of Facilitators for Cyprus (see page 19), the Committee to Promote Respect for International Humanitarian Law (oral report), the Gender Partnership Group (see page 20), the Advisory Group on HIV/AIDS and Maternal, Newborn and Child Health (see page 20), and the Forum of Young Parliamentarians (see page 21). It also approved the 12 decisions submitted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians, noting the reservations expressed by the delegations of Belarus, Malaysia and the Maldives concerning the cases in their respective countries.

8. Future inter-parliamentary meetings

The Governing Council took note that, for financial reasons, the Parliament of Colombia was no longer in a position to host the 133rd IPU Assembly. It approved the recommendation of the Executive Committee that the 133rd Assembly should instead take place at the Geneva International Conference Centre (CICG) from 17 to 21 October 2015. In view of the limited availability of meeting rooms at the CICG during that period, the programme of the forthcoming Assembly would have to be condensed, with some meetings taking place at IPU Headquarters.

The Governing Council approved the list of future meetings to be organized by the IPU with funding provided from either the IPU's regular budget or external sources (see page 57). It noted Pakistan's request to host a regional seminar on terrorism and human rights. Details of that event would be worked out in consultation with the host Parliament.

The Governing Council was informed of the status of preparations for the Fourth World Conference of Speakers of Parliament, to be held in New York from 31 August to 2 September 2015. The Council urged all Conference participants requiring an entry visa for the United States to take the necessary steps without delay and to keep the IPU Secretariat informed of any complications.

9. Amendments to the Statutes and Rules

In conformity with Article 23 of the Statutes, the Governing Council approved an amendment to the Rules and Practices of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians pertaining to the definition of the quorum required by the Committee to carry out its functions (see page 50).

271st session of the Executive Committee

The Executive Committee held its 271st session on 26, 27 and 31 March 2015. The President of the IPU chaired the meetings. The following members took part: Ms. Z. Drif Bitat (Algeria), Mr. V. Senko (Belarus) on 31 March, Mr. R. del Picchia (France), Mr. B. Fabritius, substituting for Mr. N. Lammert (Germany) on 26 and 31 March, and Mr. N. Lammert on 27 March, Ms. N. Motsamai (Lesotho), Ms. M. Mensah-Williams (Namibia), Mr. N. Schrijver (Netherlands), substituting for Mr. K. Dijkhoff, who was no longer a member of parliament, Mr. M.R. Rabbani (Pakistan), Mr. F. Drilon (Philippines), Ms. R. Kadaga (Uganda), Mr. R.M.K Al Shariqi (United Arab Emirates), Mr. R. Walter (United Kingdom), Ms. I. Passada (Uruguay) and Mr. D. Vivas (Venezuela). Mr. S. Suzuki (Japan) attended on 31 March, substituting for Mr. M. Uesugi (Japan), who was no longer a member of parliament.

At its sitting on 26 March, the Executive Committee examined the situation of a number of countries in which parliament had either been dissolved or a transitional legislative body had been established, including Burkina Faso and Thailand. At its last sitting on 31 March, the Executive Committee decided to recommend that the Governing Council urge Burkina Faso and Thailand to adhere to the agreed timeframe for the return to normal constitutional rule. The Executive Committee decided to continue to monitor the situation in those two countries. It expressed the wish to welcome the new parliaments of both countries by the time of the 134th Assembly in March 2016. It did not recommend any change of status regarding the membership of those two parliaments.

The Executive Committee took note of the report on the Secretary General on his exploratory mission to Syria earlier in the year. It recommended that a full-fledged parliamentary fact-finding mission be dispatched to Syria within three months. Based on the resolution adopted on the crisis in Syria at the 126th IPU Assembly, the overall purpose of the mission should be to examine the humanitarian situation arising from the conflict. The composition of the mission would be established in consultation with the Geopolitical Groups, the Committee on Middle East Questions and the Committee to Promote Respect for International Humanitarian Law.

The Executive Committee entrusted the Secretariat with drawing up the terms of reference of the mission, which would be finalized through e-mail exchanges with its members. The Committee also recommended that the IPU continue to provide assistance to the Parliament of Syria in order to strengthen the latter's capacity to effectively represent the Syrian people.

The Committee was informed of the Secretary General's attempts to build on previous IPU efforts to promote cooperation and dialogue between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea in order to foster a climate that was conducive to reunification. It requested him to pursue consultations to that end.

The Executive Committee heard the report of the Sub-Committee on Finance, which recommended that the Executive Committee approve the audit report and approve the Secretary General's financial administration for 2014, as well as the 2014 Financial Results. It examined reports on the Financial Results, the External Auditor's Report, the Financial Situation and the 2016 budget and took note of the report on the mobilization of voluntary funding.

The Sub-Committee on Finance had met on 25 March to prepare and facilitate the Executive Committee's consideration of financial and budgetary matters. It examined the Financial Results for 2014, the External Auditor's Report and the Financial Situation of the IPU. It had been pleased to note that the IPU's accounts were again fully IPSAS-compliant and that net assets had increased. The IPU was in a sound financial position overall, posting a net surplus for 2014 of CHF 0.64 million. The Sub-Committee had noted with satisfaction the higher level of voluntary contributions from a broad range of new and existing donors.

The Sub-Committee on Finance took note of a request made by the Twelve Plus Group to reduce Members' assessed contributions by 10 per cent in 2016. It was agreed that the request would be conveyed to the governing bodies and would be examined by the Sub-Committee during its detailed work in preparing the 2016 consolidated budget of the IPU.

The Executive Committee took note of the preparations under way for the Fourth World Conference of Speakers of Parliament. It heard a report by the Sub-Committee on the future IPU-UN Cooperation Agreement, which had received and examined a number of amendments to the draft. The Executive Committee approved the revised draft and recommended that the Council endorse it as a basis for negotiations with the United Nations.

The Executive Committee also took note of the change of venue of the 133rd Assembly from Cartagena to Geneva due to the Colombian parliamentary authorities' withdrawal of their invitation to host the Assembly for financial reasons, largely due to the drop in oil prices. It recommended that the Assembly take place from 17 to 21 October 2015 with a four-day format whereby the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians would be held on-site and would not clash with any meeting of the Geopolitical Groups. The Committee noted with concern the dearth of hosts of future IPU Assemblies and the difficulty of organizing such an event in a European Union (EU) Member State due to visa sanctions. It was apprised of the efforts deployed by the Secretary General to reach out to the EU authorities and garner the support of the European members of the Twelve Plus Group for a possible collective or individual exemption to the travel ban.

The Executive Committee was also informed of Venezuela's views on the recent Executive Order issued by US President Obama declaring Venezuela a threat to US national security. The Committee took note of Venezuela's position.

The Executive Committee was also informed of staff movements. Ms. N. Babic (an Irish national) had been promoted to the post of Manager of the Technical Cooperation Programme at the P4 level. Following the departure of a programme officer in the Gender Programme, the process for recruiting a replacement had been initiated and was nearing completion. A female Brazilian national was being considered for the post. The members sent wishes for a speedy recovery to Ms. A. Lorber-Willis, Director of the Division for Support Services, who was on extended medical leave.

Meeting and Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians

The 21st Meeting of Women Parliamentarians took place on 28 March 2015. It was attended by 93 delegates from 67 countries and representatives of various international organizations.

The deliberations started with the election of Ms. Nguyen Thi Kim Ngan, Deputy Speaker of the National Assembly of Viet Nam, as President of the Meeting. The Speaker of the National Assembly of Viet Nam, Mr. Nguyen Sinh Hung, and the President of the IPU, Mr. S. Chowdhury, welcomed the participants and congratulated the Meeting on its 30th anniversary.

Ms. F. Al Farsi (Oman) summed up the work of the two most recent sessions of the Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians, held during the 131st and 132nd Assemblies. Ms. R. Kadaga (Uganda) presented the report of the Gender Partnership Group (see page 20).

The participants heard a presentation on the 2015 edition of the *Women in Politics Map* (http://www.ipu.org/pdf/publications/wmnmap15_en.pdf) and *Women in Parliament: 20 years in review* (<http://www.ipu.org/pdf/publications/WIP20Y-en.pdf>).

As their contribution to the Assembly's proceedings, the participants examined, from the point of view of gender equality, the items on the agendas of the Standing Committees on Peace and International Security and Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade.

The participants were divided into two working groups, one on each item. Ms. S. Atallahjan (Canada) and Ms. M. Mensah-Williams (Namibia) were elected as president and rapporteur respectively of the first group, and Ms. M. André (France) as president and rapporteur of the second group. The groups' reports resulted in proposed amendments to the draft resolutions of both Standing Committees.

The Meeting also marked its 30th anniversary with a speech by Ms. Nguyen Thi Kim Ngan and a presentation by the IPU Secretary General. It adopted and signed a call for action by parliamentarians to use their power to create a better world for women and girls – *My Power for Women's Power* (see page 56).

A panel discussion on Beijing+20 provided an opportunity to review implementation of the Beijing commitments and to define new objectives. The panellists were Ms. R. Kadaga (Uganda), Ms. C. Roth (Germany), Ms. A.J. Mohammed, UN Secretary-General's Special Advisor on Post-2015 Development Planning, and Ms. B. Lasagabaster, acting Director of the Policy Division, UN Women.

The discussion focused on the progress made on women's rights, gender equality and the presence of women in decision-making and leadership positions. It also covered the difficulties that remained, in particular discriminatory social norms and stereotypes, financial constraints, mounting conservatism and unwillingness to promote the rights of women and girls. The place of women in strategic positions, particularly in the financial sector, and women's participation at the local level must be enhanced.

The active contribution of parliaments was indispensable to ensuring that the priority principles of the Beijing Platform for Action were incorporated into legislative and oversight processes, in particular the budget process. Parliaments also had an essential role to play in ensuring that their respective governments honoured commitments made. Parliaments had to be encouraged to take legislative initiatives, private members' bills having proven to be an effective means of prompting government action on certain gender issues. Advocacy and educational initiatives aimed at changing stereotypes and attitudes were also needed.

The Meeting discussed the potential duplication of efforts that resulted from the emergence of other actors such as the Women in Parliaments Global Forum (WIP). It decided to engage with those actors with a view to avoiding overlap.

The 35th session of the Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians was held on 28 and 31 March. It discussed strategies for enhancing the role of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians, and decided to submit to the Meeting's next session a set of amendments to the Rules of the Meeting and its own Rules, with a view to increasing the Meeting's visibility, facilitating its functioning and improving gender mainstreaming at the IPU.

Subsidiary bodies of the Governing Council

1. Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

Mr. F.K. Chowdhury (Bangladesh), Mr. B. Fabritius (Germany), Mr. A.A. Gueye (Senegal), Mr. K. Jalali (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. J.-P. Letelier (Chile) and Ms. M. Kiener Nellen (Switzerland) took part in the Committee's 147th session, which was held from 27 to 31 March 2015. Ms. A. Clwyd (United Kingdom), Ms. C. Giaccone (Argentina), Ms. I. Stoejberg (Denmark), and Mr. B. Mbuku Laka (Democratic Republic of the Congo) were unable to attend.

During the session, the Committee held 10 hearings with delegations and complainants to enhance its understanding of the cases before it and convey its concerns. It examined 39 cases relating to the situation of 178 parliamentarians in 24 countries. Of those cases, 46 per cent concerned parliamentarians from Asia, 23 per cent parliamentarians from the Middle East and North Africa, 18 per cent parliamentarians from Africa, 8 per cent parliamentarians from the Americas and 5 per cent parliamentarians from Europe. Twelve per cent involved women and nearly 74 per cent opposition members. While freedom of expression was a matter of direct or indirect concern in most cases, the violations most frequently considered by the Committee during the session were arbitrary arrest and detention, failure to respect fair-trial guarantees, and acts of torture, ill-treatment and other forms of violence inflicted on parliamentarians.

The Committee submitted 12 decisions to the Governing Council for adoption concerning the following countries: Belarus, Kenya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Palestine/Israel, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda and Zambia.

The Committee also examined cases concerning parliamentarians from other countries. It decided that there was no need to submit decisions to the Governing Council at that point, since its existing concerns remained valid for most of them and it required more extensive information to reach a decision in the others.

2. Committee on Middle East Questions

The Committee held two sittings, on 28 and 31 March, including a hearing with the Speakers of the Parliaments of Jordan and Syrian Arab Republic. The President of the IPU addressed the Committee at its second sitting, reporting on the Executive Committee's discussion of the Secretary General's exploratory mission to Syria. He informed the Committee that the Executive Committee had decided to dispatch a parliamentary fact-finding mission to Syria within three months. It wished to include members of the Committee on Middle East Questions in its delegation. The terms of reference of the mission had yet to be established.

The Committee suggested that its President and one of its members, Ms. M. Green, should participate in the fact-finding mission, and said that the terms of reference should stipulate that the delegation should comprise men and women, a balanced representation of the Geopolitical Groups, and members of the Committee to Promote Respect for International Humanitarian Law. The terms of reference should incorporate a humanitarian element and should be broadened to ensure that the mission involved all parties to the conflict.

The Committee reaffirmed that its mandate included the wider Middle East context while still giving due attention to the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. The Committee stressed the importance of encouraging cooperation between the parliaments of Israel and Palestine. In that regard, a series of roundtable discussions would be held to assess possible areas for cooperation, the first of which would be on the subject of water, and should include not only representatives of Israel and Palestine, but also other countries in the region. The Committee agreed that the first roundtable would be held in Jordan, and expressed a wish to combine the event with a visit to Jerusalem and Ramallah.

3. Group of Facilitators for Cyprus

The Group of Facilitators met on 31 March 2015. The meeting was attended by the two Facilitators, Mr. P. Burke (Ireland) and Ms. R. Albernaz (Portugal), four members of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus and four representatives of the Turkish Cypriot political parties.

The parties appreciated the opportunity to engage in continued dialogue and expressed resolute support for a solution that would benefit all Cypriots. They were strongly in favour of resuming talks that would lead to a lasting and viable solution for the unification of Cyprus based on a bizonal, bicommunal federation and political equality, in accordance with the relevant UN resolutions and the values and principles of the European Union. They hoped that such a solution would be found and welcomed the fact that the Group of Facilitators would continue to meet.

4. Committee to Promote Respect for International Humanitarian Law

The Committee met on 29 March. As it did not have the necessary quorum to take decisions, it held an informal meeting which was chaired by its President, Ms. G. Cuevas (Mexico). Representatives from the ICRC and UNHCR also took part.

The Committee heard a presentation on the overall situation of refugees in the world. The most dire refugee situation was currently in Syria and neighbouring countries, which accounted for more than 3.9 million refugees. Other countries also gave cause for concern, including the Central African Republic and South Sudan.

The Committee discussed the various difficulties in providing adequate assistance to refugees and highlighted the importance of securing sufficient funding for operations, coordination with the relevant countries and national partners, as well as monitoring and oversight. The question of growing security challenges faced by humanitarian aid workers was also raised as a major concern which prevented the delivery of humanitarian assistance to those in need.

The Committee also discussed ongoing projects, which included the organization of a parliamentary conference on nationality and statelessness with UNHCR, the update of the IPU-UNHCR Handbook on refugee protection and the update of the IPU-UNHCR Handbook on International Humanitarian Law.

The Committee discussed at length its mandate and working methods and the various actions it should take within the framework of IPU Assemblies as well as in-between Assemblies. It decided to dedicate its next session in Geneva to an in-depth discussion on that topic.

5. Gender Partnership Group

The Gender Partnership Group held its 35th session on 27 and 31 March 2015. The session was attended by Ms. R. Kadaga (Uganda), Mr. R.M.K. Al Shariqi (United Arab Emirates) and Ms. I. Passada (Uruguay).

The Group reviewed the composition of the delegations present at the 132nd IPU Assembly. Of the 675 parliamentary delegates present, 189 (27.8%) were women. At that level, representation of women delegates at the 132nd Assembly was the lowest in four years. Of the 128 delegations present, 117 were composed of at least two delegates. Of those, 16 were composed exclusively of men (13.7%) and one (Mauritania) exclusively of women. The all-male delegations were from the parliaments of the following countries: Bulgaria, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Estonia, Haiti, Italy, Kuwait, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Maldives, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), the Netherlands, Palau, Qatar and Romania. Five delegations were subject to sanctions at the Assembly for being represented exclusively by men more than three times in a row: Kuwait, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Papua New Guinea and Qatar.

The Group noted that the average proportion of women at IPU meetings was stagnating below 30 per cent and discussed how to break that glass ceiling and enhance women's participation at the IPU. In particular, it considered how to ensure that both sexes were equally represented in delegations and that gender parity was mainstreamed as a common standard throughout the IPU's Statutes and Rules.

In its review of parliaments with few or no women members, the Group noted that five parliamentary chambers currently had no women members. Three were in the Pacific (Federated States of Micronesia, Palau (lower house) and Vanuatu), one in the Arab region (Qatar) and one in Latin America and the Caribbean (Senate of Haiti).

On Tuesday 31 March, the Group met with the delegation of Palau, which it encouraged to reflect on strategies for enhancing women's participation in both houses of parliament and offered its support to the National Congress of Palau. The Group also urged Palau to ratify the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, which it had signed in 2011.

Lastly, the Group agreed that the forthcoming Fourth World Conference of Speakers of Parliament (31 August – 2 September 2015, New York) and Tenth Meeting of Women Speakers of Parliament would provide golden opportunities for adopting a strong statement recognizing the work of the IPU on gender equality.

6. Advisory Group on HIV/AIDS and Maternal, Newborn and Child Health

The Advisory Group met on Saturday 28 March. The meeting was chaired by Ms. L. Davies (Canada), the Group's President, and attended by Mr. F. Ndugulile (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. V. Suarez (Dominican Republic) and Mr. K. Solanki (India), as well as by representatives of UNAIDS, WHO and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis.

The Advisory Group discussed its strategic engagement in the post-2015 period. It agreed to continue addressing barriers to access to services, especially legislative obstacles. Laws that criminalized the behaviour of men who had sex with men, sex workers and injecting drug users for example had led to higher HIV infection rates in those groups, while rates in the general population continued to fall. In the area of women's health, discriminatory laws contributed to poor reproductive health outcomes.

In that context, the Advisory Group recommended that the IPU be actively involved in the forthcoming UNAIDS global *Zero Discrimination Initiative*, which would target laws preventing access to HIV testing and services, discrimination in health settings and access to justice. UNAIDS saw parliaments as key

partners in addressing discriminatory laws and practices, and the IPU Advisory Group as a key advocate for the initiative. The Advisory Group proposed that a cooperation agreement be drafted by the UNAIDS and IPU Secretariats and include financial support enabling the IPU to perform that task.

The IPU should provide parliamentary input to consultations on three global strategies currently being developed by WHO: on women's, children's and adolescents' health; on HIV, viral hepatitis and sexually transmitted infections; and on violence against women and children.

Cooperation with WHO in the area of accountability for women's and children's health had yielded many useful results in countries with the highest maternal and child mortality rates. It was imperative that good practices be replicated in other countries facing similar challenges and the IPU should continue to receive financial and technical support for that purpose.

7. Forum of Young Parliamentarians

The Forum met on Sunday 29 March. The meeting was chaired by its President, Mr. F. Al Tenajji (United Arab Emirates).

A total of 50 participants attended, of whom 26 per cent were women. The average age of the participants was 38, which was higher than at the previous Assembly in Geneva.

The deliberations focused on the Forum's contribution to the work of the 132nd Assembly, in particular that of the Standing Committees on Peace and International Security, and Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade.

Members noted that the proposals for an emergency item to be discussed by the Assembly, many of which addressed the subject of terrorism, were particularly relevant from the perspective of young people, who were often the target of terrorist groups, either as recruits or victims. As such, young people should also be part of the solution. Young parliamentarians should participate in the debate and make efforts to ensure that the draft resolution on the emergency item reflected a youth perspective.

The IPU's support for youth participation was contributing to the Forum's visibility and to filling gaps in knowledge and data on youth participation in parliament. The members of the Forum were invited by Mr. T. Shimizu (Japan) to take part in the IPU Global Conference of Young Parliamentarians in Tokyo in May 2015.

The Board of the Forum agreed to hold its next meeting in Tokyo, one day before the Conference of Young Parliamentarians.

Other events

1. Meeting of the Presidents of the Geopolitical Groups

In the morning of 28 March, the President and the Secretary General of the IPU met with the Presidents of the Geopolitical Groups to discuss implementation of IPU reform and outstanding issues relating to the organization of work during and in-between IPU Assemblies.

Participants included Mr. M. Al Ghanim (Kuwait) President of the Arab Group, Mr. R. León (Chile), President of the Group of Latin America and the Caribbean, Mr. P. Mahoux (Belgium), President of the Twelve Plus Group and Mr. K. N'zi, Secretary General of the African Parliamentary Union, on behalf of the African Group. The President of the Asia-Pacific Group sent his apologies as he was required to attend another meeting. The Secretary General gave an overview of matters that were currently before the Assembly, such as the SDGs, disaster risk reduction and climate change, the Fourth World Conference of Speakers of Parliament and the revised IPU-UN Cooperation Agreement. Other matters being dealt with as a matter of priority included increasing membership, ensuring more effective monitoring and reporting by IPU Members, and efforts to secure a sounder funding base.

The President of the IPU provided an overview of his activities since his election in October 2014. He was looking forward to working closely with the Presidents of the Geopolitical Groups to enhance the effectiveness and visibility of the IPU. A number of vacancies in the IPU's main bodies were to be filled during the 132nd Assembly and he underscored the need for the groups to submit the candidatures of parliamentarians who were both knowledgeable and available to take up those roles both during and between Assemblies, and who had the support of their national parliaments, in particular with regard to their inclusion in national delegations to IPU Assemblies.

In order to improve communication and cooperation with and among the Geopolitical Groups, it was decided that the IPU Secretariat should prepare a note on the Groups' roles and responsibilities. The groups could play a more active role in engaging with non-member parliaments from their regions, and in serving as a bridge between those parliaments and the IPU. Since the meetings between the President and the Secretary General of the IPU and the Presidents of the Geopolitical Groups were so valuable, it was agreed that they would be convened on a regular basis, in advance of each IPU Assembly.

2. 30th anniversary of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians

On the occasion of the 132nd Assembly, the IPU celebrated the 30th anniversary of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians, which had been instituted in Lomé in 1985.

With the Meeting's establishment, women parliamentarians had created a space of their own that they had since improved and turned into a key vehicle for promoting women and gender equality. Thirty years on, the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians had unquestionably prompted profound changes, both at the IPU and at the global and national levels. It had served as a powerful instrument of reform, leading to the transformation of persons, institutions and processes.

The IPU Meeting of Women Parliamentarians was the first global forum for women parliamentarians. Throughout the years it had been an effective mechanism for enabling women parliamentarians to articulate their views and concerns. It had also had a major impact on citizens' lives by encouraging reform and providing support to parliaments on issues such as violence against women. The Meeting had also contributed greatly to bolstering women's participation in national parliaments by promoting and supporting legislative reform, advocacy and empowerment. Most importantly, the Meeting had placed the question of gender equality high on the IPU's agenda.

The 30th anniversary of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians had been celebrated during the Meeting's session and in the Assembly plenary, at a special ceremony held on Monday 30 March. Ms. Nguyen Thi Kim Ngan, President of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians, Mr. Nguyen Sinh Hung, Speaker of the National Assembly of Viet Nam, Mr. S. Chowdhury, IPU President, and Ms. Nguyen Thi Doan, Vice-President of Viet Nam, delivered keynote speeches.

Ms. M. Mensah-Williams (Namibia), President of the Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians, then read out a call for action, *My Power for Women's Power* (see page 56). It appealed to parliamentarians to use their power to create a better world for women and girls.

3. Launch of the *Common Principles for Support to Parliaments*

On Wednesday 1 April, during the Governing Council's morning sitting, a ceremony was held to launch the *Common Principles for Support to Parliaments*. Mr. P. Herminie, Speaker of the National Assembly of the Seychelles, moderated a panel that comprised representatives of the European Parliament, the French National Assembly, the National Democratic Institute (USA) and UNDP.

The panel emphasized the importance of strong partnerships, inclusiveness, coordination and sustainability when providing support to parliaments. The participants observed that the *Common Principles* were intended to provide a summary of the most important aspects of parliamentary development and guidelines when designing and managing effective parliamentary support. They were also intended to assist partners engaged in parliamentary support in working with parliaments with greater relevance and effectiveness.

By the end of the 132nd Assembly, the *Common Principles for Support to Parliaments* had received close to 80 endorsements (including 45 parliaments and 59 individual chambers, three parliamentary assemblies and 12 partner organizations).

4. *Achieving the vision of Beijing: The views of men*

Twenty years since the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action had called for "gender balance", women remained a significant minority among political leaders. Increasing women's political participation and leadership required a number of prerequisites, the most important being political will.

Men in leadership roles, in particular parliamentarians, were key allies in efforts to enhance women's participation and advance gender equality. In cases where men had prioritized gender equality, results had been yielded. Male parliamentarians had acted to promote gender equality in three key areas:

men's support for legislative initiatives and sponsorship of gender equality legislation; the appointment of men as leaders and members of parliamentary bodies for gender mainstreaming; and the involvement of men in public activities and outreach to raise awareness of women's rights and gender equality, such as public consultations and activities to mark International Women's Day.

On 29 March 2015, the IPU and UN Women jointly organized a panel discussion on men's views on gender equality. The discussion provided an opportunity to reflect on the contributions of men to realizing the vision and commitments agreed in Beijing. The IPU Secretary General made introductory remarks, followed by panellists Mr. H.M. Hue (Viet Nam), Mr. G. Monde (Zambia) and Lord Dholakia (United Kingdom). The discussion was moderated by Ms. B. Amongi (Uganda). Particular attention was paid to the roles and responsibilities of men in changing attitudes and addressing social stereotypes, as well as the need for political parties to support women's access to parliament. Men parliamentarians were encouraged to engage in UN Women's "HeForShe" campaign.

5. Consultation on the updated Global Strategy for Women's, Children's and Adolescents' Health

The IPU, WHO and the Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health organized a side event on 31 March to brief parliamentarians on the updated Global Strategy for Women's, Children's and Adolescents' Health.

Although parliamentarians had not been significantly involved in the development of either the first Global Strategy or the MDGs, in recent years they had played a critical role in efforts to improve women's and children's health and in the shaping of the SDGs. That had prompted many countries to implement stronger accountability mechanisms for reviewing progress and protecting rights, including in cooperation with civil society and development partners. Robust budget oversight, combined with legislative reviews and effective advocacy, were essential to protecting and promoting the health of women and children.

Participants shared their national experiences and emphasized the key role of parliaments in placing the health of women and children at the top of the political agenda and amending legislation to improve access to good quality health services. In addition to fulfilling their budgetary and oversight functions, parliaments should ensure that effective accountability mechanisms were in place. Participants underscored the importance of awareness-raising campaigns for understanding citizens' real needs and ensuring that laws and policies that were in line with the Global Strategy were being implemented effectively.

6. Eliminating risks of nuclear war by accident, cyber-attack or conflict escalation

A side event was held in the afternoon of 1 April to discuss implementation of the resolutions entitled *Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: The contribution of parliaments*, adopted by the 130th IPU Assembly, and *Cyber warfare: A serious threat to peace and global security*, to be adopted by the 132nd IPU Assembly.

Opening presentations were made by Mr. A. Ware, Global Coordinator of Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament (PNND), and Mr. T. Kõiv (Estonia). A clip was shown from the movie *The Man Who Saved the World*, which chronicled a computer error in the Soviet nuclear command-and-control system that had nearly resulted in an inadvertent nuclear exchange. That was just one example of numerous close calls, with experts indicating an increased potential for third parties to hack into command-and-control systems and unleash an unauthorized nuclear attack or a nuclear response to a falsified alarm.

A lively debate ensued on how to build confidence in nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament in Europe, South Asia and the Middle East. The participants recalled that the nuclear-weapon States had a special responsibility to reduce dangers and achieve nuclear disarmament. Parliaments and parliamentarians had to act decisively so as to avert such unacceptable risks.

7. Field trip on nutrition and young child feeding

About 30 parliamentarians from 16 countries took part in a field trip to four feeding centres for infants and young children on 31 March. Viet Nam had a proactive policy on the protection of motherhood and young child feeding through *Little Sun* centres.

The participants were divided into four groups, first attending an oral presentation and then taking part in a guided visit of each centre. Following these visits, they commended the Vietnamese policy on young child feeding and maternal health, noting in particular the emphasis placed on the role of fathers.

They also concluded that parliamentarians had a key role to play by adopting appropriate laws, allocating sufficient funds and monitoring government action.

8. Open consultation on the next *Global Parliamentary Report*

An open consultation was held in the afternoon of 1 April. It was moderated by Mr. D. McGuinty (Canada), assisted by members of staff from the IPU Secretariat and UNDP working on the Report. The purpose of the Open Consultation was to obtain the views of parliamentarians and Secretaries General of parliaments on three proposals identified following an earlier round of consultations: *Parliament's power to hold government to account: Realities and perspectives; The place of money, lobbying and ethics in parliamentary life; and How parliaments respond to crisis situations.*

The participants shared their views and explained how those issues were being addressed in their parliaments. The IPU and UNDP would pursue consultations in order to reach a decision on a theme of relevance and use to parliaments around the world.

Elections and appointments

1. Executive Committee

The Governing Council elected the following three new members of the Executive Committee:

- Ms. A. Habibou (Niger), to replace Ms. F. Diendere Diallo, who was no longer a member of parliament, for a four-year term ending in March 2019;
- Mr. S. Suzuki (Japan), to replace Mr. M. Uesugi (Japan), who was no longer a member of parliament, for the remainder of the latter's term ending in October 2018;
- Mr. N. Schrijver (Netherlands), to replace Mr. K. Dijkhoff (Netherlands), who was no longer a member of parliament, for the remainder of the latter's term ending in October 2017.

2. Sub-Committee on Finance

The Executive Committee appointed Mr. S. Suzuki (Japan) to replace Mr. M. Uesugi (Japan), who was no longer a member of parliament, for a two-year term ending in March 2017.

The Sub-Committee confirmed its acting President, Mr. R.M.K. Al Shariqi (United Arab Emirates), in that post.

3. Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

The Governing Council elected Mr. A.A. Alaradi (Bahrain) as a Committee member for a five-year term ending in March 2020.

4. Committee to Promote Respect for International Humanitarian Law

The Governing Council elected the following three members to fill the vacancies on the Committee for a four-year term ending in March 2019:

Asia-Pacific Group

- Ms. N. Ali Assegaf (Indonesia)
- Mr. M.R.H. Harraj (Pakistan)

Twelve Plus Group

- Mr. T. Ravn (Denmark)

5. Advisory Group on HIV/AIDS and Maternal, Newborn and Child Health

The Group appointed Mr. F. Ndugulile (United Republic of Tanzania) as its Vice-President.

6. Bureaux of the Standing Committees

The Standing Committees elected the following Bureau members, whose terms of office would in theory run until the dates indicated below:

Standing Committee on Peace and International Security

African Group

- Ms. E. Banda (Zambia), for a term ending in March 2019

Asia-Pacific Group

- Mr. R.K. Singh (India), for a term ending in March 2019

Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights

Arab Group:

- Ms. J. Alsammak (Bahrain), replacing Ms. J. Nassif (Bahrain), for a term ending in March 2019
- Mr. M.N. Abdrabbou (Iraq), replacing Mr. R. Abdul-Jabbar (Iraq), for a term ending in March 2018
- Ms. F. Dib (Syrian Arab Republic), replacing Mr. Y. Assaad (Syrian Arab Republic), for a term ending in March 2018

Group of Latin America and the Caribbean:

- Mr. G. Rondón Fudinaga (Peru) for a term ending in March 2019

Twelve Plus Group:

- Ms. A. King (New Zealand), replacing Ms. L. Wall (New Zealand), for a term ending in March 2017

Standing Committee on United Nations Affairs

African Group:

- Mr. D.G. Boko (Botswana), for a term ending in March 2019

Asia-Pacific Group:

- Mr. A.K. Azad (Bangladesh), for a term ending in March 2019

Eurasia Group:

- Mr. K. Kosachev (Russian Federation), for a term ending in March 2019

Twelve Plus Group:

- Mr. A. Avsan (Sweden), for a term ending in March 2019

The Bureau of the Standing Committee on United Nations Affairs, having met after the Committee's session, nominated Mr. A. Avsan (Sweden) as the Committee President. That nomination would have to be formally approved at the Committee's next session.

7. Rapporteurs to the 133rd and 134th Assemblies

Standing Committee on Peace and International Security

The Assembly endorsed the Committee's recommendation to appoint Mr. D. Triverdi (India) and Ms. C. Guittet (France) as co-Rapporteurs for the subject item *Terrorism: The need to enhance global cooperation against the threat to democracy and individual rights*, on which the 134th Assembly would adopt a resolution.

Standing Committee on Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade

The Assembly endorsed the Committee's recommendation to appoint Mr. A. Destexhe (Belgium) and Mr. H. Kouskous (Morocco) as co-Rapporteurs for the subject item *Ensuring lasting protection against destruction and deterioration for the tangible and intangible cultural heritage of humanity*, on which the 134th Assembly would adopt a resolution.

Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights

The Assembly endorsed the Committee's recommendation to appoint Mr. H. Jhun (Republic of Korea) as the second co-Rapporteur for the subject item *Democracy in the digital era and the threat to privacy and individual freedoms*, on which the 133rd Assembly would adopt a resolution.

8. Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians

The Meeting of Women Parliamentarians elected the following new members of the Coordinating Committee:

African Group:

- Ms. J. Nze Mouenidiambou (Gabon) as a substitute member for a term ending in March 2018

Arab Group:

- Ms. A. Algharageer (Jordan) as a titular member for a term ending in March 2016

Asia-Pacific Group:

- Ms. W.A. Khan (Bangladesh) as a titular member for a term ending in March 2018

In accordance with Rule 31.1(a) of the Rules of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians, the newly elected member of the IPU Executive Committee, Ms. A. Habibou (Niger), would become an *ex officio* member of the Coordinating Committee for the duration of her term on the Executive Committee (i.e. until March 2019).

Likewise, Ms. Nguyen Thi Kim Ngan (Viet Nam), President of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians, held during the 132nd Assembly, was appointed *ex officio* to the Coordinating Committee for a two-year term ending in March 2017.

Media and communications

IPU Communications issued five press releases related to the 132nd Assembly. Four press briefings and press conferences were also held. More than 500 television, radio and print journalists and photographers were registered to cover the Assembly, around 20 of whom were accompanying national delegations.

Initial media monitoring from limited open-source content on websites around the world revealed coverage of the Assembly in several languages, including English, French, Spanish, Arabic and Vietnamese.

More than 4,420 online articles and blog posts mentioning the IPU and the 132nd Assembly were published during the Assembly period, with just 240 of them on websites, facebook and blogs with more than 252 million unique visitors. The articles covered the various themes of the Assembly, as well as bilateral meetings between delegations. News of the Assembly appeared on the front pages of daily newspapers in Viet Nam and television reports were also aired daily on multiple national television channels. The Huffington Post carried an opinion editorial on women's political participation and the achievements of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians.

More than 35 interviews with the IPU President, Secretary General and Director of Communications were organized through the Secretariat with broadcasters and other reporters, predominantly from Viet Nam. The Vietnamese media also carried out numerous spontaneous interviews with MPs.

A live Twitter feed using the #IPU132 hashtag was displayed in plenary meetings of the Assembly and similarly during the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians using the #WomenMPs hashtag. Social media monitoring showed that there were nearly 2,700 posts using #IPU132 by more than 900 users over two weeks. These tweets reached 5.5 million accounts and left 18.4 million impressions. IPU was mentioned on Twitter through its handle @IPUparliament in 1,160 tweets, which reached more than 2.33 million accounts, and had the potential of reaching 5.9 million more. The Twitter activity around the 132nd Assembly led to the @IPUparliament account gaining more than 200 new followers during the week. Flickr was again widely used to distribute photographs of the Assembly to media and Assembly participants.

Six new publications produced either by IPU or with partner organizations were presented during the Assembly: IPU's *Annual Report 2014*; *Women in Parliament: 20 years in Review*; *Women in Politics Map 2015*; *Common Principles for Support to Parliament*; *Youth participation in national parliaments*; and *HIV/AIDS in Viet Nam – facing the challenges*. Other publications were also presented on the publications stand and more than 100 order forms were received.

Membership of the IPU¹

Members (166)

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Palestine, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe

Associate Members (10)

Andean Parliament, Arab Parliament, Central American Parliament (PARLACEN), East African Legislative Assembly (EALA), European Parliament, Inter-Parliamentary Committee of the West African Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU), Latin American Parliament (PARLATINO), Parliament of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), Parliament of the Central African Economic and Monetary Community (CEMAC) and Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE)

¹ At the closure of the 132nd Assembly

Agenda, resolutions and other texts of the 132nd Assembly

1. Election of the President and Vice-Presidents of the 132nd Assembly
2. Consideration of requests for the inclusion of an emergency item in the Assembly agenda
3. General Debate on *The Sustainable Development Goals: Turning Words into Action*
4. Cyber warfare: A serious threat to peace and global security
(*Standing Committee on Peace and International Security*)
5. Shaping a new system of water governance: Promoting parliamentary action on water (*Standing Committee on Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade*)
6. International law as it relates to national sovereignty, non-intervention in the internal affairs of States and human rights
(*Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights*)
7. Reports of the Standing Committees
8. Approval of the subject items for the Standing Committee on Peace and International Security and the Standing Committee on Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade for the 134th Assembly and appointment of the Rapporteurs
9. The role of parliaments in combating all terrorist acts perpetrated by organizations such as Daesh and Boko Haram against innocent civilians, in particular women and girls

Hanoi Declaration

The Sustainable Development Goals: Turning Words into Action

*Adopted by the 132nd IPU Assembly
(Hanoi, 1 April 2015)*

We, parliamentarians from over 130 countries and 23 international and regional parliamentary organizations, gathered in Hanoi, Viet Nam, reviewed the emerging sustainable development goals and considered our role in attaining them.

This is our declaration.

Despite global advances in technology, health, knowledge, and material wealth, longstanding economic and social disparities are increasing, to the detriment of the whole planet, with progress continuing to elude many the world over.

This situation – exacerbated by the urgent threat of climate change and growing waves of social unrest, political instability and conflict within or between countries – is coming to a head. As we saw with the Millennium Development Goals, international commitments can only be met with strong political will, leadership and national ownership. As parliamentarians, we have a moral obligation to act.

The adoption of the post-2015 development agenda and its sustainable development goals in September 2015 will afford a unique opportunity to meet global challenges, using a universal, integrated approach that will apply to all countries and link poverty eradication to sustainable development.

Vision

At this critical moment, we, the parliamentarians of the world, reaffirm our vision for people-centred sustainable development based on the realization of all human rights, to eradicate poverty in all its forms, and eliminate inequalities, thus empowering all individuals to exercise their full potential. This requires conditions of peace and security, in full observance of the Charter of the United Nations and international law.

Poverty eradication and sustainable development are a shared commitment for us all, and we should all strive for a balanced and more equitable distribution of resources. Our current production and consumption patterns are clearly unsustainable, and all countries – developed and developing alike – need to work together, based on the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. That is the only way we can advance towards a common model of inclusive and sustainable growth.

A people-centred approach requires environmental justice: the planet and all its ecosystems must be treated as common assets for the whole of humanity to enjoy now and in the future. Human well-being must be the driver of all policies for sustainable development and progress measured in terms that go well beyond gross domestic product. People are more than taxpayers and consumers; they are citizens endowed with rights and responsibilities towards each other. We must invest in them – their health, nutrition, education and skills – as our most important resource.

All government institutions must be representative and accessible to all. Cultural differences should be respected and home-grown approaches to sustainable development employed. All people, regardless of gender, race, culture, religion and health status, must be empowered to work cooperatively for peace and the common good.

Commitment

Acknowledging that the sustainable development goals will be the result of a delicate compromise, we look forward to this transformational framework that will inspire policy-making in all countries.

We are pleased that our efforts to advocate for the inclusion of goals on healthy lives and well-being, gender equality and women's empowerment, reducing inequalities within and between countries, as well as on governance, have borne fruit. We appreciate the broadened focus on health, which will provide an opportunity to end the AIDS epidemic while tackling emerging challenges such as non-communicable diseases.

We welcome the new goal calling for urgent action against climate change and we appreciate the broad-based goal on the means of implementation – finance, trade, technology, capacity building and systemic reforms – that must be mobilized in support of the new framework. This goal should inject new energy into the current global partnership for development.

We commit to doing our utmost to strengthen national ownership of the goals, particularly by making them known to our constituents. People must understand how the goals are relevant to their lives. As representatives of the people, we are responsible for ensuring that each and every voice is heard in the political process without discrimination and irrespective of social status.

We commit to translating the goals into enforceable domestic laws and regulations, including through the critical budget process. Each country must do its part to ensure that all the goals are met.

Action

As parliamentarians, we must support efforts to reach the new goals in ways that respect each country's national specificities. Our responsibility is clear: to hold governments accountable for the goals they have subscribed to, and to make sure that enabling laws are passed and budgets adopted.

Our first order of business must be to examine our institutions and decision-making processes to ensure that they are *fit for purpose*.

As representatives of the people, our concern is to defend the public interest and pursue the common good above all else. We must prevent individual interests from exercising excessive influence in our deliberations. We must focus on building consensus around practical solutions.

We will seek to overcome the silo mentality within our own parliaments and national administrations to reflect the intersectoral nature of the goals. To this end, we will do our utmost to institutionalize the goals in every parliament, with sufficient time for discussion and monitoring. Parliamentary committees and processes must pursue all goals coherently.

We will help build national ownership of the goals by seeing to it that each of our countries has a sustainable development plan, crafted in an inclusive and participatory manner, including through public hearings with civil society, and in line with the international human rights framework.

We pledge to make laws and budgetary provisions in line with the national sustainable development plan, clearly identifying the goals and targets that apply and means of funding. Governments should report annually to parliaments on the implementation of the national plan. Parliaments should garner regular feedback from their constituents to help assess progress on the ground, where it matters most.

We further pledge to measure progress not only in terms of national averages, but most importantly by looking at how the most vulnerable and disadvantaged in our societies have fared. No one should be left behind. Strong national capacities for data collection and disaggregation, including by gender, age, minority group and health status, will be crucial.

Recognizing our role in mobilizing the means to attain the goals, including through funding from private and public sources, at both the national and international levels, we will support the implementation of all international commitments. In particular, we will work to increase domestic resources, including by combating illicit financial flows. We will improve the quality and quantity of aid, set out an orderly sovereign debt restructuring mechanism, strengthen the environment for private-sector investments, including through public-private partnerships, and reform the global financial, monetary and trade regime in ways that directly support sustainable development.

Lastly, we pledge to support accountability for meeting the goals at the global level. We will seek to join our national delegations to meetings of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, where global progress reports will be discussed. We will contribute to the national reviews submitted to the United Nations High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development. Wherever feasible, we will seek to engage with United Nations field operations in our countries to share information and explore all avenues for cooperation to advance our national plans.

We ask that the central messages of this Declaration and of its predecessor, the Quito Communiqué, be reflected in the outcome of the Fourth World Conference of Speakers of Parliament later this year, which will in turn provide input to the United Nations Summit for the adoption of the post-2015 development agenda.

We urge governments to conduct negotiations keeping in mind the real needs and expectations of citizens and addressing the critical linkages between sustainable development, democratic governance and human rights. The Post-2015 United Nations Declaration should commit to building strong public institutions, including parliaments, with the ability and capacity to ensure accountability for results. We encourage the drafters of the Declaration to acknowledge the critical role and responsibility of parliaments – and of the IPU as their world organization – in implementing the new development agenda and monitoring progress.

Moreover, we stress that convergence between the outcomes of this year's negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda, financing for development, climate change and disaster risk reduction is essential to facilitate implementation at the national level.

We are profoundly grateful to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, our world organization, for raising our awareness of the sustainable development goals and for making our voices heard at the United Nations. We will continue to look to the IPU for support in our efforts to attain the goals.

Together, we will succeed.

Cyber warfare: A serious threat to peace and global security

Resolution adopted by consensus by the 132nd IPU Assembly (Hanoi, 1st April 2015)*

The 132nd Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Mindful that information and communication technologies (ICTs) are means of inclusion and development and must not be used by States or non-State actors to violate international law, in particular the provisions and principles of the Charter of the United Nations relating to sovereignty, non-intervention, the sovereign equality of States, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the prohibition of the threat or use of force,

Acknowledging the work accomplished by the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security,

Considering that people's access to cyberspace involves inter alia extensive digital communication via satellites, optical networks and advanced computer programmes, the systematic exchange of information, graphic, audio-visual and computerized data, intelligent tools and equipment, software, advanced operating systems, and the possibility to use them for their own purposes,

Acknowledging that improper use of technology can have a harmful impact at national, regional and even global level, and that internationally applicable legal regulatory authorities and instruments must therefore be established with regard to its purpose and use,

Convinced that, given the immense socio-economic benefits that cyberspace brings to all citizens around the world, predictability, information security and stability in the cyberdomain are essential,

Having considered United Nations General Assembly resolutions 31/72 of 10 December 1976 (on a convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental techniques), 55/63 of 4 December 2000 and 56/121 of 19 December 2001 (on combating the criminal misuse of information technologies), 69/28 of 2 December 2014 (on developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security) and 57/239 of 20 December 2002 (on the creation of a global culture of cybersecurity),

Recognizing the importance of international and regional agreements on cybercrime, transnational organized crime, the exchange of information and administrative assistance, including the 1977 Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques, the 2001 Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime (Budapest Convention) and its Additional Protocol (concerning the criminalization of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature committed through computer systems), the 2010 Arab Convention on Combating Information Technology Offences and the 2010 Shanghai Cooperation Organization Agreement on Cooperation in the Field of International Information Security; *also recognizing* the importance of international treaties in preventing cyber warfare,

Fully aware that some concepts, definitions and standards of cyberpolicy, especially in cyber warfare and as they relate to international peace and security, are not commonly understood and are still being clarified at the national, regional and international levels, and that international consensus still does not exist in some areas,

Welcoming the progress made in international forums towards a common perception of what constitutes acceptable behaviour on the part of States in cyberspace, in particular by the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security and by other bilateral, regional and multilateral initiatives,

* The delegation of Venezuela expressed a reservation on the use of the term "cyber warfare".

Acknowledging that certain principles of public international law, including, in particular, those contained in the United Nations Charter, the 1949 Geneva Conventions and their Additional Protocols, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, are relevant and applicable to cyberspace and are essential to maintaining peace and international stability and promoting an open, secure and peaceful ICT environment, accessible to women and men alike,

Considering that cyberspace is more than the Internet, that the use of hardware, software, data and information systems can have effects beyond networks and IT infrastructure and is considered as a tool of economic growth, and that inequalities, including gender inequalities, exist in the ICT environment,

Cognisant of the fact that different areas of cyberpolicy, while distinct, are inextricably linked and may have an impact on international peace and security aspects of cyberspace, and vice versa,

Considering that the covert and illegal use, by individuals, organizations and States, of the computer systems of foreign countries to attack third countries is a matter of grave concern because of its potential to spark international conflicts,

Also considering that cyberspace has the potential to be exploited as a new dimension of conflict as well as a new operating environment where many, if not most, cyberassets have both civilian and military applications,

Aware that cyberspace is not an isolated domain and that destabilizing activities within it may have serious effects on other areas of global social life, trigger other, traditional forms of insecurity or conflict, or start a new type of conflict, *and convinced* that there is a need for regional and international cooperation against threats resulting from the malicious use of ICTs,

Also convinced that States should encourage the private sector and civil society to play an appropriate role to improve the security and use of ICTs, including supply chain security for ICT products and services,

Aware that military ICT systems for the deployment and use of force are susceptible to acts of cyber warfare that could lead to third parties intercepting and deploying such systems to cause unauthorized, illegal and destructive use of force, *concerned* that fully autonomous military systems ("killer robots") are especially vulnerable to such unauthorized deployment, as there is no human validation of final targeting decisions, and *especially concerned* that the hacking of nuclear weapon command-and-control systems could result in the unauthorized launch and detonation of nuclear weapons and cause unparalleled catastrophes,

Noting that the use of ICTs has reshaped the national and international security environment and that such technologies can be used for malicious purposes and to violate human and civil rights; *also noting* that, in recent years, the risk of ICTs being used by State and non-State actors alike to commit crimes, including violence against women and girls, and conduct disruptive activities has risen significantly,

Bearing in mind the negative impact that the unlawful use of ICTs could have on State infrastructure, national security and economic development, and *aware* that the only viable means of preventing and dealing with these new challenges, consolidating the positive aspects of ICTs, preventing their potential negative effects, promoting their peaceful and legitimate use and guaranteeing that scientific progress is aimed at maintaining peace and promoting the well-being and development of peoples is joint cooperation between States, which will also prevent cyberspace from becoming a theatre of military operations,

Considering that cyber warfare may encompass, but is not necessarily limited to, operations against a computer or a computer system through a data stream as a means and method of warfare that is intended to gather intelligence for the purpose of economic, political or social destabilization or that can reasonably be expected to cause death, injury, destruction or damage during, but not exclusively in, armed conflicts,

Aware that cyberdefence and cybercrime control measures complement each other, and *noting*, in this connection, that the Budapest Convention, the only international treaty on crimes committed via the Internet and other computer networks, is open for accession, including by third countries,

Noting that the military use of cyberspace and the impact of specific activities are not yet fully understood; *also noting* that many cyberactivities may have the effect of destabilizing the security situation, depending on their nature, range, potential consequences and other circumstances,

Concerned about the suggestion by military planners that nuclear deterrence be maintained as an option for dealing with the existential threat of a cyberattack,

Acknowledging that a lack of strategic State-to-State communications, prompt attribution of responsibility and a limited understanding of allies' and adversaries' priorities may lead to miscalculation, misconception and misunderstanding in the cyberdomain, and that it is therefore important to introduce confidence-building measures of a nature to improve transparency, predictability and cooperation between States,

Considering that the risk to international peace and security has increased with the development and spread of sophisticated malicious tools and techniques by States and non-State actors,

Rejecting States' use of cyberspace as a means of applying economic, restrictive or discriminatory measures against another State, for the purpose of limiting access to information or services,

Condemning the use of ICTs in contravention of international law, the goals and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and internationally recognized rules of coexistence between States,

Also condemning the use of ICTs by criminal or terrorist groups to communicate, collect information, recruit, organize, plan and coordinate attacks, promote their ideas and actions and solicit funding, and *mindful* that, in so doing, these groups often exploit the vulnerability of certain social groups, and *further condemning* the use of cyberspace to destabilize and threaten international peace and security,

Noting the need to work for the conclusion of an international Internet convention to prevent the use of the Internet by terrorists or terrorist organizations for illegal activities, in particular to raise funds, enlist members or publish ideas inciting people to violence and hatred,

Recalling that acts of sexual violence during times of war or conflict are considered to be war crimes and *considering* that the broadcast of such acts using ICTs to intimidate, threaten or terrorize citizens, communities or countries and force them into submission, therefore constitutes a crime of cyber warfare,

Considering that there is a need to strike a balance between security control of cyberspace and respect for privacy, confidentiality, intellectual property, and e-government and e-commerce development priorities,

Also considering that there is a need to develop national, regional and international levels of practical confidence-building measures in the ICT field,

Condemning any intentional misuse of technology, including, but not limited to, State-sponsored espionage,

1. *Recommends* that parliaments build their capacities to better understand the complex nature of national and international security in the cyberdomain and to take into account the interlinkages between different areas of cyberpolicy development;
2. *Encourages* parliaments to work with other branches of government, civil society and the private sector to develop a holistic understanding of cyberdependence, risks and challenges at the national level; *also encourages* governments to reduce the negative effects of cyberdependence, especially with regard to e-government development and national security, and to promote the adoption of national cybersecurity strategies;

3. *Calls upon* all parliaments to review their countries' legal framework to examine how best to adapt it to potential threats, in terms of crime, terrorism and/or warfare, which might arise from the evolving nature of cyberspace;
4. *Also calls upon* parliaments to legislate to counter acts of sexual violence against women and girls during times of war and conflict, which constitute war crimes, and against the broadcasting of such acts using ICTs, which is a crime of cyber warfare;
5. *Encourages* parliaments to be accountable by scrutinizing public finances with a view to ensuring that adequate resources are allocated to cybersecurity;
6. *Also encourages* parliaments to make use of all the oversight tools at their disposal to ensure that cyber-related activities are rigorously monitored, and to enact national laws, with due regard for their respective constitutions, that stipulate stiffer penalties for cyberattacks, using appropriate safeguards, governance mechanisms and existing structures so as to protect freedom of expression and not compromise the citizen's ability to use ICT tools;
7. *Recommends* that parliaments from States which have not yet done so request that their respective governments expressly state that international law, including the law of armed conflict, must apply to cyber warfare in order to ensure that limits are placed on the use of cyberoperations as a means and method of warfare while noting that the exact manner of application is still a matter under international discussion;
8. *Encourages* parliaments to work with other branches of government and with civil society to develop a comprehensive cybersecurity strategy encompassing cyberdefence, capacity-building and action to combat cyberterrorism;
9. *Invites* parliaments to support the dissemination of cybersecurity information and best practices among all national stakeholders;
10. *Calls upon* all parliaments to ensure meaningful participation by all stakeholders, including the private sector, academics, the technical community, civil society, and women's organizations and associations, in efforts aimed at addressing the cyberthreats related to the use of ICTs;
11. *Recommends* that parliaments from nuclear-weapon States call on their governments to rescind launch-on-warning policies, stand down nuclear weapons from high operational readiness and extend the decision-making time for nuclear-weapon use in order to prevent unauthorized activation and deployment of nuclear weapon systems through cyberattacks, pursuant to the negotiation of agreements to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons and achieve their elimination;
12. *Calls upon* all parliaments to ensure their national laws and regulations do not condone the criminal use of cybertechnology for the purpose of fomenting conflict between States or provide the perpetrators with immunity and a safe haven;
13. *Encourages* national parliaments to promote close cooperation and partnership between the public and private sectors, so as to improve the effectiveness of cybersecurity and cyberdefence strategies at the national level;
14. *Recommends* the application of a strategic information plan involving the education sector, organized communities and citizen participation, for the purpose of heightening awareness of the benefits and usefulness of being active in cyberspace and the harmful effects that can be generated from its misuse;
15. *Also recommends* that States comply with international law and the Charter of the United Nations when using ICTs and that, at the legislative and executive levels, consideration be given to cooperative measures likely to enhance peace and international stability and security and lead to a common understanding of the application of the relevant international law and derived standards, rules and principles underpinning the responsible conduct of States;

16. *Encourages* parliaments to support the widest possible accession to the Budapest Convention as a means of strengthening national legislation and enhancing the effectiveness of international cooperation against cybercrime;
17. *Recommends* that parliaments press for the formulation and adoption at the regional and international levels of appropriate regulations and oversight guaranteeing that the use of cyberspace is fully compatible with international law, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and internationally recognized rules of coexistence, together with practical confidence-building measures to help increase transparency, predictability and cooperation and reduce misconceptions, thus diminishing the risk of conflict using the cyberdomain;
18. *Invites* parliaments to support the use of aid instruments and resources for capacity-building to prevent and counter cyberthreats;
19. *Urges* the IPU, together with relevant international organizations, to lend support to inter-parliamentary cooperation with a view to promoting international agreements guaranteeing better use of ICTs by countries and appropriate and secure use of cyberspace, to sharing good practices on confidence-building measures that are conducive to peace and international stability and security in that they reduce the security risks inherent in the use of ICTs, and to developing collaborative mechanisms;
20. *Encourages* parliaments to play a positive role in creating a secure environment in support of the peaceful use of cyberspace and ensuring that freedom of expression and information exchange are appropriately reconciled with public safety and security concerns;
21. *Also encourages* parliaments to work with their governments on establishing international agreements to prevent cyber warfare, apply the body of international peace and security law to cyberspace, establish global standards and ensure that national and international responses to cyberattacks are consistent with such agreements and standards;
22. *Further encourages* international cooperation to provide developing countries with technical assistance and capacity-building in terms of prevention, investigation, and the prosecution and punishment of offenders, and to enhance network security in relation to cyber warfare;
23. *Calls on* the IPU to urge the United Nations to adopt a resolution prohibiting illegal monitoring and cyberattacks on critical infrastructure such as water, electricity and hospital networks;
24. *Encourages* the United Nations to enhance cybersecurity by establishing a global registry of cyberattacks;
25. *Recommends* that the legal instruments, agreements and cooperation agreements, inter alia, relating to cyberspace, cybersecurity, technology and telecommunications, be reviewed and updated;
26. *Suggests* that the IPU, acting on the basis of this resolution, propose that the General Assembly of the United Nations convene a conference on the prevention of cyber warfare with a view to adopting a unified position on the issues involved and drafting an international convention on the prevention of cyber warfare.

Shaping a new system of water governance: Promoting parliamentary action on water and sanitation

Resolution adopted by consensus by the 132nd IPU Assembly
(Hanoi, 1st April 2015)*

The 132nd Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the resolutions adopted by the 100th Inter-Parliamentary Conference (Moscow, September 1998) and the 130th IPU Assembly (Geneva, March 2014), which acknowledged that freshwater resources are essential to basic human needs, health, food production and the preservation of ecosystems, and highlighted the need to improve water management in order to prevent and mitigate high disaster risks, strengthen resilience and ultimately contribute to sustainable development, respectively,

Recalling the IPU regional seminar for the parliaments of the Arab States, *Global capacity-building initiative for parliaments on sustainable development*, which was held in Beirut on 29 and 30 November 2005,

Having considered United Nations General Assembly resolutions 64/292 of 28 July 2010 and 68/157 of 18 December 2013, and Human Rights Council resolution 27/7 of September 2014, in which the right to safe and clean drinking water and sanitation is recognized as a human right essential for the full enjoyment of life,

Bearing in mind the entry into force of the 1997 Convention on the Law of the Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses and the global opening of the 1992 Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes,

Deeply concerned by the increased pressure being exerted on water resources by factors such as population growth, climate change, rapid urbanization, the growing needs of modern agriculture, industrialization, natural disasters, desertification, deforestation, growing energy demand and lack of effective governance,

Equally concerned by the fact that water scarcity is already affecting one in three people on every continent and that, in the absence of effective management, by 2025 approximately two thirds of the world's population, in particular women and children, will be under water stress and 1.8 billion people will face absolute water scarcity,

Also deeply concerned at the fact that 748 million people lack access to an improved drinking water source, that 2.5 billion people still lack access to improved sanitation and that 1 billion people still practise open defecation,

Aware that global numbers/statistics mask profound and persistent disparities between and within countries, and that targeted measures must be adopted to progressively eliminate such inequalities, with a specific focus on gender equality,

Mindful that water pollution, water overuse, lack of cooperation in respect of national and international river basins and aquifers, and the realization of the human right to water and sanitation are interconnected issues,

Bearing in mind that water governance can be a key element in maintaining peace between States and that good governance can promote cooperation and avoid water-related conflicts,

Aware that international law and national legal systems relating to the management of water resources tend to be fragmented and poorly implemented in practice,

* The delegation of Venezuela expressed a reservation on the use of the term "water governance".

Recognizing that men and women contribute differently and often unequally to household and community water management, in particular in developing countries and in rural areas, where it is the women and girls who fetch the family's water supply, frequently covering long distances in uncertain security conditions in which they are at greater risk of violence,

Convinced that States should increasingly pursue integrated water resources management by taking into account the water-energy-ecosystem-food security nexus, improving wastewater treatment and preventing and reducing surface and groundwater pollution,

Recalling that integrated water resources management strategies are based on the principles set out in the Dublin Statement on Water and Sustainable Development and incorporated into Agenda 21 at the UN Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro in 1992,

Stressing the urgent and absolute need to conserve and sustainably manage the quality and quantity of water resources for present and future generations,

Also stressing that effective management and multilevel good governance of water resources are indispensable preconditions for achieving the human right to water and sanitation,

Recalling the key role parliamentarians play in establishing good water governance systems that are conducive to the realization of the human right to water and sanitation, in respect of which women should be active participants in the decision-making process and able to express their needs and opinions,

Recognizing that parliamentarians have a weighty responsibility to develop national legal frameworks in order to realize a water-secure world for all present and future generations,

1. *Calls on* national parliaments to advocate a dedicated comprehensive water and sanitation goal in the post-2015 development agenda, so as to ensure the availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all, said goal to include concrete actions and in particular the development of an efficient monitoring system with global indicators;
2. *Also calls on* national parliaments to enact legislation for the appropriate implementation of international treaties, customary law and resolutions related to water management and to the human right to water and sanitation, to organize appropriate human resources training and further education so as to enhance understanding of these instruments, and to encourage awareness-raising campaigns for citizens with a view to promoting responsible use of water;
3. *Exhorts* national parliaments to ensure that women take part in all local, national and international water governance decision-making bodies;
4. *Urges* national parliaments to set aside adequate budget allocations for multilevel and efficient governance, and to establish legislative and regulatory frameworks encouraging dialogue and partnerships between the public and private sectors in order to stimulate investment in the water sector, with a view to establishing a water-secure world for all present and future generations and to securing water affordability, accessibility and safety for all;
5. *Also urges* national parliaments to approve comprehensive and integrated laws so as to encourage conservation, spur innovation and ensure sustainable use of water and energy in their respective countries;
6. *Further urges* national parliaments to promote water security by developing and implementing, within their jurisdiction, Integrated Water Resources Management plans involving inter-ministerial cooperation and stakeholder participation, in order to balance competing human needs while giving priority to water for personal and domestic use for all, without discrimination and with a special focus on gender equality and the most vulnerable sectors of society;

7. *Encourages* States sharing water resources to cooperate on matters relating to international watercourses and to consider joining international legal frameworks for transboundary water cooperation mentioned in the fourth preambular paragraph above;
8. *Calls upon* States and international organizations to use international assistance and cooperation to provide financial resources, capacity-building and technology transfers, in particular to developing countries, in order to scale up efforts to provide safe, clean, accessible and affordable drinking water and sanitation for all;
9. *Encourages* national parliaments to urge their governments to honour the commitments their countries have made in regard to the protection and conservation of freshwater sources;
10. *Calls on* parliamentarians to support and strengthen the participation of local communities in improving water and sanitation management;
11. *Calls on* States, especially developed countries, to promote cooperation and support developing country water management efforts, including in respect of water planning and effective and sustainable water protection and use for the purpose of sustainable development;
12. *Requests* the IPU to draft a compilation of best legal and policy practices related to human rights-based water management, in order to support the work of parliamentarians involved in water-related issues;
13. *Also requests* the IPU to facilitate action by its Member Parliaments to follow up on the recommendations made in this resolution in their respective countries and regions.

International law as it relates to national sovereignty, non-intervention in the internal affairs of States and human rights

Resolution adopted by consensus by the 132nd IPU Assembly (Hanoi, 1 April 2015)*

The 132nd Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Recalling the relevant provisions of previous resolutions of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the United Nations General Assembly with regard to international law, human rights, national sovereignty and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, as well as the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action and the relevant international human rights instruments, all of which are of paramount importance to the promotion of the rule of law among nations,

Reaffirming that the sovereign equality of States is the basis for international cooperation and an essential factor of stability,

Considering that international law defines the legal responsibilities of States in the conduct of their international relations and establishes the obligations of each State towards all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction,

Mindful of the fundamental importance of the rule of law for political dialogue and cooperation among all States, and *underlining* that the rule of law applies to all States equally,

Aware that the rule of law, peace and security, human rights and sustainable development are strongly interrelated and mutually reinforcing,

Reaffirming the universal, indivisible, interdependent, indissociable and complementary nature of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the commitment made by all States to respect, promote and protect the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all individuals in their territory and falling within their competence in a fair and equal manner, including refugees and internally displaced persons, and *underscoring* that this is fully compatible with the principles of State sovereignty and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States enshrined in the UN Charter,

Emphasizing the responsibilities of all States, in conformity with the UN Charter, to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction of any kind on the basis of race, ethnicity, colour, sex, language or religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status,

Stressing the importance of the existing international legal framework for women's rights and gender equality, in particular the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, and existing UN Security Council resolutions on women, peace and security (resolution 1325 and others),

Reaffirming that, while national and regional particularities and historical, cultural and religious contexts must be borne in mind, all States, regardless of their political, economic and cultural systems, have the duty to promote and protect all human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Recognizing that the respect, promotion and safeguarding of human rights is a matter of concern for all members of the international community,

* The delegations of Cuba, India and Venezuela expressed reservations. The delegation of Sudan expressed reservations specifically regarding operative paragraph 18 and on account of that, opposed the entire resolution.

Underscoring the central role played by the UN Human Rights Council as a means of monitoring State policy for the promotion and protection of fundamental rights,

Noting that, by ratifying international human rights law instruments, States accept the monitoring mechanisms foreseen in the instruments,

Recalling the resolution adopted by the 128th IPU Assembly (Quito, 2013) on *Enforcing the responsibility to protect: The role of parliament in safeguarding civilians' lives*, in particular operative paragraph 6 encouraging parliaments “to monitor the executive’s submission of country reports as required by the relevant treaty bodies, particularly those relating to human rights, [and] to become more involved with regional and international human rights mechanisms”,

Stressing that an independent judiciary, representative, accountable and inclusive institutions, an accountable administration, active civil society and independent and responsible media are important components of the rule of law at the national and international levels and necessary to guarantee democracy, as well as respect for and the promotion and protection of all human rights,

Recalling the permanent responsibility of each individual State to protect its populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity,

Mindful that justice, particularly transitional justice in conflict and post-conflict societies, is a prerequisite for achieving sustainable peace, and *reiterating* that States bear primary responsibility for investigating and prosecuting international crimes,

Stressing that women are the main victims of situations of crisis and conflict, and that armed conflicts, terrorist acts and drug trafficking heighten women’s vulnerability and place them at greater risk of gender-based violence and abuse in the form of rape, kidnapping, forced and early marriage, exploitation and sexual slavery,

Emphasizing that, in such situations, specific groups of women, such as young girls, refugees and internally displaced women, are even more at risk and in greater need of protection,

Recalling the responsibility of occupying States to respect, promote and safeguard the human rights of persons living in the occupied territories,

Considering that the application of a “double standard” in statements on or reactions to violations of international human rights law, or their politicization, will ultimately undermine the very validity of that law,

Aware of the seriousness of the threats posed to international human rights law by terrorist movements attempting to supersede the State by taking military action to seize territory and systematically murdering civilians,

Desirous of seeing positive developments in the system of international cooperation and the settlement of international disputes through dialogue and other peaceful means, within the framework of the international collective security system,

Considering that the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and the future Sustainable Development Goals could greatly contribute to such developments,

1. *Reaffirms* international law as the standard of conduct for relations between States;
2. *Also reaffirms* its commitment to a democratic and equitable international order based on the rule of law, and *underlines* the essential role of parliaments in upholding the rule of law at the national level through their legislative and oversight functions;
3. *Reiterates* the principles of the sovereign equality of States, State sovereignty, respect for their territorial integrity and political independence;

4. *Also reiterates* the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States, as a means of guaranteeing respect for human rights and democracy, and *encourages* States to respect and promote that principle;
5. *Stresses* that States have the right to choose, without external interference, their political, economic and social systems, and to organize internally in the way they deem appropriate, with due regard for international law;
6. *Urges* States to consider ratifying the core international human rights treaties, in accordance with their constitutional process, and to fulfil their treaty obligations to respect, promote and safeguard human rights without discrimination;
7. *Underscores* the importance of ensuring that women, on the basis of gender equality, and minorities fully enjoy the benefits of the rule of law, and *restates* its determination to uphold their equal rights and ensure their full and equal participation, including in institutions of governance and the judicial system;
8. *Also underscores* the right of persons with disabilities to fully enjoy their human rights, inter alia, the right to participate in all aspects of life, including politics and public affairs;
9. *Urges* States to adopt all appropriate legislative, administrative and other measures for the implementation and the interpretation, in good faith, of their obligations under international human rights law, and *calls on* parliaments to play an active role in overseeing the implementation of those obligations;
10. *Rejects* any unilateral interpretation and application of international human rights law that is not in conformity with international law, including in national legislation, and *reiterates* that human rights may not be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person the right to engage in any activity or perform any act aimed at striking down any of the rights or freedoms recognized by international human rights law, or at limiting them to a greater extent than is provided for in the relevant provisions of that law;
11. *Expresses* support for the UN Human Rights Council and the existing independent treaty-based mechanisms that monitor States' compliance with international human rights law, *calls for* such mechanisms to be further strengthened, and *calls on* parliaments to participate actively in these monitoring mechanisms;
12. *Encourages* parliaments to strengthen national systems for the respect, promotion and safeguarding of human rights, including by supporting the development of independent and effective national human rights institutions, in accordance with the 1993 Principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (Paris Principles), and ensuring equal and effective protection for all, without discrimination based on religious belief, gender, age, sexual orientation, language, ethnic origin or other status;
13. *Appeals* to States to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, and to resolve disputes by peaceful means, in such a manner that international peace and security, justice, human rights and fundamental freedoms are respected and in conformity with the purposes and principles of the UN Charter;
14. *Strongly urges* States, in the conduct of their foreign relations, to ensure that their economic, financial and trade measures are in compliance with international law and the purposes and principles of the UN Charter;
15. *Strongly supports* the provision of humanitarian and economic aid by the international community in cases of disaster, crisis or armed conflict;
16. *Reiterates* that the UN Security Council bears primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security under the UN Charter;

17. *Calls on States to strengthen the system of collective and individual security and to bring about greater democratization of the international community, including through reform of the UN Security Council to ensure greater legitimacy of its decisions, and reform of the United Nations in general, particularly the machinery for dealing with major humanitarian disasters;*
18. *Invites States that have not yet done so to consider becoming parties to the Rome Statute and the Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Criminal Court, and calls on States to strengthen their national legal systems and to cooperate fully with the Court, so as to ensure that international crimes are properly investigated and prosecuted;*
19. *Expresses its full support for a new post-2015 development agenda that ensures a rights-based approach encompassing all human rights, addresses issues of justice, equality and equity, good governance, democracy and the rule of law, and promotes peaceful societies and freedom from violence;*
20. *Appeals for greater cooperation between parliaments, the IPU and the United Nations in the respect, promotion and safeguarding of human rights and the development of the rule of law at the national and international level; strongly supports UN General Assembly Resolution 68/272 on Interaction between the United Nations, national parliaments and the Inter-Parliamentary Union, which recommends that a new IPU-UN cooperation agreement be drawn up, so as to reflect progress and developments over past years and place the institutional relationship between the two organizations on a strong footing;*
21. *Proposes that a committee be set up within the IPU to prepare a declaration based on this resolution as a way of further contributing to the enhancement of peace and international security.*

Addressing the criminal activity of Boko Haram: the role of parliamentarians

Results of roll-call vote on the request of the delegation of Chad for the inclusion of an emergency item

Results

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|---------------------------------------------|-----|
| Affirmative votes | 337 | Total of affirmative and negative votes ... | 587 |
| Negative votes | 250 | Two-thirds majority | 391 |
| Abstentions | 604 | | |

| Country | Yes | No | Abst. | Country | Yes | No | Abst. | Country | Yes | No | Abst. |
|-------------------|-----|----|---------------|-----------------------------|-----|----|---------------|-----------------------------|-----|----|---------------|
| Afghanistan | 14 | | | Hungary | | | 13 | Panama | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Albania | | | <i>Absent</i> | Iceland | | 10 | | Papua New Guinea | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Algeria | 10 | | 5 | India | | | 23 | Peru | | | 14 |
| Angola | | | 12 | Indonesia | | | <i>Absent</i> | Philippines | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Argentina | | | <i>Absent</i> | Iran (Islamic Republic of) | | | 18 | Poland | | 15 | |
| Armenia | | | 10 | Iraq | | | <i>Absent</i> | Portugal | | 13 | |
| Australia | | | 14 | Ireland | | | 11 | Qatar | | | 8 |
| Austria | | 12 | | Israel | | 10 | | Republic of Korea | | | 17 |
| Azerbaijan | | | <i>Absent</i> | Italy | | | 17 | Romania | | 14 | |
| Bahrain | 10 | | | Japan | 20 | | | Russian Federation | | | 20 |
| Bangladesh | | | 20 | Jordan | | | 12 | Rwanda | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Belarus | | | <i>Absent</i> | Kazakhstan | | | <i>Absent</i> | San Marino | 5 | | 5 |
| Belgium | | 12 | | Kenya | 15 | | | Sao Tome and Principe | 10 | | |
| Bhutan | | | <i>Absent</i> | Kuwait | | | 9 | Saudi Arabia | 14 | | |
| Botswana | | | 11 | Lao People's Dem. Republic | | | <i>Absent</i> | Senegal | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Brazil | | | 20 | Latvia | | 11 | | Seychelles | | | 10 |
| Bulgaria | | | <i>Absent</i> | Lesotho | | | 10 | Sierra Leone | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Burkina Faso | 13 | | | Lithuania | | | 11 | Slovakia | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Cambodia | | | 13 | Luxembourg | | | 10 | South Africa | | | 17 |
| Cameroon | 13 | | | Madagascar | | | <i>Absent</i> | Spain | | 10 | |
| Canada | | 15 | | Malawi | | 13 | | Sri Lanka | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Chad | | | <i>Absent</i> | Malaysia | | | 14 | Sudan | 15 | | |
| Chile | | | 13 | Maldives | | | <i>Absent</i> | Sweden | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| China | 23 | | | Mali | | | <i>Absent</i> | Switzerland | | 12 | |
| Côte d'Ivoire | | | 13 | Malta | | | <i>Absent</i> | Syrian Arab Rep. | 13 | | |
| Croatia | | | 10 | Mauritania | | | <i>Absent</i> | Thailand | | | 18 |
| Cuba | | | 13 | Mexico | 20 | | | Timor-Leste | 11 | | |
| Cyprus | | | 10 | Micronesia (Fed. States of) | | | <i>Absent</i> | Trinidad & Tobago | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Czech Republic | 13 | | | Monaco | | | <i>Absent</i> | Turkey | 18 | | |
| DR of the Congo | 17 | | | Mongolia | | | <i>Absent</i> | Uganda | | | 13 |
| DPR of Korea | | | 14 | Morocco | 5 | | 10 | Ukraine | | | 17 |
| Denmark | | 12 | | Mozambique | | | 13 | United Arab Emirates | | | 11 |
| Djibouti | 10 | | | Myanmar | | | 17 | United Kingdom | | 18 | |
| Dominican Rep. | | | <i>Absent</i> | Namibia | | | 11 | United Republic of Tanzania | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| El Salvador | | | 12 | Netherlands | | 13 | | Uruguay | | | 11 |
| Equatorial Guinea | 11 | | | New Zealand | | 11 | | Venezuela | | | 13 |
| Estonia | | | <i>Absent</i> | Niger | 13 | | | Viet Nam | | | 19 |
| Ethiopia | 10 | | 9 | Nigeria | | | <i>Absent</i> | Zambia | | | 13 |
| Finland | | | <i>Absent</i> | Norway | | 12 | | Zimbabwe | 13 | | |
| France | | 18 | | Oman | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | |
| Gabon | 11 | | | Pakistan | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | |
| Georgia | | | <i>Absent</i> | Palau | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | |
| Germany | | 19 | | Palestine | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | |
| Ghana | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Guinea | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Haiti | 10 | | | | | | | | | | |

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.

The role of the Inter-Parliamentary Union in addressing the terrorism and extremism of the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Al-Nusra Front and other terrorist groups

Results of roll-call vote on the request of the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic for the inclusion of an emergency item

R e s u l t s

| | | | |
|------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------------|-----|
| Affirmative votes..... | 216 | Total of affirmative and negative votes .. | 511 |
| Negative votes | 295 | Two-thirds majority..... | 341 |
| Abstentions | 680 | | |

| Country | Yes | No | Abst. | Country | Yes | No | Abst. | Country | Yes | No | Abst. |
|-------------------|-----|----|---------------|-----------------------------|-----|----|---------------|-----------------------------|-----|----|---------------|
| Afghanistan | 8 | | 6 | Hungary | | | 13 | Panama | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Albania | | | <i>Absent</i> | Iceland | | 10 | | Papua New Guinea | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Algeria | 15 | | | India | | | 23 | Peru | | | 14 |
| Angola | | | 12 | Indonesia | | | <i>Absent</i> | Philippines | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Argentina | | | <i>Absent</i> | Iran (Islamic Republic of) | 18 | | | Poland | | 15 | |
| Armenia | 10 | | | Iraq | | | <i>Absent</i> | Portugal | | 13 | |
| Australia | | | 14 | Ireland | | | 11 | Qatar | | | 8 |
| Austria | | 12 | | Israel | | 10 | | Republic of Korea | | | 17 |
| Azerbaijan | | | <i>Absent</i> | Italy | | | 17 | Romania | | 14 | |
| Bahrain | | | 10 | Japan | | | 20 | Russian Federation | 20 | | |
| Bangladesh | | | 20 | Jordan | 12 | | | Rwanda | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Belarus | | | <i>Absent</i> | Kazakhstan | | | <i>Absent</i> | San Marino | | | 10 |
| Belgium | | 12 | | Kenya | | | 15 | Sao Tome and Principe | | | 10 |
| Bhutan | | | <i>Absent</i> | Kuwait | | | 9 | Saudi Arabia | | | 14 |
| Botswana | | | 11 | Lao People's Dem. Republic | | | <i>Absent</i> | Senegal | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Brazil | | | 20 | Latvia | | 11 | | Seychelles | 10 | | |
| Bulgaria | | | <i>Absent</i> | Lesotho | | | 10 | Sierra Leone | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Burkina Faso | | 13 | | Lithuania | | | 11 | Slovakia | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Cambodia | 8 | | 5 | Luxembourg | | | 10 | South Africa | | | 17 |
| Cameroon | | | 13 | Madagascar | | | <i>Absent</i> | Spain | | 10 | |
| Canada | | 15 | | Malawi | | 13 | | Sri Lanka | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Chad | | | <i>Absent</i> | Malaysia | | | 14 | Sudan | 5 | | 10 |
| Chile | | | 13 | Maldives | | | <i>Absent</i> | Sweden | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| China | 23 | | | Mali | | | <i>Absent</i> | Switzerland | | 12 | |
| Côte d'Ivoire | | | 13 | Malta | | | <i>Absent</i> | Syrian Arab Rep. | 13 | | |
| Croatia | | | 10 | Mauritania | | | <i>Absent</i> | Thailand | 8 | | 10 |
| Cuba | | | 13 | Mexico | | | 20 | Timor-Leste | 11 | | |
| Cyprus | | | 10 | Micronesia (Fed. States of) | | | <i>Absent</i> | Trinidad & Tobago | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Czech Republic | 13 | | | Monaco | | | <i>Absent</i> | Turkey | | 18 | |
| DR of the Congo | | | 17 | Mongolia | | | <i>Absent</i> | Uganda | | | 13 |
| DPR of Korea | 14 | | | Morocco | | | 15 | Ukraine | | | 17 |
| Denmark | | 12 | | Mozambique | | | 13 | United Arab Emirates | | | 11 |
| Djibouti | | | 10 | Myanmar | | | 17 | United Kingdom | | 18 | |
| Dominican Rep. | | | <i>Absent</i> | Namibia | | | 11 | United Republic of Tanzania | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| El Salvador | | | 12 | Netherlands | | 13 | | Uruguay | | | 11 |
| Equatorial Guinea | | | 11 | New Zealand | | 11 | | Venezuela | 13 | | |
| Estonia | | | <i>Absent</i> | Niger | | | 13 | Viet Nam | 5 | | 14 |
| Ethiopia | | | 19 | Nigeria | | | <i>Absent</i> | Zambia | | | 13 |
| Finland | | | <i>Absent</i> | Norway | | 12 | | Zimbabwe | | | 13 |
| France | | 18 | | Oman | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | |
| Gabon | | | 11 | Pakistan | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | |
| Georgia | | | <i>Absent</i> | Palau | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | |
| Germany | | 19 | | Palestine | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | |
| Ghana | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Guinea | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Haiti | 10 | | | | | | | | | | |

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.

**The role of parliaments in combating all terrorist acts
perpetrated by organizations such as Daesh and Boko Haram
against innocent civilians, in particular women and girls**

**Results of roll-call vote on the request of the delegation of Australia and
Belgium for the inclusion of an emergency item**

R e s u l t s

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|---------------------------------------------|------|
| Affirmative votes | 994 | Total of affirmative and negative votes ... | 1017 |
| Negative votes | 23 | Two-thirds majority | 678 |
| Abstentions | 174 | | |

| Country | Yes | No | Abst. | Country | Yes | No | Abst. | Country | Yes | No | Abst. |
|-------------------|-----|----|---------------|-----------------------------|-----|----|---------------|-----------------------------|-----|----|---------------|
| Afghanistan | 14 | | | Hungary | 13 | | | Panama | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Albania | | | <i>Absent</i> | Iceland | 10 | | | Papua New Guinea | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Algeria | | | 15 | India | | | 23 | Peru | 14 | | |
| Angola | 12 | | | Indonesia | | | <i>Absent</i> | Philippines | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Argentina | | | <i>Absent</i> | Iran (Islamic Republic of) | | 18 | | Poland | 15 | | |
| Armenia | 10 | | | Iraq | | | <i>Absent</i> | Portugal | 13 | | |
| Australia | 14 | | | Ireland | 11 | | | Qatar | 8 | | |
| Austria | 12 | | | Israel | 10 | | | Republic of Korea | 17 | | |
| Azerbaijan | | | <i>Absent</i> | Italy | 17 | | | Romania | 14 | | |
| Bahrain | 10 | | | Japan | 20 | | | Russian Federation | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Bangladesh | 10 | | 10 | Jordan | 12 | | | Rwanda | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Belarus | | | <i>Absent</i> | Kazakhstan | | | <i>Absent</i> | San Marino | 10 | | |
| Belgium | 12 | | | Kenya | 15 | | | Sao Tome and Principe | 10 | | |
| Bhutan | | | <i>Absent</i> | Kuwait | 9 | | | Saudi Arabia | 14 | | |
| Botswana | 11 | | | Lao People's Dem. Republic | | | <i>Absent</i> | Senegal | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Brazil | 20 | | | Latvia | 11 | | | Seychelles | 10 | | |
| Bulgaria | | | <i>Absent</i> | Lesotho | 10 | | | Sierra Leone | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Burkina Faso | | | 13 | Lithuania | 11 | | | Slovakia | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Cambodia | 13 | | | Luxembourg | 10 | | | South Africa | | | 17 |
| Cameroon | 13 | | | Madagascar | | | <i>Absent</i> | Spain | 10 | | |
| Canada | 15 | | | Malawi | 13 | | | Sri Lanka | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Chad | | | <i>Absent</i> | Malaysia | | | 14 | Sudan | 15 | | |
| Chile | 13 | | | Maldives | | | <i>Absent</i> | Sweden | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| China | 23 | | | Mali | | | <i>Absent</i> | Switzerland | 12 | | |
| Côte d'Ivoire | 13 | | | Malta | | | <i>Absent</i> | Syrian Arab Rep. | 13 | | |
| Croatia | 10 | | | Mauritania | | | <i>Absent</i> | Thailand | 18 | | |
| Cuba | | | 13 | Mexico | 20 | | | Timor-Leste | 11 | | |
| Cyprus | 10 | | | Micronesia (Fed. States of) | | | <i>Absent</i> | Trinidad & Tobago | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Czech Republic | 13 | | | Moldova | | | <i>Absent</i> | Turkey | | | 18 |
| DR of the Congo | 17 | | | Mongolia | | | <i>Absent</i> | Uganda | 13 | | |
| DPR of Korea | | | 14 | Morocco | 15 | | | Ukraine | 17 | | |
| Denmark | 12 | | | Mozambique | 13 | | | United Arab Emirates | 11 | | |
| Djibouti | 10 | | | Myanmar | 17 | | | United Kingdom | 18 | | |
| Dominican Rep. | | | <i>Absent</i> | Namibia | 11 | | | United Republic of Tanzania | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| El Salvador | 12 | | | Netherlands | 13 | | | Uruguay | 11 | | |
| Equatorial Guinea | 11 | | | New Zealand | 11 | | | Venezuela | | | 13 |
| Estonia | | | <i>Absent</i> | Niger | 13 | | | Viet Nam | 5 | | 14 |
| Ethiopia | 19 | | | Nigeria | | | <i>Absent</i> | Zambia | 13 | | |
| Finland | | | <i>Absent</i> | Norway | 12 | | | Zimbabwe | 13 | | |
| France | 18 | | | Oman | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | |
| Gabon | 11 | | | Pakistan | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | |
| Georgia | | | <i>Absent</i> | Palau | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | |
| Germany | 19 | | | Palestine | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | |
| Ghana | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Guinea | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Haiti | 10 | | | | | | | | | | |

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.

The role of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and Member parliaments in combating terrorism and protecting the common heritage of humanity

Results of roll-call vote on the request of the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran with the support of the Asia-Pacific Group for the inclusion of an emergency item

R e s u l t s

| | | | |
|------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------------|-----|
| Affirmative votes..... | 558 | Total of affirmative and negative votes .. | 830 |
| Negative votes | 272 | Two-thirds majority..... | 553 |
| Abstentions | 361 | | |

| Country | Yes | No | Abst. | Country | Yes | No | Abst. | Country | Yes | No | Abst. |
|-------------------|-----|----|---------------|-----------------------------|-----|----|---------------|-----------------------------|-----|----|---------------|
| Afghanistan | 14 | | | Hungary | 7 | | 6 | Panama | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Albania | | | <i>Absent</i> | Iceland | | 10 | | Papua New Guinea | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Algeria | 15 | | | India | 23 | | | Peru | | | 14 |
| Angola | | | 12 | Indonesia | | | <i>Absent</i> | Philippines | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Argentina | | | <i>Absent</i> | Iran (Islamic Republic of) | 18 | | | Poland | | 10 | 5 |
| Armenia | 10 | | | Iraq | | | <i>Absent</i> | Portugal | | 13 | |
| Australia | | | 14 | Ireland | | | 11 | Qatar | 8 | | |
| Austria | | 12 | | Israel | | 10 | | Republic of Korea | | | 17 |
| Azerbaijan | | | <i>Absent</i> | Italy | | | 17 | Romania | | 14 | |
| Bahrain | | | 10 | Japan | 20 | | | Russian Federation | 20 | | |
| Bangladesh | 20 | | | Jordan | 12 | | | Rwanda | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Belarus | | | <i>Absent</i> | Kazakhstan | | | <i>Absent</i> | San Marino | | | 10 |
| Belgium | | 12 | | Kenya | 15 | | | Sao Tome and Principe | | | 10 |
| Bhutan | | | <i>Absent</i> | Kuwait | 9 | | | Saudi Arabia | | 14 | |
| Botswana | | | 11 | Lao People's Dem. Republic | | | <i>Absent</i> | Senegal | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Brazil | | | 20 | Latvia | | 11 | | Seychelles | 10 | | |
| Bulgaria | | | <i>Absent</i> | Lesotho | | | 10 | Sierra Leone | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Burkina Faso | | 13 | | Lithuania | | | 11 | Slovakia | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Cambodia | 13 | | | Luxembourg | | | 10 | South Africa | 17 | | |
| Cameroon | 13 | | | Madagascar | | | <i>Absent</i> | Spain | | 10 | |
| Canada | | 15 | | Malawi | | 13 | | Sri Lanka | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Chad | | | <i>Absent</i> | Malaysia | 14 | | | Sudan | 5 | | 10 |
| Chile | | | 13 | Maldives | | | <i>Absent</i> | Sweden | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| China | 23 | | | Mali | | | <i>Absent</i> | Switzerland | | 12 | |
| Côte d'Ivoire | | | 13 | Malta | | | <i>Absent</i> | Syrian Arab Rep. | 13 | | |
| Croatia | 10 | | | Mauritania | | | <i>Absent</i> | Thailand | 18 | | |
| Cuba | 13 | | | Mexico | 20 | | | Timor-Leste | 11 | | |
| Cyprus | | | 10 | Micronesia (Fed. States of) | | | <i>Absent</i> | Trinidad & Tobago | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| Czech Republic | 13 | | | Monaco | | | <i>Absent</i> | Turkey | | | 18 |
| DR of the Congo | 10 | | 7 | Mongolia | | | <i>Absent</i> | Uganda | 10 | | 3 |
| DPR of Korea | 14 | | | Morocco | | | 15 | Ukraine | | | 17 |
| Denmark | | 12 | | Mozambique | 13 | | | United Arab Emirates | | | 11 |
| Djibouti | 10 | | | Myanmar | 17 | | | United Kingdom | | 18 | |
| Dominican Rep. | | | <i>Absent</i> | Namibia | 11 | | | United Republic of Tanzania | | | <i>Absent</i> |
| El Salvador | 12 | | | Netherlands | | 13 | | Uruguay | 11 | | |
| Equatorial Guinea | 11 | | | New Zealand | | 11 | | Venezuela | 13 | | |
| Estonia | | | <i>Absent</i> | Niger | | | 13 | Viet Nam | 19 | | |
| Ethiopia | | | 19 | Nigeria | | | <i>Absent</i> | Zambia | | | 13 |
| Finland | | | <i>Absent</i> | Norway | | 12 | | Zimbabwe | 13 | | |
| France | | 18 | | Oman | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | |
| Gabon | | | 11 | Pakistan | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | |
| Georgia | | | <i>Absent</i> | Palau | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | |
| Germany | | 19 | | Palestine | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | |
| Ghana | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Guinea | | | <i>Absent</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Haiti | 10 | | | | | | | | | | |

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.

The role of parliaments in combating all terrorist acts perpetrated by organizations such as Daesh and Boko Haram against innocent civilians, in particular women and girls

Resolution adopted unanimously by the 132nd IPU Assembly (Hanoi, 31 March 2015)

The 132nd Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Considering that all forms and manifestations of terrorism are criminal and unjustifiable, regardless of the motivation and the perpetrators and no matter where they are committed,

Reaffirming that terrorism is not to be associated with any religion, nationality or civilization, or with any ethnic group,

Noting that those who commit, order, finance or support terrorist acts must be brought to justice,

Underscoring that such acts of violence target civilians, in particular women, children and the elderly,

Expressing grave concern at the continued threat that terrorism poses to international peace and security,

Bearing in mind that the self-proclaimed Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) (also known as Daesh) has accepted Boko Haram's pledge of allegiance,

Considering the scope and spread of the abuses committed by Boko Haram and ISIL, which is steadily expanding into new territory in Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic,

Bearing in mind that Nigeria, Chad, Niger, Cameroon and Benin decided to mobilize 8,700 men in early February to fight Boko Haram,

Considering that ISIL's ideology has inspired terrorist attacks in other parts of the world, for example Brussels, Paris, Sydney and most recently Tunis, and that those attacks are clearly aimed at undermining democracy and hampering intercultural dialogue and exchange by sowing terror,

Gravely concerned by the systematic looting and cultural destruction wrought by ISIL and deplored by UNESCO, which refers to "cultural cleansing",

Noting that all anti-terrorist measures must comply with international law, notably human rights law, refugee law and humanitarian law,

Recalling all relevant United Nations resolutions, notably those adopted by the Security Council, on terrorism and organized transborder crime, and condemning all forms of financing of terrorism,

Also recalling relevant IPU resolutions on terrorism, including the declaration adopted by the Ninth Meeting of Women Speakers of Parliament,

1. *Condemns in the strongest possible terms* all inhuman and terrorist acts and the steady escalation in violence;
2. *Requests* parliaments to use legislative channels to contribute to the implementation of relevant UN Security Council resolutions;
3. *Invites* all parliaments vigorously and unanimously to condemn the acts committed by ISIL and Boko Haram;
4. *Calls* for the development of avenues of cooperation between State security and intelligence agencies in order to facilitate the exchange of information between States;

5. *Invites* parliaments to pressure their respective governments to prosecute any person or organization helping to finance ISIL or Boko Haram, in accordance with UN Security Council resolutions 2161 (2014) and 2170 (2014);
6. *Requests* that any person having helped to commit war crimes or crimes against humanity in the name of those organizations be brought to justice;
7. *Also requests* that particular attention be paid to women and children in countries in which terrorist organizations like ISIL and Boko Haram are active;
8. *Condemns* the deliberate destruction and systematic looting of cultural property and *asks* that those responsible be held accountable and brought to justice;
9. *Calls on* parliaments to draw up a common strategy on citizens joining the ranks of such organizations and *proposes* that techniques for exchanging information between States be developed for that purpose;
10. *Also calls on* parliaments to adopt a common strategy to counter the remote recruitment of combatants and propaganda on the Internet, especially on social networks;
11. *Urges* the competent UN bodies to adopt the emergency measures needed to support the efforts being made on the ground by the countries of the Economic Community of Central African States and the Economic Community of West African States, to fight Boko Haram;
12. *Endorses* the initiatives taken by the Lake Chad Basin Commission, the African Union and the international community to find a solution to the problem, notably the establishment of the Multinational Joint Task Force;
13. *Reaffirms* the significance of dialogue among the governments and parliaments of all countries involved in the fight against terrorism.

Amendments to the Statutes and Rules of the IPU

Rules and Practices of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

*Amendment adopted by the Governing Council at its 196th session
(Hanoi, 1 April 2015)*

QUORUM

Rule 6

Amend the existing Rule as follows:

At least half of the number of members in exercise of their functions shall constitute the quorum for deliberating and taking decisions ~~shall be six members.~~

Cooperation with the United Nations system

List of activities undertaken by the IPU from 15 October 2014 to 15 March 2015

*Noted by the Governing Council at its 196th session
(Hanoi, 1st April 2015)*

United Nations

1. Pursuant to the May 2014 General Assembly Resolution on *Interaction between the United Nations, parliaments and the Inter-Parliamentary Union*, consultations were held on a new **Cooperation Agreement** between the two organizations that would place their institutional relationship on a stronger footing. A joint meeting of the IPU Sub-Committee on the future Cooperation Agreement and the Bureau of the IPU Standing Committee on United Nations Affairs was held at UN Headquarters in New York on 18 November 2014, under the chairmanship of the IPU President, and discussions were held on the main elements that should be included in the future Agreement.
2. Also in follow-up to the General Assembly Resolution, the IPU sought to introduce new language in a **decision of the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW)** giving formal recognition to the outcome of the parliamentary meeting that accompanies each session of the Commission. Several amendments to the decision on CSW working methods were introduced.
3. A new **UN focal point** for relations with parliaments and the IPU was appointed within the Department for Economic and Social Affairs (DESA). Mr. Juwang Zhu, Director of the Division for Public Administration, will help mainstream UN work with parliaments, facilitate communication between all departments and the IPU, and generally help oversee the implementation of the above-mentioned General Assembly Resolution. The IPU Secretary General met with the Division Director and the new Assistant Secretary-General of DESA on 10 March.
4. Close consultations have taken place between the Office of the IPU Permanent Observer to the UN in New York and various UN departments in preparation for the **Fourth World Conference of Speakers of Parliament**. Aspects that were discussed include protocol and security arrangements, conference facilities and related services. The IPU Secretary General met with the Director-General of the UN Office at Geneva (UNOG) and other senior officials to discuss the Speakers' Conference, the new cooperation agreement, and other issues relating to the UN-IPU partnership.
5. With respect to the **Post-2015 Declaration** that will be adopted at the UN in September 2015, the Office of the IPU Permanent Observer to the UN reached out to Permanent Missions in New York to promote the inclusion of clear language on the role of parliaments. Letters were sent to all Permanent Representatives and the IPU President met with the two co-Facilitators of the UN process, the Ambassadors of Ireland and Kenya. The missions of Bangladesh, the European Union, the United States and Viet Nam were particularly supportive of this effort. In a related development, a major synthesis **report of the UN Secretary-General** ahead of the SDG negotiations referred several times to the role of parliaments in this process.
6. On 9 and 10 February, the IPU President participated in a **thematic debate of the President of the General Assembly on the means of implementation for the SDGs**, chairing a session on the role of parliaments and local authorities in implementation. Several interventions from the floor underscored the role and responsibility of parliaments in this process. Ms. N. Assegaf, a member of Parliament from Indonesia, presented the work of her parliament's Task Force on the SDGs as a panellist.
7. Eleven members of the Forum of Young Parliamentarians of the IPU participated in the annual session of ECOSOC's **Youth Forum** on 2 and 3 February. The session was devoted to garnering a youth perspective on the emerging SDGs. The large delegation was headed by the President of the IPU Forum, Mr. F. Al Tenaiji of the United Arab Emirates. Two young parliamentarians participated as panellists. In the margins of the ECOSOC Youth Forum, the President and members of the IPU's Forum of Young Parliamentarians met with Mr. A. Alhendawi, the **UN Secretary-General's Envoy on Youth**, to further strengthen links between his Office and young members of parliament and to discuss possible cooperation.

8. The **2014 Parliamentary Hearing at the United Nations**, *Ensuring a people-centred approach to the new SDGs: A shared responsibility*, brought together over 200 parliamentarians and was co-organized with the President of the General Assembly. A number of high-level UN personalities participated as panellists, along with members of parliament and Ambassadors. The UN Secretary-General opened the Hearing and the Assistant Secretary-General responsible for the post-2015 agenda was a keynote speaker. The outcome of the Hearing will be circulated to all UN Member States as an official UN document.
9. On 6 January, the IPU participated in a **workshop organized by the group of friends of governance for sustainable development**. The group is led by the missions of Mexico, Republic of Korea and Romania. The IPU paper on *The role of parliaments in the implementation of the SDGs* was warmly received by participants. On 4 and 5 December, IPU representatives participated in the **Expert Group Meeting and Workshop** meant to help define the programme of work of ECOSOC for 2015 and 2016. The IPU participated in a panel that discussed the challenges of including the corporate sector as a development partner.
10. Following the debate on drugs within the IPU Standing Committee on United Nations Affairs at the 131st Assembly, the Office of the IPU Permanent Observer in New York lobbied for the inclusion of language on parliaments in a **UN resolution on International cooperation against the world drug problem**. As a result, the General Assembly formally “*Recognizes the constructive role that parliamentarians can play in addressing the world drug problem, and encourages their participation, as appropriate, in the preparatory process for the special session.*”
11. In keeping with its engagement with the **UN Development Cooperation Forum (DCF)**, the IPU worked closely with the DCF in preparation for the first symposium of the 2014- 2016 biennium that will be held in Republic of Korea from 8 to 10 April 2015. Some eight parliamentarians will participate in this multi-stakeholder event that will help redefine development cooperation in the light of the SDGs.
12. As a contribution to the **Second FAO-WHO International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2)** held from 19 to 21 November in Rome, Italy, a Parliamentary Meeting was organized with the Chamber of Deputies of Italy on the theme *Parliamentarians for better nutrition*. IPU Honorary President Mr. Pier Ferdinando Casini presented the outcomes of the parliamentary meeting to the ICN2 plenary.
13. The IPU mobilized a large parliamentary participation in the **United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP20/CMP10)** held in Lima, Peru, in December 2014 under the auspices of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Together with the Peruvian Congress, on 8 December the IPU organized a Parliamentary Meeting, which offered legislators an opportunity to obtain first-hand information on the main issues and orientations of the UN Conference, interact with government negotiators directly involved in the UNFCCC decision-making process and exchange views on parliamentary follow-up to the session in Lima. The declaration of the Parliamentary Meeting, the text of which was transmitted to COP20/CMP10 President, called on national parliaments to set up standing committees on climate change and on the IPU to adopt a parliamentary action plan on climate change. Immediately after the session in Lima, the IPU started consultations with a broad circle of partners, including the UNFCCC, with a view to providing effective parliamentary backing to the process of negotiations that should culminate with the adoption of a new, universal and binding global change agreement at the COP21/CMP11 session, to be held in Paris at the end of 2015. Preparations are underway to hold a major parliamentary event on the premises of the French Parliament in conjunction with the UNFCCC session in Paris.
14. The **Third International Conference on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons** was held at the Hofburg Palace in Vienna on 8 and 9 December 2014. Although not formally a UN process, the International Conference followed previous ones held in Oslo, Norway, in March 2013 and Nayarit, Mexico, in February 2014 aimed at mobilizing action on renewed global talks on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. A Parliamentary Meeting was held at the Austrian Parliament on this occasion in cooperation with Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament (PNND), and the IPU Secretary General addressed the International Conference with a strong message on behalf of the international parliamentary community, highlighting the salient points of the recent IPU resolution on *Towards a nuclear weapon-free world: The contribution of parliaments*.

15. The UN Secretary-General is due to launch his progress report on the **Global Strategy for Women's and Children's Health** (2010-2015) on the occasion of a special high-level event organized during the 59th session of the Commission on the Status of Women in March 2015. The IPU Secretary General has been invited to take part in the discussions as a panellist, sharing good practices as well as challenges faced by parliaments in promoting women and children's health.

UN Women

16. The **2015 Map of Women in Politics** will be released as a joint product of the IPU and UN Women. The official launch is scheduled to take place at a news conference at UN Headquarters on 10 March. The Map will be distributed to all UN Member States, IPU partners and participants of the Parliamentary Meeting organized in the sidelines of the CSW session.

17. The IPU and UN Women will organize on 11 March the annual **Parliamentary Meeting on the occasion of the 59th session of the Commission on the Status of Women** (9-20 March). The theme of the meeting, *Beijing+20*, replicates that of the main session, making an assessment of progress in the implementation of the landmark Beijing Declaration on its 20th anniversary. The IPU statement before the Commission will highlight the main conclusions of the Parliamentary Meeting.

18. The IPU took part in an international conference on *Women in power and decision-making: Building a different world*, organized by the Government of Chile with the support of UN Women on 27 and 28 February 2015. The IPU Secretary General delivered an address on *Creating Opportunities: Good practices to ensure women's full and equal participation in decision-making*.

UNDP

19. The IPU joined an inter-agency group led by UNDP (Millennium Campaign) working on the next version of **My World**, a global survey facility garnering citizens' perspectives on development. Building on the success of the existing online survey, *My World 2* will provide parliamentarians and other decision-makers with up-to-date feedback from citizens on the implementation of the SDGs.

20. The IPU continued to support a **Post-2015 Dialogue on Capacities and Institutions** led by UNDP and the International Labour Organization (ILO) as part of the lead-up to the adoption of the SDGs. The IPU joined a **virtual network of experts on the indicators of governance** that will need to be developed to monitor the governance goal of the SDGs (goal 16). The IPU provided important input to the first round of consultations in early February 2015.

21. The IPU continued to work closely with UNDP country offices, providing **technical assistance** and capacity-building programmes to national parliaments. This was the case over the past six months in Afghanistan, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Myanmar, Trinidad & Tobago and the United Arab Emirates.

OHCHR

22. A **seminar on Translating international human rights commitments into national realities: The contribution of parliaments to the work of the United Nations Human Rights Council**, was held for Asia-Pacific parliaments in Manila, Philippines, on 26 and 27 February. The seminar was organized jointly by the Senate of the Philippines and the IPU in collaboration with the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). It was part of a series of regional events aimed at strengthening the contribution of parliaments to the work of the Human Rights Council, including through its Universal Periodic Review (UPR).

23. As is customary at each session of the Committee on the Elimination of Discriminations against Women, the IPU presented its report on women in politics and the involvement of parliament in the reporting process in the countries under review by the Committee at its 60th session held in February 2015.

UNAIDS

24. In cooperation with UNAIDS and the National Assembly of Viet Nam, the IPU organized a mission to Viet Nam for its Advisory Group on HIV/AIDS and Maternal, Newborn and Child Health in late November 2014 to look at how the country's response to AIDS could be strengthened. The mission included a workshop for members of parliament that reviewed effective approaches to access to HIV treatment. The workshop was followed by a field visit that included meetings with the parliamentary bodies dealing with HIV, government health officials and civil society, as well as visits to treatment and research facilities. The mission recommended improvements to the Vietnamese National Assembly and documented good practices which the IPU will share with the global parliamentary community.

25. In December, the IPU and UNAIDS organized at IPU Headquarters a dialogue with a working group of six members of parliament from Kyrgyzstan, established to revise the draft bill on amending certain legislative acts of the Kyrgyz Republic (Penal Code, Administrative Responsibility Code and Laws on peaceful gatherings and mass media). The meeting was organized to enhance the understanding of members of the Kyrgyz Parliament of key challenges that are hindering effective responses to HIV, including the legal and policy environment. It focused on the role of parliament in advancing protective and effective responses to HIV for all and resulted in the Kyrgyz members of parliament expressing their commitment to engage their peers on best parliamentary practices in the context of HIV.

UNICEF

26. Hosted by the National Assembly of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, a regional parliamentary seminar was organized with UNICEF in Vientiane from 4 to 6 November. The seminar aimed to enhance the understanding of parliamentarians and parliamentary staff of issues related to malnutrition and stunting, including the damaging effects inaction to address inadequate nutrition can have on countries' economic development. The conclusions of the seminar were fed into the parliamentary meeting held at the FAO-WHO sessions later that month (see paragraph 12 above).

27. The IPU worked with UNICEF to prepare an interactive debate on the 25th anniversary of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, as part of the work of IPU's Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights at the 132nd IPU Assembly.

UNISDR

28. In cooperation with the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), the IPU held a Parliamentary Meeting on 13 March at the Third UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, aimed at reviewing progress on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 and adopt a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction. Members of parliament were encouraged to participate in the main conference as part of national delegations. Key references to parliaments and the IPU were included in the negotiated text.

WHO

29. On 6 and 7 November 2014, the IPU attended the Stakeholder Consultation jointly organized by the World Health Organization (WHO) and the Governments of Canada and Norway on the theme *Accountability for Women's and Children's Health: Setting the foundations for post-2015*. The meeting gathered representatives from government, parliament, civil society and international organizations, who reaffirmed their commitment to accelerating progress on women's and children's health. Stakeholders at the meeting agreed to update the Global Strategy for Women's and Children's Health, launched in September 2010 by the UN Secretary-General. The first consultation on the updated Strategy took place in New Delhi on 26 and 27 February, where three IPU representatives presented a parliamentary contribution to the issue.

30. From 19 to 23 January 2015, the IPU participated in the Accountability Loop Budget Advocacy training workshop held in Harare, Zimbabwe. Organized by the Harmonization for Health in Africa under the auspices of the WHO, the IPU and other partners, the workshop provided parliamentarians from five Southern African countries with an opportunity to gain exposure to and acquire skills and knowledge on effective budget advocacy.

WMO

31. Prior to the COP20/CMP10 session in Lima, where the IPU organized a parallel parliamentary meeting (see paragraph 11 above), the IPU started active cooperation with the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) with a view to bringing to the attention of legislators the vast amount of climate-related scientific knowledge generated by the WMO and bodies related to it, such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Together with WMO experts, the IPU plans to publish a handbook for parliamentarians on the subject of climate-related legislation.

WTO

32. The IPU is the driving force behind a decade-long process known as the Parliamentary Conference on the WTO, which acts as the de facto parliamentary dimension of this intergovernmental organization. With its sessions held annually and on the occasion of WTO Ministerial Conferences, the Conference aims to enhance the external transparency of the WTO and serves to hold it accountable to legislators as representatives of the people. The annual 2015 session of the Conference took place on WTO premises on 16 and 17 February and was attended by over 350 parliamentary delegates from some 65 countries. One of the distinct features of the session was its focus on dialogue between parliamentarians and senior WTO negotiators and officials. It provided delegates with a wealth of information indispensable for speedy ratification by parliaments of various trade accords negotiated at the WTO, such as the recently concluded Trade Facilitation Agreement requiring ratification by two-thirds of WTO Members in order to enter into force. The Outcome Document of the Parliamentary Conference was officially transmitted to the WTO Director-General, who participated in the session and fielded a number of questions from parliamentary delegates.

Call for action, *My power for Women's Power*

*Endorsed by the IPU Governing Council at its 196th session
(Hanoi, 1 April 2015)*

If you are an MP, use the power you have to make the world we want
Join women MPs everywhere to create a better world for all women and all girls

We parliamentarians celebrating the 30th anniversary of the IPU Meeting of Women Parliamentarians,

Believe we can and must create a better world for all women and all girls through our action.

We legislators, representatives of the people, overseers of governments, commit to a world that treats women and girls as equals of men and boys at all ages, in all spheres.

Through parliaments, we have the power to fight injustice, inequalities and discrimination in all our work and at all times;

We commit to adopting laws to anchor equality in our societies;

We commit to using our budgetary and oversight powers to make these laws a reality for women and empowering women and girls in all spheres and by all means.

We undertake to reform politics to enhance opportunities for women as leaders and decision-makers both in the public and private sectors.

We commit to lead by example and create gender-sensitive parliaments that embody and deliver on gender equality.

We know the power of women's solidarity and the power of MPs united around a common cause.

If you are an MP, join the women MPs of the world.

If you are an MP, be the power you have and sign.

I am an MP, my power for women's power

Calendar of future meetings and other activities

*Approved by the IPU Governing Council at its 196th session
(Hanoi, 1 April 2015)*

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| IPU Global Conference of Young Parliamentarians in Tokyo | TOKYO (Japan) 27-28 May 2015 |
| Third Meeting of the Preparatory Committee of the Fourth World Conference of Speakers of Parliament | GENEVA (IPU Headquarters) 1-2 June 2015 |
| Information seminar on the structure and functioning of the Inter-Parliamentary Union for English-speaking participants | GENEVA (IPU Headquarters) 9-12 June 2015 |
| Regional Seminar on Implementation of the new Sustainable Developments Goals (for Parliaments in Central and Eastern Europe) | BUCHAREST (Romania) 15-16 June 2015 |
| Twelfth Workshop of Parliamentary Scholars and Parliamentarians organized by the Centre for Legislative Studies at the Hull University and sponsored by the IPU | WROXTON (United Kingdom) 25-26 July 2015 |
| 10 th Meeting of Women Speakers of Parliament | Venue to be determined 29-30 August 2015 |
| Fourth World Conference of Speakers of Parliament | NEW YORK (UN Headquarters) 31 August -2 September 2015 |
| Parliamentary Panel within the framework of the annual WTO Public Forum | GENEVA (WTO Headquarters) 30 September 2015 |
| 34 th session of the Steering Committee of the Parliamentary Conference on the WTO | GENEVA (IPU Headquarters) 1 October 2015 |
| 133 rd Assembly and related meetings | GENEVA (Switzerland) 17-21 October 2015 |
| Joint IPU-ASGP Conference | GENEVA (Switzerland) October 2015 |
| Parliamentary Meeting on the occasion of the United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP21/CMP11) | PARIS (France) 5-6 December 2015 |
| Seminar for West African Parliaments on child labour and trafficking | ABUJA (Nigeria) Date to be determined |
| Regional seminar on violence against women / gender equality | Venue and date to be determined |
| Regional seminar for Southern African parliaments on promoting child nutrition | Venue and date to be determined |
| Seminar on Nationality and Statelessness, organized with UNHCR | Venue and date to be determined |
| Regional seminar on maternal, new-born and child health | Venue and date to be determined |
| Regional seminar on terrorism and human rights | Pakistan Date to be determined |
| 134 th Assembly and related meetings | LUSAKA (Zambia) 19-23 March 2016 |
| World e-Parliament Conference | Venue and date to be determined |

Agenda of the 133rd Assembly

(Geneva, 17 – 21 October 2015)

1. Election of the President and Vice-Presidents of the 133rd Assembly
2. Consideration of requests for the inclusion of an emergency item in the Assembly agenda
3. General Debate
4. Democracy in the digital era and the threat to privacy and individual freedoms
(Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights)
5. Reports of the Standing Committees on Peace and International Security; Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade; and United Nations Affairs
6. Approval of the subject item for the Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights at the 135th IPU Assembly and appointment of the Rapporteurs

Decisions concerning the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

KENYA

KEN/55 - Melitus Mugabe Were

*Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 196th session
(Hanoi, 1st April 2015)*

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Having before it the case of Mr. Melitus Mugabe Were, a member of parliament of Kenya who was assassinated in January 2008, which has been examined by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians pursuant to the Procedure for the examination and treatment of complaints (Annex I of the revised rules and practices of the Committee) since its 121st session (April 2008),

Taking into account the letter of the Clerk of the National Assembly of Kenya dated 28 March 2015 and the information provided by the Kenyan delegation to the 132nd IPU Assembly (Hanoi, March 2015) on the occasion of the hearing of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians,

Considering the following information on file:

- Mr. Melitus Mugabe Were, a member of the opposition Orange Democratic Movement (ODM) of Kenya, was assassinated on 29 January 2008 amidst the violence that erupted following the contested Kenyan presidential elections of December 2007;
- The police concluded the investigation in 2008 and four persons were subsequently charged with the murder, all of whom were in custody at that time;
- Several witnesses appeared in court during trial proceedings, which encountered significant delays with repeated adjournments and changes in the presiding judges. The criminal proceedings were mishandled to the point that the judge in the case declared a mistrial in November 2011 and ordered that the case be retried;
- The retrial commenced in December 2011 and continued in 2012. Twelve witnesses had testified by July 2012 and 11 more were due to testify,

Considering that the Speaker of the National Assembly has regularly provided information on the trial proceedings of the four persons who were arrested after the crime up until October 2012, and that no further information has been forthcoming from the Kenyan authorities since that date,

Considering that, according to the information recently submitted by the National Assembly of Kenya in a letter dated 28 March 2015 and during the hearing held with the Kenyan delegation during the 132nd IPU Assembly:

- The High Court of Kenya concluded the first instance proceedings against the suspected murderers of Mr. Were on 10 February 2015, convicting three of the suspects to the death penalty and acquitting a fourth person. Mr. Were's widow has reportedly expressed her satisfaction. The persons convicted have not appealed the conviction to date, but may still do so as the time period to file a notice of appeal has not yet expired;
- It is not contested that the trial took a very long time to complete. The delays were caused by procedural requirements, as the proceedings had to be restarted afresh whenever a new judge took over the hearing of the case upon the request of the defence lawyers, in compliance with the rights of the accused pursuant to the criminal procedure and the Constitution of Kenya;
- The Court established beyond any reasonable doubt that Mr. Were had been fatally shot in the course of an attempted robbery, on the basis of witness statements and forensic evidence (including fingerprints, DNA and ballistic expert examinations) adduced by the

prosecution. The Court expressed its deep appreciation for the utmost professionalism and diligence shown by the police in the investigation and the subsequent quality of the evidence produced;

- The Court has considered that it was clear that the motive for the assault on the newly elected parliamentarian was robbery, but it also noted in its ruling (without drawing further conclusions in that respect) that Mr. Were's election had been unexpected and had been challenged, as it had been assumed that the candidate from the Party of National Unity (PNU) would win the Embakasi constituency. A prosecution witness testified that Mr. Were had told some of his supporters that his life was in danger and had requested Parliament to provide him with a bodyguard. His request could not be granted, however, because he had not yet been sworn in as a member of parliament, due to persisting tensions in the country,
1. *Thanks* the parliamentary authorities of Kenya for the information provided;
 2. *Notes with satisfaction* that the High Court of Kenya finally completed the trial proceedings and sentenced the culprits for the murder of Mr. Were; *regrets nevertheless* the delays in the proceedings, which have taken more than seven years to reach a first-instance ruling;
 3. *Is pleased* that the Parliament of Kenya has continued monitoring the proceedings to date in line with its overall commitment to ensuring that the crimes committed in the aftermath of the 2007 presidential elections would not go unpunished; *trusts* that it will continue doing so, should an appeal take place;
 4. *Awaits further details* on the status of the proceedings at this stage and *wishes to be kept informed* should an appeal be filed, or should the conviction become definitive; in the event of an appeal, *would appreciate receiving information* on the process and to know whether the Court of Appeals upholds the ruling, including with regard to the motives of the crime;
 5. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the parliamentary authorities and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
 6. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining this case and to report back to it in due course.

RWANDA

RW/06 - Léonard Hitimana

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 196th session (Hanoi, 1st April 2015)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Léonard Hitimana, who disappeared 12 years ago, on 7 April 2003, while he was a member of the Transitional National Assembly of Rwanda, which was dissolved on 22 August 2003, and to the resolution it adopted at its 192nd session (March 2013); *referring also* to the report of the on-site mission carried out by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians in June 2011 (CL/189/11(b)-R.3),

Recalling the following information on file:

- Mr. Hitimana disappeared on the evening of 7 April 2003, the day before he was to have refuted accusations in Parliament that his party, the Republican Democratic Movement (MDR), was fomenting ethnic strife and division; the MDR was to be banned and dissolved on the basis of those accusations;
- The authorities have always maintained that Mr. Hitimana fled to a neighbouring country, that an Interpol yellow notice for missing persons was issued, with special emphasis on neighbouring countries where the authorities believed Mr. Hitimana might be living, and

that they were optimistic that he would soon be located; Mr. Hitimana nevertheless is still missing 12 years after his disappearance; the authorities have stated on various occasions that Mr. Hitimana was not a key political figure and that it was therefore highly unlikely that he would have been the target of an enforced disappearance; according to them, Mr. Hitimana's disappearance had nothing to do with his imminent statement in Parliament; in past letters, the Speakers of both Houses of Parliament stated that both the police and the National Human Rights Commission had looked into the complainants' allegations and concluded that they were unfounded, and that they were unaware of any new evidence having emerged since the IPU mission carried out in June 2011;

The following picture has emerged from the information provided by various complainants and sources of information over the years of the alleged circumstances of Mr. Hitimana's disappearance:

- According to eyewitness accounts, Mr. Hitimana's car was intercepted late in the afternoon of 7 April 2003 by Rwandan Directorate of Military Intelligence (DMI) agents; the agents are alleged to have taken Mr. Hitimana to Kami military camp, where, on the orders of superiors, he was tortured and killed in May 2003 by Mr. John Karangwa, who was Deputy Director of Counter-intelligence at the time; Mr. Hitimana's remains were then removed to an unknown destination; persons making their rounds at the Kaniga border post say that they saw Mr. Hitimana's car and that of the military; Mr. Hitimana's car was allegedly moved by police or intelligence officers to Byumba, where it was apparently kept for a month; Mr. Hitimana's representatives subsequently retrieved the car and were told by the police that it was in the condition in which they had found it close to the border with Uganda; according to the representatives, the car's electrical cables had been cut, the key was no longer in the ignition and there were bloodstains on the front seat;
- The suspected perpetrator, DMI officer John Karangwa, has been accused by non-governmental sources not only of having killed Mr. Hitimana, but also of having abducted and executed, in April 2003, Mr. Augustin Cyiza, the Vice-President of Rwanda's Supreme Court, the President of Rwanda's Cassation Court and a founding member of two Rwandan human rights organizations;
- The sources believe that Mr. Hitimana was abducted by the DMI in order to silence any opposition to the dissolution of his party;
- In 2003, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment sent urgent appeals to the Rwandan Government regarding the arbitrary detention and alleged torture of detainees at Kami and other military camps; the United Nations Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances has been examining the case of Mr. Hitimana's disappearance since 2 July 2003; the United Nations Human Rights Committee, in its concluding observations of 31 March 2009 (CCPR/C/RWA/CO/3), expressed "concern about reported cases of enforced disappearances and summary or arbitrary executions in Rwanda, and about the impunity apparently enjoyed by the police forces responsible for such violations", and about "the lack of information from the State party regarding the disappearance of [...] Mr. Léonard Hitimana",

Recalling that the Speakers of both Houses of Parliament, in their letter of 19 October 2012, stated that the investigations were ongoing, but had achieved no results to date, that the Rwandan judicial system respects the rights of witnesses and ensures their protection, and that videoconferencing is used in Rwanda when required for the purposes of an investigation,

Considering that, according to information provided by one of the complainants in March 2015, Mr. Hitimana's disappearance had still not been seriously investigated,

Considering that, in 2011, the UN Human Rights Council adopted a series of recommendations for Rwanda during the first cycle of the Universal Periodic Review. The following recommendations were supported by the authorities, which they considered to be in the process of being implemented: (i) ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance; (ii) respond effectively to the request for information by the Human Rights Committee in 2009 regarding the follow-up given to the recommendations related to forced disappearances; and

(iii) respond to all the cases submitted by the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances; *noting* however that, as at March 2015, the aforesaid convention has not been ratified and that there is no indication that steps have been taken to implement recommendations 2 and 3,

1. *Is extremely concerned* about Mr. Hitimana's continued disappearance, 12 years after he was last seen;
2. *Deplores* the continued silence in recent years of the Rwandan Parliament in response to its calls for effective parliamentary oversight to ensure that light is finally shed on his fate;
3. *Considers* this state of affairs to be all the more regrettable, as the lack of a serious investigation can only support the long-standing accusation that Mr. Hitimana was the victim of an enforced disappearance; *stresses* that Mr. Hitimana was not a junior politician, but played an important role in his party, and the fact that he was slated for intending to speak in Parliament the following day against the party's dissolution, in a pre-electoral context in which he was considered a serious contender, constitutes a serious motive for the crime;
4. *Recalls* that enforced disappearances are a serious human rights violation and that the enforced disappearance of a member of parliament, if the perpetrators are not brought to justice and punished, stands as a threat to Parliament as such, to all its members and, in the final analysis, to the people Parliament represents, as it can only encourage the repetition of such acts;
5. *Again urges* the authorities to carry out an independent, prompt and effective investigation, examining all lines of enquiry, including by questioning Mr. John Karangwa, Deputy Director of Counter-intelligence at the time of Mr. Hitimana's disappearance; *recalls* in this regard that the Minister of Justice pledged, during the Committee's 2011 mission, that he would ensure that the investigation would also examine the possibility that Mr. Hitimana had been assassinated in Rwanda; *is convinced* that, if new lines of inquiry are effectively followed, new evidence will soon emerge and *eagerly awaits* to receive information to this effect;
6. *Calls on* Parliament to do everything possible to help ensure that these steps are indeed taken, and to expedite the implementation of the long-standing recommendation to ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance to which the Rwandan authorities agreed; *wishes* to be kept informed of any action taken in this regard;
7. *Recalls* that witness fear of reprisals and lack of effective protection were major obstacles encountered by the mission and affect the pursuit of justice; *remains anxious*, therefore, to know whether the planned witness protection law has been adopted and what practical steps have been taken as a result, and whether other initiatives have been taken to reassure potential witnesses in Rwanda that their safety will be fully guaranteed if they come forward; *reaffirms* its belief that the investigation would benefit from hearing any witnesses living abroad in their countries of residence, in particular by means of videoconferencing; *repeats* that it wishes to know whether the authorities have explored this possibility;
8. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the relevant authorities, the complainants, and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
9. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining this case and to report back to it in due course.

ZAMBIA

| | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| ZM01 - Michael Kaingu | ZM11 - Maxwell Mwale |
| ZM02 - Jack Mwiimbu | ZM12 - Kenneth Konga |
| ZM03 - Garry Nkombo | ZM13 - Annie Munshya Chungu (Ms) |
| ZM04 - Request Muntanga | ZM14 - Howard Kunda |
| ZM05 - Boyd Hamusonde | ZM15 - Michael Katambo |
| ZM06 - Moono Lubezhi (Ms.) | ZM16 - James Chishiba |
| ZM07 - Dora Siliya (Ms.) | ZM17 - Hastings Sililo |
| ZM08 - Mwalimu Simfukwe | ZM18 - Lucky Mulusa |
| ZM09 - Sarah Sayifwanda (Ms.) | ZM19 - Patrick Mucheleka |
| ZM10 - Lt. Gen. Ronnie Shikapwasha | ZM20 - Eustacio Kazonga |

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 196th session (Hanoi, 1st April 2015)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of the above-mentioned individuals, all elected in the September 2011 parliamentary elections as members of political parties that are now in the opposition, and the decision which it adopted at its 195th session (October 2014),

Considering the report of the on-site mission that the then president and current member of the Committee, Senator Juan Pablo Letelier, conducted to Zambia from 22 to 25 September 2014 at the invitation of the Speaker of the National Assembly (CL/196/12(b)-R.1), *considering also* the information provided by the Speaker of the National Assembly at the hearing with the Committee on 27 March 2015,

Considering that the mission report underscores that the following issues provide the essential backdrop for understanding the cases of the individual members of parliament before the Committee:

- The results of the 2011 legislative elections
The September 2011 legislative elections produced a hung parliament with 60 seats for the Patriotic Front (PF), 55 for the Movement for Multiparty Democracy (MMD) and 28 for the United Party for National Development (UPND). As a result of several successful court petitions asking for the disqualification of opposition seats, party switching and the acceptance of offers of ministerial and deputy ministerial posts by members of MMD and UPND while remaining members of their original parties, the balance of power in Parliament was altered;
- The existence and application of the Public Order Act
The contents, use and interpretation of the Public Order Act, including with regard to the role and discretion of the police, have given rise to controversy. According to the opposition parliamentarians, the act was being used discriminately as a tool to intimidate and harass them. The authorities acknowledged that there were challenges, but stated that everything was being done to administer the act fairly;
- The fight against corruption
Although the government and judicial officials underscored the need to show zero tolerance for corruption, the opposition stressed that most, if not all, of the corruption-related cases brought against political opponents were not based on any evidence, but were politically motivated. In this respect, it should be noted that it was often mentioned during the mission that clear and comprehensive rules governing the financing of political parties and political campaigns were absent;

Constitutional reform

Discussions have been ongoing about the need for a new Constitution that would provide inter alia a different blueprint for Zambia's state structures, including with regard to the powers of the President, which the opposition held were excessive,

Considering that the original complaint made reference to allegedly politically motivated legal proceedings against several opposition parliamentarians and that, taking into account, as well the information provided by the Speaker of the National Assembly at the hearing with the Committee, the current situation for those listed below appears to be as follows:

- Mr. Konga is not subject to any legal proceedings and all restrictions on his property have been lifted;
- The petition challenging Ms. Sayifwanda's election was dismissed and she was declared validly elected;
- Mr. Simfukwe was acquitted on a charge of abuse of authority in February 2013;
- Mr. Hamusonde is not subject to any legal action;
- Mr. Mwale was sentenced on 25 February 2015 at first instance to a 12-month prison term on the charge of abuse of authority; he was acquitted on the charge of possession of property suspected of being the proceeds of crime; Mr. Mwale and the prosecution have appealed the verdict on the first and second charge respectively,

Considering that Mr. Mulusa, Ms. Siliya and Lt. Gen. Shikapwasha, the latter two being allegedly subjected to politically motivated proceedings on charges of abuse of authority, were not available at the time of the mission and that no information has been forthcoming from the complainants on their situation since the mission,

Considering that Mr. Kaingu and Mr. Chishiba have switched political parties and are now members of the ruling Patriotic Front, with Mr. Kaingu having been appointed Minister of Education, Science and Technology by the new President of Zambia, Mr. Lungu, who was elected in the by-election held on 20 January 2015,

Considering that, according to the Speaker, the appointment by the current President and subsequent ratification by the National Assembly of the Chief Justice in February 2015 should help accelerate the treatment of the petitions requesting the Supreme Court to allow Mr. Mwale, Mr. Sililo and Ms. Siliya to re-contest their seats in Parliament,

Considering the allegations contained in the mission report about specific incidents of violations under the Public Order Act, namely the arbitrary arrests in December 2012 of Ms. Chungu, Mr. Katambo, Mr. Kunda and Mr. Chishiba, the arbitrary arrest of Mr. Mucheleka in June 2013, and the arbitrary obstructions by police of three rallies. Mr. Mwimbu and Mr. Nkombo participated in the first rally, organized in Kanyama in September 2012 with the authorization of the High Court. Mr. Kaingu participated in the second rally in Mongu in October 2012, while Ms. Lubezhi participated in the third rally in Namwala in December 2012; *considering* also that since the mission there have not been any new reports of alleged violations of member of parliaments' rights to freedom of assembly and to liberty under the Public Order Act,

Considering that the Speaker of the National Assembly stated that the current President of Zambia was taking steps to promote several legislative reforms and had proposed a two-pronged approach to the adoption of a new Constitution, the draft of which had been released to the public in October 2014; with the exception of the bill of rights, which adoption would require a referendum to be simultaneously held with the general elections in 2016, all other matters covered by the draft Constitution, in which several of the issues at stake in the cases at hand had found their way, could be taken up as early as June 2015 when the National Assembly reconvened,

Considering also that the Speaker stated that he was committed to promoting discussion and agreement on a new version of the Public Order Act, that he had spoken to the President of Zambia for this purpose and that discussions on a modernized version of the latter act should start soon and hopefully lead to a concrete outcome by 2016,

1. *Thanks* the Speaker and the other Zambian authorities for the full cooperation that they have extended to the mission, including the extensive documentation that they have provided;
2. *Endorses* the conclusions and recommendations contained in the mission report;
3. *Notes with concern* the report's references to incidents in 2012 and 2013 in which reliance on the Public Order Act appears to have run counter to member of parliaments' rights to freedom of assembly and to liberty;
4. *Is pleased* therefore at the prospect that effective action will be taken to modernize the Public Order Act; *trusts* that the authorities will put in place for this purpose a national consultative process involving all political parties, the police, the National Human Rights Commission, as well as other interested parties, with a view to ensuring that the concerns and challenges that have arisen in the cases at hand are properly addressed, including by giving due consideration to the recommendations made to this end in the mission report; *assures* that the IPU stands ready to assist in those efforts, including by sharing relevant experiences from other countries, should that be requested;
5. *Trusts* that, in the light of the announced revision of the Public Order Act and the absence of allegations of any new abuses in the last two years, there will be no repeat of the aforesaid incidents under the act; *requests* therefore Ms. Chungu, Mr. Katambo, Mr. Kunda, Mr. Mucheleka, Mr. Mwiimbu, Ms. Lubezhi and Mr. Kazonga to state whether they see any further need at this stage for the Committee to continue examining their case; also *requests* Mr. Muntanga to pronounce himself on this question with regard to his own situation;
6. *Is pleased* that progress is being made to promote a new Constitution; *wishes* to be kept informed of developments in this regard, in particular inasmuch as the discussions concern the regulation of issues related to public funding of political parties, fundraising, campaign spending and financial disclosure;
7. *Considers* in light of the need to ensure proper and timely representation of all Zambian citizens in the National Assembly that it is absolutely essential that the Supreme Court adopt without further delay a ruling on the petitions regarding the possibility for Ms. Siliya, Mr. Sililo and Mr. Mwale to re-contest their seats; *trusts* that the renewed impetus given to this matter will bring about a swift ruling; *wishes* to be kept informed in this regard;
8. *Is concerned* that the alleged attacker of Mr. Nkombo during the incident at a police station in February 2013 was not held to account, despite the existence of a report detailing his complaint and injury; *considers* that, even though Mr. Nkombo could have availed himself of legal avenues to pursue his claim civilly, his account of the incident and the medical report should have pushed the relevant authorities to establish full accountability for what occurred at the police station; *wishes* to know whether any further steps remain possible in this regard;
9. *Decides* to close the examination of the cases where legal proceedings against parliamentarians are not or no longer pending, including with regard to Mr. Konga, Ms. Sayifwanda, Mr. Simfukwe and Mr. Hamusonde; *decides* also to close the cases of Mr. Kaingu and Mr. Chishiba in the absence of any updated information on their part;
10. *Appreciates* the commitment expressed by the Speaker to make available a copy of the ruling in the case against Mr. Mwale; *requests* Ms. Siliya and Lt. Gen. Shikapwasha to indicate to the Committee whether they wish it to continue the examination of their case and, if so, on what grounds; also *requests* Mr. Mulusa, who was also not available to meet the mission in September 2014, to state whether or not he would like to see further examination of his case by the Committee;
11. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the relevant authorities, the complainant, the parliamentarians directly concerned, and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
12. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining this case and to report back to it in due course.

MALAYSIA

MAL21 - N. Surendran
MAL22 - Teresa Kok (Ms.)
MAL23 - Khalid Samad
MAL24 - Rafizi Ramli
MAL25 - Chua Tian Chang
MAL26 - Ng Wei Aik
MAL27 - Teo Kok Seong

Decision adopted by consensus by the IPU Governing Council at its 196th session (Hanoi, 1st April 2015) ³

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the cases of Mr. N. Surendran, Ms. Teresa Kok, Mr. Khalid Samad, Mr. Rafizi Ramli and Mr. Chua Tian Chang, members of the House of Representatives of Malaysia, and to the decision it adopted at its 194th session (October 2014),

Having before it the cases of Mr. Ng Wei Aik and Mr. Teo Kok Seong, which have been examined by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians pursuant to the Procedure for the examination and treatment of complaints (Annex I of the revised rules and practices),

Taking into account the information provided by the Malaysian delegation to the 132nd IPU Assembly (Hanoi, March 2015) on the occasion of the hearing held with the Committee; *recalling also* the information provided to the Committee by the Malaysian delegation to the 131st IPU Assembly (October 2014); *taking into account also* the information regularly provided by the complainants,

Recalling that the following parliamentarians have been charged since May 2013 with sedition, or are being investigated under (a), (b) and (c) of Section 4(1) of the Sedition Act of 1948:

- Ms. Teresa Kok, an opposition member of parliament for Seputeh in the Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur, was charged on 5 May 2014 for making a satirical video called “Onederful Malaysia”, which was published on YouTube on 27 January 2014. The Malaysian delegation emphasized in October 2014 that, according to the charges, the video raised sensitive security issues in Sabah, contained insults and promoted disaffection against the judiciary;
- Mr. Khalid Samad, a member of parliament for Shah Alam in the State of Selangor, was charged on 26 August 2014, under Section 4(1)(b) of the Sedition Act, for suggesting during a press conference in the parliamentary lobby, held on 26 June 2014, that an enactment allowing the Selangor Islamic Religious Council (MAIS) to control the State's religious authorities should be reviewed. The Malaysian delegation emphasized in October 2014 that, according to the charges, his remarks included calls for the return to a constitutional monarchy and questioned the powers of the rulers;
- Mr. N. Surendran, an opposition member of parliament for Padang Serai in the State of Kedah and lawyer for opposition leader Mr. Anwar Ibrahim, was charged twice within two weeks. His first charge, under Section 4(1)(c) of the Sedition Act, was for a press statement he released on 18 April 2014 entitled “Court of Appeal's Fitnah 2 written judgement is flawed, defensive and insupportable”, in which he criticized the decision of the appellate court against the appeal of his client, Mr. Anwar Ibrahim, for a second sodomy conviction. The second charge, under Section 4(1)(b) of the Sedition Act, on 28 August 2014, was for a video on YouTube dated 8 August 2014 in which he stated that Mr. Anwar Ibrahim's second sodomy trial and conviction was part of a political conspiracy;
- Mr. Rafizi Ramli, an opposition member of parliament for Pandan in the Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur, is currently under three separate sedition investigations. One is for providing the media with a letter allegedly written to Bank Rakyat from the Domestic Trade, Cooperatives and Consumerism Minister, Datuk Seri Hasan Malek. Another is for remarks

³ The delegation of Malaysia expressed its reservation regarding the decision.

he made against right-wing groups in the country in which he criticized their call to protest outside churches. The third is for writing a book called “Reformasi 2.0: Fakta Kes Anwar Ibrahim” (translated as “Reforms 2.0: The Facts of Anwar Ibrahim’s Case”);

- Mr. Chua Tian Chang, an opposition member of parliament for Batu, is also being charged with sedition over speeches he made at the Kuala Lumpur and Selangor Chinese Assembly Hall in Jalan Maharajalela, allegedly claiming that the United Malays National Organization staged the Sulu invasion into Sabah,

Recalling that the complainants affirm that the Sedition Act aims to stifle the opposition; they consider that the act is drafted so broadly so as to criminalize democratic speech, including criticism against the Government, its leaders, and ruling political parties,

Considering that, according to the complainants, the sedition charges and investigations have been put on hold pending a ruling by the Federal Court on the petition challenging the constitutionality of the Sedition Act 1948; on 24 March 2015, the Federal Court reserved judgement on the matter,

Recalling that the late member of parliament, Mr. Karpal Singh, was convicted on 21 February 2014 of sedition and sentenced to pay a fine of 4,000 ringgit; persons who are convicted of a crime for which the punishment is imprisonment of one year or more or a fine of 2,000 ringgit cannot be members of parliament; if convicted, parliamentarians charged with sedition face a maximum prison sentence of three years and a maximum fine of 5,000 ringgit,

Recalling that, according to the Malaysian delegation in October 2014, freedom of expression was fully respected in Malaysia, that the Sedition Act was nothing new and had been inherited from the former British rulers, that the existence of the Sedition Act had to be seen in the context of complex racial and religious relations in Malaysia and that parliamentarians charged with sedition were not targeted because of their opposition to the Government, but because they had allegedly violated the laws of Malaysia; the delegation also emphasized that the Attorney-General, in deciding whether or not to bring or pursue a case, placed great importance on whether or not it was in the public interest to do so; according to the Malaysian delegation, the Government has been actively exploring, through the establishment of a dedicated team, four different options to review the Sedition Act, namely: (i) maintaining the act with minor changes; (ii) abolishing it; (iii) replacing it with the National Harmony Act; or (iv) maintaining the Sedition Act along with the adoption of the National Harmony Act; the matter was now in the hands of the Attorney-General’s Office, which was due to make a proposal on how to go forward,

Considering that the Malaysian delegation to the 132nd IPU Assembly (Hanoi, March 2015) stated that the intention of the Government had now become to amend the Sedition Act and that specific legislation would be proposed to Parliament in the coming weeks; the Malaysian delegation stated that the new legislation would have to strike the right balance between protecting stability and social harmony on the one hand and freedom of expression on the other; one of the proposed amendments would entail the crime of sedition now also covering topics related to the territorial integrity of Malaysia as well as religion,

Considering that the complainants affirm that the amendments aim to further limit freedom of speech in Malaysia; they recall in this regard that the Prime Minister, after first announcing in 2012 that he intended to promote a comprehensive review of the Sedition Act with a view to abolishing it, made a U-turn at the end of November 2014 by publicly announcing the intention not to repeal but to bolster the act instead,

Considering that Mr. Chua Tian Chang was arrested on 20 March 2015 and held overnight in connection with his involvement in the allegedly unlawful Kita Lawan rally that took place on 7 March 2015 in protest against the conviction on 10 February 2015 of opposition leader Mr. Anwar Ibrahim on a sodomy charge and his sentence to a five-year prison term. Mr. Teo Kok Seong and Mr. Rafizi Ramli are also being investigated with regard to their involvement in the same rally. According to one of the complainants, the arrest and investigation infringe the member of parliaments’ rights to freedom of expression and freedom of assembly. The complainants point out that the police have disregarded the Court of Appeal’s ruling on Section 9(5) of the Peaceful Assembly Act, which held that the 10-day notice requirement is unconstitutional and that what is “fundamentally lawful cannot be criminalized”. It appears that the basis for

the investigation was subsequently changed to an alleged violation of Section 143 of the Criminal Code, which states that, “whoever is a member of an unlawful assembly shall be punished with imprisonment for a term that may extend to six months, or with a fine, or with both”,

Considering that the Malaysian delegation to the 132nd IPU Assembly reiterated its invitation for a delegation of the Committee to come to Malaysia so as to gain a better understanding of the complex issues at hand,

1. *Thanks* the Malaysian delegation for their cooperation and the information provided;
2. *Is concerned* about what appears to be a wave of criminal proceedings limiting the rights to freedom of expression and assembly, respect for which is essential for members of parliament to effectively carry out their functions; *considers* in this regard that the conviction of the late Mr. Karpal Singh bears out that the application of the Sedition Act can have the effect of punishing remarks that seem to fall squarely within the exercise of the right to freedom of expression, easily leading to the loss of the parliamentary mandate, as would have been the case had his sentence been upheld on appeal;
3. *Decides* therefore to monitor closely the legal proceedings regarding the parliamentarians under the Sedition Act, the Peaceful Assembly Act and/or Criminal Code; *would appreciate receiving* further details on the precise facts that have led to charges or to investigations, as well as clarification as to whether or not the legal proceedings under the Sedition Act are currently on hold pending the challenge of constitutionality of the act; *also wishes* to understand the exact legal basis for the steps taken against three parliamentarians in connection with the Kita Lawan rally;
4. *Is concerned* that, from the four options to review the Sedition Act, the authorities have chosen the one of keeping the act with amendments; *is particularly concerned* at reports that the amendments, rather than raising, may further limit guarantees of freedom of speech; *calls on* the Malaysian Parliament to do everything possible to ensure that, at this critical juncture, the new legislation fully complies with relevant international standards and fully guarantees that citizens and parliamentarians alike can speak out freely without fear of undue legal action; *wishes* to receive a copy of the amendments as soon as they become available; *assures* that the IPU stands ready to assist Parliament in its legislative work, including by sharing relevant experiences from other countries, should that be requested;
5. *Welcomes* the invitation extended by the Malaysian delegation for a Committee delegation to travel to Malaysia; *considers* that such a mission would be a good opportunity to enhance the Committee’s understanding of the review of the Sedition Act and of Malaysian legislation governing the right to freedom of assembly that investigators have relied on in proceedings against members of parliament, and to identify opportunities for sharing other countries’ relevant legislative experiences;
6. *Requests* the Secretary General to make the necessary arrangements for the mission to take place in the near future;
7. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the relevant authorities, the complainant and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
8. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining this case and to report back to it in due course.

MALAYSIA

MAL28 - Nurul Izzah Anwar

*Decision adopted by consensus by the IPU Governing Council at its 196th session (Hanoi, 1st April 2015)*⁴

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Having before it the case of Ms. Nurul Izzah Anwar, a member of the House of Representative of Malaysia, which has been examined by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians pursuant to the Procedure for the examination and treatment of complaints (Annex I of the revised rules and practices),

Taking into account the information provided by the Malaysian delegation to the 132nd IPU Assembly (Hanoi, March 2015) on the occasion of the hearing held with the Committee; *taking into account* the information provided by the complainant,

Considering that Ms. Nurul Izzah Anwar was arrested and detained overnight from 16 to 17 March 2015 under the Sedition Act 1948 for a speech she made in Parliament on 10 March 2015 in support of her father, Mr. Anwar Ibrahim, who had been sentenced at final instance on 10 February 2015 to a five-year prison term on a sodomy charge. In her intervention, Ms. Nurul Izzah said that, although Mr. Anwar Ibrahim would be in prison for five years, and even if other Pakatan Rakyat (PR) leaders were to be similarly punished, the people would not give up the struggle for reform. "I am certain Barisan Nasional's greed for power will not be able to extinguish the fire of the people's struggle," she said. She then read out portions of the speech that Mr. Anwar Ibrahim made at the close of his trial, including the parts in which he: (i) expressed grave disappointment over the injustice that continued to be perpetuated against him, even though he was already incarcerated; (ii) criticized those in power whom he accused of manipulating the Prisons Department and other government agencies in denying him his right to attend Parliament as leader of the opposition; (iii) accused the judges of bowing to political masters and said that they were partners in a crime that contributed to the death of a free judiciary. Ms. Nurul Izzah stated, in her intervention, that she felt for those who were disappointed that Mr. Anwar Ibrahim was not able to personally deliver his speech and that he had accepted the sacrifice of going to prison for the country and the people. She also said that her father would never remain silent and would continue to fight for freedom and justice, adding that he would not surrender,

Considering that article 10 of the Constitution of Malaysia guarantees freedom of expression (subject to restrictions necessary in the interests of security of the Federation, friendly relations with other countries, public order or morality, to protect the privileges of Parliament, to provide against contempt of court, defamation or incitement to any offence), and in article 63(2) confers immunity from any proceedings in court for anything said by a member of parliament in Parliament; article 63(4) provides an exception to this immunity under article 63(2) for words uttered by members of parliament that fall under the Sedition Act 1948; this exception under article 63(4) is, however, limited and specifies that action can only be taken against members of parliament for words uttered that fall under section 3(1)(f) of the Sedition Act 1948, i.e. on citizenship, the status of rulers, national language, or the special status of Malays,

Considering that the complainant considers that Ms. Nurul's intervention in Parliament was protected under her right to freedom of expression, as well as to parliamentary privilege, and that the exceptions under the Sedition Act limiting such privilege are not applicable in this case,

Recalling that the complainant affirms that the Sedition Act as it currently stands aims to stifle the opposition; it considers that the act is drafted so broadly so as to criminalize democratic speech, including criticism against the Government, its leaders, and ruling political parties,

Considering that, according to the information provided at the hearing with the Committee in October 2014 by the Malaysian delegation to the 131st IPU Assembly with respect to cases MAL21-27, the Government was actively exploring, through the establishment of a dedicated team, four different options to review the Sedition Act, namely: (i) maintaining the act with minor changes; (ii) abolishing it; (iii) replacing it

⁴ The delegation of Malaysia expressed its reservation regarding the decision.

with the National Harmony Act; or (iv) maintaining the Sedition Act along with the adoption of the National Harmony Act; the matter was now in the hands of the Attorney-General's Office, which was due to make a proposal on how to go forward,

Considering that the Malaysian delegation to the 132nd IPU Assembly (Hanoi, March 2015) stated that the intention of the Government had now become to amend the Sedition Act and that specific legislation would be proposed to Parliament in the coming weeks; the Malaysian delegation stated that the new legislation would have to strike the right balance between protecting stability and social harmony on the one hand and freedom of expression on the other; one of the proposed amendments would entail the crime of sedition also covering topics related to the territorial integrity of Malaysia as well as religion,

Considering that the complainant affirms that the amendments aim to further limit freedom of speech in Malaysia; *it recalls* in this regard that the Prime Minister, after first announcing in 2012 that he intended to promote a comprehensive review of the Sedition Act with a view to abolishing it, made a U-turn at the end of November 2014 by publicly announcing the intention not to repeal but to bolster the act instead,

Considering that the Malaysian delegation to the 132nd IPU Assembly reiterated its invitation for a delegation of the Committee to come to Malaysia so as to gain a better understanding of, amongst other things, the Sedition Act and its review,

1. *Thanks* the Malaysian delegation for its cooperation and the information provided;
2. *Is deeply concerned* that Ms. Nurul Izzah was arrested, briefly detained and might be the subject of an investigation on account of a statement she made in Parliament;
3. *Recalls* that freedom of expression is essential to the working of a democratic parliament, and that members of parliament must be entitled to raise questions of public interest, such as concerns about the functioning of the judiciary, all the more so when they refer to a case with immense national ramifications; *fails to understand* therefore how the statement which Ms. Nurul Izzah made would not be covered by parliamentary privilege and the right to freedom of expression; *considers* that Parliament, as the guardian of the rights and privileges of its members, and therefore the protection of the institution as a whole, should take this incident extremely seriously; *wishes* to know what steps Parliament, through its Committee on Privileges, has taken to this end;
4. *Calls on* the authorities to discontinue any further investigation against Ms. Nurul Izzah in connection with her aforesaid statement in Parliament; *wishes* to receive official information and the views of the authorities on this matter;
5. *Is concerned* that, from the four options to review the Sedition Act, the authorities have chosen the one of keeping the act with amendments; *is particularly concerned* at reports that the amendments, rather than raising, may further limit guarantees of freedom of speech; *calls on* the Malaysian Parliament to do everything possible to ensure that, at this critical juncture, the new legislation fully complies with relevant international standards and fully guarantees that citizens and parliamentarians alike can speak out freely without fear of undue legal action; *wishes* to receive a copy of the amendments as soon as they become available; *assures* that the IPU stands ready to assist Parliament in its legislative work, including by sharing relevant experiences from other countries, should that be requested;
6. *Welcomes* the invitation extended by the Malaysian delegation for a Committee delegation to travel to Malaysia; *considers* that such a mission would be a good opportunity to enhance the Committee's understanding of the review of the Sedition Act and to identify opportunities for sharing other countries' relevant legislative experiences;
7. *Requests* the Secretary General to make the necessary arrangements for the mission to take place in the near future;
8. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the relevant authorities, the complainant and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
9. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining this case and to report back to it in due course.

MALDIVES

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| MLD16 - Mariya Didi | MLD42 - Mohamed Aslam |
| MLD28 - Ahmed Easa | MLD43 - Mohammed Rasheed |
| MLD29 - Eva Abdulla | MLD44 - Ali Waheed |
| MLD30 - Moosa Manik | MLD45 - Ahmed Sameer |
| MLD31 - Ibrahim Rasheed | MLD46 - Afrasheem Ali |
| MLD32 - Mohamed Shifaz | MLD47 - Abdulla Jabir |
| MLD33 - Imthiyaz Fahmy | MLD48 - Ali Azim |
| MLD34 - Mohamed Gasam | MLD49 - Alhan Fahmy |
| MLD35 - Ahmed Rasheed | MLD50 - Abdulla Shahid |
| MLD36 - Mohamed Rasheed | MLD51 - Rozeyna Adam |
| MLD37 - Ali Riza | MLD52 - Ibrahim Mohamed Solih |
| MLD38 - Hamid Abdul Ghafoor | MLD53 - Mohamed Nashiz |
| MLD39 - Ilyas Labeeb | MLD54 - Ibrahim Shareef |
| MLD40 - Rugiyya Mohamed | MLD55 - Ahmed Mahloof |
| MLD41 - Mohamed Thoriq | MLD56 - Fayyaz Ismail |

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 196th session (Hanoi, 1st April 2015)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of the first group of 27 parliamentarians above, all members of the People's Majlis of the Maldives at the time of the original complaint, and all, except Mr. Abdulla Jabir and Dr. Afrasheem Ali, members of the opposition Maldivian Democracy Party (MDP), and to the resolution it adopted at its 192nd session (March 2013); *noting* that a significant number of the persons concerned were not re-elected in the parliamentary elections held in March 2014,

Having before it the new case of Mr. Ahmed Mahloof, which has been examined by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians pursuant to the Procedure for the examination and treatment of complaints (Annex I of the revised rules and practices),

Taking into account the information that the Maldivian delegation to the 132nd IPU Assembly (Hanoi, March 2015) provided and the letter from the Deputy Secretary General of the People's Majlis, dated 24 March 2015; *taking into account* as well the information regularly provided by the complainant,

Recalling that the original cases have to be seen in the context of the transfer of power on 7 February 2012, when Vice-President Mohammed Waheed assumed the office of president following the disputed resignation of President Mohamed Nasheed; immediately thereafter, MDP supporters took to the streets in protest and were met with excessive use of force by the police, including against members of parliament, which has been corroborated, inter alia, by the Police Integrity Commission and the Commission of Inquiry in their reports of October and August 2012 respectively; the authorities have repeatedly stated that any police officers found to have acted unlawfully would be properly sanctioned,

Considering the following with regard to the concerns that have emerged since March 2014:

- The complainant insists that, in the aftermath of the March 2014 parliamentary elections, MDP parliamentarians have increasingly become the subject of violent death threats, causing them not only to fear for their lives, but also preventing them from carrying out their parliamentary mandate. Despite appeals from the members and the MDP party to the police, the Maldives National Defence Force and the Government, calling for an investigation into the threats and for additional security protection, the complainant has reported that the measures that have been taken have been insufficient;
- The parliamentary authorities have repeatedly expressed a commitment to investigate the instances of threat and intimidation, which they claim have been sent to members from all parties. To this end, they have reported that all cases of threats received were forwarded to

the appropriate authorities. However, no suspects have as yet been named. The authorities have also claimed to have taken measures to ensure that parliamentarians are provided with sufficient security from the Maldives National Defence Force;

- The complainant has also reported a new wave of arrests and instances of ill-treatment of MDP members following the arrest of former president and current MDP leader Mohamed Nasheed on 22 February 2015, and his subsequent conviction on 13 March 2015; the complainant affirms the following in this regard:
 - (i) Mr. Ali Azim was arrested in February 2015 for peacefully protesting against the arrest of former President Nasheed. According to the authorities, Mr. Azim was arrested for obstructing police from performing their duty. On 5 March 2015, the complainant reported that Mr. Azim had been released from detention on the condition that he did not take part in a demonstration for the following 60 days. No official documentation to this effect was provided, despite a request;
 - (ii) On 6 March 2015, the complainant reported that Mr. Fayyaz Ismail had been arrested during a protest the night before and had been denied access to a lawyer. The complainant added that Ms. Eva Abdullah had been beaten with a riot shield, and that she and Mr. Imthiyaz Fahmy had been sprayed with pepper spray. The complainant subsequently added that Mr. Fayyaz Ismail had his detention extended by 15 days – a length of time usually reserved for more serious offences – for refusing to agree not to take part in any protests for a period of 60 days; the letter from the parliamentary authorities of 24 March 2015 indicated that Mr. Ismail had since been released;
 - (iii) The same letter from the parliamentary authorities indicated that the parliamentary Committee on Privileges had reviewed both cases and had recognized that the arrests were sufficiently justified and not politically motivated. Furthermore, the Majlis endorsed the findings in a formal vote; the complainant affirms that the MDP is being prevented from taking part in parliamentary work and that members have been told that they would face sanctions if they insist on airing their grievances in Parliament; the parliamentary authorities affirm that the MDP is obstructing Parliament with no other purpose than to prevent it from continuing with its parliamentary activities,

Considering the following with regard to ongoing, earlier concerns:

- On 2 October 2012, Mr. Afrasheem Ali, a member of the People's Majlis representing the Progressive Party of the Maldives, was killed; one individual was convicted and sentenced. A letter from the parliamentary authorities, dated 24 March 2015, indicated that a second individual, Mr. Azlif, had been acquitted; in this regard, the complainant affirms that the latter was a member of the Maldives National Defence Force, was released and that it has been alleged that he went to Syria to take part in training with the Islamic State. It is unclear why Mr. Azlif was allowed to leave the country; the complainant noted in this regard that there has been an alarming growth of links between the Islamic State and gangs in the Maldives;
- On 1 February 2014, Mr. Alhan Fahmy was stabbed in a coffee shop. On 22 January 2015, the complainant stated that there had been no investigation into the stabbing; the letter from the parliamentary authorities, dated 24 March 2015, indicated that the crime had been investigated and that the suspects were being prosecuted in the Criminal Court in Male;
- Since 2012, criminal action had been taken, often in connection with ongoing protests, against several MDP members of parliament for which, according to the complainant, there was no legal ground; according to the information provided by the complainant in March 2015, the case of Mr. Mohamed Rasheed (charged with terrorism) is pending in court; according to the information contained in the communication of the People's Majlis of 24 March 2015, this is the state of proceedings in the other cases:
 - (i) The cases against Mr. Ali Waheed for obstructing police duties and incitement to violence, against Mr. Ilyas Labeeb and Mr. Imthiyaz Fahmy for obstructing police duties, and against Mr. Moosa Manik for insulting the judiciary were withdrawn by the Prosecutor General's Office due to lack of sufficient evidence;

- (ii) The charges of drug and alcohol-related offences against Mr. Ghafoor and Mr. Jabir were dropped by the prosecution due to lack of evidence; Mr. Jabir has been pardoned for his conviction for refusing to take a urine test; the complainant has confirmed this information;
- (iii) The case against Mr. Ibrahim Rasheed for obstructing police duties is still pending;
- (iv) The case against Mr. Mohamed Shifaz for producing pornographic cards was still with the Prosecutor General's Office,

Bearing in mind that the Republic of Maldives is a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and is thus bound to respect freedom of expression and assembly and the right to liberty and security,

1. *Thanks* the Maldivian parliamentary authorities and the delegation for their cooperation and the extensive information they have provided;
2. *Is deeply concerned* about the serious and repeated death threats since 2014 against MDP members of parliament; *considers* that these matters have to be taken very seriously through speedy and effective investigations and by putting in place, in agreement with the parliamentarians concerned, the security measures their situations warrant; *notes* in this respect that the authorities and the complainant have opposing views as to whether such steps are being taken;
3. *Expresses profound concern* at the climate of heightened confrontation and polarization outside and inside the Parliament of the Maldives since the arrest, trial and conviction of former President Nasheed, which has been the subject of criticism in the Maldives and abroad; *calls on* the competent authorities, in particular the law enforcement agencies, to show restraint and abide fully by international and national human rights standards when handling public protests; also *calls on* all political parties to move beyond political expediency and partisanship and to engage constructively in dialogue inside and outside Parliament to resolve their differences;
4. *Takes note* that the complainant contests the outcome of the deliberations of the parliamentary Committee on Privileges with regard to the legality of the recent arrests of Mr. Ali Azim and Mr. Fayyaz Ismail; *would appreciate* receiving a copy of the committee's decision on this matter and official information on whether legal action is still pending against both members of parliament;
5. *Is pleased* that progress has been made in establishing accountability for the murder of Mr. Afrasheem Ali and the stabbing of Mr. Alhan Fahmy; *would appreciate* receiving a copy of the first-instance ruling in the murder case, including with regard to the motive for the crime, along with details of the acquittal of a second suspect and the allegations made in this regard by the complainant; *also wishes to know* whether the suspects in the case of Mr. Fahmy are in custody, the facts underpinning their prosecution and whether the police authorities have been able to establish the motive for the stabbing;
6. *Notes* that legal proceedings against several current and former parliamentarians have been discontinued; *decides* to close the cases of Mr. Ghafoor and Mr. Jabir, since these legal proceedings were the only matter under examination by the Committee, and to close any further examination of this same point with regard to Mr. Waheed, Mr. Labeeb and Mr. Imthiyaz Fahmy, and hence to focus only on the other pending concerns in their cases; *is eager to know* the precise legal basis and facts underpinning the cases that are still ongoing against Mr. Mohamed Rasheed, Mr. Ibrahim Rasheed and Mr. Mohamed Shifaz;
7. *Considers* that the complexity and seriousness of the concerns in the cases at hand, and the contradictory views that exist with regard to many of the facts, warrant an urgent on-site mission by the Committee, so that it can gather first-hand information on the allegations and ascertain the prospects for their examination and clarification in the current political situation in the Maldives; *is pleased*, therefore, that the Maldivian delegation welcomes a mission for this purpose, which would meet with the parliamentary, executive and judicial authorities, the parliamentarians concerned and any third party likely to be in a position to assist the mission;

8. *Requests* the Secretary General to arrange for the mission to take place as early as possible and to pursue his contacts with the parliamentary authorities for this purpose;
9. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the relevant authorities, the complainant and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
10. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining this case and to report back to it in due course.

MONGOLIA

MON01 - Zorig Sanjasuuren

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 196th session (Hanoi, 1st April 2015)

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 on 2 October 1998, and to the resolution adopted at its 193rd session (October 2013),

Considering the information provided by a member of the delegation of Mongolia to the 132nd IPU Assembly (Hanoi, March 2015) on the occasion of the hearing held with the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians,

Recalling the following information on file:

- Mr. Zorig Sanjasuuren, a leader of the democracy movement in Mongolia in the 1990s, was assassinated in October 1998. The culprits have not been identified to date, despite uninterrupted investigations since his death;
- The failure of the initial investigation has been attributed largely to police inexperience in investigating contract killings, the failure to secure the crime scene and the decision to allow 40 to 50 people to contaminate it, together with a certain lack of political will on the part of the authorities in place at the time;
- The investigation team assigned to the case has repeatedly changed composition and leadership over the years. It was eventually established as a single investigative working group composed of members of the General Police Department and of the Central Intelligence Agency under the authority of the Deputy Prosecutor General;
- Foreign technical assistance in forensic matters was provided to the investigators on several instances in the past but, owing to the confidentiality of the investigation, no information has been made available to date as to whether or not the assistance provided and the results of the tests carried out shed more light on the murder and helped move the investigation forward;
- The State Great Hural has continued to monitor the investigation and to ensure that it receives the necessary assistance and support. However, no information has ever been provided on any results it may have achieved. In 2010, members of parliament raised a query with the Minister of Justice regarding the case in the hope of initiating a parliamentary debate, which, however, failed to materialize, the minister invoking the confidentiality of the investigation;
- In September 2011, a meeting of the National Security Council (comprising the President, the Prime Minister and the Speaker of the State Great Hural) was convened to discuss the investigation with the Prosecutor General. The National Security Council has, however, not met again to review the investigation since that date;

- The State Great Hural indicated in 2012 that the investigation was now being monitored by its special oversight subcommittee, and that the National Security Council had renewed the mandate of the investigative working group, which continued to work on the case and expressed the need for additional foreign forensic technical assistance to help the investigative working group run unidentified fingerprints found at the crime scene through the identification systems of foreign countries;
- Unconfirmed media reports of February 2013 indicated that two suspects of Mongolian nationality may have been arrested in the United States for the murder of Mr. Zorig;
- Ms. Oyun Sanjasuuren, the victim's sister and who is a member of parliament, has reaffirmed on several occasions that the investigation continued, although there had been no progress in the case to her knowledge. She observed that she had been unable to obtain detailed information on the progress of the investigation from the investigative working group or from the parliamentary oversight subcommittee for confidentiality reasons. She continued to believe that there was still hope that the case would be cleared up, as some of the officers in the working group were genuinely trying to solve it,

Considering that, despite repeated requests, no information has been forthcoming from the authorities of Mongolia to date on the concrete steps taken by the investigative working group since 2011 to pursue the investigation and their outcome, including whether progress has been made in the identification of the perpetrators and instigators of the murder, as well as on whether the foreign forensic assistance provided in the past had helped shed light on the murder and moved the investigation forward and, if so, how,

Considering that the member of the Mongolian delegation to the 132nd IPU Assembly who appeared before the Committee referred to a letter of the Chairman of the State Great Hural dated January 2015 and provided the following information: the State Great Hural had addressed a request for information on the status of the investigation to the Prosecutor General and the National Intelligence Agency, and had been informed that the investigative working group had recently been renewed; it continued to work actively under the supervision of the Deputy Prosecutor General; it was difficult for the State Great Hural to obtain detailed information on the investigation; the authorities of Mongolia had now appealed to 39 countries for assistance in running fingerprints found at the crime scene through their respective identification systems; a number of States had responded positively, but no matching fingerprints had yet been found; foreign forensics assistance continued to be needed to help advance the investigation and the State Great Hural would welcome IPU assistance in that regard; both the Speaker of the State Great Hural and Ms. Oyun Sanjasuuren would welcome a delegation of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians on a mission to Mongolia; it would allow the delegation to obtain more detailed information on the investigation through meetings with the members of the investigative working group; it would be particularly useful if the delegation could include an international forensics expert,

1. *Thanks* the parliamentary authorities of Mongolia for their cooperation, and *wishes to receive* a copy of the letter of the Chairman of the State Great Hural sent in early 2015, which has not been received to date;
2. *Notes with appreciation* that the State Great Hural welcomes a mission of the Committee; and *trusts* that the mission will help shed further light on the current status of the investigation, including on the progress made to identify the culprits and on the challenges that the investigative group continues to face, including as regards forensics evidence; *recommends* therefore that the delegation of the Committee be accompanied by an international forensics expert;
3. *Remains concerned* that, after all these years, the investigation remains shrouded in secrecy, and *fails to understand* why the State Great Hural, as well as Mr. Zorig Sanjasuuren's sister, are not being provided with detailed updates on the investigation; *again invites* the National Security Council to authorize the investigative working group to disclose appropriate information on a regular basis on the status of the investigation, the steps taken and their outcome, while fully acknowledging that certain details of the investigation may need to remain confidential;

4. *Reaffirms its view* that, without such information, the State Great Hural cannot properly exercise its oversight function and ensure that the competent authorities are indeed doing their utmost to shed light on Mr. Zorig Sanjasuuren's murder; and *once again urges* the State Great Hural, in particular the special oversight subcommittee, to conduct an open parliamentary debate on the case and its non-confidential aspects;
5. *Requests* the Secretary General to make the necessary arrangements for the mission to take place and to convey this decision to the President of Mongolia, the Speaker of the State Great Hural and the Prosecutor General, as well as the complainant and any other third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
6. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining this case and to report back to it in due course.

PAKISTAN

PAK23 - Riaz Fatyana

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 196th session (Hanoi, 1st April 2015)

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Riaz Fatyana, a former member of the National Assembly of Pakistan affiliated to the Pakistan Muslim League Q and a former substitute member of the IPU Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights, and to the decision it adopted at its 194th session (March 2014),

Taking into account the updated information recently provided by the complainant,

Recalling that Mr. Fatyana was the victim of an attack during his parliamentary term that has remained unpunished to date,

Recalling the following information on file:

- On 19 June 2012, Mr. Fatyana's residence was attacked by a group of people protesting against repeated power shortages, allegedly at the instigation of the ruling political party in Punjab province, the Pakistan Muslim League-N (PML-N);
- Mr. Fatyana, who was expecting such protests would take place, had given prior notice to the police the day before to ensure that proper security measures would be put in place for his protection. The police did not, however, take any precautionary measures. Mr. Fatyana called for urgent protective measures again when the protesters started gathering in large numbers in front of his residence, but to no avail. The protests turned into violent confrontations and one person was killed;
- The police, when they finally arrived, allegedly abstained from protecting the member of parliament and instead allowed the attackers free access to his house and arbitrarily arrested and detained Mr. Fatyana for three days. They also detained 13 employees present in the house at the time;
- While in detention, Mr. Fatyana and the 13 employees were charged with murder by the police. The complainant alleged that these charges were fabricated and were not supported by any evidence. After a long investigation, the charges against Mr. Fatyana were dismissed, but the proceedings continued against the 13 detained employees until the court finally acquitted and released them almost a year later in March 2013;
- Mr. Fatyana immediately lodged a criminal complaint against his attackers. The police initially refused to register it, but eventually did so on 22 June 2012, following the intervention of the Provincial Police Office. Reports of the Commissioner and the District Coordinator Officer on the incident appear to have confirmed the names of the alleged attackers and exposed a personal vendetta of the local police against Mr. Fatyana;

- According to the complainant, the police have not undertaken any effective investigation into the complaint lodged by Mr. Fatyana and none of the attackers or instigators have been arrested and held to account to date, almost three years after the incident. Furthermore, no sanction has been taken against the police officers responsible for Mr. Fatyana's arbitrary arrest and for bringing trumped-up charges against him;
- Following the attack, the complainant further alleged that the attackers had repeatedly threatened Mr. Fatyana with reprisals if he pursued the case against them. Mr. Fatyana has allegedly also been threatened on many instances by the police. While in detention, he was told by police officials that he should not run in the forthcoming National Assembly elections, otherwise he and his family would face reprisals. After these events, he was forced to flee his constituency, together with his entire family. The complainant alleged that Mr. Fatyana was not able to run his electoral campaign properly, as the police had not provided him with the security he required to move around and campaign freely in his constituency. The complainant claimed that, due to this situation, together with allegations that the elections in Mr. Fatyana's constituency had been rigged in favour of his political opponent, Mr. Fatyana had not been re-elected in the May 2013 general elections;
- The complainant alleges that Mr. Fatyana has been framed by the Punjab police, at the instigation of PML-N leaders in Punjab and of Mr. Chourdry Asad ur Rehman Ramdey, his long-standing main political opponent in the constituency, in order to sideline him in the run-up to the general elections in May 2013. The complainant indicated that the local police, the lower ranks of the judiciary and the local administration of Punjab were completely controlled by the officials who had allegedly instigated the attack;
- The complainant further points out that Mr. Fatyana was the Chairman of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Human Rights and has been a vocal critic of Pakistan's police system, repeatedly denouncing police heavy-handedness and brutality in parliamentary debates, and that he has been outspoken on other violations of human rights such as missing persons, targeted and extrajudicial killings, abuse of authority and acts of torture carried out by law enforcement agencies,

Recalling that the members of the delegation of Pakistan to the 127th Assembly (Quebec, October 2012) and to the 129th Assembly (Geneva, October 2013) confirmed that the National Assembly was fully informed of the case and that the Speaker had strongly condemned the attack against Mr. Fatyana, but that Parliament had not been able to formally monitor Mr. Fatyana's situation and the judicial proceedings, as no formal mechanism exists within the Parliament of Pakistan enabling it to do so,

Further recalling that, during the hearing held at the 130th IPU Assembly (Geneva, March 2014), the member of the delegation of Pakistan confirmed that neither the alleged attackers, nor the complicit police officers had yet been held to account for arbitrarily arresting and detaining a member of parliament, but that judicial proceedings were ongoing before the High Court of Kamalia and that their outcome was awaited,

Considering that the complainant has repeatedly expressed the fear that justice would not be done, that, according to complainant, the judicial proceedings have remained at a standstill since 2012 and the Trial Court has recently taken the decision to put an end to the ongoing proceedings without giving prior notice to Mr. Fatyana or any explanation as to the grounds for such decision,

1. *Regrets* that no recent information has been forthcoming from the authorities of Pakistan;
2. *Remains deeply concerned* that, almost three years after the attack against Mr. Fatyana, no serious attempt appears to have been made to arrest the attackers and the complicit police officers and bring them to justice; *is particularly alarmed* that the judicial proceedings initiated against Mr. Fatyana's attackers were discontinued; *wishes* to know why and whether there are any avenues of appeal available to reopen the judicial inquiry and provide prompt and appropriate redress to Mr. Fatyana;
3. *Recalls* that impunity presents a serious threat both to members of parliament and to those they represent and that, accordingly, physical attacks against members of parliament, if left unpunished, not only violate the fundamental rights of individual parliamentarians, but also affect the ability of Parliament to fulfill its role as an institution; *emphasizes* that Parliament has a duty to ensure that every effort is made to hold the culprits accountable;

4. *Urges therefore* the Parliament of Pakistan and all relevant Pakistani authorities, particularly the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General, to take urgent action to ensure that this attack does not remain unpunished; *wishes* to be kept informed of the measures taken by the authorities to that end and of any new developments in the case;
5. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the relevant authorities, to the complainant and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
6. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining this case and to report back to it in due course.

PHILIPPINES

PHI02 - Saturnino Ocampo

PHI04 - Teodoro Casiño

PHI05 - Liza Maza

PHI06 - Rafael Mariano

*Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 196th session
(Hanoi, 1st April 2015)*

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the cases of Mr. Saturnino Ocampo, Mr. Teodoro Casiño, Ms. Liza Maza and Mr. Rafael Mariano (the so-called Batasan Four), former members of the House of Representatives of the Philippines, and to the resolution adopted by the IPU Governing Council at its 191st session (October 2012),

Taking into account the information provided by the Executive Director of the Inter-Parliamentary Relations and Special Affairs Bureau of the House of Representatives, in her letter dated 10 March 2014, the information provided by the Secretary of the Department of Justice, in her letter dated 27 February 2014, and the information provided by the complainants and other sources of information,

Recalling that the persons concerned were, along with others, prosecuted on a charge of rebellion that had been dismissed in June 2007 by the Supreme Court of the Philippines and judged as unfounded and politically motivated; and that, soon after, the following new charges – allegedly also unfounded and politically motivated – had been laid against them:

· Multiple Murder Charges in Nueva Ecija

Multiple murder charges were brought against the Batasan Four in 2007 in Nueva Ecija; one of these charges (of murder with kidnapping) was dismissed on account of inadmissible evidence (extrajudicially obtained confessions); the prosecutor proceeded with the other charges, although they were based on the same inadmissible evidence; and a petition brought by the Batasan Four on the grounds of grave abuse of discretion has been pending before the Supreme Court since March 2009,

Considering that, according to the complainants, the petition before the Supreme Court remains pending,

· First Multiple Murder Charge in Leyte

A multiple murder charge was brought against Mr. Ocampo in 2007 in Leyte concerning alleged offences already dealt with in the context of the rebellion case after the discovery of a mass grave in 2006; Mr. Ocampo's petition to have the case dismissed for this reason, as well as due to a lack of evidence, was submitted in April 2007 before the Supreme

Court; Mr. Ocampo has also strongly refuted the accusations, stressing that at the time in question he was in detention, that the affidavits adduced by the prosecution were false and “perturbed”, and that the evidence was fabricated; in particular, that five of the skeletons reportedly discovered had already been discovered in 2000 in connection with another criminal case which had been subsequently dismissed,

Considering the following new developments with regard to the case:

- After almost seven years since Mr. Ocampo’s petition was submitted, on 11 February 2014 the Court ruled to dismiss it while permitting Mr. Ocampo to remain in provisional liberty by virtue of bail bonds; and Mr. Ocampo filed a motion seeking reconsideration of the decision;
- According to the complainants, despite the validity of the issues raised in his motion for reconsideration, on 1 April 2014 the Supreme Court rejected it in a short resolution. The case was then remanded to the Regional Trial Court of Manila Branch 32. Given that the original indictment was susceptible to annulment because it grouped several alleged victims into one indictment, the prosecution subsequently filed a “Motion to Admit Amended Information and the 14 New Informations”. In response, Mr. Ocampo filed an “Omnibus Motion to Quash the Amended Information and the 14 New Informations and to Dismiss the Case”, arguing that: (i) the amended information failed to specifically allege the circumstances or acts qualifying the crime as murder; (ii) the information referring to three victims must be dismissed on the grounds of *res judicata* and forum shopping, as the same victims were already included in a previously dismissed case filed in the Regional Trial Court of Baybay, Leyte; and (iii) two of the cases must be dismissed because the alleged offence with respect to two alleged victims had already been prescribed. On 30 September 2014, this motion was denied, as was Mr. Ocampo’s “Motion for Reconsideration”. Mr. Ocampo subsequently launched a petition for *certiorari* to the Court of Appeals, which is currently pending. The Court of Appeals did not issue a restraining order or injunction, as requested by Mr. Ocampo, and his arraignment before the Regional Trial Court is set for 7 May 2015,

· Second Multiple Murder Charge in Leyte

An additional multiple murder charge was brought against Mr. Ocampo in 2008 based on the same mass grave dealt with in the context of the 2007 Leyte case; the proceedings had been suspended pending the decision of the Supreme Court in the first Leyte case,

Considering that, according to the complainants and the parliamentary authorities, this case is related to, if not identical with, the first Leyte case; that according to the complainants, this case should be consolidated with the first case, but continues to be treated as separate and is currently pending before the Regional Trial Court of Hilongos,

· Obstruction of Justice Case

A charge of obstruction of justice was brought against Mr. Casiño in May 2007 on the grounds that he had prevented an arrest; Mr. Casiño affirms that he prevented plainclothes armed policemen from arresting someone without an arrest warrant; according to information provided by the Department of Justice, the prosecution dismissed this case on 13 March 2012; Mr. Casiño and the parliamentary authorities have yet to be notified of the dismissal,

Considering that, according to the complainants, it could now be assumed that the case has been dismissed, despite Mr. Casiño having not received any official notification,

· Writ of Amparo Abduction Case

A charge of abduction (following a petition for a writ of amparo) was filed against Mr. Ocampo in March 2008 before the Regional Trial Court of Basey, Western Samar; the case was pending and, according to the complainants, the charge was factually and legally baseless,

Considering that, according to the complainants, following repeated delays and the subsequent submission of a motion to dismiss the case for lack of evidence by Mr. Ocampo, on 28 February 2014 the court dismissed the case on the grounds that there was no government involvement – a precondition for this type of petition – in the alleged abduction, that the petitioner had not filed an appeal, and the dismissal has apparently become final,

Recalling that the Secretary of Justice of the Philippines consistently affirmed in her letters that, under the administration of President Benigno S. Aquino, due process would be respected and all actions and decisions based on the rule of law, and that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in his letter of 8 August 2011, likewise affirmed that the rule of law and due process would prevail in the cases of the Batasan Four,

1. *Thanks* the Executive Director of the Inter-Parliamentary Relations and Special Affairs Bureau, and the Department of Justice for their information and cooperation;
2. *Notes with satisfaction* that two of the cases can now be considered dismissed; however, *deeply regrets* that the Nueva Ecija case remains at a standstill; *recalls* that the right to be tried without undue delay is an element of the right to a fair trial enshrined in the International Covenant on Political and Civil Rights, to which the Philippines is party, and that it is designed to ensure that people are not kept in a state of uncertainty about their fate for too long;
3. *Takes note* that Mr. Ocampo's petition before the Supreme Court was dismissed and that the judicial proceedings against him in connection with the multiple murder charges in Leyte are progressing; *wishes* to be kept informed of new developments in this case, as well as to receive a copy of the Supreme Court decision dismissing the petition; *trusts* that the courts will take due account of the concerns raised by the defence counsel with regard to the evidence submitted and the issues raised in Mr. Ocampo's petition for *certiorari* now before the Court of Appeals;
4. *Fails to understand* why the two Leyte cases have not been merged since the reactivation of the first Leyte case; *wishes* to receive clarification on this point;
5. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the relevant authorities, the complainants, and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
6. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining this case and to report back to it in due course.

BELARUS

BLS05 - Victor Gonchar

*Decision adopted by consensus by the IPU Governing Council at its 196th session (Hanoi, 1st April 2015)*⁵

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, together with his friend, Mr. Anatoly Krasovsky, on 16 September 1999, and to the resolution it adopted at its 193rd session (October 2013),

Recalling, among the extensive information on file, the following:

- The investigation into the disappearances of Mr. Gonchar and Mr. Krasovsky after their abduction has thus far yielded no results, and the authorities have consistently refuted the conclusions of a report by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe into disappearances for allegedly political reasons in Belarus (Pourgourides report), which linked senior officials to the disappearances. The evidence collected by Mr. Pourgourides

⁵ The delegation of Belarus expressed its reservation regarding the decision.

to this effect includes a handwritten document from the then police chief, General Lapatik (the authenticity of which the Belarusian authorities have acknowledged), in which General Lapatik accuses Mr. V. Sheyman, then secretary of the Belarusian Security Council, of having ordered the killing of Mr. Zakharenko, a former Minister of the Interior, and states that the order was carried out by a special task force (SOBR unit) commanded by Colonel Pavlishenko, with the assistance of the then Minister of the Interior, Mr. Sivakov, who provided Colonel Pavlishenko with an official pistol, temporarily removed from SIZO-1 prison, for the execution. The same method was reportedly used in the executions of Mr. Gonchar and Mr. Krasovsky;

- According to the results of the initial investigation by the Belarusian authorities, Mr. Gonchar and Mr. Krasovsky were abducted by an organized armed group and driven to an undisclosed location. The traces of blood discovered at the scene proved to belong to Mr. Gonchar. Witnesses were found to the abduction. In November 2000, after the media reported the alleged implication of senior state officials, the Prosecutor General, the KGB Chairman and his deputy, and the officials involved in the investigation were removed from duty. Mr. Sheyman, the main suspect at the time in the case, was appointed Prosecutor General⁶. According to the complainants, it was at that time that the investigation started to drag on and two volumes disappeared from the investigation file;
- In an interview President Lukashenko gave on 10 June 2009 to the Russian newspaper *Zavtra*, he stated that the cases of Mr. Gonchar and Mr. Krasovsky “were murders for business reasons; they had to buy or sell something and failed to stick to their promises, so they were killed, as is usual in ‘half-bandit’ circles, and traces of a murderer had been found in Germany”. The German authorities, however, denied this, and Ms. Krasovsky denied that her husband had any business problems;
- In July and August 2010, a documentary entitled “The Nation’s Godfather” was aired on a Russian TV channel and was also available in Belarus. The film dealt, inter alia, with the involvement of state authorities in the disappearance of politicians, including Mr. Gonchar. No response has been received to an application made to the Prosecutor General to investigate the evidence presented in the documentary;
- According to the letter dated 8 January 2013 from the Chairman of the House of Representatives Standing Committee on National Security, who was appointed after the September 2012 legislative elections in Belarus, the Standing Committee was informed by the General Prosecutor’s Office that the case of the disappearance of Mr. Gonchar and Mr. Krasovsky had been transferred from the Minsk City Prosecutor’s Office to a new Investigative Committee, which was established on 1 January 2012 in order to conduct the preliminary investigation under the oversight of the General Prosecutor’s Office and pursuant to an additional investigation plan. In his letter, the Chairman further indicated that the investigation had once more been extended, this time until 24 March 2013, but, yet again, provided no new information, and in particular no response to or observations on the specific questions and considerations long raised in previous resolutions. The Chairman merely reiterated that various lines of investigation were being pursued, that no details regarding the investigation could be revealed before the investigation was closed, and that the House of Representatives lacked supervisory authority over the Prosecutor General’s Office, thereby precluding any possibility of studying the case material being investigated by the Office,

⁶ Following heavy criticism of his appointment, including in a joint statement issued by the Committee on Legal Affairs of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe and the IPU Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians, Mr. Sheyman was later removed from this post.

Recalling that, in April 2012, the United Nations Human Rights Committee established under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights issued its decision on the merits of the application filed by Ms. Krasovsky and her daughter regarding the disappearance of Mr. Krasovsky. It concluded that Belarus had violated its obligation to investigate properly and take appropriate remedial action regarding Mr. Krasovsky's disappearance, and requested Belarus to provide the victims with an effective remedy, including a thorough and diligent investigation and prosecution and punishment of the perpetrators. The UN Human Rights Committee further required Belarus to provide adequate information concerning the results of the investigation, as well as adequate compensation to the authors of the complaint, and Belarus was given 180 days by the Human Rights Committee to submit information about the measures taken pursuant to its decision,

Considering that, according to the complainant, no measures have been taken to date by the Belarusian authorities to implement the decision of the UN Human Rights Committee,

Further considering that the Parliament of Belarus has not supplied any updated information on the case since January 2013, or provided a response to its request of March 2013 that the Committee conduct a visit to Belarus,

1. *Is appalled* that impunity continues to prevail in the present case, almost 16 years after Mr. Gonchar's disappearance;
2. *Deeply regrets* that the parliamentary authorities have remained silent on the proposed visit of the Committee to Belarus and they have not supplied any updated information; *remains convinced* that a visit to Belarus by a delegation of the Committee would offer an opportunity to obtain first-hand information on the current state of the investigation and the prospects for progress in the case; and *urges* once again the authorities to respond positively to the request;
3. *Recalls* that the conclusions by the United Nations Human Rights Committee in the case of Mr. Krasovsky have confirmed its own long-standing concerns about the absence of an effective investigation into both disappearances and the secrecy in which the investigation has been shrouded from the beginning; *further recalls* that impunity presents a serious threat both to members of parliament and to those they represent and that, accordingly, attacks against the life of members of parliament, if left unpunished, not only violate the fundamental rights of individual parliamentarians, but also affect the ability of Parliament to fulfil its role as an institution;
4. *Reaffirms its view* that the Parliament of Belarus has a direct responsibility to ensure that every effort is made by all relevant authorities to identify and punish those responsible for the enforced disappearance of one of its members, and that the grave conclusions reached by the United Nations Human Rights Committee should prompt the Belarusian authorities to investigate thoroughly and diligently the many leads and concerns that have emerged thus far, in particular in the report of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe; *wishes* therefore to know how this has been addressed to date;
5. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the relevant authorities and to any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information, as well as to continue seeking the authorities' agreement for a visit;
6. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining this case.

PALESTINE/ISRAEL

| | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| PAL18 - Yaser Mansour * | PAL67 - Ibrahim Abu Salem * |
| PAL21 - Emad Nofal * | PAL68 - Mohammed Musleh * |
| PAL28 - Muhammad Abu-Teir | PAL69 - Omar Abd Al Razaq * |
| PAL29 - Ahmad 'Attoun | PAL70 - Daoud Abo Seer * |
| PAL30 - Muhammad Totah | PAL71 - Khaled Saeed * |
| PAL32 - Basim Al-Zarrer | PAL72 - Ibrahim Dahbour * |
| PAL35 - Mohamed Ismail Al-Tal * | PAL73 - Fadhel Hamdan * |
| PAL47 - Hatem Qfeisheh | PAL74 - Mohd. Mutalaq Abu Jihaisheh * |
| PAL48 - Mahmoud Al-Ramahi * | PAL75 - Nayef Rjoub |
| PAL57 - Hasan Yousef | PAL76 - Sameer Al Qadi * |
| PAL60 - Ahmad Mubarak * | PAL77 - Khalil Al Rabee * |
| PAL61 - Mohd. Jamal Natsheh | PAL78 - Husni Al Borini |
| PAL62 - Abdul Jaber Fuqaha | PAL79 - Riyadhgh Radad |
| PAL63 - Nizar Ramadan | PAL80 - Abdul Rahman Zaidan |
| PAL64 - Mohd. Maher Bader | PAL81 - Fathi Qaraa'wi * |
| PAL65 - Azzam Salhab | PAL82 - Khalida Jarrar (Ms.) |
| PAL66 - Ayman Daraghmech * | |

Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 196th session (Hanoi, 1st April 2015)

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 (PLC) in January 2006, and to the decision it adopted at its 195th session (October 2014),

Recalling that the parliamentarians concerned were elected to the PLC on the Electoral Platform for Change and Reform and arrested following the kidnapping of an Israeli soldier on 25 June 2006, that they were prosecuted and found guilty of membership of a terrorist organization (Hamas), holding a seat in Parliament on behalf of that organization, providing services to it by sitting on parliamentary committees, and supporting an illegal organization, and that they were sentenced to prison terms of up to 40 months,

Noting that, while most of the parliamentarians concerned were released upon having served their sentences, many were subsequently re-arrested, sometimes several times, and placed in administrative detention,

Considering that, although by September 2014 the number had reached 25 to 26 PLC members in administrative detention, according to information provided in March 2015 by one of the complainants, the number now stands at 10,

Recalling that, in the first half of 2014, one of the complainants referred to the hunger strike which started in April 2014 of 125 Palestinians in administrative detention in Israel. According to the complainant, PLC members Mr. Mahmoud Al-Ramahi, Mr. Hatem Qfeisheh, Mr. Mohammad Jamal Natsheh, Mr. Abdul Jaber Fuqaha, Mr. Nizar Ramadan and Mr. Mohammed Maher Bader were part of this group. The hunger strike ended on 25 June 2014, reportedly after minor concessions, but no major change of policy from Israel,

* According to information provided by one of the sources of information in March 2015, these parliamentarians are no longer in detention.

Recalling that, with regard to the use of administrative detention:

- The Supreme Court of Israel has ruled that the exceptional measure of administrative detention, which is usually ordered for six months, but may, in fact, be prolonged indefinitely, can only be applied if there is current and reliable information to show that the person poses a specific and concrete threat, or if the confidential nature of the intelligence and security of the sources prohibit the presentation of evidence in an ordinary criminal procedure. According to the Israeli authorities, there are two avenues of judicial review, namely the independent and impartial military courts, which have the authority to assess the material relevant to the detainee in question in order to determine whether the decision to detain him/her was reasonable given his/her general rights to a fair trial and freedom of movement, and military prosecution, which implements a “cautious and level-headed” policy in the use of administrative detention. This approach is said to have reduced the number of administrative detention orders;
- Human rights organizations in and outside Israel have repeatedly stressed that administrative detention is usually justified by reference to a “security threat”, without, however, specifying the scope and nature of the threat or disclosing the evidence. Accordingly, although administrative detainees are entitled to appeal, this right is ineffective, given that the detainees and their lawyers do not have access to the information on which the orders are based and are therefore unable to present a meaningful defence,

Recalling that, during the mission in March 2013 by the delegation of the Committee on Middle East Questions to Israel and Palestine, an invitation was extended to the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians to observe the legal proceedings in one or more cases of administrative detention of PLC members directly,

Considering that, according to one of the complainants, PLC member Mr. Husni Al Borini had been sentenced to a 12-month prison term and that Mr. Riyadh Radad and Mr. Abdul Rahman Zaidan, who had first been held in administrative detention, were now in detention subject to criminal charges,

Recalling that, on 20 August 2014, PLC member Ms. Khalida Jarrar was ordered, according to the complainant, based on secret information that she is a threat to the security of the area, to leave her home in Ramallah and to move to Jericho for the next six months. According to recent unofficial reports, following an appeal against the decision, the military court reduced the expulsion order from six months to one month,

Recalling also the following information on file with regard to the revocation of the residence permits of three PLC members: In May 2006, the Israeli Minister of the Interior revoked the East Jerusalem residence permits of Mr. Muhammad Abu-Teir, Mr. Muhammad Totah and Mr. Ahmad Attoun, arguing that they had shown disloyalty to Israel by holding seats in the PLC; the order was not implemented, owing to their arrest in June 2006; after their release in May/June 2010, the three men were immediately notified that they had to leave East Jerusalem; Mr. Abu-Teir was ordered to leave by 19 June 2010 and, refusing to do so, was arrested on 30 June 2010 and later deported to the West Bank; the other two parliamentarians were ordered to leave by 3 July 2010 and, likewise refusing to comply with the order, took refuge in the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) building in Jerusalem, from which they were removed by the Israeli authorities on 26 September 2011 and 23 January 2012 respectively,

Bearing in mind that, in its concluding observations on the third periodic report of Israel under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,⁷ the United Nations Human Rights Committee recommended, inter alia, that all persons under Israel’s jurisdiction and effective control be afforded full enjoyment of the rights enshrined in the Covenant,

⁷ CCPR/C/ISR/CO/3.

Considering that parliamentary elections were held in Israel on 17 March 2015,

1. *Is concerned* that 10 PLC members are still being held in administrative detention; *deplores* this situation, which not only affects the parliamentarians directly, but also greatly impairs the right of the Palestinian people to be represented by persons of their choice;
2. *Regrets* the fact that, as the case history shows, even when PLC members are released, they remain subject to renewed arrest and can be placed in administrative detention again at any time, a practice which lends weight to claims that the use of such detention is arbitrary;
3. *Draws attention once again* to the need for further clarification as to how, given that administrative detention often relies on classified evidence, those so detained can fully benefit from due process in practice, and to what extent they can effectively challenge their deprivation of liberty, as the authorities affirm; *sincerely hopes*, therefore, that, with the assistance of the authorities of the recently elected Knesset, invitations to attend judicial reviews of PLC members in administrative detention will materialize soon; and *requests* the Secretary General to make the necessary arrangements for a Committee member to attend at least one such hearing;
4. *Reiterates its wish* to receive official information regarding the reported conviction of and 12-month prison term for PLC member Mr. Husni Al Borini, and should he have indeed been sentenced, a copy of the ruling, as well as the criminal charges brought against detained PLC members Mr. Riyadh Radad and Mr. Abdul Rahman Zaidan and, should charges exist, to receive details of their nature and the facts to support them;
5. *Remains eager* to receive the official views on Ms. Khalida Jarrar's one-month expulsion order from Ramallah, including any information that can be provided to explain the justification and legal grounds for the order;
6. *Remains deeply concerned* that Mr. Totah, Mr. Abu-Teir and Mr. Attoun were effectively removed from East Jerusalem; *reiterates its long-standing concerns* about the decision to revoke their residence permits and the manner of its implementation; *considers* that the revocation is at odds with the Hague Convention (IV) of October 1907 on the rules of customary international law, article 45 of which stipulates that the inhabitants of an occupied territory, of which East Jerusalem may be considered an example, are not to be compelled to swear allegiance to the occupying power;
7. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the relevant authorities, the complainant and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
8. *Invites* the Israeli delegation to the 133rd IPU Assembly (October 2015) to meet with the Committee on that occasion in order to discuss progress in the cases at hand;
9. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining the cases at its next session and to report back to it.

PALESTINE/ISRAEL

PAL83 - Aziz Dweik

*Decision adopted unanimously by the IPU Governing Council at its 196th session
(Hanoi, 1st April 2015)*

The Governing Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Referring to the case of Mr. Aziz Dweik, Speaker of the Palestinian Legislative Council (PLC), and to the decision it adopted at its 195th session (October 2014),

Recalling that Mr. Dweik was elected to the PLC on the Electoral Platform for Change and Reform and arrested during the night of 15 to 16 June 2014, along with and followed by scores of other Palestinian leaders, following the abduction, which Israel blamed on Hamas, of three Israeli teenagers, who were subsequently found killed. According to the complainant, after first being placed in administrative detention, Mr. Dweik is now facing criminal charges,

Recalling that, on 4 September 2014, an indictment was reportedly handed down against a member of the Hebron branch of Hamas, Mr. Hussam Qawasmeh, charging him with helping to plan the abduction of the three Israeli teenagers. The document, as described in Israeli news reports, spells out a detailed account of the crime's planning, execution and aftermath, but does not appear to contain any evidence that the leadership of Hamas – or anyone else outside of Mr. Qawasmeh's family, which reportedly controls the Hebron branch – had any knowledge of the crime before or after its commission,

Recalling that Mr. Dweik was previously arrested during the night of 5 to 6 August 2006 by the Israeli Defence Forces, and later charged with membership of a terrorist organization, namely Hamas, and leadership of that organization through his membership of the PLC and assuming the role of Speaker of the PLC. On 16 December 2008, the judge handed down her verdict, finding him guilty of membership of an unauthorized organization and leadership of that organization through his membership of the PLC and, on account of his poor health, sentenced him to 36 months' imprisonment, which he served until his release on 23 June 2009,

Recalling that since then, Mr. Dweik was re-arrested in 2012 and spent six months in administrative detention in Israel until his release on 19 July 2012,

Recalling that, in the face of escalating violence in the region, the United Nations Human Rights Council convened a special session on 23 July 2014 and adopted a resolution on the question of "Ensuring respect for international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem", in which it expressed "deep concern at the condition of Palestinian prisoners and detainees in Israeli jails and detention centres, in particular following the arrest by Israel of more than 1,000 Palestinians since 13 June 2014, and calls upon Israel, the occupying power, to immediately release all Palestinian prisoners whose detention is not in accordance with international law, including all children and all members of the Palestinian Legislative Council",

Considering that parliamentary elections were held in Israel on 17 March 2015,

1. *Is profoundly disturbed* at Mr. Dweik's continued detention, which is an affront to the authority of the Palestinian Legislative Council; *fears* that his arrest may not be based on formal charges of any specific criminal activity, but rather on his political affiliation, and that it was therefore carried out for non-judicial purposes;
2. *Recalls* in this regard its long-held view that, with regard to Mr. Dweik's previous arrest, detention and prosecution, they were unrelated to any criminal activity on his part, but were linked to his election on the Change and Reform list in a free and fair election recognized as such by the international community;
3. *Regrets* therefore that no official information from the Israeli authorities has been forthcoming as to whether Mr. Dweik is currently the subject of recognizable charges of criminal activity against him; *remains extremely eager* to receive that information;
4. *Urges* the Israeli authorities, should such charges have been made, to try him in a fair and transparent legal process, guaranteeing the full right of defence, as required under international human rights law and international humanitarian law, or otherwise to release him forthwith; *requests* the Secretary General to look into the possibility of sending a trial observer should Mr. Dweik stand trial;
5. *Reiterates its wish* to receive official information on Mr. Dweik's current conditions of detention, in particular his family visiting rights, along with information on the extent to which he has access to medical care; *remains concerned* in this regard about the reported prison conditions in which Palestinian prisoners are held in Israel;
6. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the relevant authorities, the complainant and any third party likely to be in a position to supply relevant information;
7. *Invites* the Israeli delegation to the 133rd IPU Assembly (October 2015) to meet with the Committee on that occasion in order to discuss progress in the case at hand;
8. *Requests* the Committee to continue examining this case at its next session and to report back to it.