

SIRACUSA GUIDELINES FOR INTERNATIONAL, REGIONAL AND
NATIONAL FACT-FINDING BODIES

SIRACUSA GUIDELINES FOR
INTERNATIONAL, REGIONAL
AND NATIONAL FACT-FINDING
BODIES

International Institute of Higher
Studies in Criminal Sciences

Edited by M. Cherif BASSIOUNI
and Christina ABRAHAM



intersentia

Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland

Intersentia Publishing Ltd.
Trinity House | Cambridge Business Park | Cowley Road
Cambridge | CB4 0WZ | United Kingdom
tel.: +44 1223 393 753 | email: mail@intersentia.co.uk

Distribution for the UK:

NBN International
Airport Business Centre, 10 Thornbury Road
Plymouth, PL6 7PP
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 1752 202 301 | Fax: +44 1752 202 331
Email: orders@nbninternational.com

Distribution for the USA and Canada:

International Specialized Book Services
920 NE 58th Ave Suite 300
Portland, OR 97213
USA
Tel.: +1 800 944 6190 (toll free)
Email: info@isbs.com

Distribution for Austria:

Neuer Wissenschaftlicher Verlag
Argentinierstraße 42/6
1040 Wien
Austria
Tel.: +43 1 535 61 03 24
Email: office@nwv.at

Distribution for other countries:

Intersentia Publishing nv
Groenstraat 31
2640 Mortsel
Belgium
Tel.: +32 3 680 15 50
Email: mail@intersentia.be

Siracusa Guidelines for International, Regional and National Fact-finding
Bodies

Edited by M. Cherif Bassiouni and Christina Abraham

© 2013 International Institute of Higher Studies in Criminal Sciences
(ISISC)

www.intersentia.com | www.intersentia.co.uk

Cover photograph: © Chones

ISBN 978-1-78068-193-1
D/2013/7849/109
NUR 828

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data. A catalogue record for this book is
available from the British Library.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm
or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABOUT THE EDITORS	ix
ABBREVIATIONS	xi
PREFACE	xiii
DRAFTING COMMITTEE OF THE SIRACUSA GUIDELINES	xix
PARTICIPANTS OF THE MEETING OF EXPERTS AT THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF HIGHER STUDIES IN CRIMINAL SCIENCES – SIRACUSA, ITALY	xxi
PART I: IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES IN RELATION TO UN FACT- FINDING MECHANISMS	1
<i>INTRODUCTION</i>	3
<i>INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS OF INQUIRY</i>	8
<i>Methods and Costs of COIs</i>	11
<i>SPECIAL PROCEDURES</i>	18
<i>Methods and Costs of Special Procedures</i>	19
<i>TREATY BODIES</i>	21
<i>Methods and Costs of the Treaty Body System</i>	22
<i>DE-FACTO FACT-FINDING MISSIONS UNDERTAKEN BY THE UN DEPARTMENT OF PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS (DPKO)</i>	27
<i>NATIONAL FACT-FINDING BODIES</i>	29
<i>CONCLUSION</i>	34
PART II: THE SIRACUSA GUIDELINES	35
PART III: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF UNITED NATIONS COMMISSIONS OF INQUIRY: TOWARD THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STANDARDIZED METHODOLOGY	53
<i>ABSTRACT</i>	55
<i>INTRODUCTION</i>	56
<i>UN MONITORING, REPORTING AND FACT-FINDING ACTIVITIES</i>	58
<i>METHODS</i>	63
<i>RESULTS</i>	65
<i>Mandates</i>	65

<i>State Consent</i>	67
<i>Prior and Simultaneous Investigations</i>	67
<i>Terms of Reference</i>	68
<i>Facts Alleged and Conclusions Reached</i>	69
<i>Investigative Methodology</i>	69
<i>Commissioners and Mission Personnel</i>	73
<i>Witnesses, Victims and Detainees</i>	75
<i>The Role of Non-Governmental Organizations</i>	78
<i>Recommendations and Follow-up</i>	79
<i>Budgets and Resource Allocation</i>	80
DISCUSSION ON THE CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTING AND FACILITATING FACT-FINDING MISSIONS	80
<i>Mandates and Terms of Reference</i>	81
<i>Lack of Standardized Methodology Guiding Fact-Finding Missions</i>	82
<i>Commissioners and Personnel</i>	85
<i>Witnesses, Victims and Detainees</i>	87
<i>The Role of NGOs and Members of Civil Society</i>	90
<i>Budgets and Resource Allocation</i>	92
IMPLICATIONS FOR BEST PRACTICE IN FACT-FINDING MISSIONS	93
<i>Mandates</i>	93
<i>Appointment of Commissioners and Hiring of Mission Personnel</i>	93
<i>Terms of Reference</i>	94
<i>Investigative Methodology and Report Compilation</i>	95
<i>Recommendations Regarding Witnesses and Victims</i>	96
<i>Recommendations Regarding Budgets and Resource Allocation</i> ...	97
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	98
APPENDICES TO THE EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF UNITED NATIONS COMMISSIONS OF INQUIRY	101
APPENDIX 1: REPORTS EVALUATED IN SAMPLE	103
APPENDIX 2: QUANTITATIVE VARIABLES	107
APPENDIX 3: OPERATIONALIZATION OF QUANTITATIVE VARIABLES . 109	
APPENDIX 4: THEMATIC GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR QUALITATIVE REVIEW	111

UN DOCUMENTS	117
UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 67/1	119
REPORT OF THE UN SECRETARY-GENERAL ON DELIVERING JUSTICE: PROGRAMME OF ACTION TO STRENGTHEN THE RULE OF LAW AT THE NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEVEL	125
STATEMENT OF THE UN SECRETARY-GENERAL AT THE HIGH- LEVEL MEETING OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON THE RULE OF LAW, 24 SEPTEMBER 2012	145
STATEMENT OF ISISC PRESIDENT, PROFESSOR M. CHERIF BASSIOUNI, AT THE HIGH-LEVEL MEETING OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON THE RULE OF LAW, 24 SEPTEMBER 2012	149

ABOUT THE EDITORS

M. CHERIF BASSIOUNI

M. Cherif Bassiouni is *Emeritus* Professor of Law at DePaul University where he taught from 1964-2012. He was a founding member of the International Human Rights Law Institute at DePaul University which was established in 1990. He served as President from 1990-1997 and then President *Emeritus*. In 1972, he was one of the founders of the International Institute of Higher Studies in Criminal Sciences (ISISC) located in Siracusa, Italy, where he served as Dean from 1972-1989 and then as President to date. He also served as the Secretary General of the International Association of Penal Law from 1974-1989 and as President for three five-year terms from 1989-2004 when he was elected Honorary President.

Since 1975, Professor Bassiouni has been appointed to the following United Nations positions: Chair and then member of the Commission of Inquiry for Libya (2011-2012); Independent Expert on Human Rights for Afghanistan (2004-2006); Independent Expert on the Rights to Restitution, Compensation, and Rehabilitation for Victims of Grave Violations of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (1998-2000); Chair, Drafting Committee of the Diplomatic Conference on the Establishment of an International Criminal Court (1998); Vice-Chair of the General Assembly's Preparatory Committee on the Establishment of an International Criminal Court (1996-1998); Vice-Chair of the General Assembly's Ad Hoc Committee on the Establishment of an International Criminal Court (1995); Chair of the Commission of Experts Established Pursuant to Security Council 780 (1992) to Investigate Violations of International Humanitarian Law in the Former Yugoslavia (1993-1994) and the Commission's Special Rapporteur on Gathering and Analysis of the Facts (1992-1993).

He also served as Chair of the Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry which was established in 2011.

To date, Professor Bassiouni has authored 27 books, edited 45 books, and authored 265 articles on International Criminal Law, Comparative Criminal Law, Human Rights, and U.S. Criminal Law that have been published in various law journals and books. Additionally, he has written 14 Monographs on such subjects as history, politics, and religion.

CHRISTINA ABRAHAM

Christina Abraham is the international research fellow at the International Institute of Higher Studies in Criminal Sciences (ISISC) in Siracusa, Italy. At ISISC, Ms. Abraham assists in developing programs on the rule of law, international criminal law and human rights, in line with ISISC's mandate. She also conducts research and analytical work on ISISC research programs. Prior to joining ISISC, Ms. Abraham was the Civil Rights Director at the Council on American-Islamic Relations in Chicago (CAIR-Chicago). In 2011, she served as the Chief of Staff for the Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry (BICI), an independent commission that investigated human rights abuses in Bahrain after demonstrations calling for government reforms began in February 2011. She is an attorney-at-law and holds a JD from DePaul University and an MA from the University of Chicago.

ABBREVIATIONS

COI – Commission of Inquiry
HRC – Human Rights Council
HRTD – Human Rights Treaties Division
ICC – International Criminal Court
ICTR – International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda
ICTY – International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia
MRF – Monitoring, Reporting and Fact-finding
NGO – Non-governmental Organization
OHCHR – Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
UDHR – Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UNDPKO – United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations
UN – United Nations
UNSG – United Nations Secretary-General
UNGA – United Nations General Assembly
UNSC – United Nations Security Council

PREFACE

Fact-finding bodies have been and continue to be established in different contexts by a variety of mechanisms. They may be established by the UN, treaty monitoring bodies, regional organizations, governments or national institutions, or NGOs, whether working alone or in collaboration with another body. As a result, the mandates that establish fact-finding bodies include political considerations, but more importantly they lack the specificity related to the professional nature of these bodies' missions. The objectives established for these fact-finding bodies, and more importantly how they function, the expertise of their personnel, the professionalism of their methods, and the resources they have at their disposal, vary significantly. Because each fact-finding situation is *sui generis*, the mixture of objectives and benefits of fact-finding bodies will differ from situation to situation or from country to country, but most importantly the difference will also be in the manner in which these bodies function. Very often the *sui generis* nature of fact-finding bodies also leads to ad hoc approaches to their operations. Fact-finding bodies may be purely investigatory, quasi-judicial, or have a truth and reconciliation component attached. Whatever the mechanisms of accountability, the first necessary step is always fact-finding, and these guidelines are concerned primarily with the issue of how to conduct a professional investigatory operation irrespective of what the ultimate purpose is of the data collected, or how the analysis made will be used. This is indispensable to ensure the professionalism of fact-finding operations, the reliability of the data obtained, its credibility, all of which are essential for any subsequent determination of whatever action may be contemplated. It is also the only way in which a comparison can be made of different situations that are the subject of fact-finding inquiries.

Many fact-finding bodies are created to investigate allegations of human rights violations. These fact-finding bodies allow international and national institutions to obtain information on a given situation and may provide advice on actions or remedies that should be taken to avert further conflict, restore stability, promote accountability or support adherence to the rule of law. They have also been useful in establishing a basis for future criminal investigations and prosecutions, whether internationally or nationally,

sometimes working alongside domestic and international criminal justice mechanisms. This is in line with the UN General Assembly's Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power. Human rights fact-finding bodies also provide an important mechanism for bringing closure to the victims of human rights abuse, which is a necessary component of achieving reconciliation, and promoting the right to truth. Finally, fact-finding bodies may also have a monitoring role: to establish whether any breaches of law (whether international humanitarian law, international human rights law, international criminal law or domestic law) have occurred, and investigating and publicizing the facts surrounding those breaches. Fact-finding bodies can also minimize ongoing violations of human rights and enhance compliance with national and international law.

Human rights fact-finding has increasingly become recognized as an important exercise to strengthen and support the rule of law in certain contexts. For example, UN General Assembly Resolution 67/1 emphasized the importance of fact-finding, "including those that investigate patterns of past violations of international human rights law and international humanitarian law and their causes and consequences" as "important tools that can complement judicial processes." Further, the UN Secretary-General has recognized fact-finding as an effective tool to "draw out facts necessary for wider accountability and transitional justice efforts."

Because the political objectives of fact-finding bodies vary from mission to mission, each fact-finding body produces different results. It is therefore difficult to compare the work products of these different missions because each one relies on different financial and human resources, adopts different methodologies, and therefore produces different results. The implication of this is that the work products of these fact-finding bodies cannot necessarily be relied upon by international or national judicial mechanisms such as the International Criminal Court or international and mixed-model tribunals. Also, very often human rights fact-finding bodies do not take into account parallel work conducted by historical or prosecutorial commissions, UN Special Procedures or the fact-finding work conducted within the Treaty Body System. The lack of coordination among these different bodies and inconsistencies in approaches and methodologies may lead to duplicated work and unreliable results. Perhaps an effective way of dealing with this would be to create a permanent body or pool of experts from which individuals could be selected to serve as Commissioners on these human rights fact-finding bodies. Such a system may help guarantee that fact-finding bodies are led by qualified experts, while at the same time ensure a

degree of flexibility for mandating bodies to select the experts that best fit each unique situation.

Understandably, there are differences in the goals and missions of different fact-finding bodies, which are reflected in their mandates. Ongoing fact-finding in connection with UN Special Procedures and other mechanisms that fall within the meaning of Special Procedures have developed since the establishment of the United Nations, first under the Commission on Human Rights and the sub-commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, and as of 2005 under the Council on Human Rights. But these are not the only UN bodies that have dealt with fact-finding processes, some like the Security Council Commission established pursuant to Resolution 780 (1992) was probably the most extensive fact-finding operation the United Nations undertook since its establishment. The Commission's two-year work resulted in the longest report published as a Security Council document (3,500 pages with 72,000 documents attached, 300 hours of video tape material, and 3,000 pictures). The work of the Commission resulted in the establishment of the ICTY as noted in the preamble of UN Security Council Resolution 827. As noted in the study made of these different bodies, *An Empirical Analysis of United Nations Commissions of Inquiry: Toward the Development of a Standardized Methodology*, available in this publication, there have been 30 fact-finding bodies established by various United Nations bodies, distinguishable from the continued work of the Special Procedures and Treaty Body System. The way in which these and other bodies conducting human rights fact-finding differ from one another is explored in the study *Identification of Issues in Relation to UN Fact-finding Mechanisms*, also available in this publication. What both of these studies evidence is the differences that exist both among UN Commissions of Inquiry, and between UN Commissions of Inquiry and other UN fact-finding bodies and procedures. This diversity cannot be explained in professional terms, only in political ones. What these two studies reveal is that there is definitely a need for enhanced professionalization of these fact-finding bodies, notwithstanding the diversity of their origin and the differences in their mandates. Having had the privilege of Chairing and being a member of four official fact-finding bodies, three established by the United Nations for the Former Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, and Libya (of which I was first Chair and then Member), and Chair of the Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry (BICI), a national commission, and also head of a private project in Iraq which compiled the oral history of over 5,000 victims of the Saddam regime, I can attest to the problems and

difficulties encountered in each one of these fact-finding bodies for the reasons discussed in the two studies contained in this publication.

In developing the Siracusa Guidelines, various best practice documents and training manuals were also reviewed, such as the *Chicago Principles on Post-Conflict Justice*, the *Lund-London Guidelines*, the *Brahimi Report*, the *Belgrade Minimum Rules of Procedure for International Human Rights Fact-Finding Visits*, the *University of Nottingham's Guiding Principles for Human Rights Field Officers Working in Conflict and Post-conflict Environments*, the *OHCHR Training Manual on Human Rights Monitoring*, the *Manual of Operations of the Special Procedures of the HRC*, and the *Institute for International Criminal Investigations' Investigators Manual*, among a number of other materials. The results of the research studies identified above and the review of other best practice documents were used to prepare the first draft of the Guidelines.

ISISC then organized a Meeting of Experts to review the draft Guidelines. This Meeting brought together over 70 international judges and prosecutors, UN officials, academics and other experts to review the Guidelines and provide comments. After the conclusion of the Meeting, a Drafting Committee composed of highly experienced academics, jurists and legal practitioners met to review the comments made by experts and deliberate upon the draft Guidelines. A subsequent draft of the Siracusa Guidelines was circulated to participants of the Meeting of Experts. Their comments were received by the Drafting Committee, who then adopted a final draft of the Guidelines. The experts and Drafting Committee members have contributed to this endeavor in their personal capacities. Although nothing in this undertaking is attributable to any government, UN agency, or institution with which any of the participants are affiliated, their input has been of immense value in developing the Guidelines.

The Siracusa Guidelines seek to promote an effective approach to human rights fact-finding based upon compliance with international best practices. The Guidelines have been developed as a practical guide for establishing and operating a fact-finding body investigating human rights violations. The Guidelines are intended to aid a mandating body in establishing a mandate and selecting Commissioners, as well as to aid Commissioners and staff in effectively carrying out their mandate. They are therefore designed to address the three main phases of the life of a fact-finding body: 1) establishment; 2) investigation; and 3) reporting and follow-up.

The structure of the Guidelines recognizes that each mission operates within different contexts. The effectiveness of any fact-finding body requires that it consider this context in its establishment and operation. As such,

the Guidelines contain a degree of flexibility, and all guidelines may not apply in all situations equally. Because of the variety of different contextual possibilities, the applicability of each Guideline may not be reflected in the text; however, compliance with the Guidelines will result in enhanced credibility and effectiveness for missions. The Siracusa Guidelines have been developed keeping in mind the experiences of UN and other fact-finding bodies, including the BICI, which reviewed other fact-finding body experiences before establishing its mandate and internal rules and procedures. The Guidelines are therefore intended, amongst other things, to ensure that the positive elements and lessons learned from these fact-finding bodies are preserved and readily accessible for future missions.

ISISC and I extend our deepest appreciation to the participants of the Meeting of Experts and to the Drafting Committee, whose names follow.

M. Cherif Bassiouni

President, ISISC; Emeritus Professor of Law and President Emeritus,
International Human Rights Law Institute, DePaul University College
of Law; Honorary President, International Association of Penal Law

DRAFTING COMMITTEE OF THE SIRACUSA GUIDELINES

PROFESSOR M. CHERIF BASSIOUNI, CHAIR

President, International Institute of Higher Studies in Criminal Sciences; Emeritus Professor of Law, DePaul University College of Law; former Chair, Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry; former Chair and then Member, UN Commission of Inquiry for Libya; former UN Independent Expert on the Situation of Human Rights in Afghanistan; former Chairman, UN Security Council Commission to Investigate Violations of International Humanitarian Law in the Former Yugoslavia; former Independent Expert for the Commission on Human Rights on The Rights to Restitution, Compensation and Rehabilitation for Victims of Grave Violations of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (United States/Egypt)

H.E. COMMISSIONER KAREN ABUZAYD

Commissioner, UN Commission of Inquiry for Syria; former Commissioner-General, UNRWA (United States)

DR. MAHNOUSH H. ARSANJANI

Judge, World Bank Administrative tribunal; Former Vice President, The American Society of International Law; former Director of Codification, Office of Legal Affairs for the United Nations; former Commissioner, Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry (Iran)

DR. TARIQ BALOCH

Advisor, Freshfields Brukhaus and Derringer (United Kingdom)

H.E. SERGE BRAMMERTZ

Prosecutor, ICTY; former Federal Prosecutor, Kingdom of Belgium
(Belgium)

H.E. PHILIPPE KIRSCH

Former Commissioner, Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry;
Former Member and Chair, UN Commission of Inquiry on Libya; Former
President, International Criminal Court; Former Ambassador of Canada to
Sweden (Canada/Belgium)

MS. CHRISTINA ABRAHAM, SECRETARY

Siracusa Guidelines Project Coordinator; International Research Fellow,
International Institute of Higher Studies in Criminal Sciences; Attorney-at-
Law, Chicago, USA

**PARTICIPANTS OF THE MEETING OF
EXPERTS AT THE INTERNATIONAL
INSTITUTE OF HIGHER STUDIES IN
CRIMINAL SCIENCES – SIRACUSA, ITALY**



**Participants of the Meeting of Experts on the Establishment of
Principles and Best Practices for International and National
Commissions of Inquiry, Siracusa, Italy, 14 – 17 March 2013.**

1. H.E. Commissioner Karen AbuZayd, Commissioner, UN Commission of Inquiry for Syria; former Commissioner-General, UNRWA (United States).
2. Judge Khaled Ahmed, Judge, Cairo Court of Appeals; Legal Advisor to the Supreme Judicial Council of Bahrain Former Chief Investigator, Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry (Egypt).
3. H.E. Judge Walid Akoum, Judge, Trial Chamber, Special Tribunal for Lebanon (Lebanon).
4. Ms. Elham Alshejni, Director of Human Rights, League of Arab States (Yemen).
5. Ms. Elizabeth Andersen, Executive Director and Executive Vice President of the American Society of International Law (United States).
6. Dr. Kjell Anderson, Senior Researcher, The Hague Institute for Global Justice (The Netherlands).
7. Dr. Mahnoush H. Arsanjani, Judge, World Bank Administrative Tribunal; Former Vice President, The American Society of International Law; former Director of Codification, Office of Legal Affairs for the United Nations; former Commissioner, Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry (United States/Iran).
8. Dr. Tariq Baloch, Advisor, Freshfields Brukhaus and Derringer (United Kingdom).
9. Ms. Shamila Batohi, Senior Legal Advisor and Head of the Legal Advisory Section, Office of the Prosecutor, International Criminal Court (South Africa).
10. H.E. Serge Brammertz, Prosecutor, ICTY (Belgium).
11. Professor Claude Bruderlein, Senior Researcher, Program on Humanitarian Policy and Conflict Research, Harvard University; Strategic Advisor, International Committee of the Red Cross (United States).
12. H.E. Dr. Ali Bin Fadhel Al Buainain, Attorney General, Bahrain (Bahrain).
13. Ms. Anna Capello, Head of the Division of Confidence-Building Measures, Directorate of Political Advice, Council of Europe (Switzerland).
14. Professor Andrew Clapham, Professor of International Law, Geneva Graduate Institute of International Studies (United Kingdom).
15. Professor José-Luis De La Cuesta Arzamendi, President, Association Internationale de Droit Pénal; Director, Instituto Vasco de Criminología, Basque University of San Sebastian (Spain).
16. Judge Terje Einarsen, Judge, Galuting High Court, Norway (Norway).

17. Mr. Georg Fliege, Police Reform Adviser, Standing Police Capacity of the Police Division of the Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions (OROLSI), U.N. Department of Peacekeeping Operations (Germany).
18. Mr. Rob Grace, Project Coordinator and Researcher, Monitoring, Reporting and Fact-Finding Project, Program on Humanitarian Policy and Conflict Research, Harvard University (United States).
19. Professor Larissa van den Herik, Professor of Public International Law, Grotius Centre for International Legal Studies, Leiden University (The Netherlands).
20. H.E. Hassan Bubacar Jallow, Prosecutor, International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (Gambia).
21. H.E. Philippe Kirsch, Former Commissioner, Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry; Former Member and Chair, UN Commission of Inquiry on Libya; Former President, International Criminal Court; Former Ambassador of Canada to Sweden (Canada/Belgium).
22. Professor Sarah Knuckey, Director, Initiative on Human Rights Fact-Finding (Center for Human Rights and Global Justice, NYU); Adjunct Professor of Clinical Law (New York University School of Law); Advisor, UN Special Rapporteur Inquiry into Drone Strikes and Targeted Killings (United States).
23. Ms. Britta Madsen, Project Coordinator, Rule of Law Training Program, Center for International Peace Operations (Germany).
24. Dean Gregory Mark, Dean, DePaul University College of Law (United States).
25. H.E. Dr. Ali Bin Mohsen Bin Fetais Al Marri, Attorney General, Qatar (Qatar).
26. H.E. Professor Juan Mendez, Visiting Professor of Law, American University, Washington College of Law; UN Special Rapporteur on Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment; Co-Chair of the Human Rights Institute of the International Bar Association; former Special Advisor on Prevention to the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court (Argentina).
27. H.E. Judge Theodor Meron, President of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia; Presiding Judge of the Appeals Chambers of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the ICTY; President of the Mechanism for International Criminal Tribunals (United States).
28. H.E. Judge Howard Morrison, Judge, Trial Chambers, International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (United Kingdom).

29. Professor Vitit Muntarbhorn, Commissioner, UN Commission of Inquiry on Syria; Former Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea; UN Committee of Experts on Recommendations of the International Labour Organization; Professor of Law, Chulalongkorn University (Thailand).
30. Mr. Daragh Murray, Programme Director, Human Rights Clinic, Human Rights Centre, University of Essex (United Kingdom).
31. Mr. Constantine Partasides, Partner, Freshfields Brukhas and Derringer (United Kingdom).
32. Dr. Gisela Perren-Klingler, President, International Humanitarian Fact-Finding Commission (Switzerland).
33. H.E. Ambassador Stephen J. Rapp, Ambassador at Large Office of Global Criminal Justice, U.S Department of State, former Chief Prosecutor for the Special Court for Sierra Leone (United States).
34. Mr. Ravi K. Reddy, Legal Affairs Officer, Standing Police Capacity of the Police Division of the Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions (OROLSI), U.N. Department of Peacekeeping Operations (India).
35. Ms. Mona Rishmawi, Chief of the Rule of Law, Equality and Non-Discrimination Branch, Research and Right to Development Division, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (Egypt).
36. Professor Amr Shalakany, Aga Khan Visiting Distinguished Professor of Islamic Humanities, Brown University; Associate Professor of Law, American University in Cairo (Egypt).
37. Dr. Jan-Michael Simon, Head of the Department for Latin America, Max-Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law (Germany).
38. Dr. Elin Skaar, Senior Researcher, Coordinator: Rights and Legal Institutions, Chr. Michelsen Institute (Norway).
39. Professor Elies van Sliedregt, Dean of the Faculty of Law and Professor of Criminal Law, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (The Netherlands).
40. Professor Carsten Stahn, Professor of International Criminal Law and Global Justice – Grotius Centre for International Legal Studies, Leiden University (The Netherlands).
41. H.E. Judge Cuno Tarfusser, Second Vice-President, ICC (Italy).
42. Judge Jean-François Thony, Procureur Général, Colmar; Vice-President ISISC; Vice-President AIDP (France).
43. Professor John Vervaele, Professor of Economic and European Criminal Law, Willem Pompe Institute, Utrecht University; Vice-President and Director of the Scientific Committee of the AIDP; Member, Board of Directors, ISISC (The Netherlands).

44. Professor Eric Wiebelhaus-Brahm, Director of International Affairs, Florida State University (United States).
45. Professor Ellen Yee, Professor of Law, Drake University (United States).

DELEGATION FROM BAHRAIN

1. Ms. Dana Rashed Al-Zayani, Head of the Follow Up Unit (Bahrain).
2. Mr. Nawaf Hamza, Head of the Special Investigation Unit (Bahrain).

DELEGATION FROM QATAR

1. Mr. Fras Ahmed, Head of International Relations, Public Prosecution (Qatar).
2. Mr. Fahad Al Athba, Chief Prosecutor (Qatar).
3. Mr. Khalid Al Kotoub, Expert, Office of the Attorney General (Qatar).
4. Mr. Abdul Hakim Amer Al Sayeri, Undersecretary, Office of Affairs, Office of the Attorney General (Qatar).

OBSERVERS

1. Mr. Husam Alkatlabi, Researcher and Data Analyst, Syrian Justice and Accountability Center (United States/Syria).
2. Mr. Francis Arthur, Researcher, MSW (cand), Dominican University (United States).
3. Mr. Ari Bassin, Action Officer, United States Department of State (United States).
4. Ms. Maxine Davis, Researcher, MSW (cand), Dominican University (United States).
5. Ms. Catherine Harwood, Ph.D. (cand) and Researcher, Grotius Center for International Legal Studies, Leiden University (New Zealand).
6. Dr. Ekkehart Muller-Rappard, former Director of Human Rights, Office of the Council of Europe (France).
7. Mr. Ahmed Rehab, Executive Director, Council on American-Islamic Relations – Chicago Chapter (United States/Egypt).
8. Mr. Laith Saud, Ph.D. (cand) University of Chicago; Lecturer, DePaul University (United States/Iraq).
9. Mr. Wael Sawah, Project Director, Syrian Justice and Accountability Center (United States/Syria).
10. Dr. Leticia Villarreal Sosa, PhD, LCSW; Assistant Professor, Dominican University (United States).

11. Dean Charlie Stoops, Dean, Graduate School of Social Work, Dominican University (United States).
12. Mr. Yaser Tabbara, Legal Advisor, Syrian National Coalition (United States/Syria).

ISISC STAFF

1. Ms. Christina Abraham, Project Coordinator, International Research Fellow, ISISC; Attorney-at-Law, Chicago, Illinois (United States).
2. Ms. Assia Buonocore, ISISC Head of Secretariat (Italy).
3. Ms. Jessica DeWalt, Attorney-at-Law, Chicago, Research Assistant to Professor Bassiouni (United States).
4. Ms. Stefania Lentinello, ISISC Program Officer (Italy).
5. Ms. Michelle Martin, PhD (cand), MSW, MSocSci; Lecturer, Dominican University Graduate School of Social Work (United States).
6. Dr. Filippo Musca, Acting Scientific Director, ISISC (Italy/United Kingdom).