



NEWS FLASH N° 19

(End of July 2014)

Recent developments / Développements récents

Selected recent developments in Syria

On 12 February 2014, the *Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic* presented a report (A/HRC/25/65) to the United Nations Human Rights Council, which covered the period from 15 July 2013 to 20 January 2014. This report concludes *inter alia* that:

- The Syrian Arab Republic has acted in breach of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Convention on the elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women, the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Optional Protocol thereto on the involvement of children in armed conflict;
- As a State, the Syrian Arab Republic is responsible for all acts committed by its officially sanctioned agents, in breach of international treaty obligations;
- In the course of the conflict, the warring parties have failed to comply with their obligations under international humanitarian law and have violated the fundamental prohibitions of common article 3 of the Geneva Conventions. Individual fighters and their commanders may be held accountable for their acts under international criminal law and by States exercising universal jurisdiction;
- External actors that support the belligerents financially and logistically have obligations under international law. States should not authorize the transfer of arms if there is a risk that they will be used in the commission of crimes against humanity or war crimes, as it is the case for Syria. States that exert influence over the parties in Syria have an obligation to ensure their compliance with the rules of international humanitarian law.

The report *inter alia* recommends that the UN Security Council takes appropriate action by referring the situation in Syria to justice, possibly to the ICC, bearing in mind that in the context of Syria, only the UN Security Council is competent to refer the situation.

See:

http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/HRC/25/65&referer=http://daaccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N14/270/33/PDF/N1427033.pdf?OpenElement&Lang=E

On 22 February 2014, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 2139 (2014). The UN Security Council expressed grave alarm at the significant and rapid deterioration of the humanitarian situation in Syria, in particular the dire situation of hundreds of thousands of civilians trapped in besieged areas, as well as the dire situation of over 3 million people in hard-to-reach areas. It also expressed its regret that the Presidential Statement issued on 2 October 2013 has failed to translate into meaningful progress in practice. It listed *inter alia* the following several central points to be implemented by all parties:

- Immediately stop all forms of violence, and cease and desist from all violations of international humanitarian law and violations and abuses of human rights;
- Cease all attacks against civilians, as well as the indiscriminate employment of weapons in populated areas, including shelling and aerial bombardment, such as the use of barrel bombs, and methods of warfare which are of a nature to cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering;
- Fully implement the provisions of the 2 October 2013 Statement by the President of the Security Council (S/PRST/2013/15);
- Immediately lift the sieges of populated areas, allow the delivery of humanitarian assistance, cease depriving civilians of food and medicine indispensable to their survival, and enable the rapid, safe and unhindered evacuation of all civilians who wish to leave;
- Agree on humanitarian pauses, days of tranquility, localized ceasefires and truces to allow humanitarian agencies safe and unhindered access to all affected areas in Syria;
- Allow rapid, safe and unhindered humanitarian access for United Nations humanitarian agencies and their implementing partners, including across conflict lines and across borders, in order to ensure that humanitarian assistance reaches people in need through the most direct routes;
- Respect the principle of medical neutrality and facilitate free passage to all areas for medical personnel, equipment, transport and supplies;

- Demilitarize medical facilities, schools and other civilian facilities and avoid establishing military positions in populated areas and desist from attacks directed against civilian objects;
- End the practices of arbitrary detention, torture, kidnappings, abductions and forced disappearance, and release all arbitrarily detained persons;
- End impunity for those who violated international humanitarian law and violations and abuses of human rights, and bring the wrongdoers to justice.

The Security Council requested the UN Secretary-General to report to the Council on the implementation of the resolution and expressed its intent to take further steps in the case of non-compliance with the resolution.

See:

[http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2139\(2014\)&referer=http://www.un.org/en/sc/documents/resolutions/2014.shtml&Lang=E](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2139(2014)&referer=http://www.un.org/en/sc/documents/resolutions/2014.shtml&Lang=E)

On 24 March 2014, the UN Secretary-General presented his first report on the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 2139 (2014), which covered the period from 22 February 2014 to 21 March 2014. The report details how during the reporting period, indiscriminate and disproportionate attacks caused mass civilian death and injuries and forced displacement. The worsening security environment notwithstanding, the United Nations and its partners continued to provide humanitarian aid to millions of Syrian civilian in need. Significant challenges to the delivery of assistance remain, including the need for multiple requests for approval of inter-agency convoys, which often go unanswered; the Syrian Government's lack of internal communication of approvals to those on the ground; and continued insecurity.

See:

http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/2014/208&referer=http://www.un.org/en/sc/documents/sgreports/2014.shtml&Lang=E

On 28 March 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted Resolution A/HRC/25/L.7 *inter alia* extending the mandate of the *Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic* through to the twenty-eighth session of the Human Rights Council.

See:

<http://www.ohchr.org/en/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=14455&LangID=E>

On 23 April 2014, the UN Secretary-General released his second report on the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 2139 (2014), which covered the period from 22 March 2014 to 21 April 2014. The report states that "two months

since the adoption of the resolution, none of the parties to the conflict have adhered to the demands of the UN Security Council”.

See: http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/2014/295

On 15 May 2014, France presented a draft resolution to the UN Security Council on the issue of referring the situation of Syria to the ICC. On 19 May 2014, 58 countries released a public statement to call on the Security Council to adopt the French proposal. However, Russia and China jointly vetoed this resolution on 22 May 2014, in spite of the support of the other 13 Security Council members.

See: <http://un-report.blogspot.be/2014/05/french-draft-resolution-on-icc-syria-in.html?spref=tw>

http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/related_material/2014-05-19%20Syria%20ICC%20SC%20Res%20Public%20Statement%20final.pdf

http://www.un.org/depts/dhl/resguide/scact_veto_en.shtml

On 22 May 2014, the UN Secretary-General released his third report on the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 2139 (2014), covering the period from 22 April 2014 to 19 May 2014. The report states documents that there had been no reduction in the appalling patterns of violations international humanitarian law and human rights abuses, as documented in his previous reports. “Despite the adoption of the resolution, the situation on the ground has become worse, not better”, he says.

See: http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/2014/365

On 20 June 2014, the Secretary-General released his fourth report on the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 2139 (2014), covering the period from 20 May 2014 to 17 June 2014. The security situation continued to deteriorate, and the humanitarian crisis continued to escalate in the reporting period. The report also stated that UN Security Council Resolution 2139 (2014) had yet to make a meaningful difference in the lives of millions of people.

See: http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/2014/427

On 23 June 2014, Human Rights Watch released a report entitled “*Maybe We Live and Maybe We Die: Recruitment and Use of Children by Armed Groups in Syria*”, which revealed the wide use of child soldiers by the Syrian extremist Islamist groups including the ISIS.

See: <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2014/06/22/maybe-we-live-and-maybe-we-die>

On the same day, the OPCW-UN Joint Mission for the elimination of the chemical weapons programme of Syria, which was established under the provisions of the

OPCW Executive Council's Decision EC-M-33/Dec.1 and UN Security Council Resolution 2118 (2013), issued a statement which confirmed the removal of Syria's chemical weapons material from Syria.

See: <http://www.opcw.org/news/article/announcement-to-media-on-last-consignment-of-chemicals-leaving-syria/>

(Siwen Huang)

Mandate of the United Nations Mission in South Sudan extended

Background:

On 8 July 2011, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 1996 (2011), which welcomed the establishment of the Republic of South Sudan on 9 July 2011 upon its proclamation as an independent State, and also established the UN Mission in the Republic of South Sudan (UNMISS) for an initial period of one year. The mandate of UNMISS includes the following tasks:

- Support for peace consolidation and thereby fostering longer-term state-building and economic development;
- Support the Government of the Republic of South Sudan in exercising its responsibilities for conflict prevention, mitigation, and resolution and protect civilians;
- Support the Government of the Republic of South Sudan, in accordance with the principles of national ownership, and in cooperation with the UN Country Team and other international partners, in developing its capacity to provide security, to establish the rule of law, and to strengthen the security and justice sectors.

See: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/4f1d3b322.html>

On 5 July 2012, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 2057 (2012) granting a one-year extension of the mandate of the UNMISS, through 15 July 2013. In this resolution the Security Council *inter alia*:

- requested the Secretary-General, through his special Representative, to continue to direct the operations of an integrated UNMISS, coordinate all activities of the UN system in the Republic of South Sudan;
- called upon the Government of the Republic of South Sudan to take greater responsibility for the protection of its civilians, and in this respect encouraged cooperation with UNMISS;

- Authorized UNMISS to use all necessary means, within the limits of its capacity and in the areas where its units are deployed, to carry out its protection mandate as set out in Resolution 1996 (2011);
- demanded that the Government of the Republic of South Sudan and all relevant parties cooperate fully in the deployment, operations, and monitoring, verification, and reporting functions of UNMISS, in particular by guaranteeing the safety, security and unrestricted freedom of movement of United Nations personnel, as well as of associated personnel throughout the territory of the Republic of South Sudan and in this regard strongly condemned any attack on UNMISS troops and staff and demanded that there be no recurrence of such attacks.

See: [http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2057\(2012\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2057(2012))

On 11 July 2013, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 2109 (2013) granting an extension of the mandate of UNMISS, as set out in the UN Security Council resolution 1996 (2011), through 15 July 2014. In this resolution the UN Security Council requested the Secretary-General, through his Special Representative, to continue to direct the operations of an integrated UNMISS, coordinate all activities of the United Nations system in the Republic of South Sudan, and support a coherent international approach to a stable peace in the Republic of South Sudan, while respecting United Nations guiding principles of humanitarian assistance including humanity, impartiality, neutrality, and independence.

See: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/51e53aaf4.html>

On 15 December 2013, an internal power struggle within the Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM), South Sudan's ruling political party, came to a head during a meeting of its second highest organ, the National Liberation Council. The Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA) became involved in the dispute, with fighting in military barracks in the capital, Juba, initially among the Presidential Guards.

See: <http://www.crisisgroup.org/~media/Files/africa/horn-of-africa/south%20sudan/217-south-sudan-a-civil-war-by-any-other-name.pdf>

24 December 2013, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 2132 (2013). In this Resolution the UN Security Council expressed grave alarm and concern regarding the rapidly deteriorating security and humanitarian crisis in South Sudan resulting from the political dispute and subsequent violence caused by the country's political leaders. In this resolution the Security Council *inter alia*:

- Called for an immediate cessation of hostilities and the immediate opening of a dialogue;
- Demanded that all parties cooperate fully with UNMISS as it implements its mandate, in particular the protection of civilians, and stressed that efforts to undermine UNMISS' ability to implement its mandate and attacks on United Nations personnel will not be tolerated;
- Endorsed the recommendation made by the Secretary-General to temporarily increase the overall force levels of UNMISS to support its protection of civilians and provision of humanitarian assistance.

See: <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2013/sc11230.doc.htm>

On 23 January 2014, the Government of the Republic of South Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Army signed the *Cessation of Hostilities Agreement*, in which the Parties remain fully committed to the outcome of the peace process and welcome the spirit of an all-inclusive dialogue to resolve the issues connected with the crisis in the country.

See: http://enoughproject.org/files/IGAD_StatusofDetainees_GRSS.pdf

On 8 May 2014, the UN released the UNMISS human rights report on South Sudan, covering the period from 15 December 2013 (when violence broke out) to 25 April 2014. The Report finds that there are reasonable grounds to believe that gross violations of human rights and serious violations of humanitarian law have been committed by both parties in the context of the ongoing conflict in the Republic of South Sudan.

See:

<http://www.gurtong.net/ECM/Editorial/tabid/124/ctl/ArticleView/mid/519/articleId/15232/UNMISS-Human-Rights-Report-on-South-Sudan.aspx>

Mandate extension:

On 27 May 2014, the UN Security Council adopted resolution 2155 (2014) granting an extension of the mandate of UNMISS until 30 November 2014. This resolution focuses the mandate of UNMISS on the protection of civilians. In this resolution the Security Council *inter alia*:

- Decides that the mandate of UNMISS shall be as follows, and authorizes UNMISS to use all necessary means to perform the following tasks:
 - (a) Protection of civilians;
 - (b) Monitoring and investigating human rights;
 - (c) Creating the conditions for delivery of humanitarian assistance;

(d) Supporting the Implementation of the Cessation of Hostilities Agreement.

See: <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2014/sc11414.doc.htm>

For more information please visit:

ICRC Resource Centre: «South Sudan: Boosting aid effort to respond to alarming humanitarian situation» on 15 May 2014
<http://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/news-release/2014/05-15-south-sudan-budget-extension.htm>

Amnesty International Report «South Sudan: the UN Human Rights Council must support international efforts to address the dire situation», written statement to the 26th session of the UN Human Rights Council (10-27 June 2014)
<http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/538d98cc4.pdf>

(Kseniya Viaselskaya)

Publication of Interest/ Publication intéressante

In November 2013 the ICRC published the report of an expert meeting on «The use of force in armed conflicts - interplay between the conduct of hostilities and law enforcement paradigms». This report was prepared and edited by Gloria Gaggioli, Legal Adviser at the ICRC.

As indicated by its subtitle, this publication deals with two paradigms, in particular, the conduct of hostilities paradigm and the law enforcement paradigm. In January 2012 the ICRC organised an expert meeting whose objective was to examine which paradigm applies to the use of force in different armed conflict situations. Hereafter you will find a brief review/summary of the ICRC report, making use of the terms and words of the original report itself.

In the *Introduction*, Mrs. Gaggioli submits that under the IHL lens, fighters are legitimate targets and can be targeted according to the conduct of hostilities paradigm. However, the law enforcement paradigm could also be seen as relevant because, ultimately, force is used against fighters in order to maintain or restore public security, law and order. It is also mentioned that nowadays international law does not always provide clear and straightforward answers to these challenges. So, the main question is: in which cases does the use of force fall within the conduct of hostilities paradigm and or, by contrast, within that of law enforcement?

The report is divided into three parts. It addresses successively:

- The legal basis and distinguishing features of the conduct of hostilities and law enforcement paradigms;
- Case studies analysis pertaining to the actual use of force;
- The legal issues relevant before and after the actual use of force – notably questions of planning and investigation.

The *First Part* is divided in four sections and deals with the legal basis and distinguishing features of the two paradigms. Mrs. Gaggioli first assesses the legal regimes governing the use of force in armed conflicts. It is mentioned that in IHL, the rules and principles regarding the use of force can primarily be found in the 1907 Hague Regulations, the Additional Protocols to the Geneva Conventions and customary IHL. In international human rights law, the legal regime governing the use of force against individuals is mainly derived from the right to life, which is protected in every general human rights treaty, in particular the ICCPR, ECHR, ACHR, and ACHPR, and under customary law. In order to be covered by IHL, the use of force must take place in an armed conflict situation and must have a nexus with the armed conflict. In addition, as stated by the ICTY in the *Tadić* decision, IHL applies “in the whole territory of the warring States or, in the case of internal armed conflicts, the whole territory under the control of a party, whether or not actual combat takes place there.” As for international human rights law, it is true that some rights can be derogated from “in time of public emergency which threatens the life of the nation” (Art. 4 ICCPR, Art. 15 of ECHR, Art. 27 ACHR). This is not the case however for the prohibition of arbitrary deprivation of life, which is non-derogable and from which the limits for the use of force against individuals in human rights law are derived (para. 2 Art.4 ICCPR, para. 2 Art. 27 ACHR).

After that the author looks at the two paradigms and mentions the main differences between the conduct of hostilities and law enforcement paradigms. The principles governing the conduct of hostilities and law enforcement paradigms operate differently. The main differences can be summarised as follows:

1) The principle of *necessity* is conceived in a different way under the two paradigms. Under the conduct of hostilities paradigm, the military necessity to use force against legitimate targets is presumed. In contrast, under the law enforcement paradigm, the principle of “absolute necessity” implies that the use of force must be the last resort and can be undertaken only in order to pursue a legitimate aim, such as self-defence, effecting a lawful arrest, preventing the escape of a person lawfully detained, or quelling a riot. In brief, force must be absolutely necessary in order to maintain public security, law and order.

2) The *principle of proportionality*, the observance of which is crucial to both conduct of hostilities and law enforcement operations, is conceived differently under IHL and human rights law. IHL prohibits an attack against a legitimate target if this attack

“may be expected to cause incidental loss of civilian life, injury to civilians, damage to civilian objects, or a combination thereof, which would be excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage anticipated.” By contrast, when a State agent is using force against an individual under human rights law, the proportionality principle requires a balancing between the risks posed by the individual versus the potential harm to this individual as well as to bystanders.

3) In the same vein, under the conduct of hostilities paradigm, the *principle of precaution* requires belligerents to take constant care to spare the civilian population, civilians and civilian objects. On the contrary, under the law enforcement paradigm, all precautions must be taken to avoid, as far as possible, the use of force as such, and not merely incidental civilian death or injury or damage to civilian objects.

In *Part 2*, Mrs. Gaggioli analyses 5 cases which concern the use of force in armed conflicts in five different situations:

- when force is used against legitimate targets (the isolated sleeping fighter example);
- when civilians are involved in riots, in close proximity to or intermingled with fighters;
- when civilians belong to criminal groups which are not party to the armed conflict but which have close links to organised armed groups;
- when detainees or internees attempt an escape or are involved in a riot in detention;
- when civilians do not respect military orders.

In *Part 3*, entitled «Issues before and after the use of force» and divided into two sections, Mrs. Gaggioli addresses issues that are relevant before and after the actual use of force, notably as regards preventive obligations and investigation.

In the first subpart of the Part 3, the author focuses on the preventive obligations. The interplay between the conduct of hostilities and law enforcement paradigms poses challenges not only at the moment of the execution of an operation when force is actually being used, but also before force is used. Many difficult practical issues arise when planning an operation, when elaborating a legal and administrative framework for the use of force in armed conflicts, and when training and equipping armed forces.

Regarding the *legal and administrative framework*, several experts mentioned the importance of national rules of engagement (RoE). It was argued that RoE can work as a useful “policy bridge.” Even where IHL is the *lex specialis*, RoE can take into account and introduce human rights law concepts, although these are not required as a matter of law. Another view was instead that RoE are more than just policy. RoE “interact” with domestic law in two directions. Although experts agreed that RoE

constitute a useful and necessary tool for regulating the use of force in armed conflict situations, they did not argue in favour of one or another way of shaping RoE in order to take into account the fact that both conduct of hostilities and law enforcement paradigms may be relevant in armed conflict situations.

Regarding the *training* of armed forces, a number of experts highlighted the necessity, in today's armed conflicts, to train armed forces – including peacekeeping personnel – not only in the conduct of hostilities but also in law enforcement techniques. It was mentioned that, in some countries, it is part of good practices to have trainers for armed forces that are in some cases police officers or members of the military police, who are very familiar with law enforcement techniques.

As regards the *equipment* of armed forces, the majority of experts agreed that, to the extent that armed forces conduct law enforcement operations, they should be provided with law enforcement equipment, including so-called “non-lethal” or less-than-lethal weapons where appropriate. It was also mentioned that what is important when talking about law enforcement activities is not only the equipment of armed forces but also the general infrastructure. For example, the way in which a checkpoint is set up is crucial in order to minimize the potential use of lethal force.

In the second part of the Part 3, the author focuses on the obligation to investigate.

Regarding the obligation to investigate in armed conflict situations, experts agreed that such an obligation exists both under human rights law and IHL, although the purpose and scope of (or trigger for) this obligation remains different under these two bodies of law.

Experts also addressed the question of the interplay between IHL and human rights law regarding the obligation to investigate in armed conflict situations. The majority of experts were of the view that IHL has to prevail regarding the obligation to investigate in armed conflicts. The human rights obligation to investigate every killing was seen as unrealistic and not practicable in armed conflict situations. It was also argued that it would not make sense to oblige belligerents to investigate deaths that are perfectly lawful under IHL. Thus, when it comes to investigations in armed conflict situations (at least in the context of the use of lethal force), IHL is the *lex specialis* and the human rights obligation to investigate has to be read in light of IHL; otherwise one might come to the conclusion that what is lawful under IHL is a violation of human rights law.

Mrs. Gaggioli concludes the Report on the numerous of challenges between the law enforcement and conduct of hostilities paradigms in situations of armed conflict.

It is mentioned also that the meeting showed moreover that, for many experts, the main (if not the only) legal criterion for determining whether a situation is covered by the conduct of hostilities or law enforcement paradigms is the status, function or conduct of the person against whom force may be used. Another issue discussed during the meeting was the phenomenon of the concurrence of civilian unrest with actual hostilities. In that regard, the meeting showed – in the context of the discussions on case study 2 (riot) and 3 (fight against criminality) – that there was a genuine agreement among experts that the “parallel approach” was legally attractive notwithstanding the practical difficulties. This means that the conduct of hostilities paradigm can be used only against combatants, fighters and civilians directly participating in hostilities. Civilian unrest has to be dealt with under a law enforcement paradigm even in the context of an armed conflict.

It was noticed that in many situations, such as case studies 4 (rioting/escaping fighters) and 5 (checkpoint), and in particular in case of doubt as to the status, function or conduct of person seemingly posing a threat, most experts agreed that an escalation of force procedure has to be used. Even if experts did not adopt the same legal reasoning, they reached the same result in practice and considered that an escalation of force procedure was required (although the details of this procedure were not discussed). In this regard, it was interesting to note that a number of experts read into IHL rules (in particular the rule on doubt as to the status, function or conduct of the target and the principle of precautions in attack) the obligation for belligerent parties to use an escalation of force procedure in some situations.

The meeting showed also that, in order for any clarification of the law in this area to be comprehensive and meaningful, the issue of the interplay between the conduct of hostilities and law enforcement paradigms needs to be tackled from a broad perspective, taking into account issues arising not only at the moment of the execution of an operation (actual use of force) but also before and after the use of force.

Finally, Mrs. Gaggioli notices that the meeting revealed that there is a disparity between the way the issue of the use of force in armed conflicts is perceived by IHL practitioners and the approach adopted by human rights experts and bodies.

The full text of the ICRC Report «THE USE OF FORCE IN ARMED CONFLICTS - INTERPLAY BETWEEN THE CONDUCT OF HOSTILITIES AND LAW ENFORCEMENT PARADIGMS» can be found at: <http://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/publications/icrc-002-4171.pdf>

(Kseniya Viaselskaya)

Upcoming Events / Événements futurs

Germany

The *German Group of the International Society for Military Law and the Law of War* will hold its next conference in Speyer (Germany) from **6 to 7 October 2014**. The title of the conference is "**Moderne Waffentechnologie – halt das Recht Schritt?**". The conference will focus on legal, technical and ethical questions related to new weapon technologies. The conference will be held in the German language. The *Deutsche Universität für Verwaltungswissenschaften*, which will host the conference, offers rooms in the Guest House of the University for 40 euro per night. Registration for the conference is now possible. For more information please visit the website of the *German Group* at www.dgwhv.de.

Belgium

The *International Society for Military Law and the Law of War*, the *International Committee of the Red Cross*, and the *Royal Higher Institute for Defense (Belgium)* will hold the **Flanders Fields Conference of Military Law and the Law of War in Ypres (Belgium)** from **12 through 15 October 2014**. The event forms part of the activities commemorating the centenary of the outbreak of World War I. The event also enjoys the institutional support of the Institute for International Affairs of the University of Hamburg, as well as the Melbourne Law School and the Asia-Pacific Centre for Military Law.

The conference is built around 4 themes:

- Legal and policy issues associated with chemical weapons;
- The application of international humanitarian law in the conduct of hostilities;
- The protection of specific groups in situations of armed conflict; and
- Military justice in difficult circumstances.

For additional information on this conference see the Society's website.

Czech Republic

The **20th Congress of the International Society for Military Law and the Law of War** will take place in **Prague (Czech Republic)** from **21 through 25 April 2015**.

The plenary session of this Congress will deal with **Challenges in the Implementation of International Humanitarian Law**. The topic of this session will be prepared on the basis of the national responses to a specific questionnaire inspired

by a workshop hosted by the *Society* in Brussels on 23 September of last year. The questionnaire is built around five aspects:

- Imperfect implementation of IHL;
- Progress through international criminal law;
- Lessons learned from other areas of law;
- Specific responsibilities for States not directly involved in an ongoing armed conflict; and
- Non-State actors.

More information about the 20th Congress will be published on the website of *Society*.

Ciardi Prize / Prix Ciardi

The Italian PROF. GIUSEPPE CIARDI FOUNDATION will award its scientific prize in 2015 for the overall amount of 1.500 €.

The prize is intended to reward a substantial and original study dealing with military law, the law of war or any subject connected with or related to the aforementioned fields.

The submitted works must have been published after 1 January 2012 and must be written in English, French, German, Italian or Spanish.

The Jury will be presided over by Doctor Giovanna Ciardi. The four other members will be designated in equal number both by the *International Society for the Military Law and the Law of War* and the Italian Group of said *Society*.

The submitted works need to be sent in three copies, by postal mail, before 1 November 2014 as follows: a) two copies to FONDAZIONE PROF. GIUSEPPE CIARDI, Presidente Dott.ssa Giovanna Ciardi, c/o Gruppo Italiano della Società di Diritto Militare e della Guerra, Via degli Acquasparta, 2 - 00186 ROMA ITALIA; b) one copy to INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR MILITARY LAW AND THE LAW OF WAR/SOCIETE INTERNATIONALE DE DROIT MILITAIRE ET DE DROIT DE LA GUERRE, Avenue de la Renaissance 30 - 1000 BRUSSELS/BRUXELLES, BELGIUM/BELGIQUE - General Secretariat/Secrétariat général.

All submissions must indicate the author of the work (full name; postal and e-mail addresses; phone and fax numbers).

The *International Society for Military Law and the Law of War*, in order to increase the number of scientific works to be considered for the award, may submit a list of works, based *inter alia* on both the book reviews published in *the Military Law and the*

Law of War Review/Revue de Droit Militaire et de Droit de la Guerre, and the articles published in the said journal, after having sought the consent of the authors. The above lists must be submitted by mail with one copy of each work before 1 December 2014, with all necessary information regarding the author, to FONDAZIONE PROF. GIUSEPPE CIARDI, Presidente Dott.ssa Giovanna Ciardi, c/o Gruppo Italiano della Società di Diritto Militare e della Guerra, Via degli Acquasparta, 2 - 00186 ROMA ITALIA. Appropriate consideration will be given in order to comply with both the principle of impartiality and the separation of duties between designated members of the Jury and the members reviewing and/or acting as proponents of works eligible for the award.

The Jury has the faculty to award a second prize for the amount of 500 €. In this case, the winner of the first prize will be awarded 1.000 €. Other works may receive a special mention for exceptional scientific worth.

The proclamation of the winner(s) will take place at the XXth Congress of the *International Society for Military Law and the Law of War*, to be held in the city of Prague.

(Prof. Giuseppe Ciardi Foundation)

News Flash of the *International Society for Military Law and the Law of War* - Terms and conditions: The News Flash is circulated electronically as an e-mail attachment. The selected authors contributing to an issue of this News Flash do so in their personal capacity. All views expressed and all descriptions of facts in any issue of this News Flash are solely those of its respective author. The *International Society for Military Law and the Law of War* holds the right to modify any issue of this News Flash as deemed necessary, including after initial publication. All issues of this News Flash, as modified if deemed necessary, will be published at www.ismllw.org. This official website of the *International Society for Military Law and the Law of War* shall serve as the source for referencing to this News Flash. The *International Society for Military Law and the Law of War* is the exclusive copy right holder of this News Flash. Reproduction under any form and of any issue of this News Flash is only authorized after having received the written approval thereto of the General Secretariat of the *International Society for Military Law and the Law of War*.

News Flash de la *Société Internationale de Droit Militaire et de Droit de la Guerre* – Conditions : Le News Flash est distribué en format électronique sous la forme d'un attachement au courrier électronique. Les auteurs sélectionnés contribuent à ce News Flash de leur propre chef. Toutes opinions émises et toutes descriptions de faits dans ce News Flash est uniquement celles de leurs auteurs respectifs. La *Société Internationale de Droit Militaire et de Droit de la Guerre* se réserve le droit de modifier tous les points de ce News Flash en cas de besoin, même après publication initiale. Tous les numéros de ce News Flash, modifiés en cas de besoin, seront publiés sur www.ismllw.org. Ce site Web officiel de la *Société Internationale de Droit Militaire et de Droit de la Guerre* sera la source de référence pour ce News Flash. La *Société Internationale de Droit Militaire et de Droit de la Guerre* est titulaire exclusive des droits d'auteur de ce News Flash. La reproduction sous toutes ses formes, d'un point de ce News Flash n'est autorisée qu'après en avoir obtenu l'autorisation par écrit du Secrétariat général de la *Société Internationale de Droit Militaire et de Droit de la Guerre*.