

Oxford International Organizations

Regulation No. 2006/12 on the Establishment of the Human Rights Advisory Panel, 23rd March 2006 (UN Doc UNMIK/REG/2006/12), OXIO 202

United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo [UNMIK]

Content type: Notes, Institutional rules, National legislation

Product: Oxford International Organizations [OXIO]

Article last updated: 19 June 2017

Subject(s):

Human rights remedies — Acts of international organizations — Resolutions of international organizations — Subsidiary organs of international organizations — Peace keeping

Core Issues

1. The authority of the Human Rights Advisory Panel according to United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo Regulation No 2006/12 on the Establishment of the Human Rights Advisory Panel ('Regulation').
2. Implementation of the Regulation.

This headnote pertains to: Regulation No. 2006/12 on the Establishment of the Human Rights Advisory Panel, an act of an international organization. [Jump to full text](#)

Background

Regulation No 2006/12 on the Establishment of the Human Rights Advisory Panel ('Regulation') was issued by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General ('SRSG') for the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) for the purpose of establishing the Human Rights Advisory Panel ('Advisory Panel'). For the first time, the United Nations (UN) vested a panel of experts with the specific authority to receive and examine complaints from victims of the UN's own human rights violations. Despite its novelty, the Regulation—and its subsequent implementation—fell short of ensuring the Advisory Panel's independence. The Regulation limited the Advisory Panel's temporal jurisdiction and could not allocate sufficient resources to ensure its effective functioning. While the Regulation was a stepping stone toward the development of human rights law that is applicable to international organizations, the bitter experience of the Advisory Panel illustrated that the UN has remained hesitant when holding its own decision-making accountable according to human rights standards.

The Regulation was adopted against the criticisms levelled at the lack of human rights accountability of UNMIK—especially those criticisms from the Council of Europe (see *The Human Rights Advisory Panel, History and Legacy, Kosovo, 2007–2016, Final Report* ('Final Report'), paras 22–34). On 25 January 2005, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe recommended that UNMIK commence work to establish a human rights court for Kosovo, to study the possibilities to utilise the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), and to create an advisory panel for scrutinising the human rights compatibility of draft UNMIK regulations (Resolution 1417, paras 4–5). The UN instead opted for the establishment of the Advisory Panel which was without the power to render a binding decision or examine the compatibility of draft UNMIK regulations.

The creation of the Advisory Panel was accompanied by changes to the role of the Ombudsperson Institution in Kosovo ('Ombudsperson') which had been established earlier in June 2000 as an office entrusted with investigating human rights complaints in Kosovo (Regulation No 2006/6; Regulation No 2000/38, section 3.1). In February 2006, the SRSG excluded human rights claims directed against UNMIK from the Ombudsperson's jurisdiction (Regulation No 2006/6, section 3.1). The accountability gap created by the changed role of the Ombudsperson was subsequently remedied when, on 23 March 2006, the SRSG promulgated the Regulation for the purpose of subjecting UNMIK's conduct to the examination of the Advisory Panel.

Summary

The Regulation established with the Advisory Panel the task of examining complaints from any person claiming to be the victim of a human rights violation by UNMIK. [sections 1.1, 1.2] Human rights standards against which UNMIK was assessed were set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), and six other international human rights treaties. [section 1.2] The Advisory Panel consisted of three members, who were to be appointed by the SRSG based on the proposal of the President of the ECtHR. [section 5.1]

The Advisory Panel had jurisdiction over alleged human rights violations which had occurred after 23 April 2005. [section 2] A complaint could be submitted by a complainant, as well as by a family member, non-governmental organization, or trade union on behalf of the complainant. [section 10.2] The Advisory Panel was also competent to deal with human rights complaints submitted by an *ex officio* representative of the Advisory Panel. [section 10.3]

On receiving the complaint, the Advisory Panel, if it found the complaint admissible, requested the SRSG to submit a response within twenty days. [section 11.3] The SRSG was to 'cooperate' with the Advisory Panel. [section 15.2] Ultimately, however, the SRSG could decide whether to comply with the Advisory Panel's requests for the appearance of UNMIK personnel or for the submission of UN documents. [section 15.3]

The Regulation made it clear that findings of the Advisory Panel shall be of an advisory nature. [section 1.3] The SRSG retained 'exclusive authority and discretion' to decide whether to act on the Advisory Panel's findings. [section 17.3]

Analysis

UNMIK was established in June 1999 according to UNSC Resolution 1244 as an international civil presence in Kosovo (UNSC Resolution 1244, para 10). The SRSG was vested with all legislative and executive authority, including the administration of the judiciary (Regulation No 1999/1, section 1.1). The SRSG's regulations even took precedence over the pre-existing domestic law in Kosovo (Regulation No 1999/24, section 1.1). Despite the extent of UNMIK's authority, the mission enjoyed jurisdictional immunities in Kosovo (Regulation No 2000/47), which left victims of alleged human rights violations without any remedy. The Regulation was therefore one of the UN's responses in this regard to develop its own human rights accountability mechanisms.

The Regulation enabled the Advisory Panel to benefit from a 'diversity of sources' in examining complaints against UNMIK (Final Report, para 137). While the Advisory Panel's primary sources of international law were the ECHR and the jurisprudence of the ECtHR, it also referred to the jurisprudence of UN human rights treaty-monitoring bodies and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (eg *NM v UNMIK*, paras 199-200)—despite the fact that the American Convention on Human Rights was not explicitly mentioned in the Regulation.

However, the arrival of such a 'unique opportunity' to develop human rights jurisprudence (Final Report, para 137) was overshadowed by concerns over the Advisory Panel's independence, temporal jurisdiction, and resources.

In the first place, the Advisory Panel was designed in such a manner that its functioning would depend on UNMIK. While candidates were selected by the President of the ECtHR, the SRSG ultimately had appointing authority. [section 5.1] The SRSG also retained the power to reappointment, already exercisable a year after initial appointment (Regulation No 2007/3, section 1). The SRSG was not obliged to comply with the Advisory Panel's requests for the submission of UN documents. [section 15.3] Nor was the SRSG obliged to abide by the Advisory Panel's ultimate findings and recommendations. [section 17.3] The underlying assumption was that the Advisory Panel should not act as a judicial organ.

Second, violations which occurred prior to 23 April 2005 were outside the Advisory Panel's temporal jurisdiction. [section 2] This left UNMIK unaccountable for a number of alleged human rights violations. One such case is the complaint submitted by Agim Behrami, whose sons were killed or seriously injured by undetonated cluster bombs in the Mitrovica area of Kosovo in March 2000. Behrami filed an application to the ECtHR which nevertheless found his application inadmissible (*Behrami and Behrami v France; Saramati v France, Germany and Norway*). After being rejected by the ECtHR, Behrami resorted to the Advisory Panel. The Advisory Panel declared

the complaint inadmissible simply because it fell outside its competence *ratione temporis* (*Behrami v UNMIK*).

Finally, with regard to the Advisory Panel's financial and human resources, the Regulation merely provided 'appropriate arrangements' to be made to ensure the Advisory Panel's effective functioning together with a full-time secretariat. [sections 8–9] The actual provision of financial and human resources was therefore primarily left in the hands of UNMIK, whose budget arrangement did not prioritize the Advisory Panel's swift operationalization. According to the Final Report, the staffing of this secretariat, particularly the hiring of legal officers, turned out to be one of the 'most chronic problems' (Final Report, para 73) which undermined the Advisory Panel's functionality.

Overall, these constraints obscured the objective of establishing the Advisory Panel. While it was supposed to be part of the mechanisms to improve the protection of human rights, the Advisory Panel's competence was not designed in such a way to provide effective redress for alleged human rights violations. Rather, the Regulation gave rise to the concern that the Advisory Panel was established primarily to alleviate political pressure imposed on the UN by the Council of Europe and other international stakeholders.

Impact

After the SRSG promulgated the Regulation on 23 March 2006, it took almost ten months before it managed to officially appoint the first three members of the Advisory Panel, in January 2007. The Advisory Panel convened its first session in November 2007, adopted the Rules of Procedure on 6 February 2008, and issued its first opinion on 12 November 2008 (*Shaip Canhasi v UNMIK*). This means that victims were effectively deprived of any remedy for almost two years, from February 2006 when the SRSG removed UNMIK from the Ombudsperson's jurisdiction (Regulation No 2006/6).

On 17 October 2009, the SRSG issued Administrative Direction No 2009/1 ('Administrative Direction'), which restricted the role of the Advisory Panel. Under the Administrative Direction, the SRSG directed the Advisory Panel's public hearings to be 'non-adversarial' (Administrative Direction, section 1.1)—namely, without the quasi-judicial exchange of opposing statements. As a result, the Advisory Panel no longer saw merit in holding a public hearing in the first place (Final Report, para 100). The Administrative Direction also excluded from the Advisory Panel's jurisdiction any complaint which is or 'may ... in the future' be taken up by the UN's third party claims process (Administrative Direction, section 2.2). On top of this, the SRSG set out the cut-off date for the submission of complaints as 31 March 2010 (Administrative Direction, section 5).

Despite many operational constraints, the Advisory Panel received and examined 527 complaints in total until it ceased its activities in May 2016 (Final Report, summary para 23). The Advisory Panel adopted 335 opinions on the merits in which UNMIK was found in violation of human rights (Final Report, para 231). The Advisory Panel recommended that UNMIK obtain certain assurances from Kosovan authorities that the cases would be duly processed, awarded adequate compensation, and even sought systemic responses to human rights violations. Furthermore, the Advisory Panel decided to reopen proceedings in *Kadri Balaj*, *Shaban Xheladini*, *Zenel Zeneli and Mustafë Nerjovaj v UNMIK* and in *NM v UNMIK* after completion of the UN's third party claims process—in which the UN dealt with liability claims resulting from property loss or damage, and for personal injury, illness, or death.

However, despite all the resources devoted to the Advisory Panel's examination, it did not result in tangible outcomes. UNMIK did not, and at times could not, take meaningful action in response to the Advisory Panel's recommendations (Final Report, para 241). By the time the Advisory Panel started issuing its opinions, decision-making powers had been transferred to local authorities and to the EU's Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo (Final Report, paras 242–5). This frustrated the SRSG's capacity to give effect to the Advisory Panel's recommendations. Also, according to the UN General

Assembly's policies, UNMIK was not authorized to pay compensation other than for material damage or physical harm. The Advisory Panel, in its highly critical Final Report, characterized the lack of meaningful responses of UNMIK as 'the biggest failure' of the entire experience of the Advisory Panel.

Overall, the arduous path that the Advisory Panel followed provides yet another example of the UN's half-hearted commitment to the incorporation of human rights standards in its own decision-making. The lack of human rights accountability mechanisms within the UN creates asymmetry in the protection of human rights by the UN or by international organizations in general. While the UN promotes the application of human rights law for the regulation of governmental authority, it is itself hesitant in upholding the analogous standard for the regulation of international authority. The experience of the Advisory Panel, albeit a step forward, falls short of mitigating this asymmetry, with the consequence that many local complainants are left with no effective mechanisms to hold the UN's exercise of authority accountable according to international human rights standards.

Further Analysis and Relevant Materials

Leading Comments

Aleksandar Momirov 'Local Impact of "UN Accountability" Under International Law: The Rise and Fall of UNMIK's Human Rights Advisory Panel' (2012) 19 *International Peacekeeping* 3
Christopher PM Waters 'Nationalising Kosovo's Ombudsperson' (2007) 12 *Journal of Conflict and Security Law* 139

Cases Cited

European Court of Human Rights; Grand Chamber

Behrami and Behrami v France; Saramati v France, Germany and Norway, Admissibility decision, 2 May 2007, App No 71412/01 and App No 78166/01

United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK)

Shaip Canhasi v UNMIK, Human Rights Advisory Panel, opinion, 12 November 2008, Case No 04/08

NM v UNMIK, Human Rights Advisory Panel, opinion, 26 February 2016, Case No 26/08

Kadri Balaj, Shaban Xheladini, Zenel Zeneli and Mustafë Nerjovaj v UNMIK, Human Rights Advisory Panel, opinion, 27 February 2015, Case No 04/07

Agim Behrami v UNMIK, Human Rights Advisory Panel, decision, 17 October 2008, Case No 24/08

Materials Cited

Council of Europe

Resolution 1417 on Protection of Human Rights in Kosovo (25 January 2005)

Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms ('European Convention on Human Rights') (signed 4 November 1950, entered into force 3 September 1953) 213 UNTS 222; ETS No 5; UN Reg No I-2889

Organization of American States

American Convention on Human Rights (signed 22 November 1969, entered into force 18 July 1978) OASTS No 36; 1144 UNTS 123

United Nations General Assembly

Universal Declaration of Human Rights (10 December 1948) UN GA Res 217A (III)

United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK)

The Human Rights Advisory Panel, History and Legacy, Kosovo, 2007–2016, Final Report (30 June 2016)

Human Rights Advisory Panel: Rules of Procedure (12 February 2010)

[<http://www.unmikonline.org/hrap/Eng/Pages/Regulations.aspx>]

Administrative Direction No 2009/1 Implementing UNMIK Regulation No. 2006/12 on the Establishment of the Human Rights Advisory Panel (17 October 2009) UN Doc UNMIK/DIR/2009/1

Regulation No 2007/3 Amending UNMIK Regulation No. 2006/12 on the Establishment of the Human Rights Advisory Panel (12 January 2007) UN Doc UNMIK/REG/2007/3

Regulation No 2006/6 on the Ombudsperson Institution in Kosovo (16 February 2006) UN Doc UNMIK/REG/2006/6

Regulation No 2000/47 on the Status, Privileges and Immunities of KFOR and UNMIK and Their Personnel in Kosovo (18 August 2000) UN Doc UNMIK/REG/2000/47

Regulation No 1999/24 on the Law Applicable in Kosovo (12 December 1999) UN Doc UNMIK/REG/1999/24

Regulation No 1999/1 on the Authority of the Interim Administration in Kosovo (25 July 1999) UN Doc UNMIK/REG/1999/1

United Nations Security Council

UNSC Resolution 1244 (1999) on the Deployment of International Civil and Security Presences in Kosovo (10 June 1999) UN Doc S/RES/1244

Reporter(s): Machiko Kanetake

Source text

Original Source PDF

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General,

Pursuant to the authority given to him under United Nations Security Council resolution 1244 (1999) of 10 June 1999,

Taking into account United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) Regulation No. 1999/1 of 25 July 1999, as amended, on the Authority of the Interim Administration in Kosovo,

For the purpose of establishing a Human Rights Advisory Panel as a provisional body during the term of the mandate of UNMIK to examine alleged violations of human rights by UNMIK,

Hereby promulgates the following Regulation:

Chapter 1: The Establishment and Jurisdiction of the Human Rights Advisory Panel

Section 1 Establishment of the Human Rights Advisory Panel

1.1 The Human Rights Advisory Panel (Advisory Panel) is hereby established.

1.2 The Advisory Panel shall examine complaints from any person or group of individuals claiming to be the victim of a violation by UNMIK of the human rights, as set forth in one or more of the following instruments:

- (a) The Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 10 December 1948;
- (b) The European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950 and the Protocols thereto;
- (c) The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 16 December 1966 and the Protocols thereto;
- (d) The International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights of 16 December 1966;
- (e) The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination of 21 December 1965;
- (f) The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women of 17 December 1979;
- (g) The Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment of 17 December 1984; and
- (h) The Convention on the Rights of the Child of 20 December 1989.

1.3 Upon completion of an examination of a complaint, the Advisory Panel shall submit its findings to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. The findings of the Advisory Panel, which may include recommendations, shall be of an advisory nature.

Section 2 Temporal and Territorial Jurisdiction

The Advisory Panel shall have jurisdiction over the whole territory of Kosovo and over complaints relating to alleged violations of human rights that had occurred not earlier than 23 April 2005 or arising from facts which occurred prior to this date where these facts give rise to a continuing violation of human rights.

Section 3 Admissibility Criteria

3.1 The Advisory Panel may only deal with a matter after it determines that all other available avenues for review of the alleged violations have been pursued, and within a period of six months from the date on which the final decision was taken.

3.2 The Advisory Panel shall not deal with any complaint that

- (a) Is anonymous; or
- (b) Is substantially the same as a matter that has already been examined by the Advisory Panel and contains no relevant new information.

3.3 The Advisory Panel shall declare inadmissible any complaint which it considers incompatible with the human rights set forth in one or more of the instruments referred to in section 1.2 above, manifestly ill-founded or an abuse of the right of complaint.

Chapter 2: The Composition and Status of the Human Rights Advisory Panel

Section 4 Seat and Composition

4.1 The Advisory Panel shall have its seat in Pristina.

4.2 The Advisory Panel shall consist of three members, of whom one shall be designated as the presiding member. At least one member of the Advisory Panel shall be a woman.

4.3 The members of the Advisory Panel shall be international jurists of high moral character, impartiality and integrity with a demonstrated expertise in human rights, particularly the European system.

Section 5 Appointment of the Members

5.1 The Special Representative of the Secretary-General shall appoint the members of the Advisory Panel, upon the proposal of the President of the European Court of Human Rights.

5.2 The members shall be appointed for a term of two years. The appointment may be renewed for further terms of two years.

Section 6 Oath or Solemn Declaration

Upon appointment, each member of Advisory Panel shall subscribe to the following declaration before the Special Representative of the Secretary-General or his or her designate:

"I do hereby solemnly declare that:

"In carrying out the functions of my office, I shall uphold the law at all times and act in accordance with the highest standards of professionalism and the utmost respect for the dignity of my office and the duties with which I have been entrusted.

In carrying out the functions of my office, I shall uphold at all times the highest level of internationally recognized human rights standards, including those embodied in the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and its Protocols, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its Protocols, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 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."

Section 7 Immunity and Inviolability

7.1 The premises used by the Advisory Panel shall be inviolable. The archives, files, documents, communications, property, funds and assets of the Advisory Panel, wherever located and by whomsoever held, shall be inviolable and immune from search, seizure, requisition, confiscation, expropriation or any other form of interference, where by executive, administrative, judicial or legislative action.

7.2 Members of the Advisory Panel shall have the same immunities as UNMIK personnel under sections 3.3 and 3.4 of UNMIK Regulation No. 2000/47 on the Status, Privileges and Immunities of KFOR, UNMIK and their Personnel in Kosovo.

7.3 The Secretary-General shall have the right and duty to waive the immunity of a member of the Advisory Panel in any case where in his opinion the immunity would impede the course of justice and can be waived without prejudice to the interests of UNMIK.

Section 8 Financial and Human Resources

Appropriate arrangements shall be made to ensure the effective functioning of the Advisory Panel through the provision of requisite financial and human resources.

Section 9 Secretariat

A full-time secretariat shall service the Advisory Panel.

Chapter 3: Procedure before the Human Rights Advisory Panel

Section 10 Submission of complaints and *Ex Officio* Representatives

10.1 A complaint shall be submitted in writing to the Advisory Panel.

10.2 The complainant may submit the complaint or a family-member, a non-governmental organization or a trade union may submit the complaint on behalf of the complainant.

10.3 In the absence of the submission of a complaint under section 10.2, the Advisory Panel may appoint a suitable person as an *ex officio* representative to submit a complaint and act on behalf of a suspected victim or victims in the procedure set forth in the present Chapter, if the Advisory Panel has reliable information that a violation of human rights has occurred.

10.4 On the application of the *ex officio* representative, the Advisory Panel may terminate a procedure under section 10.3 if the suspected victim or victims do not wish the procedure to continue or if the continuation of the procedure is not in the public interest for some other reason.

10.5 There shall be no charge for the submission of a complaint.

Section 11 Written Submissions

11.1 A complaint shall set forth all relevant facts upon which the alleged violation of human rights is based. Documentary evidence may be attached to the complaint.

11.2 On receiving the complaint the Advisory Panel shall determine whether the complaint is admissible. If the information provided with the complaint does not allow such determination to be made, the Advisory Panel shall request additional information from the complainant. If the Advisory Panel determines that the complaint is inadmissible, it shall render a determination by which the complaint is dismissed.

11.3 When the Advisory Panel determines that a complaint is admissible, it shall refer the complaint to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General with a view to obtaining a response on behalf of UNMIK to the complaint. Such response shall be submitted to the Advisory Panel within twenty (20) days of the receipt of the complaint by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General.

11.4 The Panel may request the complainant and UNMIK to make further written submissions within periods of time that it shall specify if such submissions are in the interests of justice.

Section 12 Confidentiality of Communications

12.1 The communications between the Advisory Panel and the complainant or the person acting on his or her behalf shall be confidential.

12.2 The confidentiality of communications as set forth in section 12.1 shall apply fully when the complainant or the person acting on his or her behalf is in detention.

Section 13 The Participation of an *Amicus Curiae* and the Ombudsperson

13.1 The Advisory Panel may, where it is in the interests of justice, invite

- (a) An *amicus curiae* to submit written observations; and
- (b) The Ombudsperson to submit written observations if the Ombudsperson has already been seized of the matter.

13.2 The submission of written observations by the Ombudsperson shall be without prejudice to the powers, responsibilities and obligations of the Ombudsperson under the applicable law.

Section 14 Oral hearings

Where it is in the interests of justice, the Advisory Panel shall hold oral hearings.

Section 15 Requests for the appearance of persons or the submission of documents

15.1 The Advisory Panel may request the appearance of any person, including UNMIK personnel, or the submission of any documents, including files and documents in the possession of UNMIK, which may be relevant to the complaint.

15.2 The Special Representative of the Secretary-General shall cooperate with the Advisory Panel and provide it with the necessary assistance in the exercise of its powers and authorities, including, in particular, in the release of documents and information relevant to the complaint.

15.3 Requests for the appearance of UNMIK personnel or for the submission of United Nations documents shall be submitted to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. In deciding whether to comply with such requests, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General shall take into account the interests of justice, the promotion of human rights and the interests of UNMIK and the United Nations as a whole.

Section 16 Public hearings and access to documents deposited with the Advisory Panel

16.1 Hearings of the Advisory Panel shall be in public unless the Advisory Panel in exceptional circumstances decides otherwise.

16.2 Upon the approval of the Advisory Panel, documents deposited with the Human Rights Advisory Panel may be made available to a person having a legitimate interest in the matter in response to a request in writing.

Section 17 Findings and Recommendations of the Advisory Panel

17.1 The Advisory Panel shall issue findings as to whether there has been a breach of human rights and, where necessary, make recommendations. Such findings and any recommendations of the Advisory Panel shall be submitted to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General.

17.2 The findings and recommendations of the Advisory Panel shall be published promptly in English, Albanian and Serbian in a manner that ensures broad dissemination and accessibility.

17.3 The Special Representative of the Secretary-General shall have exclusive authority and discretion to decide whether to act on the findings of the Advisory Panel.

17.4 The decisions of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General shall be published promptly in English, Albanian and Serbian in a manner that ensures broad dissemination and accessibility.

Section 18 Rules of Procedure

18.1 The Advisory Panel shall adopt rules of procedure for its proceedings. The rules of procedure may assign powers and responsibilities to the secretariat of the Advisory Panel.

18.2 Upon adoption by the Advisory Panel, the rules of procedure shall be published promptly in English, Albanian and Serbian in a manner that ensures broad dissemination and accessibility.

Chapter 4: Final Provisions

Section 19 Implementation

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General may issue any necessary Administrative Directions for the implementation of the present Regulation.

Section 20 Applicable Law

The present Regulation shall supersede any provision in the applicable law that is inconsistent with it.

Section 21 Entry into force

The present Regulation shall enter into force on 23 March 2006, except for section 10 which will become effective on 23 April 2006.