

# Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>page</i> xiv
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xvi
<i>Table of Treaties</i>	xxv
<i>Table of Documents and Instruments of International Organizations</i>	xxviii
<i>Table of Domestic Legislation</i>	xxxvi
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xxxvii
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Research Design: A Framework and Three Case Studies	5
1.1.1 The Research Question	5
1.1.2 A Framework	6
1.1.3 Three Case Studies	7
1.2 Methodology	8
1.2.1 Doctrinal Legal Analysis	9
1.2.2 Normative Standards for Assessing IO Accountability Mechanisms	10
1.2.3 Qualitative Research Interviews as a Supporting Method	12
1.3 Legal Sources	15
1.3.1 Legal Sources and IO Accountability Mechanisms	15
1.3.2 Secondary Law of IOs – Legal Status, Identification, and Interpretation	16
1.4 Applying the Concept of Accountability to IOs and Individuals	18
1.4.1 Defining Accountability	18

1.4.2	The Accountability Relationship between IOs and Individuals	21
	<b>A FRAMEWORK</b>	27
<b>2</b>	<b>The Responsibility of IOs for Human Rights Violations</b>	29
2.1	Introduction	29
2.2	IOs, Individuals, and the Law of International Responsibility	31
2.2.1	IOs and the Codification of the Law of International Responsibility	32
2.2.2	International Responsibility toward Individuals	35
2.3	Attribution of Conduct and Indirect Responsibility	37
2.3.1	Conduct of Organs or Agents of an IO	38
2.3.2	Conduct of Organs of States Placed at the Disposal of an IO	41
2.3.3	Indirect Responsibility – Complicity	43
2.4	The Breach of an International (Human Rights) Obligation	45
2.4.1	IO Constitutions and Secondary Law as Sources of Human Rights Obligations	47
2.4.2	Treaty Law as a Source of IO Human Rights Obligations	49
2.4.3	Customary Law as a Source of IO Human Rights Obligations	51
2.4.4	General Principles of Law as a Source of IO Human Rights Obligations	55
2.4.5	Summary	58
<b>3</b>	<b>IO Accountability Mechanisms: Definition, Typology, and Assessment</b>	60
3.1	Definition – What Is an IO Accountability Mechanism?	60
3.2	A Typology of IO Accountability Mechanisms	63
3.2.1	Administrative Appeals Procedures	64
3.2.2	Internal Oversight Mechanisms	67
3.2.3	Ombudspersons	73
3.2.4	Inspection and Review Panels	75
3.2.5	Treaty Bodies	77
3.2.6	International Courts	78
3.2.7	International Arbitral Tribunals	84
3.2.8	Domestic Courts	85

3.3	Assessing IO Accountability Mechanisms	90
3.3.1	The Theoretical Approaches	93
3.3.1.1	The Right to an Effective Remedy as <i>Lex Ferenda</i>	93
3.3.1.2	Procedural Justice	98
3.3.1.3	The Relationship between the Two Theoretical Approaches	105
3.3.2	The Normative Yardsticks	106
3.3.2.1	Access	106
3.3.2.2	Participation	109
3.3.2.3	Neutrality	110
3.3.2.4	Outcome	113
	<b>THREE CASE STUDIES</b>	<b>117</b>
4	<b>Case Study: The EU's Common Security and Defense Policy Missions</b>	<b>119</b>
4.1	Introduction	119
4.2	CSDP Missions and the Need for Accountability	120
4.2.1	CSDP Missions as Part of the Common Foreign and Security Policy	120
4.2.2	EU Human Rights Obligations and CSDP Missions	122
4.2.3	NAVFOR Atalanta – A Military CSDP Mission	125
4.2.3.1	Structure and Exercise of Power	125
4.2.3.2	Potential for Human Rights Violations	128
4.2.4	EULEX Kosovo – a Civilian CSDP Mission	131
4.2.4.1	Structure and Exercise of Power	131
4.2.4.2	Potential for Human Rights Violations	134
4.2.5	The Accountability Mechanisms Applicable to CSDP Missions – an Overview	137
4.3	The Court of Justice of the EU	137
4.3.1	Access – the CJEU's (Lacking) Jurisdiction over the CFSP	138
4.3.1.1	The CFSP Carve-Out and Its Limits	138
4.3.1.2	The Two Claw-Back Provisions	140
4.3.2	Conclusion	144
4.4	The European Ombudsman	144
4.4.1	Access	145
4.4.1.1	Lack of Direct Access	145

4.4.1.2	Indirect and Informal Avenues for Complaints	146
4.4.2	Participation	149
4.4.3	Neutrality	150
4.4.4	Outcome	151
4.4.5	Summary	153
4.5	Domestic Courts	153
4.5.1	Access	153
4.5.1.1	Jurisdictional Immunity before Domestic Courts in the Mission Area	153
4.5.1.2	The Lack of Jurisdictional Immunity before the Courts of EU Member States	154
4.5.1.3	Jurisdictional Competence	155
4.5.2	Outcome	156
4.5.2.1	The Potential Obstacle of <i>Foto-Frost</i> (Lack of Annulment Powers)	156
4.5.2.2	Immunity as an Obstacle for Enforcement	158
4.5.3	Summary	160
4.6	Mission-Specific Accountability Mechanisms	160
4.6.1	An Overview	160
4.6.2	NAVFOR Atalanta's SOFA Claims Procedure(s)	161
4.6.3	EULEX Kosovo's Human Rights Review Panel	164
4.6.3.1	Access	165
4.6.3.2	Participation	168
4.6.3.3	Neutrality	169
4.6.3.4	Outcome	170
4.6.4	Summary	171
4.7	Overall Assessment and Conclusion	172
5	<b>Case Study: UNHCR-Administered Refugee Camps</b>	174
5.1	Introduction	174
5.2	The Evolution of the UNHCR's Mandate	176
5.3	Refugee Camp Administration and the UNHCR	178
5.3.1	Refugee Camp Administration as Exercise of Power	178
5.3.2	The UNHCR's Role in Refugee Camp Administration	179
5.3.3	Implementing Partners and the Attribution of Conduct to the UNHCR	182
5.4	The Need for Accountability	184

5.4.1	The Human Rights Obligations of the UNHCR	184
5.4.2	Human Rights Violations in UNHCR-Administered Refugee Camps	188
5.5	An Overview of UNHCR Accountability Mechanisms	191
5.6	The UNHCR Inspector General's Office	193
5.6.1	Introduction	193
5.6.2	Access	195
5.6.3	Participation	199
5.6.4	Neutrality	201
	5.6.4.1 Independence	201
	5.6.4.2 Impartiality	203
5.6.5	Outcome	206
5.6.6	Summary	208
5.7	The UN Office of Internal Oversight Services	209
5.7.1	Access	211
5.7.2	Participation	213
5.7.3	Neutrality	214
5.7.4	Outcome	218
5.7.5	Summary	219
5.8	Domestic Courts	219
5.8.1	Access – Jurisdictional Competence	219
5.8.2	Access – the UNHCR's Absolute Jurisdictional Immunity	221
5.8.3	Summary	229
5.9	Overall Assessment and Conclusion	230
<b>6</b>	<b>Case Study: The ICC Detention Centre</b>	<b>232</b>
6.1	Introduction	232
6.2	The ICC Detention Centre	234
6.2.1	The Conditions of Detention	234
6.2.2	The Three Groups of Detainees	235
6.2.3	Management of the Detention Centre	237
6.3	The Need for Accountability	239
6.3.1	The Human Rights Obligations of the ICC	239
6.3.2	Human Rights Violations in Connection with ICC Detention	243
6.4	An Overview of ICC Accountability Mechanisms	246
6.5	The ICC's Administrative Appeals Procedure	247
6.5.1	Introduction	247

6.5.1.1	The Right to Complain and the Procedure before the CCO	247
6.5.1.2	Appeals to the Registrar and the Presidency	249
6.5.2	Access	250
6.5.2.1	Appeals to the Registrar	250
6.5.2.2	Appeals to the Presidency	253
6.5.3	Participation	255
6.5.4	Neutrality	257
6.5.5	Outcome	259
6.5.6	Summary	261
6.6	(Pre-)Trial and Appeals Chambers	262
6.6.1	Introduction	262
6.6.2	Access	262
6.6.2.1	Jurisdiction	263
6.6.2.2	Admissibility	269
6.6.3	Participation	271
6.6.4	Neutrality	271
6.6.5	Outcome	272
6.6.6	Summary	273
6.7	The Independent Oversight Mechanism	273
6.7.1	Access	274
6.7.2	Participation	277
6.7.3	Neutrality	277
6.7.4	Outcome	280
6.7.5	Summary	281
6.8	Domestic Courts	281
6.9	Overall Assessment and Conclusion	283
	<b>CONCLUSION</b>	285
7	<b>Conclusion</b>	287
7.1	Key Findings and Overall Conclusion	287
7.1.1	Access	287
7.1.2	Participation	288
7.1.3	Neutrality	289
7.1.4	Outcome	291
7.1.5	Overall Conclusion	292
7.2	Hypotheses Generated by the Case Studies	292
7.2.1	Variations between Cases	292

7.2.2	Variations between Different Types of Accountability Mechanisms	294
7.3	Broader Implications: Sketching an Agenda for Reform	295
7.3.1	Enhancing Accountability by Curtailing Jurisdictional Immunity?	298
7.3.2	Enhancing Accountability through Reform at the International Level	300
	<i>Bibliography</i>	302
	<i>Index</i>	320