

21 January 2026

Commissioner Krissy Barrett APM
Australian Federal Police

Via e-mail only

Dear Commissioner Barrett,

RE: SUBMISSION REGARDING IMMINENT PRESENCE IN AUSTRALIAN TERRITORY OF ISRAEL'S PRESIDENT, ISAAC HERZOG, AND ALLEGATIONS OF INCITEMENT TO GENOCIDE AND ADVOCATING GENOCIDE UNDER THE COMMONWEALTH CRIMINAL CODE

The Australian Centre for International Justice (**ACIJ**), together with Al Haq, and the Al Mezan Center for Human Rights write to urgently alert you to an imminent visit to Australia by the current President of Israel, Isaac Herzog and our concerns of such a visit in light of serious and credible criminal allegations of incitement to genocide and advocating genocide against him, in the context of the military onslaught in Gaza since 7 October 2023.

The below submission sets out the basis for the criminal allegations posed against Herzog. There is sufficient and credible information in the public domain to suggest that his visit is imminent, in the aftermath of the terrorist attack in Bondi on 14 December 2025.

Without detracting from the horrific nature of the Bondi terror attack, and noting Herzog's likely attendance in Australia in light of that tragedy, it must be cautioned that such incidents should not be treated as a licence to legitimise or platform figures whose conduct has been assessed by the UN Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and Israel (**UN COI** or the **Commission**) as amounting to direct and public incitement to commit genocide under Article III(c) of the *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide* (**Genocide Convention**).

Where there are credible allegations of serious international crimes, Australia is under an obligation to investigate such conduct. Moreover, Australia's domestic laws permit the initiation of an investigation for the offences that are the subject of this submission, as will be shown.

A plea of Head of State immunity must not curtail investigative or prosecutorial endeavours where, as in the present case, the allegations concern breaches of peremptory norms of international law

(*jus cogens*).¹ Even if immunity were engaged, it would not preclude the Australian Federal Police (AFP) from undertaking preliminary investigative steps, including seeking a voluntary interview with Herzog upon his arrival to Australia.

In light of the information canvassed in this submission, we urge the AFP take steps to investigate the serious and credible allegations of incitement to genocide and advocating genocide, given the real possibility that Herzog may soon enter Australian territory.

a. Overview of the alleged criminal conduct

i. The concerned offences

There is credible information to allege Herzog has incited genocide and/or advocated genocide pursuant to the *Criminal Code*.

Under the *Criminal Code*, conduct amounting to ‘incitement to genocide’ is captured through section 11.4 (incitement) when read in conjunction with the alleged predicate offences of genocide in Subdivision B of Division 268 (specifically, sections 268.3-268.6). Incitement requires that a person urges the commission of the predicate offence with the requisite intent that the offence incited be committed.²

Separately, section 80.2D criminalises ‘advocating genocide’, an offence directed to those that counsel, promote, encourage or urge genocide, including where a person is reckless as to whether another person will engage in such conduct.³

Neither offence requires that genocide be established as having occurred; liability turns on the nature of the conduct and the relevant fault element. Both provisions are capable of application to public statements made outside Australia where the requisite jurisdictional and evidentiary thresholds are met. Relevantly, extended geographical jurisdiction - category D pursuant to section 15.4 of the *Criminal Code* applies to both offences, which notes that the offence applies “whether or not the conduct constituting the offence occurs in Australia; and whether or not a result of the conduct constituting the alleged offence occurs in Australia”. Notably, section 15.4 does not prescribe a requirement that the alleged victim or perpetrator be an Australian citizen, resident or body corporate. Therefore, Herzog is not immune from investigation under Australian law.

An offence of incitement in the present circumstances requires the Attorney-General’s written consent in light of the application of sections 11.(4) and 268.121 of the *Criminal Code*.⁴ Relevantly, however, pursuant to section 268.121(3), a person may be arrested, charged, remanded in custody or released on bail in connection with an offence under Division 268 before the necessary

¹ *The Minister of Justice and Constitutional Development v The Southern African Litigation Centre* (867/15) [2016] ZASCA 17 (15 March 2016).

² Criminal Code, section 11.4(1)-(2).

³ Criminal Code, section 80.2D(1).

⁴ Section 11(4) of the Criminal Code requires that any defences, procedures, limitations or qualifying provisions that apply to an offence apply also to the offence of incitement in respect of that offence.

consent has been given. In support of this, the High Court in *Taylor v Attorney-General* (Cth) [2019] HCA 30 cited the Explanatory Memorandum to the *International Criminal Court (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2002*, which said of section 268.121(3):

Proposed subsection (3) provides that a person may be arrested, charged and remanded in custody or released on bail for an offence under this Division before the consent has been given. This is to ensure that any delay in obtaining written consent from the Attorney-General will not delay the arrest of a person or allow a person to escape, and that it also will not result in a person being unduly held on remand.⁵ [Emphasis added]

The AFP is therefore not precluded from undertaking preliminary investigative steps against Herzog.

ii. Findings of the UN COI report of 16 September 2025

The allegations against Herzog arise from findings set out in the UN COI report of 16 September 2025, which, amongst other matters, assessed statements and conduct attributable to Israeli political leadership, including Herzog, against Article III(c) of the Genocide Convention concerning direct and public incitement to commit genocide.⁶

As documented and analysed by the Commission, Herzog has made concerning public statements since the commencement of hostilities in Gaza following the 7 October 2023 attacks in Israel, including on 13 October 2023 stating:

It's an entire nation out there that is responsible. It is not true, this rhetoric about civilians who were not aware and not involved. It is absolutely not true. They could have risen up. They could have fought against that evil regime which took over Gaza in a *coup d'état*.⁷

In relation to the above statement, the Commission noted that the:

... statement must be assessed in the context of the beginning of a war where the Israeli security forces had just initiated their military operations in Gaza. Hence, the statement that an entire nation is responsible for the attack of 7 October 2023 may reasonably be interpreted as incitement to the Israeli security forces personnel to target the Palestinians in Gaza as a group as being collectively culpable for the 7 October 2023 attack in Israel.⁸

⁵ *Taylor v Attorney-General* (Cth) [2019] HCA 30 citing Australia, House of Representatives, *International Criminal Court (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2002*, Explanatory Memorandum at 16.

⁶ Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and Israel, Legal analysis of the conduct of Israel in Gaza pursuant to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, UN Human Rights Council, 60th sess, UN Doc A/HRC/60/CRP.3, (16 September 2025), ('*UN COI Report*'); paras.170, 221-233.

⁷ UN COI Report, para.170; Sprinter Press (@SprinterPress), 'Israeli President says there are no innocent citizens in the Gaza Strip', (Tweet, 14 October 2023).

⁸ UN COI Report, para.231.

Relevantly, the Commission found that the clarification later provided by Herzog that “there are many, many innocent Palestinians who don’t agree” with the actions of Hamas, was plainly an attempt to deflect responsibility for the initial statement of 13 October 2023.⁹

In any case, the Commission was satisfied that Herzog was “unequivocally clear” that all civilians in Gaza were aware of, and involved in, and responsible for Hamas’ actions. In referring to the consequence of Herzog’s statement, the Commission noted that the slogan “there are no uninvolved” in Gaza was subsequently proclaimed by soldiers deployed to Gaza.¹⁰

Relevantly, in its report on the ITV documentary *Breaking Ranks: Inside Israel’s War*, *The Guardian* wrote of how some Israeli soldiers described being influenced by the language of Israeli politicians and religious leaders suggesting that “every Palestinian was a legitimate target”.¹¹ An Israeli tank commander interviewed in the documentary, described how rhetoric about “no innocents [...] seeped down into army ranks”, stating, “you hear that all the time, so you start to believe it.”¹² *Please refer to Annexure A for a non-exhaustive list of instances highlighting the influence of Israeli leadership statements on the Israeli military.*

The Commission further noted that the conduct of Israeli security forces in Gaza, including evidence of celebrations of the destruction of Palestinian property and the absence of investigations or accountability for misconduct, indicated that such behaviour was effectively authorised and unpunished. **On this basis, the Commission concluded on reasonable grounds that the relevant statements of Israeli officials (including that by Herzog) not only enabled a persistent disregard for international law but also actively fueled the killing and injury of Palestinians in Gaza as acts of retribution following the 7 October 2023 attacks, and further concluded that the statement by Herzog of 13 October 2023 amounted to direct and public incitement to commit genocide under Article III(c) of the Genocide Convention.**¹³

iii. Consideration by the International Court of Justice

In its Provisional Measures Order of 26 January 2024, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) confirmed that the Genocide Convention prohibits not only the act of genocide (Article II), but also the “related prohibited acts”¹⁴ of Article III, including “direct and public incitement to commit genocide”.¹⁵ In assessing plausibility and urgency, the Court stated that it had “taken note of a number of statements made by senior Israeli officials”,¹⁶ before proceeding to identify illustrative

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Julian Borger, ‘Israeli soldiers speak out on killings of Gaza civilians’, *The Guardian*, 10 November 2025, accessed 21 January 2026.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ UN COI Report, paras.232-233.

¹⁴ International Court of Justice, *Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in the Gaza Strip (South Africa v Israel)* (Provisional Measures), (Order, 26 January 2024) *I.C.J. Reports* 2024, 3, (‘ICJ Provisional Measures Order’), para.54.

¹⁵ *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*, opened for signature 9 December 1948, 78 UNTS 277 (entered into force 12 January 1951), art III(c) (‘Genocide Convention’)

¹⁶ ICJ Provisional Measures Order, para.51.

examples of incitement to commit genocide.¹⁷ The Court expressly quoted Herzog, noting that in October 2023 he stated, among other things, that “it is an entire nation out there that is responsible” and that Israel would “fight until we’ll break their backbone”.¹⁸

Having regard to the facts and circumstances, including statements by senior Israeli officials, the Court held that at least some of the rights claimed by South Africa were plausible, including the right of Palestinians in Gaza to be protected from “acts of genocide and related prohibited acts identified in Article III”.¹⁹ Critically, the Court indicated a specific provisional measure concerning incitement, requiring Israel to take all measures within its power to prevent and punish direct and public incitement to commit genocide in relation to Palestinians in the Gaza Strip.²⁰ The Court repeated this requirement in its operative clause, ordering (by sixteen votes to one) that Israel shall take all measures within its power to prevent and punish direct and public incitement to commit genocide in relation to Palestinians in the Gaza Strip.²¹ These findings underscore that the offence of incitement is squarely within the Court’s contemplation and concern regarding the statements made by Israeli officials, including Herzog.

While the Court and the Commission’s respective findings are not determinative of criminal liability under Australian law, they constitute a credible and persuasive factual basis capable of grounding investigative consideration of relevant offences under the *Criminal Code*. In light of the Court and the Commission’s assessment, **we submit that Herzog’s statement is capable of engaging the elements of incitement to genocide and advocating genocide under Australian law, warranting consideration by the AFP irrespective of whether the ultimate crime of genocide is found to have been committed.**

iv. Context and timing of Herzog’s statement and the operational environment in October 2023

In assessing whether public statements potentially constitute direct and public incitement to commit genocide, *Prosecutor v Akayesu* remains the leading international authority on the offence.²² In *Akayesu*, the Trial Chamber of the International Criminal Tribunal of Rwanda (ICTR) emphasised that the offence of public incitement is characterised by a call for criminal action to a number of individuals in a public place or to the general public at large, including through mass media.²³

We note that Herzog’s statement was made publicly in his position as Head of State, at the beginning stages of Israel’s military operation in Gaza, in a media setting, and was subsequently reproduced and widely disseminated in media reports, as well as authoritative fact-finding

¹⁷ Ibid, paras.51-53

¹⁸ Ibid, para.52.

¹⁹ Ibid, para.54.

²⁰ Ibid, para.79.

²¹ Ibid, para.86(3).

²² *Prosecutor v Akayesu* (Judgment) (International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, Trial Chamber I, Case No ICTR-96-4-T, 2 September 1998) (‘Akayesu’) paras.549–562, 674–675.

²³ Ibid.

records. The UN COI likewise treats social-media dissemination and broadcast statements as public communications for the purposes of Article III(c) of the Genocide Convention.²⁴

In its Provisional Measures Order of 26 January 2024, the ICJ identified Herzog's "entire nation" remark as *relevant to the risk environment* requiring urgent preventive measures.²⁵ The UN COI assessed such statements through their contextual meaning and potential impact *at the time they were made*.²⁶ The Commission reasoned that direct and public incitement to commit genocide is criminal in itself and must be assessed by reference to whether the communication would be understood by its intended audience as a call to commit genocide, taking into account social and cultural context and potential impact.²⁷ Applying this framework, the UN COI identified Herzog's "entire nation" remark as occurring in the beginning phase of hostilities and reasoned that, even absent an express call for genocide, such framing may reasonably be interpreted in context as encouraging security forces to treat Palestinians in Gaza as collectively culpable and thus targetable as a group.²⁸

The timing of Herzog's remark is especially significant as it falls within a tight cluster of contemporaneous announcements signaling extreme measures toward Gaza. Within days of 7 October 2023, senior Israeli officials publicly articulated a framing that repeatedly collapsed the distinction between Palestinian armed groups and Gaza's civilian population and communicated measures designed to impose severe deprivations on Gaza as a whole.²⁹

In early October 2023, senior Israeli officials made a series of public statements framing Gaza in terms of total deprivation and collective responsibility. On 9 October, then Defence Minister Gallant announced a "complete siege" on Gaza, stating that "there will be no electricity, no food, no fuel, everything is closed."³⁰ The Court noted in particular, Gallant's further statements the following day that, "we are fighting human animals and we are acting accordingly", and that "Gaza won't return to what it was before" and that Israel would "eliminate everything".³¹ This dehumanising rhetorical pattern was further reinforced by Prime Minister Netanyahu's public invocation of "Amalek" on 28 October 2023, and again referred to in a letter from Netanyahu to Israeli soldiers and commanders published on 3 November 2023, a reference also assessed by the UN COI.³² Taken together, this context supports the inference that Herzog's "entire nation" remark operated as an authorising signal within a broader environment calling for mass deprivation and collective responsibility.

The ICJ and the UN COI's inclusion of Herzog's statement is notable not only for its content but also for its temporal placement within the first week of major Israeli military operations and

²⁴ UN COI Report, paras.222-224.

²⁵ ICJ Provisional Measures Order, paras.51-52, 70-75, 78-79.

²⁶ UN COI Report, paras.222, 229, 231.

²⁷ Ibid, paras.221-224.

²⁸ UN COI Report, paras.229, 231.

²⁹ ICJ Provisional Measures Order, paras.51-52.

³⁰ Ibid, para.52.

³¹ Ibid; UN COI Report, paras.169, 226; Reuters, ["Israel says imposing total Gaza blockade in battle against 'beastly people'"](#), 9 October 2023.

³² Government of Israel, ["Statement by PM Netanyahu"](#), 28 October 2023, (accessed 20 January 2026); UN COI Report, para.172.

accompanying public policy signals. This is the environment the UN COI explicitly emphasises when assessing meaning and impact—where official rhetoric is capable of shaping how relevant audiences, including the Israeli military, understand what is permissible.³³

The “complete siege” announced on 9 October 2023 was reflected in measures affecting essential services and humanitarian access, with public reporting indicating stoppage/restriction of key utilities and resources to Gaza consistent with that policy direction.³⁴ In parallel, on 12–13 October 2023, UN reporting and expert statements addressed an evacuation order affecting approximately 1.1 million people in northern Gaza within 24 hours, highlighting the magnitude of displacement in the same timeframe.³⁵

Taken together, the convergence of (i) collective-responsibility rhetoric, (ii) dehumanising and “elimination” language by senior Israeli leadership, and (iii) near-immediate implementation of siege/deprivation and mass displacement measures provides a coherent evidentiary basis for the UN COI’s conclusion regarding the impact of Herzog’s statement of incitement. **Herzog’s rhetoric was not abstract commentary but formed part of a broader mobilisation narrative, capable of encouraging security forces and other actors to treat Palestinians in Gaza as collectively culpable and therefore subject to treatment that international law prohibits.**

b. Australia’s obligation to investigate and prosecute

Australia’s obligation to investigate and prosecute international crimes forming the subject of this submission exist by virtue of its ratification of the Rome Statute and the Genocide Convention.

Incitement to genocide is expressly criminalised under Article III of the Genocide Convention.³⁶ As it is listed as an independent punishable act, incitement does not require a finding of genocide, it is inchoate.³⁷ Furthermore, States Parties of the Genocide Convention, including Australia, are obligated to prevent and punish genocide (and the related Article III acts).³⁸ Article IV specifically instructs that persons committing any Article III act, including incitement, “shall be punished”, regardless of any official capacity (rulers, public officials or private individuals).³⁹

Consistent with this legal framework, the UN COI emphasised in their findings that Article IV obligates punishment of individuals for direct and public incitement to genocide regardless of

³³ ICJ Provisional Measures Order, paras.51-52; UN COI Report, paras.222, 227, 229, 231-232.

³⁴ ICJ Provisional Measures Order, paras. 52, 70, 80; United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), *Hostilities in the Gaza Strip and Israel | Flash Update #30*, 5 November 2023, see “Electricity”; “Water and sanitation”.

³⁵ United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), *Hostilities in the Gaza Strip and Israel | Flash Update #7*, 13 October 2023, see ‘Key Points’ (first bullet); Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, *Israel must rescind evacuation order for northern Gaza and comply with international law: UN expert*, Press Release, 13 October 2023.

³⁶ Genocide Convention, art III.

³⁷ *Akayesu*, paras.561-562; *Prosecutor v Nahimana, Barayagwiza and Ngeze* (Appeal Judgment), International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, Appeals Chamber, Case No ICTR-99-52-A, 28 November 2007, para.678; *Prosecutor v Bikindi* (Appeal Judgment), International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, Appeals Chamber, Case No ICTR-01-72-A, 18 March 2010, para.146.

³⁸ Genocide Convention, art IV.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

official capacity, and therefore stresses that States have a duty to investigate and, where applicable, punish persons—including political and military leaders and Israeli security forces personnel—who have directly and publicly incited others to commit genocide against Palestinians in Gaza as a group.⁴⁰

In addition, the Preamble to the Rome Statute recalls that every State must exercise its criminal jurisdiction over those responsible for international crimes.⁴¹ Articles 1 and 17 of the Statute emphasise that the International Criminal Court (**ICC**) is complementary to national criminal jurisdiction.⁴² Accordingly, the ICC operates as a court of last resort, with jurisdiction to prosecute perpetrators only where no State with jurisdiction is either unable or unwilling to act.⁴³

Australia is a necessary forum to investigate allegations of incitement to commit genocide by senior Israeli officials, including Herzog, where credible indicators have consistently shown that effective accountability is unlikely to be pursued on a national level.

Palestinian human rights organisations, including Al Haq, Al Mezan and the Palestinian Centre for Human Rights, as well as a number of international civil society organisations including Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, have long raised concerns about the effectiveness and independence of Israeli investigatory and accountability mechanisms for alleged international crimes, including patterns of non-investigation, rare prosecutions, and outcomes characterised as “whitewashing”.⁴⁴ Those concerns are underscored by the fact that the ICC’s Palestine investigation has been open since 3 March 2021, and by subsequent proceedings noting the issuance of ICC arrest warrants on 21 November 2024 against senior

⁴⁰ UN COI Report, para.244-245.

⁴¹ Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, opened for signature 17 July 1998, 2187 UNTS 90 (entered into force 1 July 2002), (*‘Rome Statute’*), Preamble, para.6.

⁴² Ibid, arts. 1, 17.

⁴³ Ibid; International Criminal Court, [‘About the Court’](#), accessed 21 January 2026.

⁴⁴ Palestinian Centre for Human Rights, *Genuinely Unwilling: An Update — The Failure of Israel’s Investigative and Judicial System to Comply with the Requirements of International Law, with particular regard to the Crimes Committed during the Offensive on the Gaza Strip (27 December 2008 – 18 January 2009)*, Report, August 2010; Adalah, *Israeli Military Probes and Investigations Fail to Meet International Standards or Ensure Accountability for Victims of the War on Gaza*, Briefing Paper, January 2010; Al-Haq et al, *‘Four Palestinian Human Rights Organizations Submit File to the ICC Prosecutor: Israel is Unable and Unwilling to Conduct Genuine Investigations and Prosecutions’*, Joint Statement, 23 December 2017; B’Tselem, *Three years after Operation Cast Lead: Israeli military utterly failed to investigate itself*, 18 January 2010; B’Tselem, *Israel’s report to the UN misstates the truth*, 4 February 2010; Human Rights Watch, *‘Promoting Impunity: The Israeli Military’s Failure to Investigate Wrongdoing’*, II “Why Investigate?”, Report, Vol 17 No 7(E), June 2005; Amnesty International, *Lethal force and accountability for unlawful killings by Israeli forces in Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories*, Public Statement, Index: MDE 15/4812/2016, September 2016; Amnesty International, *Time to address impunity: Two years after the 2014 Gaza/Israel war*, Report, Index: MDE 15/4199/2016, 7 July 2016; Yesh Din, *‘Data sheet: Law enforcement against Israeli soldiers suspected of harming Palestinians and their property – Summary of figures for 2017–2021’*, 21 December 2022: concluding that military law enforcement authorities “systematically avoid investigating and prosecuting” and that the system’s main function “is whitewashing crimes”.

Israeli officials—developments that, in complementarity terms, arise only where national proceedings are absent or not genuine.⁴⁵

As noted, on 26 January 2024 the ICJ ordered Israel to take all measures within its power to prevent and punish direct and public incitement to commit genocide in relation to Palestinians in the Gaza Strip.⁴⁶ The UN COI has since concluded in September 2025 that the elements of direct and public incitement are established in relation to the statement made by Herzog (among others), and that Israeli authorities have failed to take action to punish this incitement;⁴⁷ other credible reports indicate an absence of criminal prosecutions for inciting statements notwithstanding the ICJ's binding provisional measures.⁴⁸ Against this backdrop, Australia's exercise of jurisdiction would not displace genuine domestic accountability; it would instead provide an avenue to fulfil its obligations to investigate and prosecute.

c. Conclusion

We reiterate our request for the AFP to investigate the serious and credible allegations against Herzog raised in this submission, considering the likelihood of his presence in Australian territory. Failure to do so, would jeopardise Australian efforts to seek accountability for serious international crimes and end impunity for violations of international law and human rights.

We look forward to receiving your prompt response in relation to the serious matters raised above.

Sincerely,

Rawan Arraf

Executive Director and Principal Lawyer
Australian Centre for International Justice

Issam Younis

General Director
Al Mezan Center for Human Rights

Shawan Jabarin

General Director
Al-Haq

⁴⁵ *International Criminal Court, Office of the Prosecutor, 'Statement of ICC Prosecutor, Fatou Bensouda, respecting an investigation of the Situation in Palestine'*, Statement, 3 March 2021; International Criminal Court, Pre-Trial Chamber I, *Situation in the State of Palestine* (International Criminal Court, Pre-Trial Chamber I), Decision on the State of Israel's Challenge to the Jurisdiction of the Court Pursuant to Article 19(2) of the Rome Statute (ICC-01/18-374, 21 November 2024); International Criminal Court, *'Situation in the State of Palestine: ICC Pre-Trial Chamber I rejects the State of Israel's challenges to jurisdiction and issues warrants of arrest for Benjamin Netanyahu and Yoav Gallant'*, Press Release, 21 November 2024.

⁴⁶ ICJ Provisional Measures Order, paras.79, 86(3).

⁴⁷ UN COI Report, paras.233, 245 and 253.

⁴⁸ European Center for Constitutional and Human Rights (ECCHR), *The Pretense of Justice* (9 September 2025), section "Responses to allegations of incitement to genocide": stating that Israel does not appear to have initiated a single criminal prosecution for incitement to genocide despite the ICJ's 26 January 2024 order (lines 1276–1285; see also discussion at lines 2644–2651).

Copy:**Assistant Commissioner Stephen Nutt**

Counter Terrorism & Special Investigations Command
Australian Federal Police

The Hon Anthony Albanese MP

Prime Minister of Australia

The Hon Michelle Rowland MP

Attorney-General of Australia

About the Australian Centre for International Justice

The Australian Centre for International Justice (**ACIJ**) is an independent not-for-profit and specialist legal centre working to develop Australia's capacity to investigate and prosecute international crimes offences, including those outlined in the Commonwealth Criminal Code. ACIJ has established a dedicated legal service that works with survivor groups and affected communities and engages with Australian authorities through legal action, submissions and policy advocacy.

About Al-Haq

Al-Haq is an independent Palestinian non-governmental human rights organisation based in Ramallah, West Bank. Established in 1979 to protect and promote human rights and the rule of law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, the organisation has special consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

About Al Mezan Center for Human Rights

Al Mezan Center for Human Rights (Al Mezan) is an independent, non-partisan, non-governmental human rights organization based in the occupied Gaza Strip. Since its establishment in 1999, Al Mezan has been dedicated to protecting and promoting the respect of human rights, especially economic, social and cultural rights, supporting victims of violations of international human rights law and international humanitarian law, and enhancing democracy, community and citizen participation, and respect for the rule of law in Gaza as part of the occupied Palestinian territory.