This report represents the outcome of the meeting of the accreditation sub-committee held in Geneva on 15 April 2002 under the chairmanship of the Canadian Human Rights Commission.

Members of the sub-committee are the National Institutions (NI) of:

Australia for the Asia-Pacific Region (chair in 2000)
Canada for the Americas Region (chair in 2001 and 2002)
France for the European Region
Togo for the Africa Region

In attendance:
Chair: Canadian Human Rights Commission
(Ms. M. Falardeau-Ramsay and Ms. K. Buck)

Other Members: Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission
(Mr. W. Jonas and Ms. M. Wilke)
Commission Nationale Consultative des Droits de l’homme de France
(Mr. Fellous; Mr. E. Decaux and Mme. Pellet)
Commission Nationale Consultative de Droits des l’homme du Togo
(Mr. K. Gnondoli)

As previously established, any National Institution requesting accreditation may meet with the sub-committee to discuss its application, be it at the request of the sub-committee or on its own initiative.

**Geneva - 15 April 2002**
At this meeting, the following institutions were accorded **Category A status:**

**AFRICA:**
Niger:
- The legislation governing the NI was submitted.
- Recommendation that the Government be encouraged to make greater provisions in its annual budget for the NI.
  ✓ Accredited.

**Mauritius:**
- Questions put to the representative of the NI present at the meeting related to
  - Immunity
  - Complaints
On the question of Immunity stated that the President and his personal staff are immune from the jurisdiction of the NI

validity of complaints, the representative noted that the NI was only empowered in its constitution to deal with complaints dating back two years

✓ Accredited

AMERICAS:

Ecuador
✓ Accredited

Guatemala
✓ Accredited

Venezuela
Questions put to the representative of the NI present:
• The Regulations and the Specific Constitutional Provisions relating to the NI
• The Financial Independence of the Commission
• The issue of Plurality of the NI and its cooperation with civil society

✓ Accredited

ASIA PACIFIC:

Nepal
• Previously granted an A(R) because there was no annual report
• This year the NI submitted an annual report with full disclosure of the budgetary information, and legislation governing their NI
• The reservation was removed

✓ Accredited

Malaysia – SUHAKAM
The composition of the NI is not fully pluralistic which could be perceived as discriminatory
The term of office of 2 years, could comprise commissioners’ independence

✓ Accredited

EUROPE:

Luxembourg
• An annual report submitted.
• No objection raised as to lifting the reserve

✓ Accredited
The following institutions were accorded **Category A(R):**

**AFRICA:**

**Algeria**
- Founded by a presidential decree
- A question was asked as to the status of the government representatives who are members of the commission
- Accreditation grid was submitted

→ **Accreditation with reservation was granted until the annual report is submitted, and clarification given on the status of the government representatives**

**Burkina Faso**
- Recommendation to urge the government to include the NIs financial needs in the government’s annual budget

→ **A accredited with reservation.**

**Madagascar**
- Previously awarded an accreditation with reservation.
- Submitted a report on the NIs activities of the year.
- Question raised as to the status of the Secretary General (also the Minister for Justice)

→ **The sub-credentials committee decided to accredit with reservation while clarification is sought as to the status of the Secretary General (Minister of Justice)**

**ASIA**

**Mongolia**
- Submitted an organisation chart and budgetary summary
- No annual report with full budgetary information was provided

→ **Accredit with reservation.**

**EUROPE**

**Bosnia & Herzegovina**
The request for accreditation was not supported with full documentation.

→ **Accreditation with reservation maintained.**

**Germany**

→ **Accreditation with reservation maintained.**

**Ireland**
- The following documents were submitted; an amendment to the Human Rights Act, the decree establishing the NHRI and an accreditation grid

→ **The sub-committee decided to accredit with reserve, as there was no annual report.**
The following institutions were accorded **Category B:**

No country considered

The following institutions were accorded **Category C:**

AFRICA

**Benin**
Issues were raised on the credibility of the Commission, especially relating to:
- Its budget,
- Status of the NI as the preamble of their constitution refers to the Commission as an NGO.
- Its compliance with the duty to make annual reports as there was no annual report on the activities in 1999-2002.

→ As many items were missing which would form a basis for awarding a B classification, ** awarding the Benin NI a C classification as it is an NGO.**

**Zambia**
No documents submitted

→ Deferred to next year for consideration

EUROPE

**Slovakia**
Originally the institution was an NGO. The bill to create convert it into a NHRI was rejected by the Slovak Parliament as a result, the institution still remains an NGO.

→ The Sub-credentials committee took the decision to drop Slovakia from the previously awarded B to a C category.

→ Deferred until next year for consideration.