

**INTERNATIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE OF  
NATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTIONS  
FOR THE PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS  
14<sup>th</sup> Session, Geneva, 15-16 April 2004**

**Report and Recommendations from the Sub-Committee on Accreditation**

**INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with the Rules of Procedure of the International Coordination Committee of Nations Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, the Sub-Committee on Accreditation (“the Committee”) has the mandate to review and analyze accreditation applications forwarded by the ICC Chairperson and to make recommendations to ICC members on the compliance of applicants with the Paris Principles.

The national institutions of Canada, Denmark, Fiji, and Uganda, as members of the Sub-Committee on Accreditation and representing their respective regions, met on 13 and 14 April 2004. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights participated as a permanent observer and in its capacity as Secretariat of the ICC. The Committee considered the accreditation applications from the national institutions of Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Republic of Korea and Thailand. While the latter two applications were new, others were being reviewed as they had been presented in previous years.

In accordance with the Paris Principles and the ICC Rules of Procedures, the different classifications for accreditation used by the Committee are:

- A: Compliance with the Paris Principles;
- A(R): Accreditation with reserve – granted where insufficient documentation is submitted to confer A status;
- B: Observer Status - Not fully in compliance with the Paris Principles or insufficient information provided to make a determination;
- C: Non-compliant with the Paris Principles.

After considering all applications, the Sub-Committee presents this report, which includes a summary of discussions and recommendation, followed by further background information as appropriate.

**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

<b>National Institution</b>	<b>Year(s) reviewed</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Europe</b>			
<b>Albania</b> ( <i>Institution for the People’s Advocate of Albania</i> )	2003 (A (R)) 2004	A (remove reserve)	In compliance with the Paris Principles.
<b>Bosnia-Herzegovina</b> ( <i>Human Rights Ombudsman of Bosnia and Herzegovina</i> )	2001 (A(R)) 2002 (A (R)) 2003 (A (R)) 2004	A (remove reserve)	In compliance with the Paris Principles.

<b>Ireland</b> ( <i>Human Rights Commission of the Republic of Ireland</i> )	2002 (A (R)) 2003 (A (R)) 2004	A (remove reserve)	In compliance with the Paris Principles. Need for progress report in 2005 on the implementation of recommendations.
<b>Netherlands</b> ( <i>The Netherlands Equal Treatment Commission</i> )	1999 (B)	B (no change)	Not fully in compliance. Need for progress report in 2005 addressing concerns.
<b>Norway</b> ( <i>Norwegian Centre for Human Rights</i> )	2003 (A (R)) 2004	A (R) (no change)	Not fully in compliance. Need for progress report in 2005 addressing concerns.
<b>Asia-Pacific</b>			
<b>Republic of Korea</b> ( <i>National Human Rights Commission of the Republic of Korea</i> )	New	A	In compliance with the Paris Principles.
<b>Thailand</b> ( <i>National Human Rights Commission of Thailand</i> )	New	A	In compliance with the Paris Principles.

## REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS

### Europe

#### **Albania**

**Recommendation: A (remove reserve)**

In 2003, the Institution of Ombudsman of Albania was granted the accreditation status A with reserve. While the Institution had provided most relevant documents, the Sub-Committee indicated that the Institution should submit an activity report that would reflect at least one year of activity. The Institution of Ombudsman of Albania submitted in 2004 a report of activities for the year 2003 to the ICC Chairperson. After consideration of this annual report, the Sub-Committee believes the Institution is in compliance with the Paris Principles. The Committee recommends that the ICC removes its reserve on the accreditation of the Institution and that it be granted a status A accreditation.

#### **Bosnia and Herzegovina**

**Recommendation: A (remove reserve)**

In 2001, 2002 and 2003, the ICC Sub-Committee on Accreditation granted the accreditation status A with reserve to the Human Rights Ombudsman of Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), due to the fact that no annual reports had been submitted. The Ombudsman of BiH submitted in 2004 reports of activities for the years 2000-2003 to the ICC Chairperson. After consideration of these reports, as well as the BiH Ombudsman Law (03 January 2001), the Sub-Committee believes the Ombudsman is in compliance with the Paris Principles. The Committee recommends that the ICC removes its reserve on the accreditation status of the Ombudsman and that it be granted a status A accreditation.

**Ireland****Recommendation: A (remove reserve)  
With follow-up**

In 2002, the Human Rights Commission of the Republic of Ireland was accredited status A with reserve. The reserve was maintained in 2003 due to the absence of an annual report. In 2004, the Commission submitted an annual report for 2002-2003, as well as a Strategic Plan for 2003-2006. After consideration of these documents, the Sub-Committee believes the Commission is in compliance with the Paris Principles. The Committee recommends that the ICC removes its reserve on the accreditation status of the Commission and that it be granted a status A accreditation. However, in its annual report, the Human Rights Commission raises many key issues (attribution of budget, nomination of staff, etc) that will have an impact on its functioning and that are being addressed with the Government. The Sub-Committee therefore also recommends that the Commission submit to the ICC Chairperson in 2005 a progress report on the implementation of recommendations outlined in its annual report. It is further recommended that the ICC Chairperson correspond with the Commission with a view to providing more detailed information on these considerations and steps that need be taken to ensure that the Commission remains in compliance with the Paris Principles.

**Netherlands****Recommendation: B (no change)  
With follow-up**

The Netherlands Equal Opportunity Commission was granted status B accreditation in 1999, due to its narrow equal treatment mandate and the absence of supporting documentation. In 2004, the Commission applied for Accreditation status A, submitting its accreditation grid, enabling legislation, annual report and budget and other supporting documents. In these documents, the Commission indicates concerns over its lack of autonomy from the Ministry of Justice. Furthermore, we note the indication of various potential changes in its national environment, such as the ongoing discussion with the Government on the establishment of an institution with a broad human rights mandate, keeping in mind that each country can only have one fully accredited national institution. In light of these considerations, the Sub-Committee believes the Commission is not in full compliance with the Paris Principles. The Committee recommends that the ICC maintains the status B accreditation, and that the Commission submit a progress report on these issues in 2005. It is further recommended that the ICC Chairperson correspond with the Commission with a view to providing more detailed information on these considerations and steps that need be taken to ensure that the Commission is in compliance with the Paris Principles.

**Norway****Recommendation: A (R) (no change)  
With follow-up**

The Norwegian Center for Human Rights was granted accreditation status A with reserve in 2003. This decision was based on various concerns, including: lack of annual report of activity; the fact that the Center lacks pluralism in its governing body, in particular with respect to the representation of civil society; the fact that the Center lacks autonomy with respect to accountability, infrastructure, staff and resources, given that it is embedded within the structure of the University of Oslo. In 2004, the Centre submitted an annual report for activities in 2003 and further information to address the concerns outlined by the ICC. After consideration of the annual report and other information submitted, the Sub-Committee believes the Center is not in full compliance with the Paris Principles. The Committee

believes that the concerns of the ICC have not been addressed, and that no substantial changes in this area have taken place. In light of these considerations, the Sub-Committee therefore recommends that the ICC maintains the status A (R) accreditation, and that the Center submit further clarifications in 2005. It is further recommended that the Chair of the ICC correspond with the Center with a view to providing more detailed information on these considerations and steps that need be taken to ensure that the Center be granted full status A accreditation.

## **Asia-Pacific**

### **Republic of Korea**

**Recommendation: A**

The National Human Rights Commission of the Republic of Korea submitted a new application in 2004, along with relevant supporting documents, including enabling legislation, annual report and budget, and accreditation grid. After consideration of these documents, the Sub-Committee believes the Commission is in compliance with the Paris Principles. The Committee recommends that the ICC grant a status A accreditation to the Human Rights Commission of the Republic of Korea.

### **Thailand**

**Recommendation: A**

The National Human Rights Commission of Thailand submitted a new application in 2004, along with relevant supporting documents, including enabling legislation, annual report and budget, and accreditation grid. After consideration of these documents, the Sub-Committee believes the Commission is in compliance with the Paris Principles. The Committee recommends that the ICC grant a status A accreditation to the Human Rights Commission of Thailand.

## **Conclusion**

The Sub-Committee on Accreditation submits this report with recommendations to ICC members for their consideration and approval. The Committee further recommends, as outlined above, that the ICC Chairperson correspond with the national institutions of Ireland, Netherlands and Norway, with a view to providing more detailed information on considerations and concerns pertaining to their applications, as well as to outline steps that would be required to ensure that their national institution remains or is in compliance with the Paris Principles. The Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and the members of the Sub-Committee on Accreditation will provide support to the ICC Chairperson in implementing this recommendation.

Finally, the members of the Sub-Committee on Accreditation would like to express their deepest appreciation for the exceptional support provided by the National Institution Team at the OHCHR in preparing for the meeting of the Committee, in distributing relevant documents to members, in ensuring close communications between members and in providing technical advice to the Committee during its deliberation.