



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
3 February 2011

Original: English

---

## Human Rights Council

### Sixteenth session

Agenda items 2 and 8

### Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General

### Follow-up and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

## **Process currently utilized by the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights to accredit national institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles**

### **Report of the Secretary-General\* \*\***

#### *Summary*

The present report is submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council decision 2/102 of 6 October 2006 and contains information on the activities carried out by the Subcommittee on Accreditation of the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, in considering and reviewing applications for accreditation and carrying out re-accreditation and accreditation reviews of national human rights institutions. It also contains detailed information on the development of the general observations of the Subcommittee, aimed at a more rigorous but at the same time fairer and more transparent accreditation and review process.

---

\* Late submission.

\*\* The annex to the present document is circulated as received, in the language of submission only.

## Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction.....	1–4	3
II. Improvement of the International Coordinating Committee accreditation process .....	5–12	3
III. Accreditation process in 2010 .....	13–17	6
IV. General observations .....	18–20	7
V. Conclusions and recommendations .....	21–26	7
Annex		
Chart of the status of national institutions accredited by the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights.....		9

## I. Introduction

1. The present report is submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council decision 2/102, in which the Council requested the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to continue with the fulfilment of her activities, in accordance with all previous decisions adopted by the Commission on Human Rights and to update the relevant reports and studies. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) had initially interpreted decision 2/102 as extending previous reports of the Commission of Human Rights and providing for an annual reporting cycle. Until recently, this interpretation had been deemed to have received the tacit approval of member States. However, an objection was placed on the record in 2010, albeit in the context of another report which equally used decision 2/102 as the basis for its annual reporting. OHCHR has thus further reviewed the said decision, and concluded that the Human Rights Council sought to fill a technical gap by ensuring that reports which were deemed to be submitted to the sixty-second session of the Human Rights Commission would be extended by one year and transferred to the subsequent substantive session of the Human Rights Council. With this transition period over, and the objection now on record with regard to the initial interpretation of annual reporting cycles, if the Human Rights Council wishes such reporting to be continued, a new Human Rights Council resolution or decision on the matter should be tabled.

2. The present report outlines the progress achieved since the last report on the accreditation of national human rights institutions (NHRIs) (A/HRC/13/45), submitted to the Human Rights Council at its thirteenth session in March 2010. The report should be read together with the report of the Secretary-General on national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (A/HRC/16/76), which includes, *inter alia*, information on OHCHR activities to establish and strengthen NHRIs; measures taken by Governments and the said institutions in this regard; and NHRI cooperation with international human rights mechanisms.

3. The Subcommittee on Accreditation of the International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions has the mandate to review and analyse applications for accreditation and to make recommendations to members of the International Coordinating Committee Bureau on the applicant's compliance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (Paris Principles). The Subcommittee consists of representatives from one "A" status NHRI from each of the four International Coordination Committee regional groupings: Africa, the Americas, Asia and the Pacific, and Europe. Subcommittee members are appointed by the regional groupings for a renewable term of three years and they designate by consensus, for a renewable term of one year, one member to act as the Chairperson. Currently, the members are representatives of the NHRIs of Canada, Togo, the Republic of Korea and Germany. OHCHR is a permanent observer of the Subcommittee on Accreditation and serves as its secretariat.

4. A table reflecting the accreditation status as of December 2010 is included in the annex to the present document.

## II. Improvement of the International Coordinating Committee accreditation process

5. The accreditation process carried out by the Subcommittee on Accreditation, with the support of OHCHR, is a dynamic process which has over the years increased in its

rigorousness, fairness and transparency. At its seventeenth session, held in April 2006, the International Coordinating Committee initiated a revision of the accreditation process of NHRIs. A discussion paper on the matter was developed by a working group, comprising the then members of the Subcommittee on Accreditation. Three areas were considered: (a) the composition of the Subcommittee on Accreditation and its role and responsibilities; (b) the accreditation process; and (c) the substance of criteria or minimum standards set for accreditation. The paper was submitted to the eighteenth and nineteenth sessions of the International Coordinating Committee. A decision paper was developed, which was presented and adopted at the twentieth session of the International Coordinating Committee in April 2008.

6. The accreditation process plays an important role in assessing the effectiveness of NHRIs and in strengthening their performance in the fulfilment of their mandate. On that basis, the International Coordinating Committee has undertaken a number of measures to improve its accreditation procedures:

(a) In order to ensure greater transparency and due process for NHRIs that are deemed not to comply with the Paris Principles, an appeal process has been included in the accreditation procedures;

(b) The rigorousness of the review has increased. In that regard the Subcommittee on Accreditation bases its review on all the documentary evidence provided by the applicant NHRI, including the statement of compliance with the Paris Principles;

(c) The Subcommittee on Accreditation issues more focused recommendations to each NHRI (whether “A”, “B” or “C” status) to ensure full compliance with the Paris Principles, even before the prescribed five-year time frame for review of accreditations;

(d) The recommendations of the Subcommittee on Accreditation are disseminated more widely among NHRIs and other stakeholders to ensure a more proactive role in the context of follow-up action by the United Nations or NHRI regional coordinating bodies. The reports of the Subcommittee on Accreditation are posted on the Internet ([www.nhri.net/default.asp?PID=607&DID=0](http://www.nhri.net/default.asp?PID=607&DID=0)).

7. According to article 7 of its statute, one of the functions of the International Coordinating Committee is to promote the establishment and strengthening of NHRIs in conformity with the Paris Principles. In this regard, the International Coordinating Committee continues to give high importance to the accreditation process, as evidenced in the Strategic Plan for 2010–2013, adopted by consensus at its twenty-third session, held from 22 to 25 March 2010. According to the Strategic Plan, the first strategic objective is to maintain and strengthen the accreditation process by: better preparing NHRIs for the review by the Subcommittee on Accreditation; tailoring and contextualizing the Subcommittee recommendations for specific NHRIs; strengthening the transparency in the process; and improving accessibility to the Subcommittee on Accreditation processes for NHRIs, the regional networks and civil society.

8. According to the accreditation procedure, as stipulated in article 12 of the International Coordinating Committee Statute, when the Subcommittee on Accreditation comes to an accreditation decision, that decision shall be considered an accreditation status recommendation, with the final decision being taken by the International Coordinating Committee Bureau once the following process has been completed:

(a) The recommendation of the Subcommittee shall first be forwarded to the applicant;

(b) The applicant can challenge a recommendation by submitting a written challenge to the International Coordinating Committee Chair, through OHCHR as the International Coordinating Committee secretariat, within 28 days of receipt;

(c) Thereafter, the recommendation will be forwarded to the members of the International Coordinating Committee Bureau for a decision. If a challenge has been received from the applicant, the challenge together with all relevant material received in connection with both the application and the challenge will also be forwarded to the members of the Bureau;

(d) Any member of the International Coordinating Committee Bureau who disagrees with the recommendation shall, within 20 days of its receipt, notify the Chair of the Subcommittee and the International Coordinating Committee secretariat. The secretariat will promptly notify all members of the Bureau of the objection raised and will provide all necessary information to clarify that objection. If within 20 days of receipt of this information at least four members of the International Coordinating Committee Bureau coming from not less than two regional groups notify the secretariat that they hold a similar objection, the recommendation shall be referred to the next Bureau meeting for decision;

(e) If at least four members coming from two or more regional groups do not raise any objection to the recommendation within 20 days of its receipt, the recommendation shall be deemed to be approved by the International Coordinating Committee Bureau;

(f) The decision of the International Coordinating Committee Bureau on accreditation is final.

9. In accordance with the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Accreditation, the classifications for accreditation are:

A status: Compliance with the Paris Principles;

B status: Not fully in compliance with the Paris Principles or insufficient information provided to make a determination;

C status: Non-compliance with the Paris Principles.

10. The rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Accreditation are incorporated as an annex of the Statute of the International Coordinating Committee of NHRIs (art. 59). The Canadian Human Rights Commission, together with OHCHR as the International Coordinating Committee secretariat, developed a compendium that includes extracts from the Statute relevant to the accreditation process, namely, on the rules of procedure for the Subcommittee on Accreditation, general observations, working methods, guidelines for accreditation applications, the template of the Statement of Compliance, and the Paris Principles. The compendium was submitted to the Subcommittee on Accreditation during the latter's March-April session.

11. The Subcommittee on Accreditation continued to receive from civil society organizations information on the NHRIs considered at its last two sessions, in March/April and October 2010. Summaries of all communications were prepared by the secretariat and shared with the relevant NHRIs prior to the review of their applications by the Subcommittee. NHRIs had one week to provide comments on these summaries. Subsequently, the summaries and comments were sent to the members of the Subcommittee on Accreditation. The summaries and comments were posted on ([www.nhri.net/default.asp?PID=607&DID=0](http://www.nhri.net/default.asp?PID=607&DID=0)) following the adoption by the International Coordinating Committee Bureau of the recommendations of the Subcommittee.

12. In 2010, the Subcommittee on Accreditation increased its efforts to engage NHRI regional coordinating committees in the accreditation process. The committees of the four International Coordinating Committee regions each received an invitation to participate, as observers, in the sessions of the Subcommittee. The Subcommittee welcomed the attendance of representatives of the secretariat of the Network of African National Human

Rights Institutions, the secretariat of the Asia Pacific Forum, the European Coordinating Committee and the International Coordinating Committee representative in Geneva, as well as the attendance of a representative of the Network of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights of the Americas at its October session.

### **III. Accreditation process in 2010**

13. There is a growing interest in the creation and strengthening of national human rights institutions in line with the Paris Principles, and the number of NHRIs accredited with “A” status increased in 2010. The General Assembly, in its resolution 64/161, gives a greater recognition to the accreditation process carried out by the Subcommittee on Accreditation by encouraging NHRIs, including ombudsman institutions, to seek accreditation status through the International Coordinating Committee.

14. In 2010, the Subcommittee on Accreditation considered three new applications for accreditation from NHRIs of the Congo, Scotland and Serbia. The National Human Rights Commission from the Congo was granted “B” status. The Scottish Human Rights Commission and the Protector of Citizens of the Republic of Serbia were accredited “A” status.

15. The Subcommittee on Accreditation reviewed the accreditation status (re-accreditation reviews) of 12 NHRIs from Algeria, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, the Maldives, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Slovakia, Slovenia and Switzerland<sup>1</sup>. The National Commission on Human Rights and Freedoms of Cameroon was upgraded to “A” status. The Human Rights Ombudsman of Bosnia and Herzegovina was re-accredited with “A” status. The National Human Rights Commission of Algeria, the Office of the Human Rights Ombudsman of Slovenia, the Equal Treatment Commission of the Netherlands, the Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism of Belgium, and the Human Rights Commission of the Maldives were granted “B” status. The Federal Commission against Racism from Switzerland was downgraded to “C” status. The accreditation decisions for the NHRIs from Austria, Burkina Faso, Nigeria and Slovakia were deferred to the next Subcommittee session.

16. The Subcommittee on Accreditation also conducted special reviews of the NHRIs of Azerbaijan, Great Britain, Greece, Honduras, Jordan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Morocco, Nepal, Qatar and Senegal. The decisions regarding the accreditation of the NHRIs from Azerbaijan and Senegal were deferred to the next Subcommittee session. The NHRIs from Great Britain, Greece, Jordan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Morocco and Qatar maintained their “A” status. The NHRIs from Honduras and Nepal were recommended to be downgraded to “B” status.

17. During its two last sessions, the Subcommittee on Accreditation issued tailored recommendations to the reviewed NHRIs. A recurrent recommendation has been the importance of allocating adequate funding to NHRIs in order to ensure an effective discharge of their mandate. The Subcommittee has also reiterated that the selection and appointment process of NHRI members should be open and transparent, with the involvement of all national actors. It has stressed the need for greater cooperation between NHRIs and civil society in order to ensure NHRI independence and pluralism.

---

<sup>1</sup> Commission Fédérale contre le Racisme (Federal Commission against Racism).

## IV. General observations

18. Since October 2006, the Subcommittee on Accreditation has developed general observations concerning accreditation.<sup>2</sup> These interpretative tools were formulated on common or important issues regarding the Paris Principles and are intended to constitute guidance for the Subcommittee with regard to the process for accreditation and the implementation of the Paris Principles. As noted in the decision paper adopted by the International Coordinating Committee at its twentieth session, the general observations may be used to:

- (a) Instruct institutions when they are developing their own processes and mechanisms, to ensure compliance with the Paris Principles;
- (b) Persuade domestic governments to address or remedy issues relating to an institution's compliance with the standards articulated in the general observations;
- (c) Guide the Subcommittee on Accreditation in its determination of new accreditation applications, re-accreditation applications or special reviews.

19. In November 2009, the International Coordinating Committee Bureau made suggestions to improve the development and use of the general observations concerning accreditation. During its March-April session in 2010, the Subcommittee on Accreditation decided to embark on a review of the existing general observations. A consultation on the general observations was carried out among the International Coordinating Committee members and a draft decision on the review is to be presented at the International Coordinating Committee annual session in May 2011.

20. The Subcommittee on Accreditation is currently considering the development of general observations on:

- NHRIs serving as national monitoring and preventive mechanisms
- The quasi-judicial competencies of NHRIs
- The performance of NHRIs

## V. Conclusions and recommendations

21. **Informed stakeholders, such as the regional coordinating bodies of NHRIs, have participated more actively in the accreditation process, which has significantly increased the transparency of the process.**

22. **Tailored recommendations have been issued by the Subcommittee on Accreditation, based on reviews of NHRI applications for accreditation. The States and other stakeholders, including United Nations agencies, are called upon to join efforts and follow up on the recommendations of the Subcommittee to enable NHRIs to fully comply with the Paris Principles, both in law and in practice.**

23. **The Subcommittee on Accreditation has emphasized the need for allocation by States of adequate resources to NHRIs, in order to ensure the effective discharge of their mandates. In this regard, States are encouraged to provide NHRIs with sufficient funds to perform the functions set out in their mandates.**

<sup>2</sup> For a list of the general observations of the Subcommittee as of 2009, see A/HRC/13/45, annex IV.

24. The Subcommittee on Accreditation continues to attach great importance to a transparent and open process for appointing NHRI members, with a broad participation of all national stakeholders, including civil society organizations. This process is a key guarantee of NHRI independence, diversity and accessibility.

25. Civil society organizations can be an effective link between NHRIs and individuals and vulnerable groups. The Subcommittee on Accreditation is encouraged to develop a more systematic cooperation with civil society organizations. NHRIs are encouraged to implement the Subcommittee recommendation on the maintenance of close cooperation with civil society in the fulfilment of their mandate.

26. The review of the existent general observations is an important initiative, since these observations are an additional and progressive interpretative tool of the Paris Principles. The development of additional general observations, inter alia on national human rights institutions serving as national monitoring and preventive mechanisms, on the quasi-judicial competency of national human rights institutions, and on assessing their performance, is further encouraged.

## Annex

### Chart of the status of national institutions accredited by the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights

#### Accreditation status as of December 2010

In accordance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (Paris Principles) and the Statute of the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, the following classifications for accreditation are used by the International Coordinating Committee:

- A:** Compliance with the Paris Principles;
- B:** Not fully in compliance with the Paris Principles;
- C:** Non-compliance with the Paris Principles;
- A(R):** This category (accreditation with reserve) was granted where insufficient documentation was submitted to confer A status; it is no longer in use by the International Coordinating Committee. It is maintained only for those NHRIs which were accredited with this status before April 2008.

#### “A” status institutions

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
<b>Asia and the Pacific</b>		
Afghanistan: Independent Human Rights Commission	A	October 2007 Placed under review November 2008 – A
Australia: Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission	A	1999 October 2006
India: National Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006
Indonesia: National Human Rights Commission	A	2000 March 2007
Jordan: National Centre for Human Rights	A	April 2006 March 2007 October 2007 October 2010

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Malaysia: Human Rights Commission of Malaysia (SUHAKAM)	A (see SCA report Nov. 2009)	2002 April 2008 Will be reviewed in second half of 2009 To be reviewed at the Subcommittee on Accreditation (SCA) second session of 2010 October 2010-A
Mongolia: National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia	A	2002 – A(R) 2003 November 2008
Nepal: National Human Rights Commission of Nepal	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 – A Special review started in April 2006; Under review in March 2007 October 2007 Nov 2008 – A (to be reviewed in second half of 2009) In 2009 deferred to first session of 2010 March 2010: recommended to be accredited with B
New Zealand: Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006
Occupied Palestinian Territory: The Independent Commission for Citizen's Rights	A	2005 – A(R) March 2009 – A
Philippines: Commission on Human Rights	A	1999 March 2007 October 2007
Qatar: National Committee for Human Rights	A	October 2006 (B) November 2008: deferral to March 2009 March 2009 – A, Under review in 2010 (first session) March 2010: deferral to October 2010 October 2010 -A
Republic of Korea: National Human Rights Commission	A	2004 November 2008
Timor-Leste: Provedoria for Human Rights and Justice	A	April 2008
Thailand: National Human Rights Commission	A	2004 November 2008

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
<b>Africa</b>		
Cameroon: National Commission on Human Rights and Freedoms	A	1999 – A October 2006 – B March 2010 - A
Egypt: National Council for Human Rights	A	April 2006 – B October 2006
Ghana: Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice	A	2001 November 2008
Kenya: Kenya National Commission on Human Rights	A	2005 November 2008
Malawi: Malawi Human Rights Commission	A	2000 March 2007
Mauritius: Commission Nationale des Droits de l'Homme	A	2002 April 2008
Morocco: Conseil Consultatif des Droits de l'Homme	A	1999 – A(R) 2001 October 2007 Will be reviewed in October 2010 October 2010 – A Will be reviewed in second half of 2012
Namibia: Office of the Ombudsman	A	2003 A(R) April 2006
Rwanda: National Commission for Human Rights	A	2001 October 2007
Senegal: Comité Sénégalais des Droits de l'Homme	A	2000 October 2007 Will be reviewed in October 2010 Will be reviewed in March 2011
South Africa: South African Human Rights Commission	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 October 2007
Togo: Commission Nationale des Droits de l'Homme	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 October 2007
Uganda: Uganda Human Rights Commission	A	2000 – A(R) 2001 April 2008
United Republic of Tanzania: National Human Rights Commission	A	2003 – A(R) 2005 – A(R) October 2006

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Zambia: Zambian Human Rights Commission	A	2003 A(R) October 2006
<b>The Americas</b>		
Argentina: Defensoría del Pueblo de la Nación	A	1999 October 2006
Bolivia (Plurinational State of): Defensor del Pueblo	A	1999 – B 2000 March 2007
Canada: Canadian Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006
Colombia: Defensoría del Pueblo	A	2001 October 2007
Costa Rica: Defensoría de los Habitantes	A	1999 October 2006
Ecuador: Defensor del Pueblo de Ecuador	A	1999 – A(R) 2002 April 2008 2009
El Salvador: Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos	A	April 2006
Guatemala: Procuraduría de los Derechos Humanos de Guatemala	A	1999 – B 2000 – A(R) 2002 April 2008
Honduras: Comisionado Nacional de los Derechos Humanos	A	2000 October 2007 Placed under special review for October 2010 October 2010: recommended to be accredited with B
Mexico: Comisión Nacional de los Derechos Humanos	A	1999 Oct 2006
Nicaragua: Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos	A	April 2006
Panama: Defensoría del Pueblo	A	1999 October 2006
Paraguay: Defensoría del Pueblo	A	2003 November 2008
Peru: Defensoría del Pueblo	A	1999 March 2007

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of): Defensoría del Pueblo	A	2002 April 2008
<b>Europe</b>		
Albania: Republic of Albania People's Advocate	A	2003 – A(R) 2004 November 2008
Armenia: Human Rights Defender of the Republic of Armenia	A	April 2006 – A(R) October 2006
Azerbaijan: Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman)	A	October 2006 Placed under special review for October 2010 October 2010: deferral of review to May 2011
Bosnia and Herzegovina: Human Rights Ombudsman of Bosnia and Herzegovina	A (see SCA report Nov. 2009)	2001 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) 2004 November 2008: deferral of review to October/November 2009 Placed under review – November 2009 October 2010 – A Will be reviewed in the second half of 2012
Croatia: Ombudsman of the Republic of Croatia	A	April 2008
Denmark: Danish Institute for Human Rights	A	1999 – B 2001 October 2007
France: Commission Nationale Consultative des Droits de l'Homme	A	1999 October 2006 review deferred to October 2007 October 2007
Georgia: Public Defender's Office	A	October 2007
Germany: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 November 2008
Great Britain: Equality and Human Rights Commission	A	November 2008 Placed under special review for October 2010 October 2010 - A

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Greece: National Commission for Human Rights	A	2000 – A(R) 2001 October 2007 Reviewed November 2009 A status maintained – November 2009 March 2010
Ireland: Irish Human Rights Commission	A	2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) 2004 November 2008
Luxembourg: Commission Consultative des Droits de l'Homme du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg	A (see SCA report March 2009)	2001 – A(R) 2002 Reviewed in November 2009 To be reviewed in October/November 2010 October 2010 - A
Norway: Centre for Human Rights	A	2003 A(R) 2004 A(R) 2005 A(R) April 2006
Northern Ireland (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission	A	2001 – B April 2006 – B October 2006
Poland: Commissioner for Civil Rights Protection	A	1999 October 2007
Portugal: Provedor de Justiça	A	1999 October 2007
Russian Federation: Commissioner for Human Rights in the Russian Federation	A	2000 – B 2001 – B November 2008
Scotland: Scottish Human Rights Commission	A	Nov. 2009: deferral to March 2010 March 2010
Serbia: Protector of Citizens of the Republic of Serbia	A	March 2010
Spain: El Defensor del Pueblo	A	2000 October 2007
Ukraine: Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights	A	2008 – B March 2009 – A

**“B” status institutions**

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
<b>Asia and the Pacific</b>		
Sri Lanka: Human Rights Commission of Sri Lanka	B	2000 A status placed under review March 2007 October 2007 Reviewed in March 2009
Maldives: Human Rights Commission	B	April 2008 March 2010
<b>Africa</b>		
Algeria: Commission Nationale des Droits de l’Homme	B	2000 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 – A Placed under review – April 2008 2009 – B March 2010: deferral to October 2010 October 2010 – B
Burkina Faso: Commission Nationale des Droits de l’Homme	B	2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) 2005 (B) April 2006, March 2007 Will be reviewed in May 2011
Chad: Commission Nationale des Droits de l’Homme	B	2000 – A(R) 2001 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) November 2009 – (B)
Congo : Commission Nationale des Droits de l’Homme	B	October 2010
Mauritania: Commission Nationale des Droits de l’Homme	B	November 2009
Nigeria: Nigerian Human Rights Commission	B	1999 – A(R) 2000 – A October 2006 (special review) Placed under review March 2007 October 2007 October 2010: deferral to May 2011
Tunisia: Comité Supérieur des Droits de l’Homme et des Libertés Fondamentales	B	November 2009
<b>Europe</b>		
Austria: The Austrian Ombudsman Board	B	2000 Will be reviewed in May 2011

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Belgium: The Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism	B	1999 March 2010
Republic of Moldova: Human Rights Centre of Moldova	B	November 2009
Netherlands: Equal Treatment Commission of the Netherlands	B	1999 – B 2004 March 2010
Slovakia: National Centre for Human Rights	B	2002 – C October 2007 October 2010: deferral to May 2011
Slovenia: Human Rights Ombudsman of Slovenia	B	2000 March 2010

### **“C” status institutions**

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
<b>Africa</b>		
Benin: Commission Béninoise des Droits de l’Homme	C	2002
Madagascar: Commission Nationale des Droits de l’Homme de Madagascar	C	2000 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) April 2006 – status withdrawn October 2006
<b>Americas</b>		
Antigua and Barbuda: Office of the Ombudsman	C	2001
Barbados: Office of the Ombudsman	C	2001
Puerto Rico (United States of America): Oficina del Procurador del Ciudadano del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico	C	March 2007
<b>Asia and the Pacific</b>		
Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of China: Hong Kong Equal Opportunities Commission	C	2000
Iran (Islamic Republic of): Commission Islamique des Droits de l’Homme	C	2000

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
<b>Europe</b>		
Romania: Romanian Institute for Human Rights	C	March 2007
Switzerland: Commission Fédérale pour les Questions Féminines (CFQF)	C	March 2009
Switzerland: Federal Commission against Racism (FCR)	C	1998 – B March 2010
<b>Suspended institutions</b>		
<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
<b>Africa</b>		
Niger: Commission Nationale des Droits de l'Homme et des Libertés Fondamentales	Removed Note : The CNDHLF was dissolved in February 2010	March 2010: The CNDHLF was removed as per its dissolution in February 2010
<b>Americas</b>		
<b>Asia and the Pacific</b>		
Fiji: Fiji Human Rights Commission	Suspended Note: Fiji resigned from the International Coordinating Committee on 2 April 2007	2000 Accreditation suspended in March 2007 for review in October 2007 Commission resigned from the International Coordinating Committee 2 April 2007
<b>Europe</b>		
Sweden: Equal Opportunities Ombudsman	Accreditation Status lapsed due to merging of institutions into one NHRI, effective 1 January 2009	1999 – A Requested a deferral in October 2007