



General Assembly

Distr.: General
8 March 2013

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Twenty-third 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 to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration
and Programme of Action**

Activities of the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in accrediting national institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

The present report is submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 20/14. It contains information on the activities carried out in 2012 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 re-accreditation of national human rights institutions.

The report highlights improvements in the accreditation process and contains detailed information on the development of general observations by the Subcommittee on Accreditation aimed at ensuring reviews that are more rigorous, fair and transparent.

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Pages</i>
I. Introduction	1–4	3
II. Improvement of the International Coordinating Committee accreditation process	5–12	3
III. Accreditation process in 2012	13–21	5
A. New applications	15	5
B. Applications for re-accreditation	16	6
C. Deferrals	17	6
D. Lapsed status	18–21	6
IV. General observations	22–24	7
V. Conclusions and recommendations	25–35	7
Annex		
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 resolution 20/14, in which the Council requested the Secretary-General to report to the Council at its twenty-third session on the activities of the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in accrediting national institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles.

2. The report includes activities and achievements since the report issued in 2012 on the accreditation of national human rights institutions (A/HRC/20/10), and should be read together with the report of the Secretary-General on national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (A/HRC/23/27), which includes, *inter alia*, information on activities of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) to establish and strengthen these institutions; measures taken by Governments regarding these institutions; as well as information on the cooperation of national human rights institutions with the international human rights system.

3. The Statute of the International Coordinating Committee mandates the Subcommittee on Accreditation to review and analyse the applications for accreditation submitted by national human rights institutions and to make recommendations to the Bureau of the International Coordinating Committee on the compliance of applicants with the Paris Principles. The Subcommittee comprises one representative of an “A” status national human rights institution from each of the four regional groupings of the International Coordinating Committee: Africa, the Americas, Asia-Pacific and Europe. The members of the Subcommittee are appointed by each regional grouping for a renewable term of three years. The members designate, by consensus, for a renewable term of one year, the Chairperson from among themselves. OHCHR is a permanent observer of the Subcommittee and serves as its secretariat.

4. In 2012, the Subcommittee members were from Canada, France, Qatar and Togo. The Chairperson of the Subcommittee was the representative of the national human rights institution of Qatar.

II. Improvement of the International Coordinating Committee accreditation process

5. According to article 7 of the statute of the International Coordinating Committee, one of the functions of the Committee is to promote the establishment and strengthening of national human rights institutions in conformity with the Paris Principles. Moreover, according to the Strategic Plan of the International Coordinating Committee for the period 2010–2013, its first objective is to maintain and strengthen the accreditation process by tailoring and contextualizing the recommendations made by the Subcommittee for the specific needs of national human rights institutions and by improving their access, and that of regional networks and civil society, to the Subcommittee.

6. The International Coordinating Committee has introduced a number of measures to improve its accreditation procedures:

(a) Aimed at assessing the effectiveness and the performance of national human rights institutions, the review has become more rigorous, as it is based on documented evidence provided by the institution under review, as well as on information received from civil society organizations and other stakeholders. The review has also become fairer, since

an appeals procedure has been included to give an opportunity to institutions to challenge the recommendations made by the Subcommittee on Accreditation;

(b) The Subcommittee on Accreditation issues a number of focused and tailored recommendations to the national human rights institution under review, even when it recommends an “A” status;

(c) The review has also become more transparent: recommendations formulated by the Subcommittee on Accreditation, once adopted by the Bureau of the International Coordinating Committee, are made public and distributed among national human rights institutions and other stakeholders. In addition, the reports of the Subcommittee are posted on the Internet (nhri.ohchr.org).

7. According to article 16.2 of the statute of the International Coordinating Committee Statute, where it appears that the circumstances of any national human rights institution accredited with an “A” status change in any way that may affect its compliance with the Paris Principles, the Chairperson of the Committee or the Subcommittee on Accreditation may initiate a special review of the accreditation of that institution. With regard to flagrant cases and pending the conclusion of the special review process, article 18.2 of the statute stipulates that where, in the opinion of the Chairperson of the International Coordinating Committee, an exceptional circumstance exists necessitating the urgent consideration of immediate suspension of an accredited “A” status institution, the Committee Bureau may decide to immediately suspend accreditation classification of that institution and initiate a special review, pursuant to article 16.2. A special review may result in either a re-accreditation of the institution with an “A” status or a recommendation that the institution be downgraded.

8. Article 18.3 of the statute describes the procedure to be followed for the immediate suspension of accreditation in exceptional circumstances. At the twenty-fifth annual meeting of the International Coordinating Committee, held in March 2012, the definition of “exceptional circumstance” was adopted as stipulated in the new article 18.4:

For the purposes of article 18.2 and 18.3, an “exceptional circumstance” refers to a sudden and drastic change in the internal political order of a State, such as a break in the constitutional or democratic order or a declared state of emergency or gross violations of human rights and this accompanied by any of the following: there is a change in the national human rights institution enabling legislation or other applicable law that is contrary to the Paris Principles; there is change in the composition of the institution that is not undertaken in accordance with the established selection and/or appointment process; or the institution acts in a way that seriously compromises its compliance with the Paris Principles.

9. According to the accreditation procedure, as stipulated in article 12 of the statute of the International Coordinating Committee, the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Accreditation are submitted to the Committee Bureau to make the final decision on the accreditation status of the national human rights institutions reviewed, subsequent to the following steps:

(a) The recommendation made by the Subcommittee on Accreditation is forwarded to the applicant;

(b) Within 28 days of receipt of the recommendation, the applicant may challenge it by submitting, through OHCHR, a written communication to the Chairperson of the International Coordinating Committee;

(c) The report of the Subcommittee, including the recommendation, is subsequently forwarded for a decision to the Committee Bureau, together with any challenges received;

(d) Within 20 days, any member of the Bureau who disagrees with the recommendation may notify the Chairperson of the Subcommittee and the secretariat of the International Coordinating Committee. The secretariat promptly notifies all members of the Bureau about the objection raised and provides all information necessary to clarify the objection. If within 20 days of receipt of that information at least four members of the Committee Bureau from no fewer than two regional groups notify the secretariat that they support the objection, the recommendation is referred to the Bureau at its next meeting for a decision;

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

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

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

- “A” status: Compliant with the Paris Principles
- “B” status: Not fully compliant with the Paris Principles
- “C” status: Non-compliant with the Paris Principles

11. The Subcommittee on Accreditation may also invite civil society organizations to submit reports on the functioning and efficiency of national human rights institutions under review. Such reports are shared with the institutions concerned for their comments or clarification. Summaries of all documentation received from institutions for their review are prepared by the secretariat and shared with the relevant institutions prior to the session of the Subcommittee on Accreditation. National human rights institutions are given one week to highlight any factual errors contained in the summaries. The summaries and comments are subsequently brought to the attention of the members of the Subcommittee.

12. The Subcommittee on Accreditation welcomed the attendance by representatives of the secretariat of the Network of African National Human Rights Institutions, the secretariat of the Asia Pacific Forum of National Human Rights Institutions, and the representative of the International Coordinating Committee in Geneva.

III. Accreditation process in 2012

13. The General Assembly, in its resolution 64/161, recognized the importance of establishing and strengthening national human rights institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles by encouraging national institutions, including ombudsman institutions, to seek accreditation through the International Coordinating Committee.

14. As at the end of the most recent session of the Subcommittee on Accreditation, in November 2012, 104 national human rights institutions had been accredited, of which 69 with “A” status.

A. New applications

15. In 2012, the Subcommittee on Accreditation considered eight new applications for accreditation. The Independent National Human Rights Commission of Burundi and the Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos of Chile were accredited “A” status. The Commissioner for Human Rights of Kazakhstan, the Ombudsman of Kyrgyzstan, the

Commission nationale des droits de l'homme of Mali and the Human Rights Ombudsman of Tajikistan were accredited "B" status. The accreditation decision for the Ethiopian Human Rights Commission was deferred to the second session of 2013, while the application for accreditation of the Ombudsman of Bermuda was referred to the Bureau of the International Coordinating Committee.

B. Applications for re-accreditation

16. The Subcommittee on Accreditation reviewed for re-accreditation 22 national institutions, from Armenia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Denmark, Egypt, Georgia, Indonesia, Malawi, Norway, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, Slovakia, Spain, South Africa and Togo. The national institutions of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Colombia, Denmark, Indonesia, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Spain and South Africa were re-accredited with "A" status. The Norwegian Centre for Human Rights and the Comité sénégalais des droits de l'homme were accredited with "B" status. The National Commission for Human Rights of Rwanda was recommended for "B" status accreditation unless it provided, within one year, documentary evidence deemed necessary to establish its ongoing conformity with the Paris Principles.

C. Deferrals

17. The accreditation decisions on the national human rights institutions of Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Egypt, Georgia, Malawi and Togo were deferred to future sessions of the Subcommittee on Accreditation.

D. Lapsed status

18. The accreditation status of the Commission nationale des droits de l'homme of Burkina Faso and the National Centre for Human Rights of Slovakia lapsed.

19. The table reflecting the accreditation status of national human rights institutions as of February 2013 is contained in the annex to the present report.

20. In accordance with articles 16.2, 17 and 18 of the statute of the International Coordinating Committee, the Subcommittee on Accreditation conducted a special review of the national human rights institution of Azerbaijan, and recommended a special review of that of Nepal. As a result, the institution of Azerbaijan was re-accredited with "A" status, while the special review of the institution of Nepal was scheduled for May 2013.

21. At its two sessions, the Subcommittee on Accreditation issued a number of recommendations for the national human rights institutions under review. In most of the decisions, the Subcommittee emphasized the need for a clear, transparent and participatory selection process of institution members as required by the Paris Principles and the Subcommittee in its general observations. It also stressed the importance of adequate core funding provided by the State to ensure the independence and financial autonomy of such institutions. The Subcommittee also recognized the importance of granting members of national institutions with immunity against legal liability for actions taken in their official capacity. It furthermore stressed the need for greater cooperation by and engagement of national human rights institutions with regional and international human rights systems.

IV. General observations

22. Since October 2006, the Subcommittee on Accreditation has developed general observations based on the Paris Principles. These interpretative tools are addressed to:

- (a) National human rights institutions, when developing their own processes and mechanisms;
- (b) Governments, to address or remedy issues relating to an institution's compliance with the Paris Principles;
- (c) The Subcommittee itself, when it reviews applications for new accreditation, re-accreditation or when it conducts special reviews.

23. The decision paper that the International Coordinating Committee adopted in May 2011 includes a number of recommendations to standardize the process of developing and revising general observations, and to increase the role of stakeholders in the accreditation process. Accordingly, the Subcommittee on Accreditation was requested by the International Coordinating Committee:

- (a) To establish formal communication channels with regional chairpersons and regional coordinating committees to request input at the initial drafting of general observations;
- (b) To elaborate further on the justification and application of a general observation, taking into account the existence of various institutional models and political systems;
- (c) To adopt procedures that facilitate the timely development of general observations and undertake a review of existing ones, with due regard to enhancing their comprehensibility, relevance and clarity;
- (d) To develop its outreach and education strategies to enhance the understanding of how to make use of the accreditation process and the recommendations made by the Subcommittee on Accreditation, including the general observations.

24. Three new general observations are to be considered by the International Coordinating Committee at its twenty-sixth annual meeting, in May 2013, relating to:

- (a) National human rights institutions appointed as national preventive mechanisms under the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment or national monitoring mechanism under article 33 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities;
- (b) The quasi-judicial competence of national human rights institutions to handle complaints;
- (c) The performance of national human rights institutions in both law and in practice.

V. Conclusions and recommendations

25. **With the support of OHCHR, the accreditation process carried out by the Subcommittee on Accreditation has become more rigorous, fair and transparent.**

26. **The increasing number of national human rights institutions seeking accreditation confirms the important role of the Subcommittee of Accreditation in assessing their conformity with the Paris Principles.**

27. The recommendations of the Subcommittee on Accreditation help to enhance the independence and effectiveness of the national human rights institutions under review, which in turn strengthen national human rights protection systems. States and other stakeholders, including United Nations agencies, are encouraged to assist national human rights institutions in implementing these recommendations.
28. With the enhanced role of “A” status national human rights institutions in the proceedings of the Human Rights Council,¹ the Subcommittee on Accreditation is more vigilant and rigorous in granting “A” status to ensure that only those institutions fully compliant with the Paris Principles may make use of the benefits currently accorded to “A” institutions in their interaction with Council mechanisms, namely, the universal periodic review process and the special procedures.
29. To assess efficiency and compliance with the Paris Principles in both legislation and practice, the Subcommittee on Accreditation invites informed stakeholders, including civil society organizations, to participate actively by providing their views on the functioning of the national human rights institutions under review.
30. The steps taken by the International Coordinating Committee to expedite the revision of the accreditation status of national human rights institutions in cases where exceptional circumstances arise and affect the independence and performance of institutions are welcomed. This improvement in the accreditation process will encourage national institutions to continue to fulfil their mandate effectively, for instance in the event of coup d’état or state of emergency.
31. The Subcommittee on Accreditation emphasizes the need for national human rights institutions to have a broad mandate to promote and protect all human rights, including economic, social and cultural rights. States are required to provide institutions with a mandate, including the promotion and protection of all rights as set out in international and regional instruments.
32. The Subcommittee on Accreditation attaches key importance to the transparent and open appointment of members of national human rights institutions, with the broad participation of relevant stakeholders, including civil society organizations. States are required to ensure the openness and transparency of the appointment process.
33. The Subcommittee on Accreditation encourages national human rights institutions to report regularly on their activities, as well as on the human rights situation in their respective country, and to ensure that such reports are broadly disseminated among the public.
34. The review of the general observations made by the Subcommittee on Accreditation is welcomed, since these observations are in fact a tool for the progressive interpretation of the Paris Principles. The development of additional general observations, namely, on national human rights institutions serving as national monitoring and preventive mechanisms, on the quasi-judicial competency of institutions, and on assessing their performance, is welcomed.
35. In view of the compulsory budget cuts caused by reductions in funding, the capacity of OHCHR to contribute to the establishment of national human rights institutions or assessing their compliance with the Paris Principles is affected, including specifically the support given by OHCHR to the International Coordinating Committee and its Subcommittee on Accreditation. Member States are therefore urged to ensure by their financial contribution the continuation of efficient and high-quality servicing of the Subcommittee.

Annex

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

Accreditation status as at February 2013

In accordance with the 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 to be used by the 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): The category of accreditation with reserve, previously granted where insufficient documentation had been submitted to allow for conferral of “A” status, will no longer be used by the Committee.

“A” status institutions (69)

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Asia and the Pacific		
Afghanistan: Independent Human Rights Commission	A	October 2007 Placed under review November 2008 – A
Australia: Australian Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006 May 2011
India: National Human Rights Commission of India	A	1999 October 2006 May 2011
Indonesia: National Human Rights Commission of Indonesia	A	2000 March 2007 March 2012
Jordan: National Centre for Human Rights	A	April 2006 (B) March 2007 (B) October 2007 October 2010

¹ See Human Rights Council resolution 16/21, annex.

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Malaysia: Human Rights Commission of Malaysia (SUHAKAM)	A	2002 April 2008 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 October 2007 May 2011
New Zealand: New Zealand Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006 May 2011
Occupied Palestinian Territory: Palestinian Independent Commission for Citizen's Rights	A	2005 – A(R) March 2009 – A
Qatar: National Committee for Human Rights	A	October 2006 (B) March 2009 – A October 2010 – A
Philippines: Philippines Commission on Human Rights	A	1999 March 2007 October 2007 March 2012
Timor-Leste: Provedoria for Human Rights and Justice	A	April 2008
Republic of Korea: National Human Rights Commission of the Republic of Korea	A	2004 November 2008
Thailand: National Human Rights Commission	A	2004 November 2008
Africa		
Burundi: Independent National Human Rights Commission	A	November 2012
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 October 2011: deferral to November 2012 November 2012: deferral to May 2013

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
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 March 2012: deferral to November 2012 November 2012: deferral to May 2013
Mauritania: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	A	November 2009 – B May 2011
Mauritius: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	A	2002 April 2008
Morocco: Conseil consultatif des droits de l'homme du Maroc	A	1999 – A(R) 2001 October 2007 October 2010 – A
Namibia: Office of the Ombudsman	A	2003 A(R) April 2006 May 2011
Nigeria: National Human Rights Commission of Nigeria	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 – A October 2007 – B May 2011
Rwanda: National Commission for Human Rights	A	2001 October 2007 March 2012: given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles
Sierra Leone: Human Rights Commission	A	May 2011
South Africa: South African Human Rights Commission	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 October 2007 November 2012
Togo: National Commission for Human Rights	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 October 2007 November 2012: deferral to May 2013

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Uganda: Uganda Human Rights Commission	A	2000 – A(R) 2001 April 2008
United Republic of Tanzania: National Human Rights Commission	A	2003 – A(R) October 2006 October 2011 To be reviewed in October 2013
Zambia: Zambian Human Rights Commission	A	2003 A(R) October 2006 October 2011
Americas		
Argentina: Defensoría del Pueblo de la Nación Argentina	A	1999 October 2006 October 2011
Bolivia (Plurinational State of): Defensor del Pueblo	A	1999 – B 2000 March 2007
Canada: Canadian Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006 May 2011
Chile: Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos	A	November 2012
Colombia: Defensoría del Pueblo	A	2001 October 2007 March 2012
Costa Rica: Defensoría de los Habitantes	A	1999 October 2006 October 2011
Ecuador: Defensor del Pueblo	A	1999 – A(R) 2002 April 2008 March 2009
El Salvador: Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos	A	April 2006 May 2011
Guatemala: Procuraduría de los Derechos Humanos de Guatemala	A	1999 – B 2000 – A(R) 2002 April 2008
Mexico: Comisión Nacional de los Derechos Humanos	A	1999 October 2006 October 2011

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Nicaragua: Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos	A	April 2006 May 2011
Panama: Defensoría del Pueblo de la República de Panamá	A	1999 October 2006 October 2011: deferral to November 2012 November 2012
Paraguay: Defensoría del Pueblo de la República del Paraguay	A	2003 November 2008
Peru: Defensoría del Pueblo	A	1999 March 2007 March 2012
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of): Defensoría del Pueblo	A	2002 April 2008
Europe		
Albania: Republic of Albania People's Advocate	A	2003 – A(R) 2004 November 2008
Armenia: Human Rights Defender of Armenia	A	April 2006 – A(R) October 2006 October 2011: deferral to November 2012 November 2012: deferral to May 2013
Azerbaijan: Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman)	A	October 2006 Placed under special review for October 2010 May 2011: Recommended for accreditation with “B” status March 2012 – A
Bosnia and Herzegovina: Institution of Human Rights Ombudsmen of Bosnia and Herzegovina	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) 2004 November 2008: deferral of review to November 2009 Placed under review – November 2009 October 2010 – A November 2012: deferral to May 2013
Croatia: Ombudsman of the Republic of Croatia	A	April 2008

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Denmark: Danish Institute for Human Rights	A	1999 – B 2001 October 2007 November 2012
France: Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'homme	A	1999 October 2006 review deferred to October 2007 October 2007 November 2012: deferral to May 2013
Georgia: Public Defender's Office	A	October 2007 November 2012: deferral to May 2013
Germany: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 November 2008
Great Britain (United Kingdom): Equality and Human Rights Commission	A	November 2008 Placed under special review for October 2010 October 2010 – A
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	2001 – A(R) 2002 Reviewed in November 2009 October 2010 – A
Northern Ireland (United Kingdom): Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission	A	2001 – B April 2006 – B October 2006 May 2011
Poland: Commissioner for Civil Rights Protection	A	1999 October 2007 November 2012
Portugal: Provedor de Justiça	A	1999 October 2007 November 2012

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Russian Federation: Commissioner for Human Rights in the Russian Federation	A	2000 – B 2001 – B November 2008
Scotland (United Kingdom): Scottish Human Rights Commission	A	November 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 November 2012
Ukraine: Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights	A	2008 – B March 2009 – A

“B” status institutions (24)

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Asia and the Pacific		
Bangladesh: National Human Rights Commission of Bangladesh	B	May 2011
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
Africa		
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
Chad: Commission nationale des droits de l’homme	B	2000 – A(R) 2001 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) November 2009 – (B)

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Congo: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	B	October 2010
Mali: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	B	March 2012
Senegal: Comité sénégalais des droits de l'homme	B	2000 – A October 2007 – A May 2011 – Decision deferred to October 2011 October 2011: recommended to be accredited with “B” status November 2012 – B
Tunisia: Comité supérieur des droits de l'homme et des libertés fondamentales	B	November 2009
Americas		
Honduras: Comisionado Nacional de los Derechos Humanos	B	2000-A October 2007 – A October 2010: recommended to be accredited with “B” status October 2011
Central Asia		
Khazakhstan: Commissioner for Human Rights	B	March 2012
Kyrgystan: Ombudsman of the Kyrgyz Republic	B	March 2012
Tajikistan: Human Rights Ombudsman of the Republic of Tajikistan	B	March 2012
Europe		
Austria: Austrian Ombudsman Board	B	2000 May 2011
Belgium: Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism	B	1999 March 2010
Bulgaria: Commission for Protection against Discrimination of the Republic of Bulgaria	B	October 2011

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Bulgaria: Ombudsman of the Republic of Bulgaria	B	October 2011
Hungary: Parliamentary Commissioner for Civil Rights	B	May 2011
Republic of Moldova: Human Rights Centre of Moldova	B	Nov 2009
Netherlands: Equal Treatment Commission of the Netherlands	B	1999 – B 2004 March 2010
Norway: Norwegian Centre for Human Rights	B	2003 A(R) 2004 A(R) 2005 A(R) April 2006 May 2011: deferral to October 2011 October 2011: recommended to be accredited “B” status November 2012 – B
Slovenia: Republic of Slovenia Human Rights Ombudsman	B	2000 March 2010
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: Ombudsman of the Republic of Macedonia	B	October 2011

“C” status institutions (11)

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Asia and the Pacific		
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
Africa		
Benin: Commission béninoise des droits de l’homme	C	2002

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
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
Americas		
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
Europe		
Romania: Romanian Institute for Human Rights	C	March 2007 May 2011
Switzerland: Commission fédérale pour les questions féminines	C	March 2009
Switzerland: Federal Commission against Racism	C	1998 – B March 2010
Romania: Romanian Institute for Human Rights	C	March 2007 May 2011

Suspended institutions

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Asia and the Pacific		
Fiji: Human Rights Commission	Suspended Note: Fiji resigned from the International Coordinating Committee	2000 Accreditation suspended in March 2007 for review in October 2007. Commission resigned from the International Coordinating Committee on 2 April 2007

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Africa		
Niger: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme et des libertés fondamentales	Removed Note: The Commission was dissolved in February 2010	March 2010: the Commission was removed following its dissolution in February 2010

Institutions whose accreditation has lapsed

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Africa		
Burkina Faso: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	B	2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) 2005 (B) April 2006, March 2007 October 2011: deferral to March 2012 March 2012: accreditation lapsed owing to non- submission of documents
Europe		
Slovakia: National Centre for Human Rights	B	2002 – C October 2007 October 2010: deferral to May 2011 May 2011: deferral to October 2011 October 2011: deferral to March 2012 March 2012: accreditation lapsed owing to non- submission of documents