



General Assembly

Distr.: General
10 April 2012

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Twentieth 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

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 17/9 of 16 June 2011 and contains information on the activities carried out in 2011 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, re-accreditation and accreditation reviews 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 a more rigorous but fairer and more transparent accreditation and review process.

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	1–4	3
II. Improvement of the International Coordinating Committee Accreditation Process	5–13	3
III. Accreditation process in 2011	14–19	5
IV. General observations	20–22	7
V. Conclusions and recommendations	23–30	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 17/9, which requested the Secretary-General “to report to the Human Rights Council at its twentieth session on the activities of the International Coordinating Committee in accrediting national institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles”, the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights.

2. The report highlights progress achieved since the previous report on the accreditation of national human rights institutions (NHRIs) (A/HRC/16/77) 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/20/9), 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 NHRIs’ cooperation with the international human rights system.

3. The Subcommittee on Accreditation of the International Coordinating Committee of NHRIs has the mandate to review and analyse applications for the accreditation of such institutions and to make recommendations to the International Coordinating Committee Bureau on the applicant’s compliance with the Paris Principles. The Subcommittee on Accreditation comprises representatives from one “A” status NHRI from each of the four International Coordinating Committee regional groupings: Africa, the Americas, Asia-Pacific and Europe. Subcommittee members are appointed by each regional grouping for a renewable term of three years. Subcommittee members designate by consensus, for a renewable term of one year, one member to act as the Chairperson. During the first session of 2011, Subcommittee members were from the national human rights institutions of Canada, Togo, Germany and the Republic of Korea. At its regional meeting held on 17 May 2011, the European Group of NHRIs appointed France as the new member of the Subcommittee on Accreditation, replacing Germany at its second session. OHCHR is a permanent observer of the Subcommittee on Accreditation and serves as its secretariat.

4. The table reflecting accreditation status of national human rights institutions as of December 2011 is attached as the annex.

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, has improved over the years, and has become more rigorous, fair and transparent.

6. At its 20th annual meeting held in April 2008, the International Coordinating Committee adopted a decision paper regarding the accreditation process which addressed three specific areas: (a) the composition of the Subcommittee on Accreditation and its role and responsibilities; (b) the accreditation procedures; and (c) the substance of criteria or minimum standards set for accreditation.

7. The accreditation process plays a critical 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) The review has increased its transparency and rigorousness, as it is based on all the documented evidence provided by the applicant national human rights institution, as well as on the information received by civil society organizations. An appeal process also gives the opportunity to the applicant NHRI to challenge the recommendations issued by the Subcommittee;

(b) The Subcommittee issued more focused recommendations to each NHRI (whether “A”, “B” or “C” status) to ensure its full compliance with the Paris Principles;

(c) Subcommittee recommendations are more widely distributed 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. Subcommittee on Accreditation reports are posted on the internet (www.nhri.ohchr.org).

8. According to article 7 of the International Coordinating Committee Statute, one of the functions of the 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. According to its Strategic Plan for 2010–2013, its first objective is to maintain and strengthen the accreditation process, by better preparing national institutions for the accreditation review, tailoring and contextualizing Subcommittee recommendations for specific NHRIs, strengthening the transparency of the process, and improving accessibility to the Subcommittee for NHRIs, the regional networks and civil society.

9. In March 2010, the Bureau members of the International Coordinating Committee directed the Subcommittee on Accreditation to review the current accreditation process in order to expedite the revision of the accreditation status of a NHRI, where exceptional circumstances may arise and affect the independence and performance of the NHRI. Subsequently, the 24th annual meeting of the International Coordinating Committee, held in May 2011, adopted an amendment to the Statute, by which it included two new provisions:

(a) Article 18.2 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 Bureau may decide to immediately suspend accreditation classification of that institution and initiate a special review, and;

(b) Article 18.3 regulates the procedure to be followed for the immediate suspension of accreditation in exceptional circumstances. A proposal to define the meaning of exceptional circumstances is scheduled to be considered at the 25th annual meeting of the International Coordinating Committee, in March 2012.

10. According to the accreditation procedure, as stipulated in article 12 of the International Coordinating Committee Statute, when the Subcommittee recommends to the Committee Bureau to make the final decision on the accreditation status of the national human rights institutions reviewed, the Bureau will make its decision after the following steps:

(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 Committee Chairperson, through OHCHR as the International Coordinating Committee Secretariat, within 28 days of receipt of the recommendations;

(c) Thereafter, the recommendation will be forwarded to the members of the International Coordinating Committee Bureau together with all relevant material received

in connection with the application, for a decision. If a challenge has been received, it will also be forwarded to the members of the Bureau;

(d) Any member of the Bureau who disagrees with the recommendation shall, within 20 days of its receipt, notify the Chairperson of the Subcommittee on Accreditation 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 Bureau 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 International Coordinating Committee Bureau meeting for 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 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.

11. In accordance with the Subcommittee on Accreditation's rules of procedure, 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.

12. Regarding the national human rights institutions reviewed in May and October 2011, the Subcommittee on Accreditation also received information from civil society organizations regarding the functioning and efficiency of the institutions in their respective countries. Summaries of all documentation received from the NHRIs for their accreditations were prepared by the secretariat and shared with the relevant NHRIs prior to their review by the Subcommittee. NHRIs had one week to provide comments on the summaries. Subsequently, summaries and comments were sent to the Subcommittee members.

13. In 2011, the Subcommittee increased its efforts to engage NHRIs regional coordinating networks in the accreditation process. The Subcommittee welcomed the attendance of representatives of the secretariat of the Network of African NHRIs, the Americas Network of NHRIs; the secretariat of the Asia Pacific Forum of NHRIs, the European Group of NHRIs and the International Coordinating Committee representative in Geneva.

III. Accreditation process in 2011

14. There is growing interest in the establishment and strengthening of NHRIs in compliance with the Paris Principles, and the number of NHRIs accredited with "A" status increased to 69 in 2011.

15. The General Assembly, in its resolution 64/161, gives greater recognition to the accreditation process carried out by Subcommittee on Accreditation by encouraging national institutions, including ombudsman institutions, to seek accreditation through the International Coordinating Committee of NHRIs.

16. In 2011, the Subcommittee considered eight new applications for accreditation. The National Human Rights Commission of Bangladesh, the Ombudsman and the Commission against Discrimination of the Republic of Bulgaria, the Parliamentary Commissioner for Civil Rights of Hungary, the Ombudsman of the Republic of Macedonia and the Equality Ombudsman of Sweden, were accredited with “B” status. The Human Rights Commission of Sierra Leone was accredited “A” status. The accreditation decision for the Ombudsman of the Republic of Bermuda was deferred to the next session of the Subcommittee.

17. The Subcommittee on Accreditation reviewed the accreditation status (re-accreditation reviews) of 23 NHRIs from Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Costa Rica, Egypt, El Salvador, India, Mauritania, Mexico, Namibia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Northern Ireland (United Kingdom), Norway, Panama, Romania, Slovakia, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia. The National Human Rights Commissions of Mauritania and Nigeria were upgraded to “A” status. The NHRIs of Argentina, Australia, Canada, Costa Rica, El Salvador, India, Mexico, Namibia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Northern Ireland (United Kingdom), the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia were re-accredited with “A” status. The Austrian Ombudsman Board was re-accredited with “B” status. The Romanian Institute of Human Rights was re-accredited with “C” status. The Norwegian Centre for Human Rights was recommended to be downgraded to “B” status and has been given the opportunity to provide in writing, within one year the documentary evidence deemed necessary to establish its continued conformity with the Paris Principles. The accreditation decision for the NHRIs of Armenia, Burkina Faso, Egypt, Panama and Slovakia was deferred to the future sessions of Subcommittee.

18. According to article 16.2 of the International Coordinating Committee Statute, where it appears that the circumstances of any national human rights institution that has been accredited with an “A” status change in any way which may affect its compliance with the Paris Principles, the Chairperson of the Committee or the Subcommittee on Accreditation may initiate a review of that NHRI’s accreditation. In this regard and in accordance with articles 17 and 18 of the Statute, the Subcommittee conducted special reviews of NHRIs of Azerbaijan, Honduras, Nepal and Senegal. The NHRIs of Azerbaijan and Senegal were recommended to be downgraded to “B” status and have been given the opportunity to provide in writing, within one year, the documentary evidence deemed necessary to establish their continued conformity with the Paris Principles. The NHRI of Honduras was downgraded to “B” status. The NHRI of Nepal was re-accredited with “A” status.

19. During its two last sessions, Subcommittee on Accreditation issued tailored recommendations to the national human rights institutions reviewed. The Subcommittee stressed that the founding law of an NHRI should clearly provide for a broad mandate to promote and protect all human rights. It has also repeatedly recognized that annual reports of NHRIs serve to highlight key developments in the human rights situation in a country and to provide public account, and therefore public scrutiny of the effectiveness of an NHRI. The Subcommittee continued to emphasize the importance of a clear, transparent and participatory selection process in order to ensure the independence of, and public confidence in the senior leadership of a national institution. In this regard, the Subcommittee has encouraged the formalization of the selection process in legislation, regulation or binding administrative guidelines, as appropriate. It has stressed the need for greater cooperation and engagement between NHRIs and the international human rights system, as well as with civil society, in order to ensure NHRIs’ independence, pluralism and effectiveness.

IV. General observations

20. Since October 2006, the Subcommittee on Accreditation has developed general observations concerning accreditation. These interpretative tools were formulated on common or important issues regarding the Paris Principles and are intended to constitute guidance for Subcommittee members on the process of accreditation and on the implementation of the Paris Principles. The general observations may be used:

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

21. Until March 2009, Subcommittee on Accreditation had developed a set of general observations related to the establishment, mandate, composition, independence, competences and responsibilities of an NHRI, among others. In November 2009, the International Coordinating Committee Bureau made suggestions to improve the development and use of the general observations. During its March-April session in 2010, the Subcommittee decided to embark upon a review of the existing general observations. A decision paper was presented and adopted at the 24th annual meeting of the International Coordinating Committee, in May 2011.

22. The decision paper includes a number of recommendations aimed at in order to standardizing the process of developing and revising general observations, and to increase stakeholders' outreach on the accreditation process and the use of general observations. The Subcommittee on Accreditation has been requested by the Committee:

- (a) To establish formal communications channels with Regional Chairpersons and Regional Coordinating Networks to ensure members are aware of, and are able to provide input in drafting, general observations at the initial stage;
- (b) To include greater information on the justification and application of a General Observation, taking into account the different institutional models and political systems, where appropriate;
- (c) To adopt procedures that facilitate the timely development of general observations and undertake a review of the 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 Subcommittee on Accreditation's recommendations, including the general observations.

V. Conclusions and recommendations

23. **The number of national human rights institution applications for accreditation continues to increase; this reflects the importance of the accreditation process in strengthening the independence and effectiveness of NHRIs which, ultimately, will result in strengthening national human rights protection systems.**

24. **The active participation of informed stakeholders in the accreditation process, such as that of the regional coordinating bodies of NHRIs as observers, as well as the growing interest of civil society organizations in providing information to**

the Subcommittee on Accreditation, are welcome developments. The Subcommittee on Accreditation is encouraged to develop more systematic cooperation with civil society organizations while undertaking the review of NHRIs applications.

25. The steps taken by the International Coordinating Committee to expedite the revision of the accreditation status of an NHRI, in cases where exceptional circumstances arise and affect the independence and performance of such NHRIs, are welcomed. This enhancement of the accreditation process will encourage NHRIs to continue fulfilling their mandate effectively, for instance in the situation of a coup d'état or state of emergency.

26. The recommendations issued by the Subcommittee on Accreditation, as a result of reviews of NHRI applications are tailored to each reviewed NHRI. States and other stakeholders, including United Nations agencies, are called upon to join efforts and follow up on the Subcommittee on Accreditation's recommendations to enable NHRIs to fully comply with the Paris Principles, both in law and in practice.

27. The Subcommittee on Accreditation underlines that NHRIs should have a broad mandate to promote and protect all human rights, including economic, social and cultural rights. The States are encouraged to provide NHRIs with a mandate as broad as possible that includes the promotion and protection of all rights set out in international and regional instruments.

28. The Subcommittee attaches great importance to the transparent and open appointment process of members of NHRIs, with participation of relevant stakeholders, including civil society organizations. States are called upon to ensure the openness and transparency of the appointment process.

29. The Subcommittee emphasizes the value of annual NHRI reports in highlighting key concerns and developments in the situation of human rights in a country and in providing public account of the effectiveness of an NHRI. In this regard, NHRIs are encouraged to regularly report on their activities, as well as on the human rights situation in the country, and to ensure that such reports are broadly disseminated.

30. The review of the general observations of the Subcommittee on Accreditation is an important initiative, since they 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 2011

In accordance with the Paris Principles and the ICC Statute, the following classifications for accreditation are used by the ICC:

- 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; is no longer in use by the ICC. 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>
Asia and the Pacific		
Afghanistan: Independent Human Rights Commission	A	October 2007 Placed under review Nov 2008 – A
Australia: Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission	A	1999 Oct 2006 May 2011
India: National Human Rights Commission of India	A	1999 Oct 2006 May 2011 Will be reviewed in the first half of 2013
Indonesia: National Human Rights Commission of Indonesia	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	2002 April 2008 October 2010-A
Mongolia: National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia	A	2002 – A(R) 2003 Nov 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 Oct 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	Oct 2006 (B) March 2009 – A October 2010 -A
Philippines: Philippines Commission on Human Rights	A	1999 March 2007 October 2007
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 Nov 2008
Thailand: National Human Rights Commission	A	2004 Nov 2008
Africa		
Cameroon: National Commission on Human Rights and Freedoms	A	1999 – A October 2006 – B March 2010 - A
Egypt: National Council for Human Rights	A	Apr 2006 – B Oct 2006 Oct 2011: deferral to October 2012

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Ghana: Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice	A	2001 Nov 2008
Kenya: Kenya National Commission on Human Rights	A	2005 Nov 2008
Malawi: Malawi Human Rights Commission	A	2000 March 2007
Mauritania : Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	A	Nov 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 Will be reviewed in second half of 2012
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
Sénégal: Comité sénégalais des droits de l'homme	A	2000 October 2007 May 2011 – Decision deferred to October 2011 October 2011: recommended to be accredited with B status
Sierra Leone: Human Rights Commission	A	May 2011
South Africa: South African Human Rights Commission	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 October 2007

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Togo: National Commission for Human Rights	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) October 2006 October 2011 Will be reviewed in October 2013
Zambia: Zambian Human Rights Commission	A	2003 A(R) Oct 2006 October 2011
Americas		
Argentina: Defensoría del Pueblo de la Nación Argentina	A	1999 Oct 2006 October 2011
Bolivia (Plurinational State of): Defensor del Pueblo	A	1999 – B 2000 March 2007
Canada: Canadian Human Rights Commission	A	1999 Oct 2006 May 2011
Colombia: Defensoría del Pueblo	A	2001 October 2007
Costa Rica: Defensoría de los Habitantes	A	1999 Oct 2006 October 2011
Ecuador: Defensor del Pueblo	A	1999 – A(R) 2002 April 2008 2009
El Salvador : Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos	A	April 2006 May 2011

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
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 Oct 2006 October 2011
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 Oct 2006 Oct 2011: deferral to October 2012
Paraguay: Defensoría del Pueblo de la República del Paraguay	A	2003 Nov 2008
Peru: Defensoría del Pueblo	A	1999 March 2007
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 of review to October 2012
Azerbaijan: Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman)	A	October 2006 Placed under Special Review for October 2010 May 2011: Recommended to be accredited with B status

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Bosnia and Herzegovina: Human Rights Ombudsman of Bosnia and Herzegovina	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) 2004 Nov 2008: deferral of review to Oct/Nov 2009 Placed under review – Nov 2009 October 2010 – A Will be reviewed at 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 Oct 2006 review deferred to Oct 2007 October 2007
Georgia: Public Defender's Office	A	October 2007
Germany: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 Nov 2008
Great Britain (United Kingdom): Equality and Human Rights Commission	A	Nov 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 Nov 2009 A status maintained – Nov 09 March 2010

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Ireland: Irish Human Rights Commission	A	2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) 2004 Nov 2008
Luxembourg: Commission consultative des droits de l’homme du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 Reviewed in Nov 09 October 2010 - A
Norway: Centre for Human Rights	A	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
Northern Ireland (United Kingdom): Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission	A	2001 – B April 2006 – B Oct 2006 May 2011
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 Nov 2008
Scotland (United Kingdom): 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>
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
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
Chad: Commission Nationale des Droits de l’Homme	B	2000 – A(R) 2001 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) Nov. 2009 – (B)
Congo: Commission Nationale des Droits de l’Homme	B	October 2010

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Tunisia: Comité Supérieur des Droits de l'Homme et des Libertés Fondamentales	B	Nov. 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
Europe		
Austria: The Austrian Ombudsman Board	B	2000 May 2011
Belgium: The 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
Bulgaria: The Ombudsman of the Republic of Bulgaria	B	October 2011
Hungary: Parliamentary Commissioner for Civil Rights	B	May 2011
Macedonia: The Ombudsman of the Republic of Macedonia	B	October 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
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

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Slovenia: Republic of Slovenia Human Rights Ombudsman	B	2000 March 2010
Sweden: Equality Ombudsman of Sweden	B	May 2011

“C” status institutions

<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
Madagascar: Commission Nationale des Droits de l’Homme de Madagascar	C	2000 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) Apr 2006 – status withdrawn Oct 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 (CFQF)	C	March 2009

<i>National institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
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 ICC 2000	Accreditation suspended in March 2007 for review in October 2007 Commission resigned from the ICC 2 April 2007
Africa		
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