

NIGERIA

Follow-up: State Reporting i) Action by Treaty Body

CERD, A/62/18 (2007)

CHAPTER IV. FOLLOW-UP TO THE CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 9 OF THE CONVENTION

...

497. On 12 April 2007, reminders were sent by the coordinator on follow-up to the following States parties which had not yet sent information following adoption of the concluding observations of the Committee at its sixty-seventh and sixty-eighth sessions, held respectively from 1 to 19 August 2005 and from 20 February to 10 March 2006: Barbados, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Lithuania, Mexico, Nigeria, Tanzania, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Venezuela and Zambia.

...

Annex IV

OVERVIEW OF INFORMATION PROVIDED BY STATES PARTIES ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

...

Sixty-seventh session (1-19 August 2005) - Follow-up reports due by 19 August 2006

<u>State party</u>	<u>Date of receipt of follow-up report</u>	<u>Session at which follow-up report was discussed</u>
Nigeria	Report not received ^a	

...

a/ A reminder was sent by the Co-ordinator on Follow-up to this State party on 12 April 2007.

ii) Action by State Party

CERD/C/SR.1131 (1996)

COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Forty-eighth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1131st MEETING

Tuesday, 27 February 1996, at 3 p.m.

...

CONSIDERATION OF A NOTE FROM THE PERMANENT MISSION OF NIGERIA

48. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, following consideration of the thirteenth periodic report of Nigeria (CERD/C/263/Add.3) at the forty-seventh session, the Permanent Mission of Nigeria, in a note dated 4 September 1995, addressed to the Centre for Human Rights, had asserted that Mr. Banton, as country rapporteur, had made inaccurate statements in his presentation, where he had referred to allegations published in *The Guardian* of 14 June 1995. In the same note, the Committee had been requested to "take steps to correct these serious errors". Mr. Banton had pointed out, in a note in reply dated 17 September 1995, that he had been responding to an important public statement, while in no way making a claim as to its veracity. The question was whether, and in what manner, the Committee should respond.

49. Mr. VALENCIA RODRIGUEZ said that the members of the Committee had all read the note from the Nigerian Permanent Mission, the press article referred to, and Mr. Banton's comprehensive reply. He foresaw no further consequences. The Committee would, of course, continue to make use of press sources, but should treat them with care whenever it appeared that the information might be imprecise.

50. Mr. van BOVEN said that although, in retrospect, he had mixed feelings about the procedure followed by the Committee in considering the report from Nigeria, the country rapporteur had clearly been treated with disrespect by the Nigerian delegation, whose members had even laughed at the reference to Mr. Saro-Wiwa, who had subsequently been executed. Mr. Banton's credibility had been called into question; the tone of the note from the Permanent Mission warranted a response by the Committee as a whole.

51. Mr. CHIGOVERA, supported by Mr. SHERIFIS, Mr. WOLFRUM, Mr. de GOUTTES, Mr. GARVALOV, Ms. SADIQ ALI, Mr. LECHUGA HEVIA and Mr. YUTZIS said that the principle of collective responsibility required that the Committee as a whole should send a reply.

52. The CHAIRMAN suggested that Mr. van Boven, assisted by any other interested members, should draft a reply, to be signed by the three Vice-Chairmen and sent to the Permanent Mission of Nigeria as soon as possible. He took it that, in concluding consideration of the matter, the Committee as a whole wished to record its unreserved support for Mr. Banton.

53. It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.