UNITED
NATIONS

CERD

International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination

Distr.
GENERAL

CERD/C/SR.1595
29 September 2003

Original: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Sixty-third session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1595th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 12 August 2003, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. DIACONU

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS, COMMENTS AND INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 9 OF THE CONVENTION (continued)

Thirteenth to sixteenth periodic reports of Bolivia (continued)

ORGANIZATIONAL AND OTHER MATTERS (continued)

GE.03-43593 (EXT)

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS, COMMENTS AND INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 9 OF THE CONVENTION (agenda item 4) (continued)

Thirteenth to sixteenth periodic reports of Bolivia (continued) (CERD/C/409/Add.3 and amended version, HRI/CORE/1/Add.54/Rev.1)

1. At the invitation of the Chairman, the members of the delegation of Bolivia resumed their places at the Committee table.

2. Mr. FABRICANO NOA (Bolivia) said that great progress had been made towards strengthening Bolivia's legal framework for the protection of human rights. At the same time, major structural reforms had transformed the economic, social and political situation in the country. The greatest efforts had been made at the municipal level and, with the support of the people, a new social and political structure had been created, which was reflected in the make-up of the legislature.

3. Turning to the questions posed by Committee members, he said that a draft bill defining the forms of racial discrimination, prepared by the Ministry of Justice, was still under consideration by the National Congress. With respect to the claims of the Chiquitano people mentioned by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous people (E/CN.4/2002/97/Add.1, para. 5), he said that it was not a private company but a cooperative of individuals from the areas bordering the Chiquitano land which was cutting down the forest; that activity had been halted pending final determination of land rights. He acknowledged that land reform had been slow, despite adoption of the National Agrarian Reform Service Act (No.1715), but said that land reform was a new process in Bolivia, based on dialogue and consensus. Its aim was to share out limited land resources fairly between indigenous and non-indigenous populations with a view to promoting harmonious co-existence.

4. With respect to the draft declaration on indigenous peoples, which included the principle of self-determination, he said that the majority of Bolivia's population was indigenous and that Bolivia was a free, independent, sovereign, multi-ethnic and multicultural unitary Republic. Bolivia continued to participate in the working group on a draft declaration on indigenous peoples. He recalled that article 171 of the Constitution guaranteed the social, economic and cultural rights of the indigenous peoples of Bolivia, including with regard to their ancestral communal lands, their natural resources, and the protection of their identity, values, languages, customs and institutions. Indigenous and peasant communities and associations were recognized as legal entities with administrative powers and the right to resolve conflicts in accordance with local customs, provided such decisions did not violate the Constitution.

5. In accordance with Act No. 1565 on Bolivian Educational Reform, education was intercultural and bilingual, and students were taught in their native languages? Educational Councils had been established for the Tupi-Guaraní, Amazon, Quechua and Aymara indigenous peoples to help formulate educational policy and monitor its implementation.

6. Turning to the issue of land ownership in coca-producing areas in Chapare Province (Department of Cochabamba), he said the indigenous inhabitants as well as local immigrants were forced to grow coca as a means of survival in the face of poverty and economic crisis. In the Andean high plateau areas, most of the population was Quechua or Aymara, whereas the Amazon plains areas were inhabited mostly by indigenous peoples, engaged in both subsistence and export-oriented activities.

7. With regard to religion, he said the Bolivian Government recognized and upheld the Catholic faith but also guaranteed full freedom of religion without distinction. Turning to the Code of Criminal Procedure (Act no.1979 of 25 March 1999), he said that a judge could impose both civil and criminal penalties, which would be implemented when the sentence was extended. The Act only referred to reducing delays in civil and family law cases. In criminal proceedings, if a judge decided that a person was entitled to compensation, that person or the prosecutor, acting as a representative of society, could request enforcement of the sentence.

8. He said that international instruments acquired the same status as domestic laws upon ratification but did not take precedence over the Constitution, since Bolivian law did not recognize the supranationality of any standard. In practice the provisions of international treaties were accorded the special status and in fact had never been amended. Development of a normative law in that regard was under consideration. He recalled that ratification of International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention No. 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries had provided Bolivia with one of its first legal instruments for the protection of indigenous rights.

9. The Code of Criminal Procedure recognized the applicability of customary law and provided that criminal proceedings would be terminated in cases where the offence had been committed by one member of an indigenous community against another and where the conflict had been settled by the community authorities in accordance with their customs on condition that the decision did not violate the provisions of the Constitution.

10. The Code of Criminal Procedure stated that in all administrative and judicial proceedings a defendant who did not understand Spanish had the right to the assistance of an interpreter. If the accused did not exercise that right or did not have the means to do so, an interpreter was appointed by the court. In cases where a member of an indigenous people or peasant community was being tried before the regular courts, the usual rules of the Code of Criminal Procedure would apply, as well as to certain special rules. For example, during the preliminary investigation and the trial the prosecutor and the judge respectively would be assisted by an expert in indigenous affairs, who could take part in the proceedings if necessary. Before sentence was passed, the expert submitted an oral report, which was designed to substantiate, mitigate or extinguish the accused's criminal liability.

11. Efforts had begun to disseminate the major legal texts in the Spanish, Quechua, Aymara and Tupi-Guaraní languages. Some press publications had begun to use indigenous languages to report on economic, social and cultural rights and the use of indigenous languages was encouraged in all spheres of activity. Although the official record of all legal proceedings was written in Spanish, that was without prejudice to the defendant's right to speak or be questioned in his native language.

12. Act No. 2426 of 21 November 2002 on universal mother and child insurance, which had entered into force on 6 January 2003, provided free health services to indigenous and

peasant women through social health networks called local health directorates, with the assistance of indigenous health councils.

13. He noted that, in April 2001, in accordance with the democratic and multicultural principles of the country, his Government had prevented the holding of a neo-Nazi event. In that context, he recalled that during the period of military dictatorships, a neo-Nazi movement had been launched, led by Klaus Barbie, who had later been arrested and extradited to France.

14. In conclusion, he reiterated, as had been said the previous day, that the greatest problem facing Bolivia was not discrimination but poverty. He was prepared to recognize, however, that his Government should do more to eliminate discrimination, especially by strengthening of the legal framework to protect basic rights. In keeping with its commitment to a culture of democracy, his Government was maintaining a dialogue with all sectors of society for the promotion of fundamental rights and freedoms, which was essential for the viability of the State and continued development. He thanked the Committee for its most useful comments and questions and apologized for the late submission of the enlarged periodic report, which contained up-to-date material and better reflected the current situation in Bolivia.

15. Mr. LINDGREN ALVES, restating that the principle Committee members acted in a personal capacity and not as representatives of their countries, said that as a Brazilian he well understood the problems which Bolivia was facing and welcomed the tremendous progress the State party had made after a long history of oppression and dictatorship. He congratulated the delegation on the continued efforts to improve the situation in the country.

16. Mr. VALENCIA RODRIGUEZ (Country Rapporteur), summarizing the discussion, said that the report dealt comprehensively with many important aspects of the situation in Bolivia, including the obstacles to the full implementation of the Convention in that State party, foremost among which was the poverty in which the majority of the population lived.

17. The Committee sought clarification or more information on a number of issues that had been raised in the report. It would welcome an explanation, first of all, for the absence of specific legislation to protect the rights of Afro-Bolivians. It would also welcome information on the measures that were being taken to give effect to the constitutional provision that Bolivia was a multi-ethnic, multicultural nation and to the legislative provisions governing the granting of titles to land and protection of the rights of migrant workers.

18. The Committee drew attention to the absence of specific laws to prevent and punish racial discrimination, as required by article 4 of the Convention, and sought clarification of whether national laws were subordinate to the provisions of the Convention and whether the State gave effect to the right of peoples to self-determination in the context of the harmonious co-existence of all of its constituent groups. The Committee would also welcome information about programmes to promote the ownership and use of land by indigenous groups and about the hierarchy of the various languages spoken in Bolivia, including whether the services of interpreters were made available, where necessary.

19. The Committee took note of the problems being encountered in the field of education, particularly with regard to bilingual education, and recognized the importance of promoting social integration in the early stages of schooling. It would welcome more information about the ownership of coca-producing land and about the special laws under

which criminal cases were currently being prosecuted. It would also be useful to know whether the texts of international human rights instruments were available in local languages and what measures were being taken to promote respect for economic, social and cultural rights. Lastly, it would be helpful to have more detailed information on the measures that had been taken to prevent a planned neo-Nazi event from being held in Bolivia.

20. Mr. ABOUL-NASR said that he would be grateful if more information on drug trafficking and land-ownership issues could be included in Bolivia's next periodic report. He also wished to know what the delegation's definition of a "unitary State" was.

21. Mr. MELENDRES (Bolivia) said that the national Constitution defined Bolivia as a free, independent, sovereign, multi-ethnic, pluricultural and unitary Republic and that the Bolivian people viewed their nation in those terms.

22. Mr. MOSCOSO BLANCO said that a unitary State was defined by opposition to a federal State. The problem of coca production should be seen in the context of the poverty of the population, for which the planting of coca provided a means of survival. It should also be remembered that the consumption of coca leaves was a deep-rooted indigenous tradition in Bolivia. The Government had embarked on a campaign to promote the replacement of coca by alternative crops. Unfortunately, the necessary resources for the campaign had not been forthcoming from the international community.

23. Mr. ABOUL-NASR expressed the hope that the international community would provide the assistance that Bolivia needed for its crop substitution and poverty eradication programmes.

24. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had thus concluded the first part of its consideration of the combined thirteenth to sixteenth periodic reports of Bolivia.

25. The delegation of Bolivia withdrew.

The meeting was suspended at 11.05 a.m. and resumed at 11.20 a.m.

ORGANIZATIONAL AND OTHER MATTERS (agenda item 2) (continued) (CERD/C/62/Misc.14/Rev.4)

26. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the document entitled "Organizational matters" (CERD/C/62/Misc.14/Rev.4).

Paragraphs 3 and 11

He said the main question before the Committee was whether the list of issues to be transmitted to the State party prior to the session should be prepared by a working group or by the country rapporteur. He would welcome the Committee's views on the matter.

27. Mr. de GROOT, referring to paragraph 3 of the document, said that he did not believe it was necessary to create a working group for the purpose of elaborating a list of issues, which could be prepared instead by the country rapporteur. He therefore wished to propose that the second sub paragraph of paragraph 11 of the document should be revised to read as follows:

> "*In order to facilitate the replies of the States parties, country rapporteurs should transmit a list of issues, to the extent possible two weeks prior to the consideration of the report, to the representatives of the State party and also to the other members of the Committee through the secretariat".*

His proposal was intended to expedite the Committee's work and to ensure maximum flexibility and transparency.

28. Mr. SICILIANOS supported the proposal made by Mr. de Groot, which would ensure flexibility and be consistent with the Committee's current emphasis on transparency. The country rapporteur could communicate with other members of the Committee by electronic mail or by facsimile.

29. Mr. YUTZIS said that the Committee should retain maximum flexibility by requesting that the list of issues be prepared simply prior to the presentation of the report rather than two weeks before.

30. Mr. AMIR said that Mr. de Groot's proposal was well thought out. It might be useful, however, to review the working methods of the other human rights treaty bodies that convened pre-session working group meetings.

31. Ms. JANUARY-BARDILL said that convening a working group meeting might prove to be cumbersome and she therefore supported Mr. de Groot's proposal. She hoped, however, that the country rapporteur would be able to count on the support of his or her colleagues in the preparation of the list of issues.

32. Mr. ABOUL-NASR said that he was categorically opposed to the idea of holding pre-session working group meetings. In his view, the Committee's current method of work was quite adequate and should not be changed.

33. Mr. HERNDL said that the idea of holding working group meetings prior to the regular session would create problems of logistics, finance and time pressure. While Mr. de Groot's proposal would introduce greater flexibility, he agreed with Mr. Aboul-Nasr, who had many years of experience with the working methods of the Committee, that the Committee should be wary about changing its method of work. If adopted, the proposal might also reduce the opportunity for dialogue between the country rapporteur and the delegation of the reporting State party. States parties might furthermore be induced mistakenly to believe that their discussion with the Committee would be limited to the list of issues that had been prepared.

34. Mr. VALENCIA RODRIGUEZ agreed that the idea of convening pre-session working group meetings should be abandoned. Preparation of the list of issues by the country rapporteur, however, would bring the Committee's method of work into line with that of the other human rights treaty bodies. It should be made clear that the list of issues was preliminary and not definitive. Members should also take into account the need for the list to be translated into the language of the reporting State party.

35. Mr. THIAM agreed that communicating a list of questions might limit dialogue with the State party to the issues listed. The document would need to be translated into the other languages and he wondered whether the secretariat would be prepared to assist. He

emphasized the importance of traditions; if harmonization with the methods of the other committees was the only reason for change, then they should leave things as they were.

36. Mr. THORNBERRY said that lists of issues might be useful for structuring dialogue with the State party and giving it focus. Experience showed, however, that such lists did not reduce the total number of questions put to the State party. They should be responding to the States parties' demand for a more secure dialogue and not to bureaucratic impulses aimed at harmonizing practices for harmonization's sake. If the list of issues was submitted in a separate official document, as was the case with the other committees, it should be made clear on the front page that the questions were provisional and not exhaustive.

37. Mr. ABOUL-NASR said that he was not opposed to the idea that the country rapporteur might contact the State party before the meeting and provide it with some preliminary questions. He felt, however, that the Committee had more important issues to address, such as the tendency for the members of the Committee to repeat questions. He took the opportunity to recall that the Committee was the only one which discriminated against the use of Arabic.

38. Mr. AMIR said it was more appropriate to put all questions to the State party during the meeting. Mr. Aboul Nasr's suggestion was logical and based on his long experience. The Committee's aim should be to ensure that the States parties cooperated as much as possible.

39. Mr. LINDGREN ALVES expressed his total opposition to the idea of lists of issues. The country rapporteurs often finalized their preparatory work during the session, relying to some extent on information gleaned from non-governmental organizations (NGOs). There was a danger that the State party might prepare answers only to the questions mentioned on the list and would not be prepared to answer any others. Most importantly, the country rapporteur's freedom would be curtailed. The Committee was the oldest of all and its rules had always worked satisfactorily.

40. Mr. BOSSUYT said that a recommendation, rather than a rule, would result in greater flexibility.

41. Mr. YUTZIS, endorsing Mr. de Gouttes's proposal, said that the time limit should be as flexible as possible and it should be made clear that the questions were both provisional and non-exhaustive.

42. Mr. de GOUTTES said that he agreed with the need for flexibility. To make his proposal even more flexible he offered to remove the mention of a time limit altogether. It would, therefore, be recommended that country rapporteurs should, to the extent possible, communicate a list of their main questions to the State party before each session. It would also be made clear that the questions were those of the country rapporteur alone, and not of the Committee as a whole, and that further questions would have to be answered. He agreed with Ms. January-Bardill that contacts among members of the Committee before each session were extremely important.

43. Mr. PILLAI said that he opposed the idea of a working group. Changes to the Committee's working methods should be made only when absolutely necessary. The suggestion that country rapporteurs should transmit a number of questions and other

information to the State party through the secretariat merely replicated current practice. They would simply be turning that practice into a written rule.

44. Mr. THIAM said that while working groups should not be set up specifically for the purpose of drawing up lists of issues, they might on the other hand be useful for preparing the thematic debate.

45. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee was in favour of issuing a recommendation to the country rapporteurs that they should communicate to the States parties lists of their main questions before consideration of the report. The list of issues would also be circulated through the secretariat to the other members of the Committee.

46. Mr. LINDGREN ALVES saw little difference between a recommendation and a rule. Regardless of what had been decided at the meeting of chairpersons, he felt that the Committee should avoid any recommendation directed at country rapporteurs.

47. Mr. YUTZIS insisted that any recommendation should make it clear that the list of issues was neither exhaustive nor closed. If carefully drafted, a recommendation would not be tantamount to a rule.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that all committees needed some rules in order to guide their work.

49. Mr. de GOUTTES said that the new wording suggested for the recommendation was sufficiently flexible to address cases where documents and other information were received at the last minute and to ensure that further questions could be put to the State party during the meeting.

50. Mr. BOSSUYT said that wording such as "the country rapporteur may communicate a list of questions to the State party" would allow for the necessary flexibility.

51. Mr. ABOUL-NASR said that the rules set out in the Convention itself clearly determined the Committee's procedures and he was opposed to any change.

52. Mr. LINDGREN ALVES said that States parties might complain if ever the Committee did not abide strictly by the new rule. Personally, he would refuse to comply with it.

53. Mr. KJAERUM reminded the Committee that it was the only such body not issuing lists of issues. He had heard that the members of other committees and the States parties found the practice useful. The Committee should look for ways of improving its working methods and he supported the recommendation suggested by the Chairman and Mr. de Gouttes.

54. The CHAIRMAN asked whether he should put the matter to a vote.

55. Mr. HERNDL was against a vote. If the Committee needed more time to reach a consensus, its decision should be delayed. Country rapporteurs were volunteers and, if it was to work effectively, the system should be kept flexible. He suggested deleting the second subparagraph of paragraph 11, and adding a sentence at the end of the first subparagraph to

the effect that country rapporteurs might communicate questions to the State party before the meeting. That would establish the desired relationship between the country rapporteur and the State party without the need for an institutionalized list of issues and all that implied. He recalled that in at least one case when a list of issues had been sent to the State party it had simply been ignored. The additional political responsibility placed upon the country rapporteur would in effect be a straitjacket.

56. Ms. JANUARY-BARDILL suggested that one way of reaching a consensus might be to allow country rapporteurs to communicate a list of issues to the State party before the meeting if they so wished. Experience of the practice could be evaluated at a later date and a decision taken then. For the time being the matter was far too divisive for a decision to be taken.

57. Mr. de GOUTTES said that transparency was as important as flexibility. It was best to avoid giving States parties the impression that questions were being sprung upon them. It was equally important to improve the preparation of dialogue and cooperation with the States parties.

58. Mr. AMIR suggested that a decision be left until the March 2004 session.

59. Mr. ABOUL-NASR, supported by Mr. VALENCIA RODRÍGUEZ, said that the debate should be brought to a close.

60. The CHAIRMAN agreed that no vote should be taken. He said, however, that he would be asking the States parties whether they favoured the idea of a list of issues at the meeting with them scheduled for later in the session. If they did, it would be up to the Committee to make every effort to draft a swift response. He reminded the Committee that it had been created by the Convention, which in turn had been signed by the States parties.

61. He said he took it that the Committee wished to delete paragraph 3 (prior meetings of the Committee's working group) and leave paragraph 11 (Action of Country rapporteurs) as it was for the time being.

62. It was so decided.

Paragraph 16

63. The CHAIRMAN said it was currently the Country Rapporteur who was responsible for monitoring follow-up of the Committee's concluding observations and recommendations, by comparing them with States parties' reports. The question was whether and in what way other Committee members should be involved in that process. Other treaty bodies had established working groups to monitor follow-up.

64. Mr. ABOUL-NASR asked in what way the content of paragraph 16 differed from the Committee's current practice. Also, if the Committee were to make a formal recommendation concerning dissemination in a State's main languages, he wondered how much it might cost a developing country to comply with that obligation.

65. The CHAIRMAN said the point was to find ways of enabling the Committee to do more to monitor follow-up than it currently did and of institutionalizing Committee members'

involvement in that process. Paragraph 16 as it stood did not necessarily answer those questions.

66. Mr. SICILIANOS said the Committee's concluding observations and recommendations were the very essence of its work, and it was most important to ensure their implementation. Both the Committee against Torture and the Human Rights Committee had devised methods of monitoring follow-up and he suggested the Committee should give some thought to the latter's system of appointing a special rapporteur in charge of follow-up to concluding observations.

67. Mr. KJAERUM said the proposal was interesting in principle. Monitoring of that kind would improve continuity from report to report and give a more dynamic dimension to the Committee's work. The Chair would also benefit from having other members available for discussion of issues arising between reports, and States parties might find it useful to have a Committee group available as a sounding-board for any legislation they might be considering in implementation of the Committee's recommendations.

68. The CHAIRMAN said a working group could be set up to propose methods of ensuring follow-up.

69. Mr. YUTZIS said all such proposals clearly implied an increase in the workload of both the Committee as a whole and its individual members. Nevertheless, such developments were necessary and inevitable and, moreover, consistent with the decisions taken at the Durban World Conference against Racism. There was no need for a complicated mechanism: a working group or a Committee member, with the help of the secretariat, simply needed to note the scope of the Committee's recommendations and their impact on the State party in question.

70. Mr. ABOUL-NASR said his position remained that he was not in favour of the idea but would not object if other members felt strongly about it. He still did not grasp the difference between paragraph 16 and the Committee's current practice.

71. The CHAIRMAN said paragraph 16 as it stood did not really analyse the issue of follow-up. The notion of follow-up was nonetheless an important one - the concluding observations and recommendations were, after all, the outcome of the Committee's work - and the Committee needed to find an approach that went beyond its current practice. He proposed that a working group should be established at the Committee's next session, to consider the issue from all points of view.

72. Mr. HERNDL said he agreed that a working group could consider the issue, but he was not convinced by the example of the Human Rights Committee, which had instituted its follow-up mechanism just over one year previously. His main objection to that model, was that the reporting cycles were completely different. The Committee's own reporting cycle was a two-yearly one, and it could therefore see the impact of its recommendations and statements of concern within a relatively short time. It was not necessary to find out what was happening between reports.

73. The CHAIRMAN said he himself did not see the issue as a theoretical one. It was important to know what action States parties were taking in practice; any mechanism would, moreover, improve the Committee's work and its dialogue with States parties.

74. Mr. THORNBERRY said that, while he agreed with Mr. Herndl's observation, the two-year cycle was in practice highly flexible: indeed, some States parties never submitted a second report. Moreover, he had heard complaints that the Committee's recommendations were being ignored or not promptly followed up, and he believed it was important to tighten up the monitoring procedure. He therefore supported the idea of establishing a working group at the Committee's sixty-fourth session.

75. Mr. DE GOUTTES said he thought the Chairman's proposal of a working group to consider possible mechanisms was reasonable and wise. It was important to bear in mind however, that every recommendation implied more work for Committee members and it was preferable that such work should be done by a panel rather than by a single individual.

76. Mr. YUTZIS said the question under discussion was of great importance for the Committee's future. The Committee had a duty to keep a finger on the pulse of implementation of the Convention.

77. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he took it that the Committee wished to retain paragraph 16, which set out the issue even though it did not provide an answer.

78. It was so decided.

79. The CHAIRMAN said he also took it that the Committee wished to adopt his proposal that an open-ended working group should be established as of the Committee's sixty-fourth session, to draft proposals for dealing with the follow-up to concluding observations and recommendations.

80. It was so decided.

81. The CHAIRMAN invited Committee members to make further comments on the document paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1

82. The CHAIRMAN, in answer to a question by Mr. LINDGREN ALVES, explained that the general debate would cover all issues relating to racial discrimination and would figure on the agenda of every session, whereas the thematic debates referred to in paragraph 4 would be occasional discussions on specific topics, such as the rights of non-citizens or descent-based discrimination.

Paragraph 2

83. Mr. DE GOUTTES said a clearer distinction should be drawn between national human rights institutions and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). He also considered that national human rights institutions should be mentioned before NGOs throughout the paragraph.

84. He suggested inserting a new sub-paragraph (a), which he read out in French:

> "Accredited national human rights institutions may provide information relating to the reports of States parties if they so wish, either by transmitting their own documents to the Committee or by participating, as independent bodies, in the preparation of the reports of States parties."

85. The CHAIRMAN said the question would then arise whether States parties were obliged to involve national human rights institutions in the preparation of the report. He was not sure all States parties would be prepared to do so.

86. Mr. ABOUL-NASR said it was not clear what "accredited" meant.

87. Mr. VALENCIA RODRÍGUEZ pointed out that, according to article 9 of the Convention, only States parties could submit reports.

88. The CHAIRMAN said that, in that regard, national human rights institutions would have similar status to NGOs, which were entitled to submit information.

89. Mr. KJAERUM said he agreed it was important to make a distinction between national human rights institutions and NGOs: national human rights institutions were separate entities. He pointed out that a note concerning the process of accreditation had been circulated during the Committee's sixty-second session, when the matter had been discussed. He suggested it would be useful to provide a special seat at the Committee table for representatives of such institutions. Paragraph 2 should also make reference to specialized national institutions (for example, ombudsmen with specific mandates).

90. Mr. SICILIANOS said that, while he agreed with the suggestion that the national institutions should take precedence in the drafting, the paragraph as it stood represented a hard-won consensus. He appealed to Committee members not to amend it.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.