



**Asamblea General**

Distr.  
GENERAL

A/HRC/4/G/14/Rev.1  
31 de octubre de 2007

ESPAÑOL  
Original: INGLÉS

---

CONSEJO DE DERECHOS HUMANOS  
Cuarto período de sesiones  
Tema 2 del programa

**APLICACIÓN DE LA RESOLUCIÓN 60/251 DE LA ASAMBLEA  
GENERAL, DE 15 DE MARZO DE 2006, TITULADA  
"CONSEJO DE DERECHOS HUMANOS"**

**Carta de fecha 19 de marzo de 2007 dirigida al Presidente del  
Consejo de Derechos Humanos por la Misión Permanente de  
Serbia ante la Oficina de las Naciones Unidas en Ginebra**

Siguiendo instrucciones de mi Gobierno, tengo el honor de dirigirme a usted en relación con el informe presentado por el Representante del Secretario General sobre los derechos humanos de los desplazados internos, Walter Kälin (A/HRC/4/38), al Consejo de Derechos Humanos en su cuarto período de sesiones. Desearía señalar a su atención la sección del informe que guarda relación con la actuación subsiguiente a misiones, en la que se hace una referencia incorrecta a "Montenegro y Kosovo" (párrs. 27 a 31).

En primer lugar, desearía señalar a la atención el hecho de que dicha actuación subsiguiente lo era en realidad respecto de la visita a Serbia y Montenegro realizada en junio de 2005, tal como se menciona correctamente en la primera frase de la sección (párr. 27). Por consiguiente, el capítulo pertinente debería aparecer bajo el encabezamiento "Serbia y Montenegro". Desearía también señalar el uso impropio del término "Kosovo" a lo largo del resto del texto sobre la actuación subsiguiente, una denominación que no se atiene a lo dispuesto en la resolución 1244 (1999) del Consejo de Seguridad.

...

GE.07-14811

Además, en los párrafos 30 y 31 del informe se indica que, en relación con las actuales conversaciones sobre el estatuto de Kosovo y en el contexto de la situación de los desplazados internos, el Sr. Kālin se dirigió por escrito, en octubre de 2006, al Presidente y Primer Ministro de la República de Serbia y al "Presidente del Gobierno Autónomo Provisional de Kosovo, así como al enviado especial del Secretario General para el proceso relativo al estatuto futuro de Kosovo, Marti Ahtisaari". A este respecto, debo expresar mi sorpresa por el hecho de que el Sr. Kālin se limitara a decir en su informe que "consignaba con satisfacción las seguridades dadas por las autoridades serbias de que el Gobierno está haciendo todo lo posible para atender las necesidades de los desplazados" (párr. 31), dejando de lado las importantes referencias que figuraban en mi respuesta de 13 de diciembre de 2006 dirigida, en nombre de mi Presidente y Primer Ministro, al Representante del Secretario General sobre los derechos humanos de los desplazados internos. De todo ello se extrae una impresión errónea, a saber, que no se ha recibido de Serbia ninguna respuesta a la mencionada carta, si bien el informe hacía una explícita mención a la réplica del Enviado Especial del Secretario General, Sr. Ahtisaari.

Le agradecería que solicitase a la secretaría que realizase las necesarias correcciones en el capítulo pertinente y sustituyese las palabras "Montenegro y Kosovo" por las palabras "Serbia y Montenegro" en su encabezamiento, e insertase "Kosovo (Serbia)" siempre que se haga referencia a esta provincia, distribuyendo dicha enmienda como corrección al informe del Sr. Kālin (A/HRC/4/38).

Tengo el honor de solicitar también, siguiendo instrucciones de mi Gobierno, que mi respuesta de 13 de diciembre de 2006 (de la que se adjunta copia\*) a la carta del Sr. Kālin dirigida al Presidente y Primer Ministro de Serbia sea distribuida como documento del Consejo de Derechos Humanos como adición a dicho informe.

*Firmado:* Slobodan Vukčević  
Embajador  
Representante Permanente

---

\* Se reproduce en el anexo únicamente en el idioma en que se presentó.

**Annex**

Geneva, December 2006

Dear Mr. Kälén,

Thank you for your letters of 2 October 2006 addressed to Mr. Boris Tadić and Mr. Vojislav Koštunica, President and the Prime Minister of the Republic of Serbia, and the recommendations regarding internally displaced persons (IDPs), attached thereto, which we studied with great interest.

We concur with you that the outcome of the current negotiations on the future status of Kosovo and Metohija should contribute to the Province's and Serbia's stability, as well as to the stability of the entire region. The issue of IDPs is, no doubt, of particular importance in that context since achieving stability will depend, in great measure, on finding solutions to this problem.

As you are well aware, the solving of the problem of IDPs remains one of the priorities of my Government. In addressing it, it has been guided by the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, which, as you pointed out in recommendation 2, set out, *inter alia*, that IDPs should be able to freely decide where they want to live. My Government therefore recognizes that IDPs should be in a position to choose between available options, i.e. between return, local integration and resettlement. But they can do so only if each of these options is real.

Unfortunately, for IDPs from Kosovo and Metohija the return is not a real option at all. As you pointed out in recommendation 3, much needs to be done to create the necessary conditions for sustainable return.

Ensuring security is an essential pre-condition for the return of IDPs. In that regard, addressing impunity, which regrettably still prevails in the Province, is of paramount importance. Yet, it is quite misleading to view the issue of bringing to justice all those responsible for war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnically motivated crimes in the context of negotiations on the future status of the Province. UNMIK and the provisional institutions of self-government (PISGs) have a clear obligation to tackle impunity regardless of the negotiations on the future status. Sadly, though, delivering justice to war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic violence remains a distant goal in Kosovo and Metohija. It is of particular concern that UNMIK has continually failed to cooperate with the ICTY as has been pointed out also by ICTY Prosecutor Carla Del Ponte in her assessment provided to the Security Council pursuant to paragraph 6 of Security Council resolution 1534 (2004) (S/2006/353 of 31 May 2006, Annex II).

Mr. Walter Kälén  
Representative of the Secretary-General  
on the Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons  
Geneva

There is no room, either, for complacency about property rights, another fundamental element for ensuring the substantial return of IDPs. In fact, the protection of property rights remains one of the gravest problems in the Province as difficulties with the repossession of property by rightful owners persist and UNMIK and PISGs continually fail to address illegal occupation of property adequately. Again, the protection of property rights should not be dealt with within the negotiation process, as you seem to have suggested, since UNMIK and PISGs are under the obligation to guarantee property rights.

We share your view about the need to create an environment for sustainable return and the steps that PISGs should take to that end. However, as in the case of transitional justice and property, it is not acceptable that an effective prohibition of discrimination in all spheres of life, safety, access to the judiciary and the protection of religious and cultural sites be treated as subjects of negotiations for those are basic human rights which PISGs and UNMIK are obliged to ensure.

In the absence of necessary conditions for sustainable IDP return despite a seven-year international presence in the Province, it is clear that reinvigorated efforts by all actors, including relevant United Nations human rights mechanisms, are needed in order to ensure the exercise of the IDPs' right to return.

The Government of Serbia has done its utmost to address the needs of the IDPs and to enable them to lead a normal life while in displacement, protecting thus fully their human rights. I trust and believe that you were given convincing evidence of these efforts during your mission to Serbia in June 2005 and in the follow-up to the mission. They include also the quest for an appropriate solution to the problem of access to personal documents, affecting mainly the Roma, Ashkali and the Egyptians, to which you referred, *inter alia*, in recommendation 1. We stand ready to provide detailed information on these measures as well.

As to the other concerns expressed in recommendation 1, namely on the issue of statelessness, we cannot but notice that it prejudices the future status of Kosovo and Metohija. Although you propose that some steps be taken in order to avoid statelessness "whatever the final outcome of the current negotiations on the future status of the province of Kosovo will be", the content clearly indicates to a particular result of these negotiations.

Similarly, your recommendation 5 on mutual recognition of rights, entitlements and documents presupposes a certain outcome of the negotiations, even though you suggest that a number of guarantees be included in the outcome of the negotiations "whatever their result".

It is our view that the prejudging of the outcome of the negotiations on the future status of Kosovo and Metohija is unacceptable and may be counter-productive as it undermines attempts to reach a mutually agreeable solution.

We fully concur with you that renewed displacement must be avoided. A new wave of displacement triggered by the outcome of the negotiations would only destabilize the region. To avoid this, it is necessary to find a negotiated solution that would be acceptable to both parties.

Looking forward to continuing our cooperation on the issues of human rights of IDPs, I remain

Yours sincerely,

Slobodan Vukčević  
Ambassador

-----