



大会

Distr.
GENERAL

A/HRC/4/G/14/Rev.1
31 October 2007

CHINESE
Original: ENGLISH

人权理事会
第四届会议
临时议程项目 2

**执行题为“人权理事会”的大会
2006 年 3 月 15 日第 60/251 号决议**

**塞尔维亚常驻联合国日内瓦办事处代表团
2007 年 3 月 19 日致人权理事会主席的信**

遵照我国政府的指示，谨就秘书长国内流离失所者的人权问题代表向人权理事会第四届会议提交的报告(A/HRC/4/38)，写信向您说明我国政府的意见。我想提请您注意的是报告中有关其访问的后续行动的部分，其中有一个错误的称呼，即“黑山和科索沃”(第 27 至 31 段)。

首先，我想提请您注意的是，如有关后续行动的部分(第 27 段)第一句中所正确提到的，有关后续行动实际上是 2005 年 6 月对塞尔维亚和黑山所进行访问的后续行动。我还想指出，在有关后续行动部分的其余案文中都错误地使用了“科索沃”一词，这不符合安全理事会第 1244 (1999)号决议。

另外，报告第 30 和 31 段表明，就正在进行的科索沃地位谈判，并结合国内流离失所者的情况，Kälin 先生 2006 年 10 月曾致函塞尔维亚共和国总统和总理，以及“科索沃临时自治政府总统和秘书长科索沃未来地位进程特使马尔蒂·阿赫蒂萨里”。在这方面，我不能不感到惊讶的是，Kälin 先生在其报告中说，他“欢迎塞

尔维亚当局所做的保证，即政府正在竭尽全力满足流离失所者的需要”(第 31 段)，但却完全忽略了我在 2006 年 12 月 13 日代表我国总统和总理给秘书长流离失所者的人权问题代表的答复中提供的大量情况。由此得出的印象是错误的印象，即没有收到塞尔维亚对所说信件的任何答复，虽然报告具体提到了来自秘书长特使阿赫蒂萨里先生的答复。

请您通知秘书处对有关章节做必要的修改，将标题中的“黑山和科索沃”改为“塞尔维亚和黑山”，并在提到科索沃这一省份的地方加上“科索沃(塞尔维亚)”，然后将其作为对 Kälín 先生报告(A/HCR/4/38)的更正分发。预致谢意。

遵照我国政府的指示，我还请求将我 2006 年 12 月 13 日对 Kälín 先生致塞尔维亚总统和总理的信件的答复(附有关副本*)作为人权理事会的正式文件和同一报告的增编分发。

常 驻 代 表 兼 大 使
Slobodan Vukčević (签字)

* 以收到时所用语文转载于附件。

Annex

Geneva, December 2006

Dear Mr. Kälin,

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 Kälin
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

- - - - -