



General Assembly

Distr.: General
23 July 2024

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Fifty-seventh session

9 September–9 October 2024

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 to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration
and Programme of Action**

Activities of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions in accrediting national institutions in compliance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles)

Report of the Secretary-General*

Summary

The present report is submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 51/31 and contains information on the activities carried out from October 2022 to June 2024 by the Subcommittee on Accreditation of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions in considering and reviewing applications by national human rights institutions for accreditation and reaccreditation. Those activities have been implemented under the guidance and auspices of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), which serves as the secretariat for the Subcommittee.

With the support of OHCHR, the accreditation process, which aims to determine compliance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles), has improved. The accreditation process ensures that national human rights institutions are independent and effective in their contribution to promoting and protecting human rights, as well as to good governance. That process has garnered interest from various stakeholders, including within the United Nations system and civil society organizations. Further efforts are still needed to sustain the expected objectives of having a fair, rigorous and credible accreditation process.

* The annex to the report is circulated as received, in the language of submission only.



Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	3
II. Accreditation process	3
A. Membership	4
B. Development.....	4
C. Sessions	5
D. Secretariat	7
E. Added value of the accreditation process	7
III. Conclusions and recommendations	8
Annex	
Status of national institutions accredited by the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions	11

I. Introduction

1. The present report is submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 51/31, in which the Secretary-General was requested to report to the Council, at its fifty-seventh session, on the activities of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions in accrediting national institutions in compliance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles).
2. The Paris Principles, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 48/134, provide that national institutions should be given a broad mandate to promote and protect all human rights, clearly set forth in a constitutional and/or legislative text, and be established in accordance with a procedure that affords all necessary guarantees to ensure pluralism of composition, independence and adequate funding.
3. In accordance with its statute, the Global Alliance entrusts its Subcommittee on Accreditation, which works in cooperation with and under the auspices of OHCHR as its secretariat,¹ to review and analyse applications for accreditation from national human rights institutions and to determine whether such institutions are fully or partially compliant with the Paris Principles, in accordance with section 10 of the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee.
4. With the technical and substantive support of OHCHR, the Subcommittee may also decide to initiate a special review of the accreditation status of national human rights institutions in situations in which it is of the view that the circumstances of the institution have changed in such a way as to affect its ongoing compliance with the Paris Principles. The Subcommittee may also decide to defer² an application for accreditation or reaccreditation rather than make a decision on status straightaway. The Subcommittee may decide to defer an application in situations in which: significant concerns have been identified requiring additional information from the national institution; the national context makes it impossible for the institution to be reviewed; or there are significant legislative reforms pending that may affect the institution's compliance with the Paris Principles.
5. In accordance with section 10 of the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee, the classifications for accreditation are the following:
 - (a) A status, indicating full compliance with the Paris Principles;
 - (b) B status, indicating partial compliance with the Paris Principles.
6. With the technical support and guidance of OHCHR, the Subcommittee issues general observations, the most recent version of which were adopted in 2018. The general observations serve to interpret the Paris Principles and provide a basis for the Subcommittee to review compliance therewith. The general observations are also used by national human rights institutions to strengthen their capacity and efficiency and to advocate for the adoption of measures by their national authorities to improve the legislative basis of the institutions and address any funding or other issues. The general observations are also used by OHCHR to fulfil its mandate in supporting States to establish and strengthen national human rights institutions in line with Sustainable Development Goal 16 to promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.

II. Accreditation process

7. Accreditation of national human rights institutions as a means of determining their compliance with the Paris Principles provides an opportunity for States to have effective and independent institutions, while also taking steps towards achieving Sustainable Development

¹ Commission on Human Rights resolution 2005/74, para. 11 (a); and article 1 of the statute of the Global Alliance.

² Subcommittee, Practice Note 1 on deferrals (2017), available at www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Countries/NHRI/GANHRI/EN_PracticeNote1_Deferrals_adopted_06.03.2017.pdf.

Goal 16, specifically in the context of indicator 16.a.1, which requires each State to establish a national human rights institution in full compliance with the Paris Principles. The work of the Subcommittee, which constitutes a peer review process by national human rights institutions, is conducted with the technical and substantive assistance and guidance of OHCHR as its secretariat. The outcome of such work provides national human rights institutions with enhanced participatory rights to the international human rights system. The process aims to guarantee fairness and provide an incentive for national human rights institutions to adequately function in promoting and protecting human rights.

8. It is in that light that the Subcommittee, cognizant of the interdependence and indivisibility of human rights, continues to require that the mandate of a national human rights institution be broad, as set out in the Paris Principles, to include the promotion and protection of all human rights – civil, political, economic, social and cultural – for everyone.

A. Membership

9. The Subcommittee is composed of four national human rights institutions with A status. To ensure a fair balance of regional representation, each member is appointed by one of the four regional networks recognized in article 31.1 of the statute of the Global Alliance (Africa, the Americas, Asia and the Pacific, and Europe) for a renewable three-year term. In accordance with section 3.2 of its rules of procedure, the Subcommittee selects one of its members as its Chair for a one-year term, renewable twice.

10. Since the Subcommittee began operations in 1999, only 25 national human rights institutions have served as members, which represents only 28 per cent of the 90 national human rights institutions (as at the beginning of 2024) that are accredited with A status and only 13 per cent of the 193 States Members of the United Nations. During the reporting period, eight national human rights institutions participated in the activities of the Subcommittee as either members or alternate members. The current members of the Subcommittee are the national human rights institutions of Croatia, Honduras, New Zealand and South Africa. The national human rights institution of Kenya participated as the alternate member from Africa as the national human rights institution of South Africa was being reviewed during the first session of 2024. The national human rights institutions of Greece and the State of Palestine and the Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain (England, Scotland and Wales) also served as members of the Subcommittee during the reporting period. The limited number of national human rights institutions that have served as members of the Subcommittee is due to the need for its members to be self-funded for their travel arrangements and participation in its activities. Another impediment to a more inclusive membership is the language barrier, as the Subcommittee currently conducts its business only in English, except for its final reports.

B. Development

11. There are currently 118 national human rights institutions that are accredited by the Subcommittee. Some 90 of those institutions have been assessed as fully compliant with the Paris Principles, representing 88 States Members of the United Nations and non-member observer States.³ That means that it will require approximately 18 national human rights institutions to be accredited with A status every year in order to achieve indicator 16.a.1 of the Sustainable Development Goals by 2030.

12. There have been efforts, during the reporting period, to strengthen the accreditation process, including through the adoption of amendments to the statute of the Global Alliance. One such amendment, which was adopted in March 2023, allows all national human rights

³ The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which is a single State Member of the United Nations has three national human rights institutions that have been accredited with A status: the Equality and Human Rights Commission (England, Scotland and Wales), the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission and the Scottish Human Rights Commission.

institutions accredited with A or B status to be reviewed outside the periodic reaccreditation process, which was previously the case for only those accredited with A status.

13. Another improvement during the reporting period was that the time allocated to sessions of the Subcommittee increased from one week for each session, held solely in person, to two weeks (with online and in-person segments). That change began during the first session of 2023; since which time, the Subcommittee has conducted an online segment and an in-person segment for each of the three sessions that have been held, which represent an increase of the meeting time from an average of 50 to 65 hours.

14. The increase in working time, a result of the growing number of national human rights institutions reviewed each session, has allowed the Subcommittee to review new applications for accreditation and allocate time to adequately scrutinize existing applications. On average, the Subcommittee reviews 19 national human rights institutions each session, compared with the previous average of 15 a session. As a result, the Subcommittee requires additional time and support, especially from its secretariat, which in turn requires more financial resources to match the requirements and increasing workload.

C. Sessions

15. During the reporting period, the Subcommittee held four sessions: one session in 2022 (3–7 October 2022);⁴ two sessions in 2023 (13–17 February and 20–24 March 2023)⁵ and (25–29 September and 23–27 October 2023);⁶ and one session in 2024 (26–28 March and 29 April–3 May 2024).⁷ As mentioned above, since 2023, each session comprises an online segment that precedes an in-person segment. During those four sessions, the Subcommittee reviewed 66 national human rights institutions compared with 54 during the previous reporting period, which represents a 20 per cent increase. Those national human rights institutions were reviewed in accordance with different articles of the statute of the Global Alliance: new applications for accreditation (art. 10);⁸ reaccreditation for previously accredited institutions (art. 15);⁹ decisions on reviews that had been previously deferred (art. 14.1);¹⁰ special reviews of the status of an institution on the basis of a significant change in its circumstances (art. 16.2);¹¹ and alteration or removal of accreditation status (art. 18.2).¹²

⁴ Report of the Subcommittee on its second session of 2022 (available at www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/countries/nhri/ganhri/2022-11-08/SCA-Adopted-Report-October-2022-EN.pdf).

⁵ Report of the Subcommittee on its first session of 2023 (available at www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/countries/nhri/ganhri/SCA-Report-First-Session-2023-EN.pdf).

⁶ Report of the Subcommittee on its second session of 2023 (available at www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/countries/nhri/ganhri/SCA-Report-Second-Session-2023-EN-new.pdf).

⁷ Report of the Subcommittee on its first session of 2024 (available at www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/countries/nhri/ganhri/SCA-Report-Second-Session-2024-EN.pdf).

⁸ Article 10 states that any national human rights institution seeking accreditation under the Paris Principles should apply to the Chair of the Global Alliance.

⁹ Article 15 requires that national human rights institutions with A status be subjected to a reaccreditation process on a five-year cyclical basis.

¹⁰ In accordance with article 14.1, the Subcommittee may decide to defer an application rather than make a decision on status.

¹¹ In accordance with article 16.2, when the circumstances of a national human rights institution change in any way that may affect its continued compliance with the Paris Principles, a review of the institution's accreditation status is conducted.

¹² In accordance with article 18.2, any decision that would serve to downgrade or remove accreditation status from a national human rights institution can only be taken after the institution is informed of this intention and is given the opportunity to provide, in writing within one year, evidence deemed necessary to establish its continued compliance with the Paris Principles.

16. During the four sessions, the Subcommittee reviewed the following:

- (a) 5 new applications for accreditation (Belgium, Chad, Dominican Republic, Pakistan and Türkiye);
- (b) 36 applications for reaccreditation (Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bolivia (the Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Lithuania, Malawi, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe and Equality and Human Rights Commission (England, Scotland and Wales));
- (c) 9 possible special reviews (Armenia, Burundi, Canada, Costa Rica, Iraq, Jordan, Myanmar and the Equality and Human Rights Commission (England, Scotland and Wales));
- (d) 6 special reviews (Burundi, Jordan, Madagascar, Myanmar, Russian Federation and Equality and Human Rights Commission (England, Scotland and Wales));
- (e) 7 deferrals (Argentina, Australia, Cyprus, Germany, Liberia, Nepal and Northern Ireland);
- (f) 2 alterations of accreditation (Nepal and Sri Lanka);
- (g) 1 suspension of accreditation (Niger).

17. The Subcommittee decided that the situation of six of the nine national human rights institutions under possible special review needed to be investigated further in a special review.¹³ Hence, the national human rights institutions of Burundi, Jordan, Myanmar, the Russian Federation and the Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain (England, Scotland and Wales) underwent special reviews, while the national human rights institutions of Canada and Iraq are scheduled to undergo special review in the second session of 2024. The Subcommittee also conducted a special review of the national human rights institution of Madagascar on the basis of decisions from the previous reporting period.

18. During the four sessions, the Subcommittee recommended that 39 national human rights institutions be accredited with A status and 4 with B status, that 2 have their status removed and 1 have its status suspended. The Subcommittee also decided that one institution (of the Dominican Republic) did not meet the minimum requirements to be a national human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles.

19. Those that were accredited or reaccredited with A status were the national human rights institutions of Argentina, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, El Salvador, Germany, Guatemala, Indonesia, Jordan, Liberia, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Morocco, Nepal, the Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, the United Kingdom, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe.

20. The Subcommittee recommended that the national human rights institutions of Azerbaijan, Belgium and Türkiye be accredited with B status. It also recommended that the national human rights institution of Burundi be downgraded to B status following a special review. The recommendation to accredit the national human rights institution of Burundi with B status will take effect after the Subcommittee's review during its first session of 2025, in accordance with article 18.2 of the statute of the Global Alliance. The Subcommittee recommended that the status of the national human rights institution of Myanmar be removed. However, it will maintain its B status until the second session of 2024 when the alteration review is finalized. The national human rights institutions of the Niger and the Russian Federation have both been suspended, in accordance with articles 18.4–18.6 of the statute of the Global Alliance.

¹³ Pursuant to article 16.3, the decision of the Subcommittee to initiate a special review cannot be challenged.

21. The Subcommittee suspended the national human rights institution of the Russian Federation and recommended that its accreditation status be removed. A final determination will be reached during the second session of the Subcommittee in 2024. As regards the national human rights institution of the Niger, its suspension was triggered by the dissolution, in July 2023, of the constitutional bodies in the country pursuant to Order No. 2023-01 of 28 July 2023 issued by the Conseil national pour la Sauvegarde de la Patrie.

22. As a result of the outcomes of the past four sessions, there are 118 accredited national human rights institutions (90 have A status and 28 have B status). In comparison with the previous reporting period, there are now two additional national human rights institutions with A status, two less with B and two have been removed from the list of accredited national human rights institutions. Irrespective of status, the Subcommittee makes recommendations aimed at improving all national human rights institutions.

D. Secretariat

23. OHCHR, as the secretariat of the Subcommittee, has been pivotal in the accreditation process. The secretariat continues to provide technical and financial guidance and support for the accreditation of national human rights institutions. It facilitates communication between national human rights institutions and the Subcommittee, as well as with and among its members and with the Bureau of the Global Alliance. Moreover, the secretariat ensures that all national human rights institutions are treated fairly and that members of the Subcommittee are provided with the requisite information to make informed decisions. That includes summarizing the files of each application, providing the human rights context within which the national human rights institution operates and its engagement with the international human rights mechanisms. At present, financial support from OHCHR covers meeting rooms and conference services, videoconferencing, translation of reports and relevant documents and organization and facilitation of meetings of the Subcommittee, including the online and in-person segments of its sessions.

24. The accreditation process also allows for third parties to submit information on the performance of a national human rights institution. The number of such submissions significantly increased during the reporting period, reaching 97 submissions in relation to 27 national human rights institutions, which represents a 32 per cent increase in the number of submissions.

25. OHCHR continued to operate within existing limited resources while trying to meet the growing workload and various requirements of the Subcommittee during the accreditation process and simultaneously implementing its mandate to support States to establish and strengthen national human rights institutions.

E. Added value of the accreditation process

26. Human Rights Council resolution 51/31 and General Assembly resolution 76/170 have provided increased opportunities and visibility to national human rights institutions with A status. In particular, under the universal periodic review, stakeholders' reports contain a separate section dedicated to contributions by such institutions. Moreover, during the review of a State, representations of institutions with A status are entitled to make a statement immediately after the presentation of that State during the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council. Institutions with A status are also able to make a statement immediately after the State concerned during the interactive dialogue between the Human Rights Council and special procedure mandate holders, following the presentation of a country visit report by the latter. Institutions with A status may also nominate candidates for special procedure mandates.

27. In its resolution 51/31, the Human Rights Council encouraged all relevant United Nations mechanisms and processes to strengthen the independent participation of national human rights institutions that are in compliance with the Paris Principles, in accordance with their respective mandates.

28. OHCHR, as the secretariat of the Subcommittee, continues to update and maintain the chart on the accreditation status of national human rights institutions, which serves as the basis for verifying such a status and access to the Human Rights Council and other international human rights mechanisms. OHCHR also uses the chart to measure progress in relation to indicator 16.a.1 of the Sustainable Development Goals.

29. In that context, national human rights institutions have participated, with support from OHCHR, in various forums and international mechanisms, including sessions of the Human Rights Council and the human rights treaty bodies. During the five sessions of the Human Rights Council that took place during the reporting period (namely, its fiftieth to fifty-fifth sessions), 83 national human rights institutions participated. That included 23 statements by 4 national human rights institutions during the fiftieth session; 23 statements by 7 institutions during the fifty-first session; 50 statements by 21 institutions during the fifty-second session; 37 statements by 17 institutions during the fifty-third session; 34 statements by 19 institutions during the fifty-fourth session; and 43 statements by 12 institutions during the fifty-fifth session. OHCHR processed 98 video statements, 29 written statements and facilitated the in-person participation of 83 national human rights institutions. Furthermore, 24 national human rights institutions participated in the universal periodic review process.

30. Regarding the human rights treaty bodies, 71 national human rights institutions participated in the 40 sessions held during the reporting period, either through the submission of written contributions or engagement with the various treaty bodies.

31. National human rights institutions also engaged with intergovernmental bodies based in New York. In April 2023, 21 national human rights institutions participated in the thirteenth session of the Open-ended Working Group on Ageing and 33 such institutions participated in its fourteenth session, from 20 to 22 and on 24 May 2024.

III. Conclusions and recommendations

32. **Being accredited with A status provides national human rights institutions with enhanced participatory rights to engage with international human rights bodies and mechanisms. National human rights institutions with A status may make statements under any agenda item of the Human Rights Council and speak after the concerned State after the adoption of the outcome of the universal periodic review.**

33. **The accreditation process for national human rights institutions, a peer review mechanism conducted under the auspices of OHCHR, contributes to building effective and independent institutions in every State.**

34. **The Paris Principles and the general observations of the Subcommittee remain the basis upon which national human rights institutions are accredited.**

35. **Those institutions that do not meet the criteria either for full or partial compliance with the Paris Principles are not qualified as national human rights institutions and should not be accredited. Not all national institutions reviewed for accreditation should be granted at least B status, as this would undermine the credibility of the accreditation process.**

36. **Since the inception of the Subcommittee in 1999, OHCHR has functioned as its secretariat, thereby safeguarding the integrity of the accreditation process and serving as institutional memory. OHCHR continued to take action, within the resources available to it, aimed at further improving the accreditation process.**

37. **The substantive and advisory role of OHCHR as the secretariat of the Subcommittee enhances the credibility of the accreditation process. The presence of OHCHR during the decision-making process is instrumental in ensuring the compliance of the process with the established rules of procedure and contributes to its transparency, impartiality, fairness and rigour, as well as consistency in the assessment of national human rights institutions and their accreditation classification.**

38. **OHCHR is required to ensure that members of the Subcommittee always perform their duties within the scope of the established rules. OHCHR should continue**

to raise awareness among new members of the Subcommittee, prior to their joining, on the statute of the Global Alliance and the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee, as well as the role of OHCHR as secretariat of the Subcommittee, to foster compliance with the established rules and practices in a respectful manner.

39. OHCHR, as secretariat of the Subcommittee, should also ensure that all national human rights institutions accredited with A status that are eligible to serve as members of the Subcommittee receive the necessary technical and logistical support, including translation. It is the responsibility of OHCHR to ensure that no national human rights institution is disadvantaged in its participation within the Subcommittee.

40. The Subcommittee and its members should continue, in the development of jurisprudence and practices, to rely on the guidance and technical expertise of OHCHR as the guardian of the accreditation process.

41. The members of the Subcommittee, who work as impartial, objective and independent experts as required by its rules of procedure, are urged to perform their roles without taking into consideration national, regional or political interests during deliberations.

42. Considering that representatives of the Global Alliance and its regional networks attend the sessions of the Subcommittee as observers, as required by the rules of procedure, they are urged to neither advocate for a particular accreditation classification nor participate in any decision-making of members of the Subcommittee. OHCHR is required to ensure that that rule is respected.

43. To ensure the credibility and rigour of the accreditation process, members of the Subcommittee and the observers thereto must respect the rules of procedure, including the confidentiality of the accreditation process, decisions and recommendations prior to publication of the outcomes of the sessions of the Subcommittee by OHCHR.

44. So as to offer all national human rights institutions the opportunity to be strengthened through their service to the Subcommittee, regional networks of such institutions are urged to collaborate with OHCHR to ensure that their members who are appointed to the Subcommittee are fully knowledgeable of the process and have a broad mandate to promote and protect all human rights, as required by the Paris Principles and the general observations of the Subcommittee.

45. National human rights institutions, as established by States in accordance with the Paris Principles, are encouraged to seek accreditation and to implement the recommendations by the Subcommittee as a means of ensuring their efficiency and credibility.

46. National human rights institutions are encouraged to engage in technical cooperation programmes with OHCHR to build and strengthen their capacity to discharge their mandate in full compliance with the Paris Principles, including the implementation of recommendations issued by the Subcommittee.

47. National human rights institutions and the Subcommittee should ensure that all communications continue to be channelled through OHCHR, as the secretariat of the Subcommittee, in order to ensure compliance and consistency with its rules of procedure.

48. National human rights institutions, particularly those accredited with A status, should be adequately supported to enhance their meaningful engagement with the international human rights mechanisms, noting that such engagement contributes to the improvement of the promotion and protection of human rights domestically.

49. The technical assistance provided by OHCHR to States to establish national human rights institutions that are in compliance with the Paris Principles, which strengthens accountability at the national level, should also be enhanced in order to increase the number of institutions accredited with A status. That will positively contribute to the attainment of Sustainable Development Goal 16.

50. States are called upon to ensure the achievement of indicator 16.a.1 of Sustainable Development Goal 16, which requires the “existence of independent national human rights institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles”. In that regard, States are invited to seek the assistance of OHCHR to draft the founding laws of a national human rights institution, including its establishment, to strengthen such institutions, and to provide guidance on applications for accreditation and implementation of accreditation recommendations.

51. States are encouraged to ensure that national human rights institutions are provided with a broad mandate to protect and promote all human rights, including economic, social and cultural rights, and are granted adequate powers of investigation into allegations of human rights violations, including the ability to visit places of deprivation of liberty.

52. States and other stakeholders are encouraged to enable OHCHR, through financial support, to further strengthen its role as the secretariat of the Subcommittee. OHCHR should be enabled to ensure that all national human rights institutions are given equal opportunity in serving on the Subcommittee and that no national human rights institution should be excluded from thus serving due to financial or linguistic limitations.

Annex

Status of national institutions accredited by the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions

Accreditation status as of 7 June 2024

In accordance with the Paris Principles and the Rules of Procedure of the Subcommittee, the classifications for accreditation used by the Subcommittee on Accreditation are:

A: Fully compliant with the Paris Principles.

B: Partially compliant with the Paris Principles or insufficient information provided to make a determination.

*A(R): The category of accreditation with reserve, previously granted where insufficient documentation had been submitted to allow for the conferral of A status, is no longer awarded. It is now only used when referring to institutions that were accredited with this status before April 2008.

A status institution (90)

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
AFRICA		
Benin: Commission Béninoise des Droits de l'Homme	A	March 2022
Burundi: Commission Nationale Indépendante des Droits de l'Homme	A	November 2012 May 2016 – Special Review in November 2016 November 2016 – recommended to be downgraded to B November 2017 – B June 2021 October 2023 – Special review in April 2024 First session 2024 – recommended to be downgraded to B
Cameroon: Cameroon Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006 – B March 2010 March 2015 – deferred to May 2016 May 2016 – deferred to November 2016 November 2016 – deferred to March 2017 ^a March 2017 – deferred to November 2017 ^b November 2017 First Session 2024
Côte d'Ivoire: <i>Conseil national des Droits de l'Homme</i>	A	December 2020
Democratic Republic of the Congo: The National Human Rights Commission	A	May 2018

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Egypt: National Council for Human Rights	A	<p>April 2006 (B)</p> <p>October 2006</p> <p>October 2011 – deferred to Nov. 2012</p> <p>November 2012 – deferred to May 2013</p> <p>May 2013 – deferred to November 2013</p> <p>November 2013 – deferred to November 2015</p> <p>November 2015 – deferred to November 2016</p> <p>November 2016 – deferred to March 2017</p> <p>March 2017 – deferred to May 2018</p> <p>May 2018</p> <p>October 2023 – deferred to the second session of 2024</p>
Ethiopia: Ethiopian Human Rights Commission	A	<p>November 2013 – B</p> <p>October 2021</p>
Gambia: National Human Rights Commission	A	March 2022
Ghana: Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice	A	<p>2001</p> <p>November 2008</p> <p>March 2014</p> <p>March 2019</p>
Kenya: Kenya National Commission on Human Rights	A	<p>2005</p> <p>November 2008</p> <p>October 2014</p> <p>October 2019</p>
Liberia: Independent National Commission on Human Rights	A	<p>March 2017</p> <p>October 2022 – deferred to October 2023</p> <p>October 2023</p>
Madagascar: <i>Commission Nationale Indépendante des Droits de l'Homme</i>	A	<p>March 2019</p> <p>March 2022 – special review in October 2022</p> <p>October 2022</p>
Malawi: Human Rights Commission	A	<p>2000</p> <p>March 2007</p> <p>March 2012 – deferred to Nov. 2012</p> <p>November 2012 – deferred to May 2013</p> <p>May 2013 – deferred to November 2013</p> <p>November 2013 – deferred to October 2014</p> <p>October 2014 – deferred to March 2015</p> <p>March 2015 – deferred May 2016</p> <p>May 2016 – deferred to November 2016</p> <p>November 2016</p> <p>October 2023</p>

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Mali: <i>Commission Nationale des Droits de l'Homme</i>	A	March 2012 – B March 2022
Mauritania: <i>Commission Nationale des Droits de l'Homme</i>	A	November 2009 – B May 2011 – A November 2016 – deferred to November 2017 November 2017 – recommended to be downgraded to B October 2018 – B December 2020
Mauritius: <i>Commission Nationale des Droits de l'Homme</i>	A	2002 April 2008 October 2014 June 2021
Morocco: <i>Conseil National des Droits de l'Homme</i>	A	1999 – A(R) 2001 October 2007 October 2010 November 2015 March 2023
Namibia: Office of the Ombudsman	A	2003 – A(R) April 2006 May 2011 November 2016 – deferred to November 2017 November 2017 – deferred to October 2018 ^c October 2018
Nigeria: National Human Rights Commission	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 October 2006 – deferred to March 2007 March 2007 – special review in October 2007 October 2007 – B May 2011 November 2016 October 2023
Rwanda: National Commission for Human Rights	A	2001 October 2007 March 2012 – recommended to be accredited B May 2013 October 2018
Sierra Leone: Human Rights Commission of Sierra Leone	A	May 2011 May 2016 October 2022

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
South Africa: Human Rights Commission	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 October 2007 November 2012 November 2017 First session 2024
United Republic of Tanzania: Commission for Human Rights and Good Governance	A	2003 – A(R) October 2006 October 2011 November 2016 – deferred to November 2017 November 2017 March 2023
Togo: <i>Commission nationale des droits de l'Homme</i>	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 October 2007 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 October 2019
Uganda: Human Commission	A	2000 – A(R) 2001 April 2008 May 2013 May 2018 October 2023 – deferred to First Session of 2025
Zambia: Human Rights Commission	A	2003 – A(R) October 2006 October 2011 November 2016 – deferred to November 2017 November 2017 – deferred to October 2018 ^d October 2018
Zimbabwe: Human Rights Commission	A	May 2016 March 2023
AMERICAS		
Argentina: <i>Defensoría del Pueblo</i>	A	1999 October 2006 October 2011 November 2016 – deferred to November 2017 November 2017 – deferred to October 2018 October 2018 – deferred to October 2019 October 2019 – deferred to October 2023 October 2023

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Bolivia (Plurinational State of): <i>Defensor del Pueblo</i>	A	1999 (B) 2000 – A March 2007 March 2012 March 2017 First Session 2024
Canada: Canadian Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006 May 2011 May 2016 March 2023 First Session 2024 – special review in Second Session 2024
Chile: <i>Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos</i>	A	November 2012 May 2018 – Special review in October 2018 October 2018 – A December 2020
Colombia: <i>Defensoría del Pueblo</i>	A	2001 October 2007 March 2012 – A* March 2017 October 2022
Costa Rica: <i>Defensoría de los Habitantes</i>	A	1999 October 2006 October 2011 November 2016 March 2023 – deferred to First Session 2024 First Session 2024
Ecuador: <i>Defensor del Pueblo</i>	A	1999 – A(R) 2002 April 2008 – recommended to be accredited B March 2009 – A March 2015 May 2018 – Special Review in October 2018 October 2018 – deferred to October 2019 October 2019 March 2022
El Salvador: <i>Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos</i>	A	April 2006 May 2011 November 2016 March 2022 – deferred to October 2022 October 2022

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Guatemala: <i>Procuraduría de los Derechos Humanos</i>	A	1999 (B) 2000 – A(R) 2002 April 2008 May 2013 May 2018 October 2023
Haiti: Office for the Protection of Citizens	A	November 2013 March 2019
Honduras: <i>Comisionado Nacional de los Derechos Humanos</i>	A	2000 October 2007 (A) October 2010 – Special Review, recommended to be accredited B October 2011 – B May 2016 – B October 2019
Mexico: <i>Comisión Nacional de los Derechos Humanos</i>	A	1999 October 2006 October 2011 November 2016 December 2020 – Special Review in June 2021 June 2021 March 2022
Paraguay: <i>Defensoría del Pueblo de Paraguay</i>	A	March 2019 – B First Session 2024
Peru: <i>Defensoría del Pueblo</i>	A	1999 March 2007 March 2012 March 2017 October 2022
Uruguay: <i>Institución Nacional de Derechos Humanos y Defensoría del Pueblo</i>	A	May 2016 October 2021
ASIA AND THE PACIFIC		
Australia: Australian Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006 May 2011 November 2016 March 2022 – deferred to October 2023 October 2023

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
India: National Human Rights Commission of India	A	1999 October 2006 May 2011 November 2016 – deferred to second session of 2017 November 2017 March 2023 – deferred to March 2024 First session 2024 – deferred to first session 2025
Indonesia: National Commission on Human Rights	A	2000 March 2007 March 2012 November 2013 – special review in March 2014 March 2014 March 2017 October 2022
Iraq: High Commission for Human Rights	A	March 2015 – B June 2021 First session 2024 – Special review in second session 2024
Jordan: National Centre for Human Rights	A	April 2006 – B March 2007 – B October 2007 October 2010 November 2015 – deferred to second session of 2016 November 2016 March 2022 October 2022 – special review in March 2023 March 2023
Malaysia: Human Rights Commission of Malaysia	A	2002 April 2008 – recommended to be accredited B November 2009 October 2010 November 2015 June 2021
Mongolia: National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia	A	2002 – A(R) 2003 November 2008 November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 October 2021

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Nepal: National Human Rights Commission of Nepal	A	<p>2001 – A(R)</p> <p>2002</p> <p>April 2006 – deferred to October 2006</p> <p>October 2006 – deferred to March 2007</p> <p>March 2007 – deferred to October 2007</p> <p>October 2007</p> <p>November 2008</p> <p>November 2009 – deferred to March 2010</p> <p>March 2010 – recommended to be downgraded B</p> <p>May 2011</p> <p>November 2012 – special review in May 2013</p> <p>May 2013 – deferred to November 2013</p> <p>November 2013 – deferred to March 2014</p> <p>March 2014 – deferred to October 2014</p> <p>October 2014</p> <p>March 2019</p> <p>June 2021 – special review in October 2021</p> <p>October 2021 – deferred to October 2022</p> <p>October 2022 – recommended to be downgraded to B</p> <p>October 2023</p>
New Zealand: Human Rights Commission	A	<p>1999</p> <p>October 2006</p> <p>May 2011</p> <p>May 2016</p> <p>March 2022</p>
Pakistan: The National Commission for Human Rights	A	First Session 2024
Philippines: Commission on Human Rights	A	<p>1999</p> <p>March 2007 – deferred to Oct. 2007</p> <p>October 2007</p> <p>March 2012</p> <p>March 2017</p> <p>March 2023</p>
Qatar: National Human Rights Committee	A	<p>October 2006 (B)</p> <p>March 2009</p> <p>March 2010 – deferred to October 2010</p> <p>October 2010</p> <p>November 2015</p> <p>October 2021</p>

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Republic of Korea: National Human Rights Commission of Korea	A	2004 November 2008 March 2014 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – deferred to March 2015 March 2015 – deferred to May 2016 May 2016 October 2021
Samoa: Office of the Ombudsman/National Human Rights Institution Samoa	A	May 2016 October 2021
Sri Lanka: The Human Rights Commission of Sri Lanka	A	2000 – B October 2007 – B March 2009 – B May 2018 – A June 2021 – Special Review in October 2021 October 2021 – recommended to be downgraded to B October 2022 – B First Session 2024
State of Palestine: Independent Commission for Human Rights	A	2005 – A(R) March 2009 November 2015 October 2021
Thailand: National Human Rights Commission of Thailand	A	2004 November 2008 November 2013 – deferred to March 2014 March 2014 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – recommended to be downgraded B November 2015 – B December 2020 – deferred to March 2022 March 2022
Timor-Leste: Provedoria for Human Rights and Justice	A	April 2008 November 2013 October 2018
EUROPE		
Albania: People's Advocate	A	2003 – A(R) 2004 November 2008 November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 December 2020

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Armenia: Human Rights Defender	A	April 2006 – A(R) October 2006 October 2011 – deferred to November 2012 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 March 2019
Austria: The Austrian Ombudsman Board	A	2000 – B May 2011 – B March 2022
Bosnia and Herzegovina: Institute of Human Rights Ombudsmen	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) November 2009 – recommended to be accredited B October 2010 – A November 2016 – deferred to November 2017 November 2017 – deferred to First Session 2024 First Session 2024
Bulgaria: The Ombudsman of the Republic of Bulgaria	A	March 2019
Croatia: Ombudsman	A	April 2008 May 2013 March 2019
Cyprus: Commissioner for Administration and Human Rights	A	November 2015 June 2021 – deferred to October 2022 October 2022
Denmark: Danish Institute for Human Rights	A	1999 (B) 2001 October 2007 – A November 2012 November 2017 – deferred to October 2018 October 2018
Estonia: Chancellor of Justice of Estonia	A	December 2020
Finland: Finnish National Human Rights Institution	A	October 2014 October 2019
France: <i>Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'homme</i>	A	1999 October 2007 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 March 2019

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Georgia: Public Defender's Office	A	October 2007 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 October 2018
Germany: German Institute for Human Rights	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 November 2008 November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 March 2015 – deferred to November 2015 November 2015 March 2022 – deferred to October 2023 October 2023
Greece: National Commission for Human Rights	A	2000 – A(R) 2001 October 2007 – A* November 2009 – A* March 2010 – A* March 2015 – deferred to May 2016 May 2016 – recommended to be downgraded to B March 2017
Ireland: Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission	A	November 2015 June 2021
Latvia: Ombudsman of the Republic of Latvia	A	March 2015 December 2020
Lithuania: Seimas Ombudsmen Office	A	March 2017 First Session 2024
Luxembourg: <i>Commission consultative des droits de l'homme</i>	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 November 2008 – recommended to be downgraded to B March 2009 – deferred to November 2009 November 2009 – A* October 2010 November 2015 March 2022
Republic of Moldova: The Office of the People's Advocate of Moldova	A	November 2009 – B May 2018 October 2023
Kingdom of the Netherlands: Netherlands Institute for Human Rights	A	March 2014 December 2020

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Norway: Norwegian National Human Rights Institution	A	March 2017 October 2022
Poland: The Commissioner for Human Rights	A	1999 October 2007 November 2012 November 2017 March 2023
Portugal: <i>Provedor de Justiça</i>	A	1999 October 2007 November 2012 November 2017 May 2024
Serbia: Protector of Citizens	A	March 2010 March 2015 October 2021
Slovenia: Human Rights Ombudsman	A	2000 – B March 2010 – B December 2020
Spain: <i>El Defensor del Pueblo</i>	A	2000 October 2007 November 2012 May 2018 May 2024
Ukraine: Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights	A	April 2008 (B) March 2009 – A March 2014 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 October 2019
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: Equality and Human Rights Commission (England, Scotland and Wales)	A	November 2008 October 2010 – Special Review – A November 2015 October 2023 – Special review in First Session 2024 First Session 2024
Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission	A	2001 (B) May 2011 – A May 2016 October 2021 – deferred to October 2022 October 2022 – deferred to March 2023 March 2023 – deferred to October 2023 October 2023

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Scottish Human Rights Commission	A	November 2009 – deferred to March 2010 March 2010 March 2015 June 2021

^a The re-accreditation application was deferred to March 2017 upon request of the NHRI.

^b The re-accreditation application was deferred to November 2017 upon request of the NHRI.

^c The NHRI re-accreditation application was deferred to October 2018 upon request of the NHRI.

^d The re-accreditation application of the NHRI was deferred to October 2018 upon request of the NHRI.

B status institutions (30)

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
AFRICA		
Algeria: <i>Commission nationale des droits de l'homme</i>	B	2000 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 – A April 2008 – recommended to be downgraded to B March 2009 – B March 2010 – deferred to October 2010 October 2010 May 2018
Congo: <i>Commission nationale des droits de l'homme</i>	B	October 2010
Libya: National Council for Civil Liberties and Human Rights	B	October 2014
Senegal: <i>Comité sénégalais des droits de l'homme</i>	B	2000 October 2007 – A* October 2010 – deferred to May 2011 May 2011 – deferred to October 2011 October 2011 – recommended to be accredited B November 2012
Tunisia: <i>Comité supérieur des droits de l'homme et des libertés fondamentales</i>	B	November 2009

AMERICAS

Nicaragua: <i>Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos</i>	B	April 2006 – A May 2011 – A November 2016 – deferred to November 2017 November 2017 – deferred to May 2018 May 2018 – recommended to be downgraded to B status; March 2019
---	---	---

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Panama: <i>Defensoría del Pueblo</i>	B	1999 – A October 2006 – A November 2012 – A November 2017 – A October 2019 – special review in March 2020 ^a December 2020 – recommended to be downgraded to B status; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles October 2021
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of): <i>Defensoría del Pueblo</i>	B	2002 – A April 2008 – A May 2013 – A March 2014 – special review in October 2014 October 2014 – deferred to March 2015 March 2015 – recommended to be accredited B May 2016*
ASIA AND THE PACIFIC		
Bahrain: National Institution for Human Rights	B	May 2016 October 2023 – deferred to the second session of 2024
Bangladesh: National Human Rights Commission	B	May 2011 March 2015
Fiji: Human Rights and Anti – Discrimination Commission	B	June 2021
Maldives: Human Rights Commission	B	April 2008 March 2010
Myanmar: Myanmar National Human Rights Commission	B	November 2015 March 2023 – special review in October 2023 October 2023 – recommendation for accreditation status to be removed
Oman: National Human Rights Commission	B	November 2013 First session 2024 – deferred to second session 2025
Uzbekistan: Authorized Person of the Oliy Majlis of the Republic of Uzbekistan	B	December 2020
Kazakhstan: The Commissioner for Human Rights	B	March 2012
Kyrgyzstan: The Ombudsman	B	March 2012
Tajikistan: The Human Rights Ombudsman	B	March 2012

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
EUROPE		
Azerbaijan: Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman)	B	October 2006 – A October 2010 – deferred to May 2011 May 2011 – recommended to be accredited B March 2012 – A March 2017 – recommended to be downgraded to B May 2018 First Session 2024
Belgium: The Federal Institute for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights	B	March 2023
Belgium: The Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunity and fight against racism and discrimination	B	May 2018
Bulgaria: Commission for Protection Against Discrimination	B	October 2011
Hungary: Commissioner for Fundamental Rights	B	November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 October 2019 – deferred to October 2020 (session held in June 2021) June 2021 – recommended to be downgraded to B March 2022
North Macedonia: The Ombudsman	B	October 2011
Montenegro: Protector of Human Rights and Freedoms	B	May 2016
Slovakia: National Centre for Human Rights	B	2002 – C October 2007 March 2012 – Accreditation lapsed due to non-submission of documentation. March 2014 – B
Sweden: Equality Ombudsman	B	May 2011
Türkiye: The Human Rights and Equality Institution of Türkiye	B	October 2022

^a March 2020 Session held virtually in December 2020.

Suspended institutions

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
AFRICA		
Niger: <i>Commission Nationale des Droits Humains</i>	Suspension Note: On the recommendation of the SCA in October 2023, the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions Bureau suspended the accreditation status of the Commission from the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions as of 28 November 2023	March 2017 October 2022 October 2023 – recommendation for immediate suspension November 2023 – Suspended
AMERICAS		
Paraguay: <i>Defensoría del Pueblo</i>	Suspension Note: The Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions Bureau decided to suspend the accreditation status of the Commission which resigned from the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions on 10 July 2014	2003 – A November 2008 – A November 2013 –deferred to March 2014 March 2014 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – March 2019 – Suspended*
ASIA AND THE PACIFIC		
Afghanistan: Independent Human Rights Commission	Suspension Note: The Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions Bureau suspended the accreditation status of the Commission which has been dissolved	October 2007– A November 2008 November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 October 2019 October 2021 – special review in March 2022 March 2022 – recommended to be downgraded to B July 2022 – accreditation suspended due to dissolution of the Commission

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
Fiji: Human Rights Commission	Suspension Note: The Commission resigned from the former International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights on 2 April 2007	2000 (A) March 2007 – accreditation suspended; documents to be submitted October 2007 2 April 2007 – The Commission resigned from the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions

EUROPE

Russian Federation: Commissioner for Human Rights in the Russian Federation	Suspension Note: The Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions Bureau decided to suspend the accreditation status. The SCA decided to initiate a special review of the Commissioner for Human Rights in its October 2023 session	2000 (B) 2001 (B) November 2008 November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 (A) October 2019 – deferred to October 2020 (Session held June 2021) June 2021 – (A) March 2023 – accreditation suspended, special review in October 2023 October 2023 – recommendation for accreditation status to be removed
--	---	---

Institutions whose accreditation has lapsed

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
AFRICA		
Burkina Faso: <i>Commission nationale des droits humains</i>		2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) 2005 – B March 2012 – accreditation lapsed due to non-submission of documentation

EUROPE

Norway: Norwegian Centre for Human Rights	In view of the establishment of Norwegian National Human Rights Institution and its accreditation in March 2017, the accreditation of this institution lapsed.
--	--

Dissolved institutions

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Year reviewed</i>
AFRICA		
Côte d'Ivoire: <i>Commission nationale des droits de l'Homme</i>		December 2020 The institution ceased to exist in view of the establishment of a new institution – <i>Conseil National Des Droits de l'Homme</i>
EUROPE		
Hungary: Parliamentary Commissioner for Civil Rights		May 2011 The institution ceased to exist in view of the establishment of a new institution – Commissioner for Fundamental Rights.
Kingdom of the Netherlands: Equal Treatment Commission		1999 – B 2004 – B March 2010 – B The institution ceased to exist in view of the establishment of a new institution – The Netherlands Institute for Human Rights.
Ireland: Irish Human Rights Commission		November 2014 The institution was dissolved by Act 2014, which established the Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission.
Belgium: The Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism		December 2014 The institution had been transformed into two institutions: The Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Discrimination and Racism; The Federal Centre for the Analysis of Migration Flows.