



International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

Distr.: General
5 November 2012

Original: English

Human Rights Committee 106th session

Summary record of the second part (public)* of the 2945th meeting**

Held at the Palais Wilson, Geneva, on Wednesday, 31 October 2012, at 12.20 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms. Majodina

Contents

Organizational and other matters (*continued*)

Draft statement on the relationship of the Human Rights Committee with national human rights institutions (continued)

-
- * The summary record of the first part (closed) of the meeting appears as document CCPR/C/SR.2945.
 - ** No summary record was prepared for the third part (closed) of the meeting.

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Editing Unit, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The public part of the meeting was called to order at 12.20 p.m.

Organizational and other matters *(continued)*

Draft statement on the relationship of the Human Rights Committee with national human rights institutions (continued) (CCPR/C/106/R.2)

1. **The Chairperson** drew attention to a revised version of the draft statement and invited the members of the Committee to comment on it paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 3

2. *Paragraphs 1 to 3 were adopted.*

Paragraph 4

3. **Mr. Flinterman** said that “procedures” should be replaced by “procedure”.
4. *Paragraph 4, as amended, was adopted.*

Paragraphs 5 to 10

5. *Paragraphs 5 to 10 were adopted.*

Paragraph 11

6. **Mr. Iwasawa** pointed out that “of States” should be deleted.
7. *Paragraph 11, as amended, was adopted.*

Paragraph 12

8. *Paragraph 12 was adopted.*

Paragraph 13

9. **Mr. Flinterman** said that it was good practice to avoid acronyms. Therefore, the term “list of issues prior to reporting” should be used instead of “LOIPR”.
10. *Paragraph 13, as amended, was adopted.*

Paragraphs 14 and 15

11. *Paragraphs 14 and 15 were adopted.*

Paragraph 16

12. **Mr. Iwasawa** said that, in October 2011, the Committee had begun to hold formal meetings with national human rights institutions and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on a trial basis. The new procedure appeared to have gained a measure of acceptance, but had not been formalized by the Committee. For that reason, paragraph 16 could be deleted, although he was not strongly opposed to its wording and NGOs appeared broadly to favour the new procedure. However, the trial meetings had complicated the Committee’s programme of work and therefore required formal discussion.

13. **Mr. O’Flaherty** said that it was his understanding that the meetings had become an accepted practice. However, to show that the practice had not been formalized, he proposed inserting “on a pilot basis” between “103rd session” and “national”.

14. **Mr. Iwasawa** supported Mr. O’Flaherty’s proposal, but said that the last sentence of the paragraph should nonetheless be deleted. The Committee might consider national

human rights institutions and NGOs as different entities, but it did not hold separate meetings for each.

15. *Paragraph 16, as amended, was adopted.*

16. **Mr. O’Flaherty**, speaking on behalf of Sir Nigel Rodley who was absent, read out Sir Nigel’s proposal for a new paragraph to be inserted between paragraphs 16 and 17: “National human rights institutions are requested to make their annual reports for the reporting period available to the Committee. Such reports are important for the Committee to appreciate and, as necessary, support the work of the national human rights institutions as well as to have concrete information on substantive issues relevant to the review of the State party’s periodic report. If national human rights institutions do not provide such reports, they should explain why.”

17. **Mr. Flinterman**, supported by **Mr. Kälin**, said that the proposal went too far. A number of national human rights institutions did not publish their annual reports in any of the United Nations working languages, nor could the Committee expect them to do so.

18. **Mr. O’Flaherty** suggested that the proposal should not be adopted.

19. *It was so decided.*

Paragraphs 17 to 23

20. *Paragraphs 17 to 23 were adopted.*

21. **Mr. Flinterman** pointed out that it had taken some time for the Committee’s previous statement to be posted online. He hoped that the statement under consideration would be published more swiftly.

22. **Mr. O’Flaherty** added that a finalized English version would be very useful to him when he attended the forthcoming International Conference of National Human Rights Institutions in Amman, Jordan.

23. **Mr. Iwasawa** said that the Committee still needed to agree on a title for the statement.

24. **Ms. Fox** (Secretary of the Committee), noting that the earlier statement on the relationship with NGOs had not received a proper title, suggested that the Committee could choose a title such as “The relationship of the Human Rights Committee with national human rights institutions”.

25. *It was so decided.*

26. *The draft statement on the relationship of the Human Rights Committee with national human rights institutions as a whole, as amended, was adopted.*

The public part of the meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.