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A Guide to the African human rights system has been conceived as an accessible and informative introduction to the human rights system established under the auspices of the African Union (AU). This Guide provides an overview of developments related to the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights, its supervisory body, the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights, the African Court on Human and Peoples’ Rights, as well as the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child and its supervisory body, the African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child. It is launched on 2 November 2017, commemorating the date, 30 years earlier, on which the African Commission was inaugurated. The Guide aims to both chart the most salient historical developments and provide an accessible introduction to the African human rights system, and is continuously revised.

It has been prepared by the Centre for Human Rights, Faculty of Law, University of Pretoria, in collaboration with the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights, the African Court on Human and Peoples’ Rights, and the African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child. It is a team effort and builds on the interactions between the Centre and the AU’s human rights institutions over many years. The Centre acknowledges the important contributions of the students who assisted in preparing previous versions of this publication (Victor Ayeni, Doris Sonsiama, Biau-Im Tin, Kyoung-Hwa Lee, and Tshepo Cyril Phanyane). Chairman Okoloise, who assisted with previous versions and the present iteration should be singled out. Lizette Hermann, Publications Manager at PULP, was responsible for the attractive and functional layout. Elsabé Boshoff, Legal Expert at the African Commission, Sègnonna Horace Adjolohoun, Principal Legal Officer at the African Court, and Ayalew Getachew Asseffa, Child Rights Legal Researcher at the African Committee of Experts secretariat, assisted on behalf of the three African human rights institutions.
The Centre for Human Rights is both an academic department and a non-governmental organisation (NGO) accorded observer status with the African Commission. The Centre teaches academic programmes and engages in research, advocacy and training on human rights, with specific focus on Africa. Its flagship programmes are the Master’s in Human Rights and Democratisation in Africa and the African Human Rights Moot Court Competition. For more information, visit www.chr.up.ac.za

This Guide is also available in open-access electronic format: www.pulp.up.ac.za

It is our aim to keep updating this publication. If you have any suggestions, please let us know (at chr@up.ac.za).

Frans Viljoen
Director: Centre for Human Rights, Faculty of Law, University of Pretoria

‘[T]he African Charter has provided a legal framework for the promotion and protection of human and peoples’ rights on our continent and the jurisprudence of the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights attests to this achievement.’

Declaration of the Assembly on the theme of year 2016

The African Union Assembly reiterates its ‘unflinching determination to promote and protect human and people’s rights and all basic freedoms in Africa and the need for the consolidation and the full implementation of human and peoples’ rights instruments and relevant national laws and policies as well as decisions and recommendations made by the AU Organs with a human rights mandate.’

The year 2017 is an important historical milestone in the African human rights system as it marks the 30th anniversary of the inauguration of the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights, on 2 November 1987, in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The Commission’s seat was subsequently moved to Banjul, The Gambia.
History

The idea of drafting a document establishing a human rights protection mechanism in Africa was first conceived in the early 1960’s. At the first Congress of African Jurists, held in Lagos, Nigeria in 1961, the delegates adopted a declaration (referred to as the ‘Law of Lagos’) calling on African governments to adopt an African treaty on human rights with a court and a commission. However, at the time African governments did not take serious steps to promote this concept.

The 1963 Charter establishing the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) imposed no explicit obligation on member states for the protection of human rights. The OAU’s founding Charter only required states parties to have due regard for human rights as set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in their international relations. In spite of the absence of a clear human rights mandate, the OAU took bold steps to address a number of human rights issues such as decolonisation, racial discrimination, environmental protection and refugee problems. The continental organisation however ignored the massive human rights abuses perpetuated by some authoritarian African leaders against their own citizens. This was due largely to the OAU’s preference for socio-economic development, territorial integrity and state sovereignty over human rights protection, as well as firm reliance on the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of member states.

At the first Conference of Francophone African Jurists held in Dakar, Senegal, in 1967, participants again revived the idea of the Law of Lagos on the need for regional protection of human rights in Africa. In the Dakar Declaration, adopted after the Conference, the participants asked the International Commission of Jurists to consider in consultation with other relevant African
organisations the possibility of creating a regional human rights mechanism in Africa.

The United Nations (UN) also facilitated a series of seminars and conferences in a number of African countries. The UN Human Rights Commission set up an ad hoc working group and adopted a resolution calling on the UN Secretary-General to provide the necessary assistance for the creation of a regional human rights system in Africa. These initiatives of the UN attempting to get African states to consent to the adoption of a regional human rights convention failed. Participants at one of the conferences decided to set up a follow-up committee mandated to carry out visits to African heads of state and other relevant authorities on the need for an African regional human rights system. Subsequent to the committee’s visit to Senegal, the then president of Senegal, Léopold Sédar Senghor, promised to table the proposition before the OAU Assembly at its next session. In 1979, the Assembly of Heads of States and Government of the OAU, meeting in Monrovia, Liberia, unanimously requested the Secretary-General of the OAU to convene a committee of experts to draft a regional human rights instrument for Africa, similar to the European and Inter-American human rights conventions.

A conference of twenty African experts presided over by Judge Kéba M’baye was organised in 1979 in Dakar, Senegal. The work of the Expert Committee was greatly influenced by the opening address of the host president, President Senghor, who enjoined the Committee to draw inspiration from African values and tradition and also to focus on the real needs of Africans, the right to development and the duties of individuals. After deliberations for about 10 days, the Committee prepared an initial draft of the Charter.

As a result of the hostility of certain African governments to regional human rights protection in Africa, a conference of plenipotentiaries scheduled for Ethiopia to adopt the draft charter could not take place. This period was the most dramatic in the history of the Charter. The Charter project was clearly under threat. Amidst this strained atmosphere and at the invitation of the OAU Secretary-General, the President of The Gambia convened two Ministerial Conferences in Banjul, The Gambia, where the draft Charter was completed and subsequently submitted to the OAU Assembly. It is for this historic role of The Gambia that the
African Charter is also referred to as the ‘Banjul Charter’. The Banjul Charter was finally adopted by the OAU Assembly on 28 June 1981, in Nairobi, Kenya. After ratifications by an absolute majority of member states of the OAU, the Charter came into force on 21 October 1986. By 1999, the African Charter had been ratified by all the member states of the OAU. Africa’s newest state, South Sudan, deposited its instrument of ratification in 2016. Thus virtually all African Union member states have now ratified the African Charter, with the exception of Morocco which rejoined the African Union in January 2017. As of 2 November 2017, Morocco had not acceded to the Africa Charter.

State parties to the African Charter

(Morocco, which withdrew from the OAU in 1984, has in 2017 rejoined the AU, and is the only non-state party.)
Important dates

- **26 June 1981** Adoption of the Charter in Nairobi, Kenya
- **21 October 1981** First ratification of the African Charter (Mali)
- **21 October 1986** Charter came into force
- **2 November 1987** Establishment of the Commission
- **2 November 1987** First ordinary session of the Commission
- **28 April 1988** First resolution adopted, on the headquarters of the Commission
- **28 April 1988** First Activity Report of Commission adopted
- **12 June 1989** Inauguration of Commission’s headquarters in Banjul, the Gambia
- **21 October 1989** The Commission adopts 21 October as ‘African Human Rights Day’
- **3-14 June 1989** First extra-ordinary session of the Commission
- **10 June 1998** Adoption of the Protocol on the African Human Rights Court
- **11 July 2003** Adoption of the Maputo Protocol
- **25 January 2004** The African Court Protocol entered into force
- **25 November 2005** Maputo Protocol entered into force
- **2 July 2006** First Judges of the African Court sworn in
- **November 2006** The Court officially started its operations
Main features of the African Charter

The Charter has the following unique features:

- The Charter recognises the indivisibility of all rights: All ‘generations’ of rights are recognised. Socio-economic rights are justiciable.

  ‘Clearly, collective rights, environmental rights and economic and social rights are essential elements of human rights in Africa. The African Commission will apply any of the diverse rights contained in the African Charter. It welcomes this opportunity to make clear that there is no right in the African Charter that cannot be made effective.’ (SERAC v Nigeria, para 68)

- No derogations are allowed.

  ‘[T]he African Charter does not contain a derogation clause. Therefore the limitations on the rights and freedoms enshrined in the Charter cannot be justified by emergencies and special circumstances. The only legitimate reasons for limitations to the rights and freedoms of the Charter are found in article 27(2).’ (Media Rights Agenda v Nigeria, paras 68 & 69)

- The Charter recognises peoples’ rights such as the peoples’ rights to development, free disposal of natural resources, and self-determination.

  ‘The African Commission wishes to emphasise that the Charter recognises the rights of peoples.’ (Endorois case, para 155)

- The Charter imposes duties on both states and individuals.

  ‘The enjoyment of rights and freedom also implies the performance of duties on the part of everyone.’ (Preamble of the African Charter)
Supplementary standards: The Maputo Protocol

Article 66 of the Charter allows state parties to the Charter to make special protocols or agreements where necessary to supplement the provisions of the Charter. A number of protocols and conventions have been adopted to supplement the substance of the Charter.

The Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa (Maputo Protocol) was adopted in Maputo, Mozambique, on 11 July 2003 and entered into force on 25 November 2005. It was inspired by a recognised need to compensate for the inadequate protection afforded to women by the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights. While the African Charter guarantees non-discrimination on the basis of sex, equality before the law, and the elimination of discrimination against women, it does not articulate specific violations of women’s rights which result from discrimination.

The Maputo Protocol is comprehensive with its inclusion of civil and political rights, economic, social and cultural rights, group rights and, for the first time in an international treaty, sexual and reproductive rights. It also contains innovative provisions that advance women’s rights further than any existing legally binding international treaty. For example, the legal prohibition of female genital mutilation is prescribed as well as the authorisation of abortion in cases of sexual assault, rape, incest, and where the continued pregnancy endangers the mental and physical health of the mother or the life of the mother or the foetus. Furthermore, the Protocol is the first international human rights treaty to explicitly refer to HIV/AIDS, in this case, in the context of sexual and reproductive health rights. Other provisions address violence against women, harmful traditional practices, child marriage, polygamy, inheritance, economic empowerment, women’s political participation, education, and women in armed conflict. Notably, the Maputo Protocol recognises that certain women suffer multiple forms of discrimination and accordingly, separate provisions for widows, elderly women, and women with disabilities are included.
State parties to the Maputo Protocol

(The 39 states that are party to the Maputo Protocol are indicated in green)
Other supplementary standards

The AU/OAU has adopted a number of treaties relevant to the promotion and protection of human rights in Africa. These instruments include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Treaty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>the OAU Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>the Convention on the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>the Constitutive Act of the AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>the Protocol on the Pan-African Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>the Protocol on the Peace and Security Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>the Convention on the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>the African Youth Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>the African Charter on Democracy, Elections and Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>the AU Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>the Statute on the Establishment of Legal Aid Fund for the African Union Human Rights Organs (not yet in force)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>the Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights on the Rights of Older Persons (not yet in force)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The AU, as well as the African Commission, has also adopted various declarations and resolutions relevant to the understanding and advancement of the African Charter provisions.
Impact of the African Charter and supplementary standards on domestic human rights in Africa

The African Commission has established itself firmly as the primary human rights body on the African continent. Through its progressive interpretation of the Charter, the Commission has given guidance to states about the content of their obligations under the Charter, and its provisions have inspired domestic legislation. In a number of countries, the Charter is an integral part of national law by virtue of the constitutional system in place. At least one state, Nigeria, has explicitly made the Charter part of domestic law through domesticating legislation.

The normative impact of the Charter has been significant. In its thematic resolutions, the Commission clarified the scope of rights and provided a yardstick for the development of domestic law, in particular in the ‘Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Fair Trial’ and the ‘Principles of Freedom of Expression’. It urged states to adopt a moratorium on the death penalty, thus supporting the trend towards abolition in Africa. The principle that indigenous peoples are rights-holders under the Charter was clearly established. In its Advisory Opinion on the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the Commission addressed the concerns of African states about this Declaration, and thus contributed to its eventual adoption by most African states. Through its active participation in the adoption of the Women’s Protocol, the Commission provided clarity about the rights of women in the African context, and provided invaluable guidance to African states. The African Commission also adopted the Model Law on Access to Information in Africa in April 2013 during its 53rd Ordinary Session.

The sessions of the Commission provide an important space for the articulation of issues that are neglected or silenced domestically. More and more, NGOs and NHRIs benefit from interactions at these sessions, and are informed, strengthened and better equipped to perform their functions. Engagement with the African human rights system shapes the agenda of these role players.
Even if the findings and concluding observations of the Commission are not formally binding, states take serious note of them. The *Endorois* decision, for example, led to an intensive national dialogue about the accommodation of indigenous communities in Kenya.

The missions undertaken to state parties sensitise and support continuing efforts at the national level to improve human rights and inspire legal or institutional reform. Commissioners acting as Special Rapporteurs also engage with states in order to address allegations falling within the domain of the Special Rapporteurs.

The Charter’s complaints mechanism provides an important avenue for recourse to complainants who could not find redress at the national level. The Commission’s findings have in a number of instances been implemented. In many instances, the finding of the Commission assisted in garnering international awareness and solidarity, as was the case in Nigeria during the Abacha regime.

National courts are increasingly influenced by and use the Charter and the Commission’s findings to assist them in interpreting national law. Prominent examples are the Constitutional Court of Benin, which in numerous cases made reference to the African Charter, and in some applied it directly; and the Court of Appeal of Lesotho, which relied on the African Charter together with other international human rights treaties in *Molefi Tsepe v The Independent Electoral Commission*.

The findings of the Commission also reverberated in the jurisprudence of national courts outside Africa, in the judgments of regional courts (such as the case of *Campbell v Zimbabwe*, decided by the SADC Tribunal), and even the International Court of Justice (for example, in the case of *Diallo (Republic of Guinea v Democratic Republic of the Congo)*).

The Maputo Protocol has inspired legislative changes in numerous state parties, in particular in respect of abortion and gender-based violence.

For more information on the Commission’s impact, see

Establishment


Composition

The Commission consists of 11 members elected by the AU Assembly from experts nominated by the state parties to the Charter. The Assembly considers equitable geographical and gender representation in electing the members of the Commission. Members of the Commission are elected for a six-year term and are eligible for re-election.

Once elected, the commissioners serve in their personal capacity and not as representatives of their respective countries. Previously, some members of the Commission held high political offices at the national level, which affected the Commission’s independence. The AU in April 2005 issued a note verbale to member states prescribing guidelines for nomination of members to the Commission which excluded senior civil servants and diplomatic representatives.

Bureau

The Commission elects its Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson as the Bureau of the Commission. They are elected for a term of two years and are eligible for re-election once. The Bureau coordinates the activities of the Commission and supervises and assesses the work of the Commission’s Secretariat. The Bureau is also empowered to take decisions on matters of emergency between the sessions of the Commission. It is however obligated to present a report on the situation to members at the next session of the Commission.
Secretariat

The Chairperson of the AU Commission appoints the Secretary of the African Commission and support staff necessary for the effective discharge of the Commission’s mandate. The Secretariat provides administrative, technical and logistical support to the Commission.

Mandate

Article 45 of the Charter sets out the mandate of the Commission.

- Promotion of human and peoples’ rights
  The Commission carries out sensitisation, public mobilisation and information dissemination through seminars, symposia, conferences and missions.

- Protection of human and peoples’ rights
  The Commission ensures protection of human and peoples’ rights through its communication procedure, friendly settlement of disputes, state reporting (including consideration of NGOs’ shadow reports), urgent appeals and other activities of special rapporteurs and working groups and missions.

- Interpretation of the Charter
  The Commission is mandated to interpret the provisions of the Charter upon a request by a state party, organs of the AU or individuals. No organ of the AU has referred any case of interpretation of the Charter to the Commission. However, a handful of NGOs have approached the Commission for interpretation of the various articles of the Charter. The Commission has also adopted many resolutions including General Comments, declarations, decisions on communications, state reporting guidelines, etc. expounding upon the provisions of the Charter.

Rules of Procedure

Members

Current Commissioners (as at 2 November 2017)

Lucy Asuagbor (2010 - 2022) Cameroon
Maya Sahli Fadel (2011 - 2023) Algeria
Solomon Ayele Dersso (2015 - 2021) Ethiopia
Jamesina Essie L King (2015 - 2021) Sierra Leone
Hatem Essaïem (2017 - 2023) Tunisia
Ngoy Remy Lumbu (2017 - 2023) Democratic Republic of the Congo
Manuela Maria Teresa (2017 - 2023) Angola

Former members of the Commission

Pacifique Manirakiza (2011 - 2015) Burundi
Mohamed Bechir Khalfallah (2009 - 2015) Tunisia
Mohamed Fayek (2009 - 2011) Egypt
Sanji Mmasenono Monageng (2003 - 2013) Botswana
Bahame Tom Mukirya Nyanduga (2003 - 2009) Tanzania
Angela Melo (2001 - 2015) Mozambique
Salimata Sawadogo (2001 - 2009) Burkina Faso
Yaser Sid Ahmed El-Hassan (2001 - 2009) Sudan
Andrew Ranganayi Chigovera (1999 - 2007) Zimbabwe
Vera Manguzwa Chirwa (1999 - 2005) Malawi
Vera Valentina De Melo Duarte Martins (1993 - 2000) Cape Verde
Atsu Kofi Amega (1993 - 1999) Togo
Yousoupha Ndiaye (1987 - 2001) Senegal
Chama LC Mubanga-Chipoya (1987 - 1993) Zambia
Sessions

As at November 2017, the Commission had held 61 ordinary sessions and 22 extraordinary sessions.

Ordinary sessions

The Commission holds two ordinary sessions each year. The duration of the session varies in each case from 10 to 15 days depending on needs and finance. The date for an ordinary session is fixed by the Commission upon a proposal by the Chairperson of the Commission in consultation with the Chairperson of the AU Commission.

Extraordinary sessions

The Commission may hold extraordinary sessions. Extraordinary sessions are convened by the Chairperson of the Commission upon a request by the Chairperson of the African Union Commission or majority of the members of the Commission.

Agenda

The agenda of an ordinary session is usually first drawn by the Commission’s Secretary in consultation with the Bureau of the Commission. Apart from the items proposed at the previous session, the Chairperson, members of the Commission, state parties, AU organs, NHRIs, NGOs and any specialized institution of the UN may suggest additional items for inclusion in the agenda. However, the Bureau of the Commission has the final say on which items finally make it to the provisional agenda. The
Commission adopts its final agenda in a closed session on the first day of the Session.

**Activity reports**

The Commission submits to every Ordinary Session of the AU Assembly a report of its activities during sessions and inter-sessions. The Executive Council considers the report on behalf of the Assembly. The Report is presented by the Chairperson of the Commission or his/her representative. The Commission may publish information about its protective activities (communications and protective missions) only after the report has been adopted by the Executive Council and Assembly. Prior to the adoption of the Activity Report by the AU Assembly, the Commission usually issues a communiqué immediately after the session.

**Ordinary sessions and Activity Reports of the Commission since 1987**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Host country</th>
<th>Activity Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2 November 1987</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>8 - 13 February 1988</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>18 - 28 April 1988</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>17 - 26 October 1988</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>3 - 14 April 1989</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>18 - 28 April 1990</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>8 - 21 October 1990</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>18 - 25 March 1991</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>8 - 15 October 1991</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>2 - 9 March 1992</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>12 - 21 October 1992</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>29 March - 7 April 1993</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>1 - 10 December 1993</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>18 - 27 April 1994</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>13 - 22 March 1995</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>2 - 11 October 1995</td>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>26 March - 4 April 1996</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>21 - 31 October 1996</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>10th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>15 - 24 April 1997</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>10th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>2 - 11 November 1997</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>11th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>20 - 29 April 1998</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>11th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th</td>
<td>22 - 31 October 1998</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>26 April - 5 May 1999</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th</td>
<td>1 - 15 November 1999</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>13th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th</td>
<td>27 April - 11 May 2000</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>13th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th</td>
<td>23 Oct - 6 Nov 2000</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th</td>
<td>23 April - 7 May 2001</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th</td>
<td>13 - 27 October 2001</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st</td>
<td>2 - 16 May 2002</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32nd</td>
<td>17 - 23 October 2002</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>16th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33rd</td>
<td>15 - 29 May 2003</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>16th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34th</td>
<td>6 - 20 November 2003</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>17th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35th</td>
<td>21 May - 4 June 2004</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>17th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36th</td>
<td>23 Nov - 7 Dec 2004</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>18th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37th</td>
<td>27 April - 11 May 2005</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>18th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38th</td>
<td>21 Nov - 5 Dec 2005</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39th</td>
<td>11 - 25 May 2006</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th</td>
<td>15 - 29 November 2006</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>21st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41st</td>
<td>16 - 30 May 2007</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>22nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42nd</td>
<td>15 - 28 November 2007</td>
<td>Rep of Congo</td>
<td>23rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43rd</td>
<td>7 - 22 May 2008</td>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>24th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44th</td>
<td>10 - 24 November 2008</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>25th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45th</td>
<td>13 - 27 May 2009</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>26th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46th</td>
<td>11 - 25 November 2009</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>27th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47th</td>
<td>12 - 26 May 2010</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>28th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48th</td>
<td>10 - 24 November 2010</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>27th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49th</td>
<td>28 April - 12 May 2011</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>30th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th</td>
<td>24 Oct - 5 Nov 2011</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>31st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51st</td>
<td>18 April - 2 May 2012</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>32nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52nd</td>
<td>9 - 22 October 2012</td>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>33rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53rd</td>
<td>9 - 22 April 2013</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>34th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54th</td>
<td>22 October - 5 November 2013</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>35th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55th</td>
<td>28 April - 12 May 2014</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>36th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56th</td>
<td>21 April - 7 May 2015</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>38th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57th</td>
<td>4 - 18 November 2015</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>39th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58th</td>
<td>6 - 20 April 2016</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>40th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59th</td>
<td>21 October - 4 November 2016</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>41st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60th</td>
<td>8 - 22 May 2017</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>42nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61st</td>
<td>1 - 18 November 2017</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extraordinary sessions of the Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extr. Sess.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Host country</th>
<th>Activity Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>13 - 14 June 1989</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>18 - 19 December 1995</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>18 - 19 September 2004</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>18th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>17 - 23 February 2008</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>24th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>21 - 29 July 2008</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>25th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>30 March - 3 April 2009</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>26th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>5 - 12 October 2009</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>27th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>22 Feb - 3 March 2010</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>28th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>23 Feb - 3 March 2011</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>30th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>12 - 16 December 2011</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>31st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>21 February - 1 March 2012</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>32nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>30 July - 4 August 2012</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>33rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>18 - 25 February 2013</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>34th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>20 - 24 July 2013</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>35th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>7 - 14 March 2014</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>36th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>20 - 29 July 2014</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>37th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>19 - 28 February 2015</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>38th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>29 July - 7 August 2015</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>39th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>16 - 25 February 2016</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>40th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>9 - 18 June 2016</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>41st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>23 February - 4 March 2017</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>42nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>29 July - 7 August 2017</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Activity Reports and information about the sessions of the Commission are available at: http://www.achpr.org/activity-reports/

Communications

Communications (complaints) are one of the mechanisms employed by the Commission to ensure compliance of states with the human rights enshrined in the Charter. The Commission may receive complaints from states against another state (inter-state complaints) or by individuals and NGOs against one or more states (individual complaints) on alleged violations of human rights in accordance with its mandate under articles 48, 49 and 55 of the African Charter. Over 655 individual communications have been received since the Commission was established in
1987, 466 of these have been finalised, of which more than 100 ended in findings on the merits.

**Inter-state communication**

The first and only inter-state communication the Commission has handled was decided on the merits in 2004.

**DRC v Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda**

*(2004) AHRLR 19 (ACHPR 2003)*

This communication was filed by the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) against the Republics of Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda. DRC alleged that Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda (respondent states) had committed grave violations of human and peoples’ rights in the Congolese provinces through the activities of rebels groups which the applicant alleged were supported by the respondent states.

Drawing inspiration from general principles of international law as well as the UN Charter and resolutions of the UN General Assembly, the Commission stated that the actions of the respondent states in occupying the territories of the complainant violated the rights of the Congolese people to self-determination and constituted a threat to national and international peace and security.

The Commission stated that the acts of barbarism displayed by the respondent states in the complainant’s territories constitute an affront on ‘the noble virtues’ of African tradition. The Commission further found that by taking charge of several natural resource producing areas of the complainant’s territory, the respondent states had deprived the Congolese people of their rights to freely dispose of their natural resources.

The Commission therefore concluded that the respondent states were in violation of several provisions of the African Charter and urged them to take measures to abide by their obligations under the UN Charter, the OAU Charter and the African Charter and to further pay adequate reparations to the victims of the violations.
Who may bring an individual communication?

Any individual or NGO may bring a communication before the Commission. The Charter is silent on the issue of standing and the Rules of Procedure of the Commission does not provide for a victim requirement. A communication may be submitted by the victim(s) or anyone on their behalf. An individual or NGO submitting a communication on behalf of another need not obtain the express consent of the victim. The NGO also does not have to enjoy an observer status with the Commission. The individual or NGO need not be a citizen or be registered in the state against which the communication is made.

Against whom can a communication be brought?

A communication can only be brought against a state that has ratified the African Charter.

Legal aid

The Commission may on its own motion or after a request by the author of a communication facilitate access to free legal aid to the author of a communication. In arriving at this decision, the Commission must be convinced that the author has no sufficient means to meet all or part of the cost of the communication and that a legal aid is essential to ensure equality of parties and for the proper discharge of the Commission’s duties.

Admissibility criteria (article 56)

Before any communication is declared admissible by the Commission, it must comply with all the following requirements:

- Communications must indicate their author(s)
- Communication must be compatible with the AU Constitutive Act and the African Charter
- Communication must not be written in disparaging or insulting language
- Communication must not be based exclusively on media report
- Domestic remedies must have been exhausted unless the domestic procedure has been unduly prolonged
- Communication must be submitted within a reasonable time after exhausting local remedies
- The issues raised in the communication must not have been settled under other UN or AU procedures
Exhaustion of local remedies

Exhaustion of domestic remedy is the most important requirement for admissibility of cases before the African Commission and other international human rights bodies. This is because of the subsidiarity of international adjudicatory system. The rationale for the requirement of exhausting domestic remedy are to notify the government of the violation, thereby affording the state an opportunity to remedy the violation and to give domestic courts a chance to decide upon the case.

Only remedies of judicial nature that are available, effective and sufficient to redress the wrong are required to be exhausted. A remedy is available if it is readily accessible without any impediments; it is effective when it offers some likelihood of success; and it is sufficient when it is capable of redressing the wrong.

A complainant however need not exhaust local remedy where the complaints fall into any of the following categories:

- If the victims are indigent (Purohit v The Gambia).
- If the complaints involve serious or massive violations (Free Legal Assistance Group v Zaire).
- If domestic legislation ousts the jurisdiction of national courts (Media Rights Agenda v Nigeria).
- If the rights claimed are not guaranteed by domestic laws (SERAC v Nigeria).
- If it is physically dangerous for the complainant to return to the erring state in order to exhaust local remedy (Jawara v The Gambia; Abubarkar v Ghana).
- If the complaint involves ‘impractical number’ of potential plaintiffs (African Institute for Human Rights and Development v Guinea).
- If the procedure for obtaining domestic remedy will be unduly prolonged (article 56(5) of the African Charter).
- If it is simply illogical to require exhaustion of local remedy.
## Communication procedure

**Registration of communication at the Secretariat of the Commission**
- Submission of communication
- Allocation of file number
- Acknowledgment of communication by the Secretariat

**Seizure of communication by the Commission**
- Secretariat prepares a list and summary of all submitted communications.
- The list and summary is distributed to all Commissioners.
- Approval of communication from not less than seven Commissioners.
- Where the Secretariat does not receive the minimum approval, the communication is presented to the Commission at its next session and it may be by a simple majority approve the communication.

The state party concerned is notified of the communication.

Invitation for comments from state party and author of communication.

Commission makes a decision on admissibility.

If communication is admissible, parties are requested to send their observations on the merits.

If parties are willing, the Commission appoints a rapporteur for amicable resolution of the complaint.

If amicable resolution could not be attained, the Commission decides the communication on the merits.

The Commission makes its final recommendations to the state.

If the Commission has found a violation, the Secretariat sends follow-up letter(s) enquiring about the implementation of the recommendations.

## Provisional measures

Once a communication has been admitted, the Commission may direct the state concerned to take one or more provisional measures pending the finalisation of the communication. Provisional measures are necessary to prevent irreparable damage being done to the victim of an alleged violation. If a state fails to comply with a request by the Commission for the adoption of provisional measures after the period specified, the Commission under rule 118(2) of its 2010 Rules of Procedure may refer the communication to the African Court.
Amicable settlement

The Rules of Procedure of the Commission require it to promote amicable settlement of disputes between parties. Before a settlement is reached, the terms must be acceptable to both parties. The settlement must comply with human rights principles.

Findings/recommendations

If the Commission finds a violation, the Commission may simply declare that the state is in violation. In some cases, the Commission has included in its findings far reaching recommendations. For instance, it may recommend that the state should take necessary measures to comply with the Charter including payment of compensation to the victim(s).

Follow-up on Commission’s recommendations

The 2010 Rules of Procedure of the Commission sets out the following follow-up procedures:

- Once the Activity Report containing the Commission’s decision has been adopted by the AU Assembly, the Secretary of the Commission must notify parties within 30 days that they may disseminate the decision.
- State parties are obliged to notify the Commission in writing within 180 days of the Commission’s decision of all measures taken or being taken to implement the decision.
- Within 90 days of receiving the response of the state party concerned, the Commission may invite the state to submit further information on other measures it has taken.
- Where no response is received in the case of the first 180 days or the subsequent 90 days, the Commission shall send a reminder to the state giving it an additional 90 days within which to respond.
- The rapporteur for the communication has a duty to monitor the measures taken by the state in relation to the Commission’s decision. The rapporteur is required to present a report of its findings to the Commission.
- The Commission may also notify the Executive Council or the Sub-Committee of the Permanent Representatives Committee of situations of non-compliance.
Some landmark decisions of the Commission

• **SERAC v Nigeria (2001) AHRLR 60 (ACHPR 2001)**

In this case, the government of Nigeria through its state-owned oil corporation, Nigeria National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC) and a multinational company, Shell Petroleum Development Corporation, was alleged to have caused severe environmental degradation to the Ogoni people. The land and water sources were contaminated as a result of oil exploration, thereby making farming and fishing (the two principal means of livelihood of the Ogoni) impossible. The complainant also alleged that Nigerian government condoned the violations because despite several petitions, the government failed to ask the oil companies to conduct environmental or social impact studies of its activities.

> ‘Governments have a duty to respect their citizens, not only through appropriate legislation and enforcement, but also by protecting them from damaging acts that may be perpetrated by private parties.’ (SERAC case, para 57)

The communities were also not consulted before the companies began operation. Security forces were unleashed to attack, burn and destroy their villages, homes and farmlands whenever they tried to protest. The complainants alleged that these activities of the Nigerian government violated the rights of the Ogoni people to enjoy the best attainable state of physical and mental health, clean environment, property, natural resources and adequate housing.

> ‘The right to food is inseparably linked to the dignity of human beings and is therefore essential for the enjoyment and fulfilment of such other rights as health, education, work and political participation … The minimum core of the right to food requires that … government should not destroy or contaminate food sources.’ (SERAC case, para 65)

The Commission found the Nigerian government in violation of the Charter. It appealed to the government to stop attacks on Ogoni communities, ensure adequate compensation for victims of the violations and also to undertake appropriate environmental and social impact assessments for future oil development.
• Centre for Minority Rights Development (Kenya) and Minority Rights Group International on behalf of Endorois Welfare Council v Kenya (2009) AHRLR 75 (ACHPR 2009)

In this case, the Kenyan government forcibly removed the Endorois people, an indigenous community, from their ancestral lands around the Lake Bogoria area of Kenya without proper consultation or compensation. As a result, the Endorois people could not access their religious sites located in the Bogoria Lake region. The complainants alleged that this violated the African Charter.

In this ground-breaking decision, the Commission pronounced on the right to development under the African Charter. The Charter is the only international binding human rights instrument to recognize this right. The Commission also elaborated on the rights of indigenous people in Africa.

‘The right to development is a two-pronged test … it is useful as both a means and an end. A violation of either the procedural or substantive element constitutes a violation of the right to development … it is not simply the state providing, for example, housing for individuals or peoples, development is instead about providing people with the ability to choose where to live.’ (Endorois case, paras 277 & 288)

The Commission found that the Endorois culture, religion and traditional way of life are intimately intertwined with their ancestral lands. It found the government of Kenya to be in violation and urged the government to allow the Endorois community unrestricted access to Lake Bogoria and the surrounding sites for religious and cultural rights to pay adequate compensation to the community for all loss suffered, to pay royalties to the Endorois from existing economic activities, and to report to the Commission on implementation of these recommendations.

• Jawara v Gambia (2000) AHRLR 107 (ACHPR)

In this communication, the Commission explored in detail article 56 of the African Charter which lays down the rules for admissibility of communications. The communication was brought by the former president of The Gambia (Sir Dawda Kairaba Jawara) who had been ousted in a military coup. The communication was brought against the military government of
The Gambia and alleged various violations of the African Charter. The communication alleged blatant abuse of power by the respondent state as well as disregard for due process of the law through the respondent state’s indiscriminate and arbitrary arrest, detention and extra-judicial executions of former officials and sympathisers of the complainant’s government. The communication further alleged that the respondent’s state through the introduction of decrees had ousted the jurisdiction of the courts as well as blatantly disregarding the judiciary. The respondent challenged admissibility of the communication on the ground that it did not comply with two of the admissibility criteria under article 56 of the Charter.

In its decision, the Commission stated that it would be futile to exhaust local remedies if conditions make it impossible to exhaust such remedies. In assessing whether an individual has exhausted local reliefs in respect of a violation suffered, three things must be considered which are availability, effectiveness and efficiency of the remedies. The remedy is available if it can be pursued without hindrance, it is effective if there is a prospect of succeeding and it is sufficient if it can redress the grievance adequately. The Commission concluded that the situation in The Gambia at the time prevented exhaustion of local remedies. The Commission further noted that the fact that parts of the communication were based on media report does not render it inadmissible.

Dealing with the merits, the Commission stated that by suspending the Bill of Rights of the Gambian Constitution, the military regime had violated the rights enshrined in the Charter protected under the Constitution. Most importantly, the Commission stated that the military regime through the coup d’état had violated the right of the Gambian people to self-determination by denying them the right to freely choose their government. The Commission found the government in violation and urged it to bring its laws into conformity with the Charter provisions.


In this communication, the Commission addressed among other issues the right to health and treatment of persons with mental
incapability. The communication was brought by the complainants on behalf of patients detained at the Psychiatric Unit of the Royal Victoria Hospital in The Gambia. The communication alleged that the provisions of the Lunatics Detention Act (LDA) was inadequate in that it failed to define who a ‘lunatic’ is and it did not prescribe requirements to guarantee safeguard of rights during diagnosis and detention of patients. The communication further alleged that the conditions of detention were unfavourable and violated the rights of patients. The complainants stated that the system did not provide for any independent examination of administration at the Unit or the facilities available. The Act did not make any provision for legal aid of inmates in addition to the fact that it was silent as to compensation for patients in the event of violation of their rights. The communication also alleged that patients were being denied their rights to vote.

‘Human dignity is an inherent basic right to which all human beings, regardless of their mental capabilities or disabilities as the case may be, are entitled to without discrimination.’ (Purohit case, para 57)

In its decision, the Commission emphasised that human dignity is an inherent right which must be respected at all times irrespective of the mental capability of a person and persons with mental disability have the right to a decent life just like all others. Such persons must not be denied their right to healthcare which is necessary for their survival in society and they should be accorded special treatment to enable them to attain the highest level of health. The state must make provisions to enable persons wrongfully detained and whose rights have been violated to access legal aid and seek redress.

The Commission stated that the right to health is vital for the enjoyment of all other rights and includes the right to access health care facilities and health services without discrimination. The Commission further noted that states have the duty to ensure that mental health patients be accorded with special treatment by virtue of their condition. The state also has an obligation to take ‘concrete and targeted steps’ to ensure the full realisation of the right to health. The Commission found that the government was in violation of the Charter and urged it to repeal the LDA and to provide adequate medical as well as material care for mental health patients.
State reporting

State reporting is one of the means of gauging states compliance with their obligations under the Charter. Article 62 of the Charter requires states to submit periodic report to the Commission. To give effect to that article of the Charter, the Commission in October 1988 adopted a general guideline on the form and content of state reporting. In 1998, more concise Guidelines to Periodic Reporting were also issued.

Article 26 of Women’s Protocol also requires states parties to the Protocol to include in their periodic report to the Commission pursuant to article 62 of the Charter a report on legislative and other measures they have taken to implement the provisions of the Protocol. The report of states parties to both the Charter and the Women’s Protocol must consist of two parts, the first part relating to the Charter and the second to the Protocol. In 2009, the African Commission adopted the Guidelines for Reporting on the Women’s Protocol and in 2010 Guidelines for Reporting on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

State reporting procedure serves as a forum for constructive dialogue. It enables the Commission to monitor implementation of the Charter and identify challenges impeding the realisation of the objects of the Charter. States are able to take stock of their achievements and failures in the light of the Charter.

The Charter requires states to submit two types of report: initial report and periodic report. Initial reports are required to be submitted by states two years after ratification or accession to the Charter. Periodic reports are required to be submitted every two years after the initial report.

Contents of a state report on the African Charter

A state report submitted by a state party to the Charter must address the following:

- Measures taken to give effect to the provisions of the Charter
- Progress made so far
- Challenges affecting the implementation of the Charter and the relevant supplementary instruments
States should also address implementation of the provisions of the Maputo Protocol if ratified in line with the Commission’s guidelines for state reporting under the Maputo Protocol.

Procedure for state reporting

Submission and consideration of state reports pass through the following stages:

- States report to the Secretariat of the African Commission.
- The Secretariat uploads the report on the Commission’s website, indicating when the report will be considered.
- Copies of the report are circulated to commissioners and relevant NGOs.
- Interested stakeholders wishing to contribute to the examination of the report submit their contributions including shadow reports to the Commission’s Secretary at least 60 days prior to the date fixed for the examination of the report.
- The Secretary may invite specific institutions to submit information relating to the Report.
- The Secretariat prepares questions based on report
- Communication of questions to all commissioners.
- The Commission communicates questions to the reporting state (accompanied by a letter requesting the attendance of state’s representatives).
- The Commission examines state report in open session, as scheduled: presentation of report by state representative, questioning by commissioners, answers to questions by state delegation (sometimes supplemented by subsequent written responses), summation and conclusion by the chairperson of the Commission
- The Commission then adopts Concluding Observations (in closed session).

Concluding observations

In 2001, the Commission started to adopt concluding observations after examination of state reports. Concluding observations touch on both positive and negative aspects that have emerged through the examination of the report. The concluding observations specify the steps which the state should adopt to remedy identified shortcomings.
Extracts of the concluding observations on the First Periodic Report of the Republic of South Africa (issued at the 38th session of the Commission in 2005)

‘The African Commission recommends that the Government of South Africa should:

28. Ensure that the provisions of the African Charter are widely known and understood by adults and children alike, in both rural and urban areas.
29. Consider lifting the reservation made on Article 6(d) of the Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa.
38. Inform the African Commission, in its next Periodic Report, of the steps it has taken to address the areas of concern, as well as how it has implemented the recommendations in this Concluding Observations.’

Follow-up

It is the duty of the Commissioners as part of their promotional mandate to ensure follow-up on the recommendations arising from the Concluding Observations. The Commission also transmits to the AU Assembly its Concluding Observations accompanied with copies of states reports submitted to it as well as the reactions of the reporting states to questions posed during the examination of the report.

When the representatives of a given states are unable to provide satisfactory answer in respect of one or more questions posed to them by the Commission during the consideration of their report, the Commission writes a follow up letter to the state concerned requesting additional information in respect of such question(s).

Examination without state representation

In case a state fails to send any representatives, the Commission may after two notifications to the state proceed with the examination of the report and forward its observations to that state.

Non-submission of report

It is the duty of the Secretary to inform the Commission of non-submission of reports by state parties. A reminder is sent to any
state concerned every three months and a list of non-reporting states is usually attached to Commission’s Activity Reports.

**Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and the African Commission**

The Commission has a very robust relationship with NGOs. Article 45(1) of the Charter requires the Commission to cooperate with other African and international institutions concerned with the promotion of and protection of human and peoples’ rights. Since 1988, the Commission has been granting observer status to NGOs. In 1999, the Commission adopted a resolution on the criteria for granting observer status to NGOs. This criteria was subsequently updated in 2016 by virtue of 361: Resolution on the Criteria for Granting and Maintaining Observer Status to Non-Governmental Organisations working on Human and Peoples’ Rights in Africa (see http://www.achpr.org/sessions/59th/resolutions/361/). As of November 2017, a total of 511 NGOs had been granted observer status by the Commission (see http://www.achpr.org/network/).

NGOs play a prominent role in the activities of the Commission. Primarily, they draw the attention of the Commission to violations of the Charter, bring communications on behalf of individuals, monitor states’ compliance with the Charter, and help to increase awareness about the Commission’s activities by organizing conferences and other activities. NGOs participate in the Commission’s public sessions and engage with the reporting procedure by submitting shadow reports and popularising concluding observations. NGOs having observer status with the Commission are required to submit a report of their activities every two years.

NGOs’ engagement with the Commission is coordinated and spearheaded by the NGO Forum, which is held before every session of the Commission to deliberate and produce reports on thematic and regional situations in Africa. The NGO Forum, organised by the Banjul-based African Centre for Democracy and Human Rights Studies, serves as a medium through which NGOs acquaint themselves with the Commission’s activities. The NGO pre-session report is usually considered by the Commissioners during the opening ceremony of the session.
Criteria for granting NGO observer status

To be accorded observer status, an NGO has to meet the following criteria:

(i) The objectives of the NGO must be in consonance with the fundamental principles and objectives of the AU Constitutive the Preamble to the African Charter, and the Maputo Protocol.

(ii) The NGO must be working in the field of human rights.

(iii) Written application to the Secretariat which must be accompanied by:

- Proof of legal existence, list of members, constituent organs, constitutive statutes, and source of funding;
- Declaration of financial resources;
- Latest financial statement;
- Latest annual activity report; and
- A current comprehensive plan of action or strategic plan covering a minimum of two years, and containing its objectives.

National human rights institutions (NHRIs) and the African Commission

NHRIs are statutory bodies established by governments in Africa and charged with the responsibility of promoting and protecting human rights institutions in their respective countries. The establishment and operations of this institution must conform to the UN Principles relating to the Status and Functioning of National Institution for the Protection and Promotion of Human Rights, otherwise called the Paris Principles.

The relationship between the Commission and NHRIs began in 1998 when the Commission adopted the resolution on the Granting of Affiliate Status to NHRIs. The resolution provides for among other the criteria for the grant of affiliate status to NHRIs. The Commission also revised its criteria for granting NHRIs Affiliate Status by virtue of 370: Resolution on the Granting of Affiliate Status to National Human Rights Institutions and specialised human rights institutions in Africa – ACHPR/Res. 370 (LX) 2017 (see http://www.achpr.org/sessions/60th/resolutions/370/).
The African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights

The basis of the relationship between the Commission and NHRI

Criteria for granting of affiliate status

To be granted affiliate status, the prospective NHRI must fulfill the following requirements:

- It shall be duly established by law;
- It shall be a national human rights institution or other specialised human rights institution of a State Party to the African Charter;
- Its independence shall be guaranteed by law;
- It shall have as broad a mandate as possible, capable of promoting, protecting and monitoring human rights through various means;
- It shall be characterised by effective functioning;
- It shall be adequately funded and not subject to financial control;
- It shall be accessible to the general public; and
- It shall be composed of diverse membership representative of the society.

The application must be submitted, at least three months prior to the Ordinary Session, accompanied by the following documents:

- A formal letter of application to the Commission;
- A copy of the law which establishes the applicant national human rights institution or other specialised human rights institution;
- Documentation showing how the applicant institution conforms to the criteria stipulated above;
- A list of the Members of the applicant institution; and
- Information on the sources of funding of the applicant institution.

The application must be submitted, at least three months prior to the Ordinary Session, accompanied by the following documents:

- A formal letter of application to the Commission;
- A copy of the law which establishes the applicant national human rights institution or other specialised human rights institution;
- Documentation showing how the applicant institution conforms to the criteria stipulated above;
- A list of the Members of the applicant institution; and
- Information on the sources of funding of the applicant institution.

The basis of the relationship between the Commission and NHRI is traceable to articles 26 and 45(1)(c) of the African Charter. The granting of affiliate status to NHRI has promoted mutual cooperation between the Commission and NHRI. Although the rights and obligations of affiliated NHRI are similar in some respects to those of NGOs granted observer status, NHRI are also required to assist the Commission in the promotion of the human rights at the country level. For instance, NHRI have encouraged their countries to ratify human rights treaties. They have also played and continue to play a significant role in enhancing the protective and promotional activities of the Commission. Their contributions include raising awareness of the
Commission’s activities. NHRIs affiliated to the Commission are entitled to attend and participate in the Commission’s public sessions. As with NGOs, they are required to submit a report on their activities to the Commission every two years.

As of November 2017, the Commission had granted affiliate status to 23 national human rights institutions. The list of NHRIs affiliated to the Commission is available at: http://www.achpr.org/network/nhri/

**Special mechanisms of the Commission**

Article 46 of the Charter mandates the Commission to employ any appropriate method of investigation in carrying out its responsibilities. A similar inference can also be made from article 45 of the African Charter. Pursuant to these provisions, the Commission has over the years established special mechanisms comprising special rapporteurs and working groups. Special mechanisms investigate human rights violations, research human rights issues and undertake promotional activities through country visits. Their reports form the basis of some of the Commission’s resolutions. Special rapporteurs are appointed from among the members of the Commission, while working groups include members of the Commission but may also include other independent experts.
Special mechanisms under the African human rights system

- Special Rapporteur on Prisoners, Conditions of Detention and Policing in Africa
- Special Rapporteur on Rights of Women
- Working Group on Indigenous Populations/Communities in Africa
- Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression and Access to Information
  - Special Rapporteur on Human Rights Defenders
  - Special Rapporteur on Refugees, Asylum Seekers, Migrants and Internally Displaced Persons
  - Committee for the Prevention of Torture in Africa
  - Working Group on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
- Working Group on Death Penalty and Extra-judicial, Summary of Arbitrary Killings in Africa
- Working Group on Rights of Older Persons and People with Disabilities
- Working Group on Extractive Industries, Environment and Human Rights Violations
- Committee on the Protection of the Rights of People Living with HIV (PLHIV) and Those at Risk, Vulnerable to and Affected by HIV

Challenges of the special mechanism

- The Commissioners double as Special Rapporteurs. This poses a great challenge to how much time they dedicate to their roles as Special Rapporteur which invariably affects their efficiency.
- Resources are insufficient to undertake all required activities.
- State consent is required for visits, but is often not given.
Missions undertaken by the Commission

The primary mandate of the Commission is to enhance the promotion and protection of human rights in Africa and to ensure that member states comply with their obligations undertaken under the Charter. Article 46 of the Charter which requires the Commission to use ‘any appropriate method of investigation’ is the legal basis for missions. Promotional missions are governed by the Commission’s Guidelines for Missions and the Format for Pre-mission Reports. The Commission also draws up terms of reference for each promotional mission.

Two categories of mission have been undertaken by the Commission since its establishment. These are the protective mission and promotional missions. Special Rapporteurs also undertake missions focusing on human rights violations within their mandates.

- **Protective missions (on-site/fact-finding)**
  There are two types of protective mission: on-site mission and fact-finding mission. The on-site mission is usually undertaken to a state against which a number of communications have been submitted. The purpose of such mission usually is to explore avenue for amicable settlement or to investigate specific facts relating to the communications. The Commission may also undertake fact-finding missions whenever there is an allegation of a general nature or widespread reports of human rights violations against a state party. Fact-findings missions do not require any prior communication to have been submitted to the Commission before the mission is undertaken.

  The Commission has conducted a number of protective missions in Africa, particularly states where there have been persistent allegations of gross human rights violations like Sudan and Nigeria. In 1997, the Commission undertook a mission to Nigeria to, among other things assess the situation of the ‘Ogoni 19’ (a group of Niger Deltan activists detained in connection with Ken Saro-Wiwa) who were detained for challenging the environmental degradation and non-development of their region.

  Similarly, in 2004, the Commission undertook a fact-finding mission (as well as an on-site visit) to the Darfur region of Sudan to verify allegations of human rights violations and international crimes, and recommend solutions for addressing the situation.
After days of conducting site visits and interviews, the mission established that ‘there was a pattern of gross human rights abuses’ committed by all parties to the armed conflict including the government, and made its recommendations. Similar missions have been conducted in Mali, Mauritania, Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic and Zimbabwe.

- **Promotional missions**

Promotional visits or missions are undertaken by the commission or its special mechanisms to sensitise states about the role of the African Charter, encourage states which have not ratified the Charter or any other human rights instrument to ratify them or to persuade non-reporting states to comply with their reporting obligations. For the purpose of promotional visits, the 54 state parties to the African Charter are distributed among the Commissioners. The Commission conducted its first promotion mission to Senegal in 1996, following allegations of massive human rights violations at Kaguitt, Casamance that greeted the clash between Senegal’s army and rebels in Casamance. Promotion missions have been conducted in over 36 other African states.

**Obligations of states during a protection mission**

State parties must:

- Refrain from taking reprisal action against persons or entities that furnished the mission with information, testimony or evidence
- Guarantee free movement of members of the mission including any necessary internal authorisation
- Provide the mission with any information or document which the mission considers necessary in order to prepare its report
- Take steps to protect members of the mission.

**Role of civil society**

Civil society facilitates the Commission’s decision to undertake missions by raising concerns on gross human rights violations. They usually accompany the Commission/Commissioners during visits and are known for playing the role of interlocutors.
Resolutions, guidelines and general comments

Article 45 of the Charter empowers the Commission to ‘formulate and lay down principles and rules aimed at solving legal problems relating to human and peoples’ rights.’ Pursuant to this provision, the Commission adopts resolutions to address diverse human rights issues. These resolutions could generally be classified into three: thematic, administrative and country specific resolutions.

Thematic resolutions, guidelines, general comments and model law

A thematic resolution elaborates in greater detail specific human right themes or a particular substantive right covered in the Charter. It defines the states’ obligations in respect of such right and describes the standard set by the Charter. The Commission has passed a number of thematic resolutions, sometimes referred to as guidelines, covering a wide range of themes including death penalty, indigenous peoples, situation of women and children, socio-economic rights, HIV/AIDS, electoral process and good governance, prisons, freedom of association, and fair trial. The Commission has adopted thematic resolutions, general comments on articles of the Maputo Protocol and on the right to life, and a model law on access to information.

**Resolution on the status of women in Africa (adopted in 2005)**
The Commission through this resolution called on member states to: ratify and domesticate the Protocol to the Africa Charter on the Rights of Women in Africa, increase women’s participation in peace keeping operation, implement affirmative actions, and respect their commitments under CEDAW and the Beijing Platform of Action.

Administrative resolution

Administrative resolutions deal with the Commission’s procedures, internal mechanisms and relationship between the Commission and other organs of the AU, intergovernmental organisations, NHRIs and NGOs. Some of the Commission’s administrative resolutions include resolutions on the appointment and mandate of special rapporteurs and working groups, resolutions on the criteria for grant of observer status to NGOs.
and affiliate status to NHRIs, and the resolution on the protection of the name, acronym and logo of the Commission.


This resolution established a formal relationship of cooperation between the Africa Commission and the Committee on the Rights and Welfare of the Child. The resolution emphasised that the protection and promotion of the rights of children especially the girl child in Africa is of vital importance and has further been reiterated by various instruments such as African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child. The resolution also appointed the Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Women in Africa to work with states parties and organisations working on children’s rights in Africa.

**Country-specific resolution**

Country resolutions address pertinent human rights concerns in member states. This genre of resolution has proven very useful whenever there are widespread violations in a member state but no individual has submitted any communications to the Commission in respect of those violations. The Commission has passed specific resolutions to address the human rights situation in Sudan, Uganda, Zimbabwe, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Somalia, Kenya, DRC, Côte d’Ivoire, Comoros, Libya, Tunisia, Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Burundi, Rwanda and many other countries.


This resolution was passed as a result of what the Commission called ‘the deteriorating human rights’ situation in The Gambia. The resolution condemned the unlawful arrests, unfair trials, torture and extrajudicial executions of alleged coup plotters, journalists and human rights defenders.

The Commission called for the immediate release by The Gambian government of all political prisoners and, requested Gambia to investigate the allegations of extra-judicial executions and torture in detention. It also called on the Gambian government to implement the ECOWAS Court judgment of 8 June 2008 dealing with human rights violations in the country.
Successes and challenges of the African Commission

• Interpretative advances
The Commission has interpreted not only the civil and political rights provisions of the Charter but also the more unusual rights contained in the Charter such as the right to protection of language, right to national and international peace and security, protection of family life, right to development, right to existence and self-determination. The Commission through the doctrine of ‘implied rights’ interpreted the right to life and health to include also the right to food. The Commission also implied the right to housing from the right to property and protection of the family.

‘Although the right to housing or shelter is not explicitly provided for under the African Charter, the corollary of the combination of the provisions protecting the right to ... health, the right to property, and the protection accorded to the family forbids wanton destruction of shelter because when housing is destroyed, property, health and family life are adversely affected ... [T]he combined effect of articles 14, 16 and 18 reads into the Charter a right to shelter or housing.’ (SERAC v Nigeria, para 60)

• Advancement of women’s rights
The Commission has taken steps to advance women’s rights in Africa. Aside from its most notable achievement in this respect, the adoption of the Women’s Protocol, it has passed resolutions on the following specific women’s rights issues: the status of Women in Africa (2005); women and girl victims of sexual violence (2007); and maternal mortality in Africa (2008).

The appointment of a Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Women in Africa, in 1998, has contributed significantly to these advancements and the mandate-holder continues to promote implementation of the Women’s Protocol and serve as the Commission’s focal point for the promotion and protection of women’s rights in Africa.

• Robust relationship with NGOs and NHRIs
The Commission has a healthy relationship with NGOs and NHRIs. NGOs make statements and interventions during public
sessions of the Commission and are represented on the working
groups established by the Commission.

• **Promotion of the right of indigenous peoples**

The Commission has been in the fore-front of the promotion of
the rights of indigenous peoples in Africa. The Commission has
made notable pronouncements on indigenous peoples’ rights
prominent among which is the *Endorois* case. The Commission
also established a working group on Indigenous populations and
communities in Africa. The report of the working group has been
adopted by the Commission.

> ‘The African Commission is ... aware that indigenous peoples have, due to past and
ongoing processes, become marginalised in their own country and they need recognition and
protection of their basic human rights and fundamental freedoms.’ (*Endorois* case, para 148)

• **Generous standing rule before the Commission**

Any individual or NGO may bring a communication before the
Commission. The author of the communication does not have to
be the victim of the alleged violation.

> ‘Article 56(1) of the Charter demands that any persons submitting communications to the
Commission relating to human rights must reveal their identity. They do not necessarily have to be
victims of such violations or members of their families.’ (*Malawi African Association v
Mauritania*, para 78)
• The Commission interpreted the ‘claw back clauses’ in the Charter progressively.

‘According to article 9(2) of the Charter, dissemination of opinions may be restricted by law. This does not mean that national law can set aside the right to express and disseminate one’s opinions; this would make the protection of the right to express one’s opinions ineffective. To allow national law to have precedent over the international law of the Charter would defeat the purpose of the rights and freedoms enshrined in the Charter. International human rights standards must always prevail over contradictory national law. Any limitation on the rights of the Charter must be in conformity with the provisions of the Charter.’ (Media Rights Agenda and Others v Nigeria, para 66)

Challenges of the Commission

Commission and Secretariat-related challenges

The time-lag between submission of complaints and final decision by the Commission is lengthy. This affects the impact of its decisions. In spite of the backlog of communications with the Commission, the Commission has not demonstrated much enthusiasm in making referrals to the Court. The Commission also delays in the adoption of reports of Special Rapporteurs. The Commission lacks a follow-up mechanism to monitor compliance of its recommendations.

A prominent challenge facing the Commission is finding a proper balance between the exercise of its promotional and protective mandates.

States-related challenges

Many states lag behind with their obligation to submit state reports under the Charter, thus depriving the Commission of a regular opportunity for reviewing the state’s human rights record. States have generally lacked political will to comply with the recommendations of the Commission.
AU-related challenges

The AU political organs provide insufficient support to the Commission and sometimes stall the work of the Commission for example by preventing the publication of its Activity Reports. There is also a serious lack of coordination between AU organs or bodies with a human rights-related mandate, though the AU is trying to address this through the African Governance Architecture (AGA).
The African Court on Human and Peoples’ Rights

Establishment

The African Court on Human and Peoples’ Rights (African Court) was established through a Protocol to the African Charter. The Protocol on the Establishment of an African Court on Human and Peoples’ Rights was adopted in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, on 9 June 1998 and entered into force on 25 January 2004. The Court was established in order to complement the protective mandate of the Commission. Its decisions are final and binding on state parties to the Protocol.

Composition

The Court consists of 11 judges elected by the AU Assembly from a list of candidates nominated by member states of the AU. The judges are elected in their personal capacity but no two serving judges shall be nationals of the same state. Due consideration is also given to gender and geographical representation. The judges are elected for a period of six years and are eligible for re-election only once. Only the president of the Court holds office on full time basis. The other 10 judges work part-time. The first judges of the Court were sworn in on 1 July 2006. The seat of the Court is Arusha, Tanzania.
States parties to the African Protocol

(The 30 states that have ratified the African Court Protocol are indicated in green and the 7 states that have, in addition to ratifying the Protocol, made a declaration under article 34(6) are indicated in yellow. Rwanda withdrew its declaration in 2016.)

Members

Current judges (November 2017)

President
Sylvain Ore (2010 - ) Côte d'Ivoire

Vice President
Ben Kioko (2012 - ) Kenya

Gérard Niyungeko (2006 - ) Burundi
El Hadji Guissé (2006 - ) Senegal
Rafaa Ben Achour (2014 - ) Tunisia
Solomy Balungi Bossa (2014 - ) Uganda
Angelo Vasco Matusse (2014 - ) Mozambique
Marie Thérèse Mukamulisa (2016 - ) Rwanda
Niyam Ondo Mengue (2016 - ) Cameroon
Tujilane Rose Chizumila (2017 - ) Malawi
Bensaoula Chafika (2017 - ) Algeria
Jurisdiction

Contentious jurisdiction

• Personal
The Court’s jurisdiction applies only to states that have ratified the Court’s Protocol. The Court may entertain cases and disputes concerning the interpretation and application of the African Charter, the Court’s Protocol and any other human rights treaty ratified by the state concerned. The Court is also empowered to promote amicable settlement of cases pending before it. The Court can also interpret its own judgment.

• Material
The Court has jurisdiction over AU human rights treaties, as well as other human rights treaties ratified by the state concerned. In the exercise of such material jurisdiction, the Court’s approach is not watertight. On the one hand, as in the Mtikila case, the Court, having considered the alleged violations under the relevant provisions of the African Charter, does not deem it necessary to consider the application of other treaties (Mtikila v Tanzania, para 123). On the other hand, as seen in the Zongo case, the Court found a violation of the right to freedom of expression under article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).

• Temporal
The temporal jurisdiction of the Court starts at the time the Court’s Protocol entered into force in respect of a particular state except in cases of continuing violations. In Mtikila v Tanzania, the Court found the respondent liable because at the time of the alleged
violation, Tanzania had ratified the African Charter and was duty bound by its provisions. It also held that the barring of independent candidates which was the conduct complained against was a continuous act which subsisted until the coming into force of the Court’s Protocol.

**Access to the Court**

**Indirect access to the Court**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State parties to Protocol</th>
<th>Indirect access (30 states)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFRICAN CHARTER + COURT PROTOCOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic remedies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individuals and NGOs may approach the Court *indirectly*, by first submitting a communication to the African Commission. This applies to all states that have ratified the Court Protocol. The Commission is entitled to submit the case to the Court. If the Commission concluded the case on its merits, finding a violation against a state party to the Protocol, it may refer the case to the Court if the state fails to comply with the Commission’s findings.
Direct access to the Court

NGOs with observer status before the Commission and individuals may submit cases **directly** to the Court, if the state has made a declaration under article 34(6) of the Protocol establishing the Court.

The following entities are also competent to submit cases to the Court: the African Commission, state parties to the Court’s Protocol and African inter-governmental organisations. In its first advisory opinion the African Court decided that the African Children’s Committee did not have standing to bring contentious cases before the Court.

**Relationship between the Court and the Commission**

The relationship between the Court and the Commission is governed by the Protocol establishing the Court. These instruments set out the relationship of the Court with the Commission as follows:

- The Court complements the protective mandate of the Commission.
- The Court may transfer a matter to the Commission of which it is seized.
- The Commission may of its own accord submit a communication to the Court in respect of massive violations of human rights.
- The Commission may at any stage of the consideration of a communication, seize the Court with the examination of a communication.
• The Commission can submit communications to the Court on grounds of failure or unwillingness of a state to comply with its decisions or provisional measures.
• The Court may request the opinion of the Commission when deciding on issues of admissibility.
• The Court can give advisory opinion upon request by the Commission.
• In drawing up its own rules, the Court is required to consult with the Commission as appropriate.

Provisional measures ordered against Libya

In response to numerous allegations of human rights violations in Libya, during early 2011, the African Commission for the first time referred a case to the African Human Rights Court. The Court ordered provisional measures, to which Libya had to respond in 15 days.

‘Whereas, in the opinion of the Court, there is therefore a situation of extreme gravity and urgency, as well as a risk of irreparable harm to persons who are the subject of the application, in particular, in relation to the rights to life and to physical integrity or persons as guaranteed in the Charter ... For these reasons, The Court, unanimously orders [that] Libya must immediately refrain from any action that would result in loss of life or violation of physical integrity of persons, which could be a breach of the provisions of the Charter or of other international human rights instruments to which it is a party.’ (African Commission (Saif Kadhafi) v Libya, paras 22 & 25)

Admissibility criteria for cases brought by individual or NGOs

In respect of cases brought by NGOs and individuals, articles 6 and 34(6) of the Protocol establishing the Court provides for the following admissibility requirements: In addition to the seven admissibility requirements under article 56 of the African Charter, cases brought directly before the Court by individuals and NGOs are admissible only when the state against which the complaint is brought has made a declaration under article 34(6) of the Court’s Protocol accepting the competence of the court to receive such complaints. As of November 2017, and with the withdrawal of Rwanda’s declaration, only Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Ghana, Malawi, Mali, Tanzania and Tunisia have made the
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declaration allowing individuals and NGOs to bring direct complaints before the Court.

Decisions on the merit

The African Court has determined nine cases on the merit since its operation in 2004. The decisions on the merits with the dates of delivery are highlighted below.

The following seven cases were submitted directly to the Court, by individuals or NGOs, against states that have made the article 34(6) declaration:

• *Mtikila v Tanzania* (14 June 2013)
The applicants in this case claimed that certain sections of the Constitution of Tanzania barring independent candidates from running for elective positions violated citizens’ freedom of association, the right against discrimination, and the right to participate in the public and governmental affairs of the country. The Court therefore found that there was a violation of the rights guaranteed under articles 2, 3, 10 and 13(1) of the African Charter.

• *Zongo and Others v Burkina Faso* (28 March 2014)
In the Zongo case, the applicants alleged that the state of Burkina Faso failed to investigate and prosecute those responsible for the death of Nobert Zongo and three others, on account of their journalistic investigations, and that this unduly exposed journalists to the risk of working under fear and intimidation. The African Court found that the state’s failure to investigate and prosecute the culprits constituted a violation of the freedom of expression as well as the right to have a person’s cause to be heard by competent national courts under articles 7 and 9 of the African Charter (read together with article 66(2)(c) of the Revised ECOWAS Treaty).

• *Konaté v Burkina Faso* (5 December 2014)
In the Konaté case, the applicant was prosecuted for defamation under Burkinabé law, sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and ordered to pay a huge fine, damages and costs, following two articles implicating the public prosecutor that he published in the print media. In its judgment, the Court found that the custodial sentence on defamation under the respondent’s criminal laws was a disproportionate interference with the exercise of the applicant’s freedom of expression, and therefore amounted to a
violation of the African Charter, the ICCPR and the Revised ECOWAS Treaty.

• **Thomas v Tanzania** (20 November 2015)
In this case, the applicant was tried and convicted in his absence by the High Court of Tanzania, while he was hospitalised for a chronic ailment. The Court of Appeal confirmed his conviction and his attempt to seek a judicial review proved abortive. The African Court found that the applicant’s right to have his cause heard, which includes that right to defend himself, had been violated.

• **Onyango v Tanzania** (18 March 2016)
In the Onyango case, the applicants claimed that their prolonged detention and delayed trial was a violation of their right to fair hearing within a reasonable time. The Court held that the respondent was in breach of article 7(1)(d) of the African Charter, which guarantees the right to be tried within a reasonable time.

• **Abubakari v Tanzania** (3 June 2016)
The applicant had been convicted of the offence of armed robbery and was serving a thirty year sentence. He claimed that at the time of his arrest and prosecution, he was neither afforded the opportunity and facilities to adequately defend himself. The Court found that the state had violated article 7 of the African Charter. The Court also found that the trial court’s improper consideration of the applicant’s defence that the prosecutor had a conflict of interest with the victim of the alleged offence, his defence of alibi as well as his conviction on the basis of the inconsistent testimony of a lone witness without any identification parade, was equally a violation of article 7 of the Charter.

• **Actions pour la Protection des Droits de l’Homme (APDH) v Côte d’Ivoire** (18 November 2016)
The applicant instituted this case to challenge a law which the Respondent enacted to enable it constitute the Ivorian electoral body in such a way as to favour the government, contrary to the African Democracy Charter, the ECOWAS Democracy Protocol and the rights contained in article 13 of the African Charter. The Court held that both the African Democracy Charter and the ECOWAS Democracy Protocol are human rights instruments within the meaning of article 3 of the African Court Protocol, and that by the nature of the Respondent’s obligations under both treaties, it was required to establish independent and impartial national electoral bodies towards implementing the rights
enshrined in article 13 of the African Charter, the failure of which violated the African Charter.

The Court decided the following two cases on the merits, based on cases submitted to it by the African Commission:

• **African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights (Ogiek) v Kenya (26 May 2017)**

In this case, the Commission approached the African Court to challenge the validity of the Kenyan government’s 30-day eviction notice to the Ogiek community and other settlers inhabiting the Mau Forest in Kenya, on the ground that the eviction notice posed huge threats to the survival of the Ogiek people contrary to the provisions of articles 1, 2, 8, 14, 17(2) and (3), 21 and 22 of the African Charter. The Court unanimously found that there was a violation.

• **African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights (Saif Kadhafi) v Libya (3 June 2016)**

The African Commission, in this case, had brought an action against Libya in respect of a complaint filed before it on behalf of Mr Saif Al-Islam Kadhafi. The application alleged that Mr Kadhafi had been held in prolonged secret detention without a court order, and was tried and subsequently sentenced to death in absentia contrary to articles 6 and 7 of the African Charter. The Court unanimously found that the Respondent had violated articles 6 and 7 of the Charter.
Future of the African Court

The African Court may, some time in the future, evolve into a two-chambered court (with the addition of a section dealing with general inter-state disputes provided for in the Protocol on the Statute of the African Court of Justice and Human Rights) or into a three-chambered court (with the further addition of a section dealing with individual and corporate criminal responsibility for international and transnational crimes, provided for under the Protocol on Amendments to the Protocol on the Statute of the African Court of Justice and Human Rights).

African human rights treaties relating to the Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treaty</th>
<th>Date of adoption</th>
<th>Date in force</th>
<th>No. of ratifying states</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protocol on the Statute of the African Court of Justice and Human Rights</td>
<td>1 July 2008</td>
<td>Not yet in force</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol on Amendments to the Protocol on the Statute of the African Court of Justice and Human Rights (Malabo Protocol)</td>
<td>27 June 2014</td>
<td>Not yet in force</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advisory jurisdiction

The Court may also render advisory opinion on any matter within its jurisdiction. The advisory opinion of the Court may be requested by the AU, member states of the AU, AU organs and any African organisation recognised by the AU. As at 2 November 2017, the Court had determined two advisory opinions on the merits.


The African Committee of Experts requested the advisory opinion of the Court on whether it is an ‘African intergovernmental organisation’ within the tenor of article 5(1)(e) of African Court Protocol such that it could submit cases to the Court. The Court held that although the Committee had standing to request the Court’s advisory opinion under article 4(1) of the Court’s Protocol, it was not an ‘African intergovernmental organization’ within the meaning of article 5(1)(e) of the Protocol. Subsequent to this advisory opinion, the political organs of the AU have embarked on a process to amend the Protocol to allow the Committee access to the Court.

• Request No 001/2013 – Socio Economic Rights and Accountability Project (SERAP)

In this request, SERAP asked the Court to interpret whether it was an African organization recognized by the AU and also determine whether extreme, systematic and widespread poverty is not a violation of article 2 of the African Charter. Declining jurisdiction, the Court held that ‘only African NGOs recognized by the AU as an international organization with its own legal personality’ can request the advisory opinion of the Court. By this decision, African NGOs with observer status with the African Commission or any other AU organ cannot refer cases to the Court until they have been expressly recognized by the African Union Commission (AUC). A memorandum of understanding with the AUC may also constitute the required recognition.

For more information on the Court, visit www.african-court.org
The African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (African Children’s Charter) is an essential standard of the African human rights system. The Charter was inspired by several regional concerns germane to the continent of Africa and which were not covered by the African Charter of 1981. Of particular significance were issues around child trafficking, use of child soldiers in armed conflicts, harmful cultural and traditional practices as well as several other localised anti-human rights practices within the domain of many African countries. These issues, having not been adequately articulated by the African Charter and existing international and regional bill of rights, highlighted the need for a context-driven and context-specific norm for the promotion and protection of the rights and welfare of the African Child.

Also, the African Children’s Charter established the African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (the Committee) within the OAU to promote and protect the rights stipulated in the African Children’s Charter. This guide therefore presents an overview of the African Children’s Charter as well as highlights the activities of the Committee, its working mechanism, achievements as well as its impact on children’s right in Africa.

History of the African Children’s Charter

The African Children’s Charter was adopted on 11 July 1990, nine years after the adoption of the African Charter. The African Charter and other human rights instruments at the time did not elaborate on children’s rights. Rather, reference to children’s rights was only to a limited extent and within the context of women’s rights. For instance, article 18(3) of the African Charter states that ‘[t]he state shall ensure the elimination of every discrimination against women and also ensure the protection of the rights of the woman and the child as stipulated in international declaration and conventions.’ No other provision of
the African Charter specifically addresses the peculiar human rights issues confronting the African child.

The UN led the way for the development of international instruments on the rights of the child. It adopted the 1959 Declaration on the Rights of the Child. African states subsequently adopted the Declaration on the Rights and Welfare of the African Child (the Declaration) in 1979. The Declaration recognized the ‘need to take all appropriate measures to promote and protect the rights and welfare of the African child.’

On 20 November 1989, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) was adopted. The CRC entered into force on 2 September 1990 as the first international treaty articulating the civil, political, social, economic and cultural rights of children. With its 196 state parties as of 21 October 2016, the CRC is the most widely ratified human rights treaty in history. Most African states ratified the CRC at the early stage of its entry into force. The CRC, however, did not address certain African problems such as children living under apartheid, sexual abuse of the girl child, child soldiers, child marriage, child refugees and harmful traditional practices. Consequently, there was a continental demand for a separate regional instrument on children’s right, which would reflect specific African concerns. A Working Group of African experts on the rights and welfare of the child was formed in 1979 to draft the African Children’s Charter.

The African Children’s Charter incorporates the universal values of the CRC while grounding its conceptions within the African cultural context. Specifically, the Charter takes into consideration Africa’s cultural heritage, historical background, and the values of African civilization. The adoption of the African Children’s Charter is in line with the UN’s recognition of regional engagements in the areas of human rights. The UN General Assembly has reiterated in resolution 45/167 that ‘regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights may make a major contribution to the effective enjoyment of human rights.’ As such, the CRC and the African Children’s Charter are not contradictory but rather complementary.

The African Children’s Charter serves as the first regional treaty which applies the CRC within the African context. Since the adoption of the African Children’s Charter in 1990, 48 member
states of the African Union have ratified it (as of 2 November 2017).

Although the African Children’s Charter does not expressly allow state parties to make reservations, some state parties have made reservations objecting to some of the Charter’s provisions.

- **Botswana**: Botswana does not consider that it is bound by the definition of a child provided for in article 2.
- **Egypt**: Egypt does not consider that it is bound by the provisions of article 21(2) pertaining to child marriage, article 24 pertaining to adoption, article 30(a) to (e) pertaining to the special treatment of children of imprisoned mothers, article 44 which permits the Committee to receive communications or complaints, and article 45(1) which allows the Committee to conduct investigations in member states. However, in 2015, the Egyptian President, Abdel Fattah al-Sisi issued a decree that will allow Egypt to withdraw its reservations to articles 21(2), 24, 30(e) and 44 of the Charter. Assuming Egypt decides to act upon the decree by formally withdrawing the reservations on those provisions, the reservations to articles 30(a) to (d) and 44 will still subsist.
- **Mauritania**: Mauritania does not consider that it is bound by article 9 relating to the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion.
- **Sudan**: Sudan does not consider that it is bound by article 10 regarding the protection of privacy, article 11(6) pertaining to the education of children who become pregnant before completing their education, and article 21(2) regarding child marriage.
State parties to the African Children’s Charter

(The states that have become party to the African Children’s Charter are indicated in green.)

Important dates

- **1 July 1990**: Adoption of the African Children’s Charter in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- **13 February 1992**: First ratification of the African Children’s Charter (Seychelles)
- **29 November 1999**: The African Children’s Charter came into force
- **11 July 2001**: First 11 members of the Committee were elected
- **29 April - 2 May 2002**: First ordinary session of the Committee
- **22 March 2011**: First decision of the Committee in the case of the Children of Nubian Descent in Kenya
Unique features of the Charter

The Charter offers better protective standards for children than the CRC in an attempt to address certain African challenges. Some of its unique features are highlighted:

Cultural context

The Charter clarifies in its preamble that African cultural heritage, historical background and the values of the African civilization are reflected in the concept of the rights and welfare of the child.

Definition of a child (article 2)

A child simply means ‘every human being under 18’. Unlike the CRC, there are no limitations, conditions or exceptions to the definition of a child. Rather, the definition helps to widen the beneficiaries of protection to the greatest possible extent.

Best interests of the child (article 4)

The best interest of the child is ‘the’ primary consideration by which to measure all actions, laws and policies affecting children. Differently from the CRC stipulation that the best interest of the child is ‘a’ primary consideration, the African Children’s Charter definitively clarifies the standard of assessment of all issues pertaining the right and welfare of the child.

‘[A]lthough states maintain the sovereign right to regulate nationality, in the African Committee’s view, state discretion must be and is indeed limited by international human rights standards, in this particular case the Charter, as well as customary international law and general principles of law that protects individuals against arbitrary state actions. In particular, states are limited in their discretion to grant nationality by their obligations to guarantee equal protection and to prevent, avoid, and reduce statelessness.’ Children of Nubian Descent in Kenya case, para 48
Protection against harmful social and cultural practices (article 21)

The Charter obliges states to take all necessary measure to eliminate harmful social and cultural practices affecting the dignity, welfare, normal growth and development of the child. The Charter also prohibits child marriage and seeks to specify the minimum age of marriage to be 18 years in domestic legislation.

Child soldiers (article 22)

No child should take a direct part in hostilities or be recruited into the armed forces. The issue of the involvement of children in armed conflict is of grave concern to Africa and the Charter offers stricter standards than other international standards. For example, the Optional Protocol on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict permits the voluntary employment of children between the ages of 16 and 18, but this is not the case under the Charter.

Refugee children (article 23)

A child who is seeking refugee status or who is considered a refugee is entitled to receive appropriate protection and humanitarian assistance. While the CRC makes stipulations on refugee children across the borders, the Charter extends the scope of refugee children to cover internally displaced children (IDP). The causes for IDPs are all-inclusive.

Protection against apartheid and discrimination (article 26)

The highest priority should be attributed to the special needs of children living under discriminatory regimes and those in states
subject to military destabilisation and material assistance should be provided to such children. By explicitly making reference to children affected by racially discriminatory regimes, the Charter directly confronts some of the most relevant issues like inequality and lack of access to quality education affecting children in Africa.

Duties of the child (article 31)

African children are assigned duties to work for the cohesion of the family, to respect their parents, superiors and elders at all times and assist in times of need, to serve the national community through their physical and intellectual abilities, and to preserve and strengthen African cultural values. These responsibilities however are subject to the age and ability of each child.
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Establishment

Subsequent to the entry into force of the Charter on 29 November 1999, the Committee was constituted when its first 11 members were elected on 11 July 2001 during the 37th session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government in Lusaka, Zambia.

Composition

The Committee is a group of individuals of high moral standing, integrity, impartiality and competence in matters concerning the rights and welfare of the child. The members of the Committee are nominated by state parties and elected by the AU Assembly of Heads of States and Government. Previously under article 37(1) of the Charter, the members were elected for a term of five years and could not be re-elected. However, by virtue of AU General Assembly decision (Assembly/AU/Dec.548(XXIV), article 37(1) has been amended and Committee members may now be ‘re-elected only once’. Once elected, the members serve in their personal capacity.

Bureau

The Committee elects from among its members, a Chairperson, three Vice-Chairpersons, a Rapporteur and a Deputy Rapporteur. They are elected for a term of two years and are eligible for re-election.

Secretariat

The Chairperson of the African Union appoints a Secretary for the Committee. The secretariat is responsible for assisting the Committee. Its members serve as intermediary for all communications concerning the Committee and custodian of the archives of the Committee.
Mandate of the Committee

Article 42 of the Charter sets out the mandate of the Committee.

- Promotion and protection of the rights enshrined in the Charter

The Committee collects and documents information, assesses the situation on Africa’s problems in relation to children’s rights, organizes meetings, encourages national and local institutions and, where necessary, gives its views and makes recommendations to government. The Committee formulates corresponding principles and rules, and cooperates with other African, international and regional institutions and organisations.

- Monitoring the implementation and ensuring the protection of the rights enshrined in the Charter.
- Interpretation of the provisions of the Charter at the request of a state party, an institution of the AU or any other person or institution recognised by the AU.
- Performance of other tasks entrusted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government.

Rules of Procedure

The activities and procedures of the Committee are regulated by its Rules of Procedure. The Committee discussed a draft Rules of Procedure at its inaugural meeting from 29 April to 2 May 2002. The document has subsequently been revised, most recently in 2014.

Members of the Committee

Committee members (as at 2 November 2017)

**Chairperson**
Benyam Dawit Mezmur - Ethiopia

**First Vice-Chairperson**
Maria Mapani-Kawimbe - Zambia

**Second Vice-Chairperson**
Joseph Ndayisenga - Burundi

**Third Vice-Chairperson**
Azza Ashmawy - Egypt

**Rapporteur**
Dikere Marie Christine Bocoum - Côte d’Ivoire

**Deputy-Rapporteur**
Goitseone Nanikie Nkwe - Botswana
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Former members of the Committee

Alfas M Chitakunye (2010 - 2015) Zimbabwe
Amal M Al-Hengari (2010 - 2015) Libya
Fatima Delladj-Sebba (2010 - 2015) Algeria
Felicité Muhimpundu (2010 - 2015) Rwanda
Julia Sloth-Nielsen (2010 - 2015) South Africa
Agnès Kabore Ouattara (2007 - 2013) Burkina Faso
Cyprien Adébayo Yanclo (2007 - 2013) Benin
Maryam Uwais (2007 - 2013) Nigeria
Mamosebi T. Pholo (2005 - 2010) Lesotho
Marie Chantal Koffi Appoh (2005 - 2010) Côte d’Ivoire
Martha Koome (2005 - 2010) Kenya
Moussa Sissoko (2005 - 2010) Mali
Assefa Bequele (2003 - 2008) Ethiopia
Jean-Baptiste Zoungrona (2003 - 2008) Burkina Faso
Peter Ebigbo (2003 - 2008) Nigeria
Nakpa Polo (2003 - 2008) Togo
Dior Fall Sow (2001 - 2005) Senegal
Lulu Tshiwula (2001 - 2005) South Africa
Nanitom Motoyam (2001 - 2005) Chad
Rudolph Soh (2001 - 2005) Cameroon
Stratton Nsanzabaanwa (2001 - 2005) Rwanda

Sessions of the Committee

The Committee’s periodic meetings are known as sessions under its Rules of Procedure. Each session is held for a period not exceeding two weeks. The Committee has two types of sessions: ordinary sessions and extraordinary sessions. The Committee held its inaugural meeting on 29 April 2002.

Ordinary session

The Committee holds its ordinary sessions biannually. Ordinary sessions of the Committee are a platform for performing its mandates. At such sessions, the Committee undertakes a number of very important activities, such as:

• convene closed sessions to consider communications, observer status applications, the report of the special
rapporteur, the report of consultant(s), the concept paper on the annual celebration of the day of the African child, elect a new Bureau and other internal matters

- receive presentations from partners such as UN bodies, international and local NGOs, et cetera
- give briefings and updates on specific issues, thematic studies, investigative missions, and outcomes of meetings with other AU bodies
- consideration of state party reports
- presentation of its general comments on the provisions of the African Children’s Charter
- adoption of the Committee’s draft activity report

As of November 2017, the Committee had held 29 ordinary sessions and one extraordinary session.

Extraordinary sessions

Extraordinary sessions of the Committee are convened by the Chairperson if the Committee so decides. When the Committee is not in session, the Chairperson may convene extraordinary sessions of the Committee in consultation with the Bureau. The Chairperson of the Committee can also convene extraordinary sessions:

- At the written request of a simple majority of the members of the Committee;
- At the written request of a state party to the Children’s Charter.

The Committee has had just one extraordinary session, which was held in Addis Ababa from 7 to 11 October 2014 at which it considered the state reports of Ethiopia, Guinea, Kenya, Mozambique and South Africa.

The Committee has to submit to the Assembly of the Union through the Executive Council, every year, its reports on the activities undertaken in the implementation of the Children’s Charter and any other such reports as appropriate.
Ordinary sessions of the Committee since 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Host country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>29 April - 3 May 2002</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>17 - 21 February 2003</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>10 - 14 November 2003</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>24 - 29 May 2004</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>8 - 12 November 2004</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>13 - 17 June 2005</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>19 - 21 December 2005</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>27 November - 1 December 2006</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>29 - 31 May 2007</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>2 - 5 May 2008</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>26 - 28 May 2008</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>3 - 5 November 2008</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>20 - 22 April 2009</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>16 - 19 November 2009</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>15 - 19 March 2010</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>9 - 12 November 2010</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>22 - 25 March 2011</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>27 November - 1 December 2011</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>26 - 30 March 2012</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>12 - 16 November 2012</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>15 - 19 April 2013</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>4 - 8 November 2013</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>9 - 16 April 2014</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th</td>
<td>1 - 6 December 2014</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>20 - 24 April 2015</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th</td>
<td>1 - 19 November 2015</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th</td>
<td>2 - 6 May 2016</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th</td>
<td>21 October - 1 November 2016</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th</td>
<td>2 - 9 May 2017</td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th</td>
<td>6 - 14 December 2017</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraordinary session of the Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraordinary session</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Host country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>7 - 11 October 2014</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ordinary and extraordinary sessions of the Committee can be found at: www.acerwc.org/session-reports/
Communications and decisions

In ensuring that there is protection of children’s rights by member states, the Committee may receive communications (complaints), from any person, group or non-governmental organisation (NGO) recognised by the OAU/AU, a member state, or the United Nations relating to any matter covered by the Charter. Every communication to the Committee must contain the name and address of the author and must be treated in confidence. So far, the Committee has received ten communications against state parties and has given its decision on five of them.

Legal aid

The Committee may, either at the request of the complainant or on its own initiative, facilitate access to free legal assistance to the complainant in the interest of justice and within its available resources. Free legal aid shall only be facilitated where the Committee is convinced that:

- It is essential for the proper discharge of the Committee’s duties, and to ensure equality of the parties before it; and
- The complainant has no sufficient means to meet all or part of the costs involved.

For the purpose of giving practical effect to the legal aid support system, the Statute on the Establishment of Legal Aid Fund for the African Union Human Rights Organs was adopted on 30 January 2016.

Jurisdiction of the Committee

The Committee’s jurisdiction is determined by the child’s age at the time of the alleged violation. When a communication has been initiated by the Committee but is not concluded before the child’s 18th birthday, the Committee retains the jurisdiction to continue to deal with the communication.

Admissibility criteria (section 9(1) of the Revised Communications Guidelines 2014)

For a communication to be admissible it must meet the following requirements:

- The communication is compatible with the provisions of the Constitutive Act of the AU and the African Children’s Charter.
• The communication is not exclusively based on information circulated by the media or is manifestly groundless.
• The communication does not raise matters pending settlement or previously settled by another international body or procedure in accordance with any legal instruments of the AU and principles of the United Nations Charter.
• The communication is submitted after having exhausted available and accessible local remedies, unless it is obvious that this procedure is unduly prolonged or ineffective.
• The communication is presented within a reasonable period after exhaustion of local remedies at the national level.
• The communication does not contain any disparaging or insulting language.

Communication procedure

A communication addressed to the Committee is submitted to the Secretariat which carries out a preliminary review and processes the communication as follows:
• The Secretariat receives the communication, assign a title and number, register it, record the date of receipt of the communication itself and acknowledge receipt to the complainant within 21 days of the date of receipt.
• The Secretary ensures that communications submitted to the Committee meet the requirements of form and content provided under section 2 of the Communications Guidelines.
• Where the communication does not meet the requirements of form and content provided under section II of Communications Guidelines, the Secretariat requests that the complainant or his/her representative comply with the rules and furnish information within 30 days of the request.
• Where the Secretariat has any doubt as to whether the requirements for a communication have been met, it consults the chairperson.
• Where the Secretary is satisfied that the formalities are met, it transmits the communication to the Committee.

Provisional measures

The Committee receives communications which reveal a situation of urgency, serious or massive violations of the African Children’s Charter and the likelihood of irreparable harm to a child or children in violation of the African Children’s Charter. If the Committee considers that one or more of the abovementioned grounds are in the communication, it may, either on its own initiative or at the request of a party to the proceedings, request the state party concerned to adopt provisional measures to
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prevent grave or irreparable harm to the victim or victims of the violations as soon as possible.

**Amicable settlement**

Parties to a communication may settle their dispute amicably any time before the Committee’s decision on the merits. In all cases of an amicable settlement, the terms of settlement reached must be based on respect for the rights and welfare of the child recognized by the African Children’s Charter and other applicable instruments. Any amicable settlement reached outside the auspices of the Committee shall be reported to the Committee which shall conclude the consideration of the communication. The Committee may, having regard to its mandate under the African Children’s Charter, decide to proceed with the consideration of the communication notwithstanding the notice of such amicable settlement.

The Committee recently considered an amicable settlement between the Institute for Human Rights and Development in Africa (IHRDA) and Malawi. The applicant had filed a communication alleging that the provisions of section 23(5) of the Malawian Constitution, which precludes children between the ages of 16 and 18 from the protection afforded by the provisions of article 2 of the African Children’s Charter, violated their children’s rights. While the Committee was yet seized of the matter, the parties requested the Committee to sanction an amicable agreement they had joint negotiated pursuant to article 44 of the Charter and Section XIII of the Revised Communication Guidelines. The Committee adopted the amicable settlement while it remains seized of the matter in accordance with the Charter and the best interest of the child.

**Findings and recommendations**

After the consideration of every communication brought before it, the Committee reaches a finding which may or may not be on the merit. Where the Committee reaches a decision on the merit in respect of a communication, it makes a finding on whether or not there has been a violation of the provisions of the African Children’s Charter. If the Committee finds no violation, it may make no recommendations. However, where there is a finding that one or more provisions of the Charter has been violated, the
Committee issues recommendations to the Respondent state party on measures to be taken in order to fulfill its obligations under the Charter. Although recommendations so issued by the Committee are not binding on the state, they form part of the activity reports submitted to the AU’s Executive Council and the Assembly of Heads of States and Government. Decisions taken by the Executive Council and the Assembly are binding on member states.

A state party to a communication in which the Committee to has found that there has been a violation of any of the articles of the African Children’s Charter must report to the Committee all measures taken to implement the decision of the Committee within 180 days from the date of receipt of the Committee’s decision.

Follow up on the Committee’s recommendations

The Committee appoints a rapporteur for each communication for the purpose of monitoring the implementation of the Committee’s decision by the state party concerned.

Decisions

• Centre for Human Rights (University of Pretoria) and La Rencontre Africaine pour la Defense Des Droits de l’homme (Senegal) v Senegal

In 2012, a Communication was submitted to the Committee in respect of about 100 000 talibés children in Senegal who were sent to Quranic schools known as daaras to receive religious education. It was established that their religious instructors, known as marabouts, force them to beg in the streets and that this practice has existed since the 1980s.

The Committee found that Senegal was in violation of article 11 of the African Children’s Charter due to its failure to provide free and compulsory education to all children - one of the primary reasons that the talibés were sent by their parents to the daaras. According to the decision ‘the government must enforce its own laws to protect talibés from this abuse and ensure that the education received in daaras equips these children with a rounded education and does not allow forced begging’.
• **Institute for Human Rights and Development in Africa (IHRDA) and the Open Society Justice Initiative (on behalf of children of Nubian descent in Kenya) v Kenya**

In this case, the applicants alleged that the Kenyan Government violated the right to a nationality and registration of children with Nubian descent in Kenya. They claimed that during the colonial era, Nubians had been forcibly moved from their homeland in what is today central Sudan and conscripted into the colonial British army in Kenya. It was also claimed that while the Nubians’ request to be returned back to their original abode was rejected by the colonial administration, the British failed to confer British citizenship on them in Kenya before Kenya’s independence. For a long time after independence, the issue of the Nubians’ nationality was never addressed, and since they had no ancestral land in Kenya, they claimed that the Kenya government treated them as ‘aliens’. The resulting issue therefore was that many parents with Nubian descendants in Kenya have difficulty in registering the birth of their children.

The Committee held that ‘there is a strong and direct link between birth registration and nationality. This link is further reinforced by the fact that both rights are provided for in the same Article under the African Children’s Charter’ (para 42). The Committee also held that it was not in the best interest of the child that the state required Nubian children to wait to turn 18 years of age before they could apply for Kenyan citizenship. The Committee found multiple violations of the African Children’s Charter and recommended that the Government of Kenya take all necessary legislative, administrative, and other measures in order to ensure that children of Nubian decent in Kenya, that are otherwise stateless, can acquire a Kenyan nationality and the proof of such a nationality at birth.

• **Michelo Hansungule and Others (on behalf of children in Northern Uganda) v Uganda**

This case relates to the situation of insurrection and instability that prevailed in Northern Uganda for some twenty years between 1986 and 2006. During this time, the government of Uganda had to deal with the activities of the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA), including the abduction of thousands of children.

The Committee found that ‘effective implementation of laws with due diligence is part of States parties obligation under the Charter’ and that by failing to specifically legislate for the
banning of the recruitment of children into the armed forces, Uganda had not complied with its obligations under article 1(1) of the African Children’s Charter. The Committee found that in the period 2001 to 2005, children were conscripted into and used in the Ugandan Defence Force contrary to article 22(2) of the African Children’s Charter, which does not allow for the voluntary recruitment of children into the armed forces of a state.

- Other Communications decided by the Committee: Dalia Lotfy on behalf Ahmed Bassiouny v Egypt; and Dalia Lotfy on behalf Sohaib Emad v Egypt

General comments

Under its interpretive mandate, the Committee has competence to issue authoritative interpretations of the Charter, in order to clarify its meaning and scope, as well as explain the corresponding obligations of state parties under the African Children’s Charter. The Committee exercises this mandate through its sporadic issuance of ‘General Comments’, which are normative tools used by treaty bodies to elaborate on the substantive meaning and scope of treaty provisions, as well as provide a detailed clarification of procedural concerns regarding human rights treaties.

So far, the Committee has issued three general comments:

- General Comment No. 1 (article 30 of the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child) on ‘Children of Incarcerated and imprisoned Parents and Primary Caregivers’ 2013 (GC 1) which deals with children of imprisoned parents. The primary goal of GC 1 is to facilitate understanding of article 30 of the African Children’s Charter and to give practical guidelines on its full implementation. According to the Committee, article 30 applies to not only mothers but also to fathers and primary caregivers who may be foster parents or family members essentially because many children in Africa are orphaned or alienated from their parents but may still require the safeguard enshrined in article 30.

The Committee also produced a short guide to GC 1 to simplify its use and understanding. The short guide can be found at: www.acerwc.org/general-comments/.
• General Comment on article 6 of the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child: ‘Right to birth registration, name and nationality’ (GC 2) deals with the issue of birth registration, name and nationality, and the prevention of statelessness in children

The Committee makes an extensive espousal of the three interlinked rights enshrined in article 6(1), (2) and (3), namely: the right to a name, the right to birth registration, and the right to a nationality. It also clarifies state obligations with regard to the implementation of the right to a nationality (article 6(4)). The purpose of this General Comment is to give the meaning and scope of these rights and explain the corresponding obligations of the state parties to the Charter for their implementation.

This General Comment is addressed to all stakeholders who play a role in the implementation of the African Children’s Charter and especially the rights embedded in article 6. This includes agencies of state parties – parliaments and judiciaries, civil society organisations, academics, legal practitioners, and civil registry authorities. Its main objectives are to explicate principles contained in the rights provided for under article 6 and to give the above stakeholders guidance on its implementation in a practical sense.

• Joint General Comment on article 7(d) of the Maputo Protocol (Child Marriage) issued by the Commission and the African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child at the joint session of both institutions in 2016

State reporting

The reporting process is an avenue for monitoring compliance of states with their children’s rights obligations. Upon ratification of the Children’s Charter, each state party undertakes to submit reports on the measures it has adopted to give effect to the provisions of the Charter and on the progress made in the enjoyment of the rights guaranteed under the Charter (article 43). The process of preparing a report for submission to the Committee offers an important occasion for conducting a comprehensive review of the various measures undertaken to harmonise national law and policy with the Charter and to monitor progress made in the enjoyment of the rights guaranteed in the Charter. Similarly, the process encourages and facilitates popular participation, national self-analysis and public scrutiny of
government policies and programs, private sector practices and generally the practices of all sectors of society towards children.

The Committee is empowered to receive and examine reports submitted by state parties on the measures they have adopted which give effect to the provisions of this Charter and on the progress made in the enjoyment of these rights. Article 43 of the Charter thus require state parties to submit an “Initial Report” within two years of the entry into force of the Charter, and thereafter a “Periodic Report” every three years. A state party which has submitted a comprehensive first report to the Committee does not need to repeat the basic information previously provided in its subsequent reports submitted in accordance with article 43(3). At the moment, only eight state parties have submitted their Periodic Reports to the Committee – Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Kenya, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa and Tanzania, while 37 states out of the 48 state parties have submitted their Initial Reports to the Committee.
Content of reports

In accordance with article 43(2) of the Charter, a state report submitted to the Committee must address the following issues:

- Contain sufficient information on the implementation of the Charter within the state party and indicate factors and difficulties, if any, affecting the fulfillment of the obligations contained in the Charter.
- The information provided by the state party regarding the implementation of each provision should make specific reference to the previous concluding observations and recommendations of the Committee and include details on how the recommendations have been implemented or addressed in practice.
- Where a previous recommendation has not been implemented or addressed, the state party should explain the reason for non-implementation and provide details on how and within what period the recommendation will be complied with.
- The information provided by the state party regarding the implementation of each provision should include statistical information and data disaggregated according to relevant criteria including age, sex, and disability.
- The state party should highlight and comment on important changes that have occurred over the reporting period.
- Statistics should be submitted as a separate annex to the periodic report.

Format of reports

- The report should be presented in a concise and structured manner. A simple and free flowing language should be adopted.
- The periodic report should not exceed 80 pages or 35 000 words. This page and/or word limit do not apply to documents (for example, legal texts) attached to the report.
- It is recommended that the report is accompanied by copies of the relevant provisions of the principal legislative, judicial, administrative and other texts referred to in the report, where these are available in a working language of the African Union.
- The report should indicate the meaning of all abbreviations used in it, especially when referring to laws, national institutions, organizations, et cetera, that are not likely to be readily understood outside the state party.
- The report should be submitted in one of the official languages of the AU.
The state reporting process

The Committee has a simplified process of state reporting, which may be summarised as follows:

- State party submits report to the Committee.
- A Rapporteur is appointed from among Committee members to examine the situation of children’s rights in relations to the state party report.
- Civil society organisations are also invited to submit complementary reports to the Committee, if any.
- A Committee pre-session Working Group is constituted to examine and identify issues for discussion with the State Party during the ordinary session.
- The plenary session (public) is held where the state party orally and summarily presents its already submitted report. Immediately after that, the Committee discusses the report with the State party.
- The Committee produces its Concluding Observations and recommendations which should be implemented by the State Party.

Concluding Observations

At the end of the reporting process, the Committee issues recommendations and observations to the government of the reporting state party on the implementation of the African Children’s Charter. The Committee highlights principal areas of concern in terms of rights in the African Children’s Charter and thereafter makes concluding observations and general comments. The Committee’s observations and recommendations are determined in a closed session.
The African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child


At the conclusion of the review of the Report, the Committee is honored to send to the Government of the Republic of Uganda the following Observations and Recommendations:

Article 2: Definition of child
For a better protection of the child, the Committee recommends to the state party the harmonization of these texts with the definition of the child as stated in the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child.

Article 6: Name and nationality
The Committee recommends the state party to ensure that registration of children at birth is mandatory and free. The Committee also urges the Government to raise the awareness of local authorities and populations about the future consequences of the non-registration of children on the civil status registry.

Article 15: Child labour
The Committee recommends to the state party to carry out a campaign of awareness raising taking into account employers, trade unions, NGOs, parents and other stakeholders on detrimental effects of child labor.

The Committee further recommends to the State party to use the media for information and awareness raising campaigns and to bring its support to institutions and organisations fighting against the phenomenon of child labor.

Article 22: Armed conflicts
The Committee observes that the report does not provide enough data on the status of child soldiers in Uganda. It recommends consequently that more information should be mentioned in the next reports.

Article 28: Drug abuse
The Committee observes that the report does not consider the appropriate measures taken to protect children against the illegal use of drugs and recommends that the situation of abuse of illicit substances and drugs by children as well as the data and arrangements taken to block this scourge be mentioned in the next reports.

• Full texts of the Committee’s Conclusion Observations are available at: http://www.acerwc.org/concluding-observations/
Investigation missions

The framework governing the Committee’s investigation missions is the Guidelines on the Conduct of Investigations. Under the Guidelines, an investigation mission is a mission of a team of the Committee to a state party to the Charter to gather information on the situation of the rights and welfare of the child in the state party (article 1). The Committee has power to receive communications from any person or a group or a state relating to any matter, and resort to any appropriate method of investigating any matter falling within the ambit of the Children’s Charter (articles 44 and 45). Therefore, the Committee may exercise its discretion to investigate a state party where there are reported allegations of violations of children’s rights. Such investigative visits are essential to gaining first-hand knowledge of purported violations and make recommendations to the state concerned.

Upon conclusion of the investigative mission, the Committee compiles a report which is submitted to the Executive Council and adopted by the AU Assembly. The report can only be published after having been adopted by the AU Assembly. The Committee also has a follow-up procedure which requires the state party visited to present a written reply on any measures taken in light of the recommendations made in the mission report.

Aim

The aim of the Committee’s investigation missions is to seek and collect accurate and reliable information on any issue arising from the Charter in order to:

• assess the general situation of the rights of the child in a country;
• clarify the facts and establish the
• responsibility of individuals and the state towards children who are victims of violations and their families, and
• promote and support the implementation of the rights and welfare of the child by the various administrative, legal and legislative institutions of the country, in conformity with the Charter (article 2 of the Guidelines).
Type

According to article 3 of the Guidelines, the Committee may undertake two types of investigative missions:

- investigations on any matter referred to the Committee
- investigations initiated by the Committee

Investigation missions were undertaken by the Committee to:

- **Northern Uganda**
  The Committee carried out an investigation mission to Northern Uganda in August 2005 to assess the situation of children in the conflict in that country. The Committee presented its report to the AU Executive Council, the Permanent Representatives Committee and the Assembly.

- **South Sudan**
  The Committee undertook a field visit to South Sudan from 3 to 9 August 2014, where it had several meetings with government officials, UN agencies, international and local CSOs.

- **Central African Republic**
  Between 15 and 20 December 2014, the Committee was in Central African Republic to appraise itself of the impact of the armed conflict in that country on children. The mission highlighted the strengths as well as resource limitation for the prevention and resolution of the several issues confronting children affected by armed conflicts.

- **Tanzania**
  In August 2015, the Committee conducted an investigation mission on the situation of children with albinism in temporary holding shelters in Tanzania. A local NGO, Under The Same Sun prompted the investigation by drawing the Committee’s attention to the alarming conditions of children with albinism in Tanzania. The Committee published the report of its investigation in March 2016.

Reports of investigation missions by the Committee are available at: http://www.acerwc.org/investigation/missions-reports/
Civil society organisations (CSOs) and the Committee

CSOs support the Committee’s activities. The Committee grants observer status to CSOs. CSOs with observer status and other CSOs working on children’s rights have started to organise CSOs Forums preceding the Committee’s sessions. The first CSO Forum preceding the session of the Committee was held from 17 to 19 April 2009, just before the 13th ordinary session of the Committee held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia from 20 to 22 April 2009.

In assessing state reports, the Committee could obtain complementary information from CSOs which have observer status with the Committee. The Committee examines the objectiveness of state reports with the assistance of complementary reports from CSOs. For this purpose, the Committee has developed guidelines for CSOs to complement state reports.

NHRIs and the Committee

Unlike the African Commission, there is no formal engagement between the Committee and NHRIs. However, there is nothing preventing members of a state’s NHRI from being part of a state party’s delegation to the Committee’s session.

Successes and challenges of the African Children’s Charter and the Committee

The Day of the African Child

The Day of the African Child (DAC) is celebrated on 16 June each year. It was adopted by the Organization of African Unity in 1991 and continued by the AU. The DAC provides an occasion for governments, international institutions, and communities to renew their on-going commitments towards improving the plight of children by organising activities aimed at inclusivity. The DAC was established in memory of over 100 school children who were massacred in Soweto, South Africa by the Apartheid government for demanding their right to quality education and to be taught in their own language on 16 June 1976. The events of every year are organised by the Committee to promote children's rights. The
The 2018 theme for the Day of the African Child is ‘Leave no child behind for Africa’s development.’

Day of the African Child themes since 2002

- **2017** The 2030 Agenda for sustainable development for children in Africa: Accelerating protection, empowerment and equal opportunity
- **2016** Conflict and crisis in Africa: Protecting all children’s rights
- **2015** Eliminating harmful social and cultural practices affecting children: Our collective responsibility
- **2014** A child-friendly, quality, free and compulsory education for all children in Africa
- **2013** Eliminating harmful social and cultural practices affecting children: Our collective responsibility
- **2012** The rights of children with disabilities: The duty to protect, respect, promote and fulfil
- **2011** All together for children on the street
- **2010** Planning and budgeting for the wellbeing of the child: A collective responsibility
- **2009** Africa fit for Children: Call for accelerated action towards their survival
- **2008** Right to participate: Let children be seen and heard
- **2007** Combatting child trafficking
- **2006** Right to protection: Stop violence against children
- **2005** An African orphan – Our collective responsibility
- **2004** The African child and the family
- **2003** Right to registration at birth
- **2002** Popularisation of the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child
Strengthening institutional structures

The Committee has also continuously worked on strengthening its institutional structures. Working with a small Secretariat, the Committee has been able to develop its:

- Rules of Procedure (2003), which are currently being revised;
- Guidelines for Initial Reports of States Parties (2003);
- Guidelines for the Consideration of Communications provided for in article 44 of the Charter (2014);
- Guidelines for the Conduct of Investigations by the Committee (2006); and
- Guidelines for the Criteria for Granting Observer Status in the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Associations (2006).

The impact of the African Children’s Charter on domestic human rights in Africa

Definition of a child

Some of the law reform efforts in Africa reflect the impact of the African Children’s Charter on standard-setting exercises at the national level. The constitutions of South Africa and the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Child’s Rights Act of Nigeria and that of Kenya all follow the Children’s Charter’s definition of a child.

The best interests of the child

Some African countries have taken on board ‘the primary consideration’ phrasing of the principle, for instance, the Constitution of Ethiopia, the Child’s Rights Act of Nigeria, and the Children’s Protection and Welfare Act of Lesotho. In addition, even though Somaliland is not a party to the Children’s Charter, its Juvenile Justice Law 2007 also echoes the same principle with similar wording.

Harmful cultural practices

Some countries of Africa have proscribed harmful traditional practices which included female genital mutilation. For instance, the Children’s Act of South Africa and that of Kenya, and the Constitution of Uganda and DRC. Madagascar passed the Law
on Marriages Act to provide for legislation proscribing early marriage, as well as Kenya, and the Constitution of DRC.

The duties of the child

There are instances of legislation that incorporate the duties of children. The South African Children’s Act in article 16, entrenched that ‘every child has responsibilities appropriate to the child’s age and ability towards his or her family, community and the state’. Article 40 of the Constitution of the DRC similarly provides that ‘children have a duty to assist their parents’, and article 16 of the Constitution of Guinea conveys the same message.
List of abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACHPR</td>
<td>African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHRLR</td>
<td>African Human Rights Law Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHSG</td>
<td>Assembly of Heads of State and Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>acquired immune deficiency syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>Coalition for African Lesbians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
<td>Economic Community of West African States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGM</td>
<td>female genital mutilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>internally displaced persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDA</td>
<td>Lunatic Detention Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTI</td>
<td>lesbian gay bisexual transgender and intersex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>non-governmental organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHRI</td>
<td>national human rights institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAU</td>
<td>Organisation of African Unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLHIV</td>
<td>persons living with HIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC</td>
<td>Southern Africa Development Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERAC</td>
<td>Social and Economic Rights Action Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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