

RAOUL WALLENBERG INSTITUTE

OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND HUMANITARIAN LAW

ROUNDTABLE REPORT

A Swedish National Human Rights Institution: Exploring Models and Options

**Organised by the Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and
Humanitarian Law, in Lund, June 2, 2016**

CONTENTS

1. Background and objective

2. Roundtable discussions:

- a) Opening**
- b) An Exploration of Different NHRI Models**
- c) Why Do We Need a National Human Rights Institution in Sweden?**
- d) Quasi-Jurisdictional Competence: The Individual
Complaints Handling Mandate of NHRIs**
- e) The Way Forward for Sweden**

Appendix 1: List of Participants

Appendix 2: Agenda

1. Background and objective

In January 2015, after Sweden's human rights performance had been examined through the Universal Periodic Review (UPR), the Human Rights Council of the UN recommended that Sweden establish an independent national human rights institution (NHRI).

In June 2015, the Swedish government accepted this recommendation and announced that it would initiate the work of establishing such an institution. As a response to the announcement, various human rights organizations in Sweden formed a network in order to discuss what a Swedish NHRI could look like.

The Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (RWI) was part of that network. In June 2016, members of the network and other relevant actors were invited to RWI in Lund to take part in a roundtable discussion on the future role and institutional set-up of a Swedish NHRI.

The objective of the roundtable was to explore different models and options available for the establishment of a Swedish NHRI. The topics of discussion were:

- ▶ An exploration of different NHRI models
- ▶ Why do we need a National Human Rights Institution in Sweden?
- ▶ Quasi- Jurisdictional Competence: the Individual complaints handling mandate of NHRIs
- ▶ The Way Forward for Sweden

The participants in the workshop consisted of representatives from the Finnish NHRI, representatives from the municipality of Malmö and Lund, representatives from Swedish civil society organizations, and experts from RWI.

2. Roundtable discussions

a) Opening

The Director of RWI, Morten Kjaerum, provided the welcome remarks where he expressed the hope that the establishment of a national human rights institution for Sweden would materialize. More and more countries in the European Union have established national institutions and Sweden with its high human rights profile should be part of that group of countries in Europe. Kjaerum said it would be important to create an efficient institution and not to be satisfied with a minimalistic model. While admitting that it was easier to start a NHRI back in the early 1990s when no one had a clear picture of what such an institution would look like, the fact that more NHRIs are in existence now, he argued, could be used as an advantage whereby one could learn from the best practices from NHRIs already in place and build upon those strong foundations.

Kjaerum also emphasized that the crux of the discussion lies not only in determining which model is most appropriate but also that any future Swedish institution is in line with the Paris Principles¹.

He also drew the attention to interesting findings from the EU Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA). It conducted a survey to see how many people knew about NHRIs and whether victims of human rights violations knew about them and how to access them. It was found that almost 80% did not know and, furthermore, many could not even mention a single institution which they thought could assist them. This was the case for almost all countries in Europe with the exception of France and Finland.

It was found that the French institutions and equality bodies were well known mainly because they present at the municipalities. The local presence is thus seen as important in order to make human rights protection accessible.

The Head of the NHRI Unit at RWI, Nieves Molina Clemente, provided the introduction to the roundtable. When talking about NHRIs, she reminded the participants that one should bear in mind the elements, competencies, tasks and think about what such an institution should look like. The primary questions to ask is “What are the needs today?” and to identify the current institutional gaps that exist which fail to address these needs. Clemente also stressed that the promotion and protection of human is still highly relevant in Europe.

b) An Exploration of Different NHRI Models

During this session, three models of NHRIs in the Nordic context were presented: the Finnish, the Danish, and the Swedish system of Ombudsman institutions.

► The Finnish Model

Sirpa Rautio, the Head of the National Human Rights Center in Finland, provided a background for the establishment of the NHRI in Finland. The initial discussions took 12 years, from 2000 to 2011, where a few models were considered and discussed. There existed then an implicit understanding that the Parliamentary Ombudsman in Finland was the right actor to be the NHRI, but the analysis also showed that some elements were missing. First, the Ombudsman did not do analytical work and that there was no plurality in its composition. Second, there was no monitoring, human rights education or outreach work. Finally, the Ombudsman did not deal with treaty reporting nor liaising with European networks.

It was eventually decided that, a new body called the Human Rights Center (HRC) would address these gaps. Its enabling law was enacted in 2011 in order to complement the existing mandate of the Ombudsman. Its offices however, would be administratively connected. In 2012 the Finnish National Human Rights Institution was established by law and consists of the Parliamentary Ombudsman, the Human Rights Center, and a Human Rights Delegation.

¹ The Paris Principles (“Principles Relating to the Status of National Human Rights Institutions”) define the minimum standards required by national human rights institutions to be considered credible and to operate effectively. They were developed at a UN meeting in Paris in 1991, which brought together representatives of national human rights institutions from all over the world to define the core attributes that all new or existing institutions should possess.

The connection envisaged between the Ombudsman and the HRC was mainly administrative, however, in reality there is also quite a bit of substantive co-operation and synergies that have been identified. During its initial phase, the Center has learnt from different actors in the region, for example the United Kingdom, where the UK Equality and Human Rights Commission has developed a Human Rights Measurement Framework.

The Center now consists of six staff members, of which four are permanent and is focused on the human rights promotion element through human rights training and information sharing with the public. It has no complaints handling mandate. The latter remains the role of the Ombudsman. However, in June 2016, the Center was also given the additional mandate of being the monitoring body for the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities together with the Parliamentary Ombudsman. This is the first joint task given by law to the Finnish NHRI. It also liaises and cooperates with human rights actors in Europe, mainly ENNHRI the European network of NHRIs, the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights and the Council of Europe.

The Human Rights Delegation consists of 20-40 representatives from academia, civil society organizations, and other supervisory organs such as Ombudsmen, Equality bodies. The Delegation is appointed by the Parliamentary Ombudsman. The task of the Delegation is to be a national coordinating body for the actors within the area of human rights.

With the establishment of the Center alongside the existence of the Ombudsman and the Human Rights Delegation, the human rights landscape in Finland has seen an improved level of cooperation and coordination. All these bodies now existed to complement each other and were all brought together under the same umbrella within the Human Rights Delegation. Some challenges do exist as the Ombudsman is 95 years old and is very well known compared to the newer institutions such as the Center and the Delegation. There is a lack of NHRI identity as such – a problem caused by the composite structure and nature of the Finnish NHRI.

After the presentation a discussion and Q & A followed. These were the main issues brought up:

- ▶ It was explained that the Human Rights Delegation is a pluralistic body that consists of civil society actors, research institutes, the equality ombudswoman and all other official supervisory bodies. The delegation now consists of 40 people.
- ▶ Ideally, Rautio said, the Human Rights Center should have more staff members, consisting of different skillsets instead of just lawyers as is the case now.
- ▶ The Center works well together with the Ombudsman. Both offices share premises and have one weekly joint meeting to keep each other updated. However, key differences do exist. The Center's work concentrates more on political and policy work while the Ombudsman mainly handles complaints, upwards of 5,000 a year and carries out inspections.
- ▶ It was highlighted that the Finnish ombudsman office is quite similar to the Swedish ombudsman. Both are traditional ombudsman offices. However, when talking about human rights, there is a significant difference between the ▶

institutions. The Swedish ombudsman office does not have a broad mandate contrary to the Finnish. This directly enables the Finnish ombudsman to monitor human rights.

- ▶ On the issue of compensation of victims of rights violations, it was clarified that compensation is sometimes recommended, depending on the case at hand.
- ▶ Regarding cooperation between the Center/Ombudsman with the judiciary, it was explained that the Ombudsman is careful not to intervene in judicial procedures. It is only done in the rare situations where it is deemed that the judiciary has overstepped its authority as one has to be careful respecting jurisdictions.
- ▶ The Center occasionally conducts training of judges and police through the lead ministries. In the Finnish National Human Rights Action Plan, training of civil servants is also one of the main focus areas which the Center contributes to.

▶ ***The Danish Model***

Morten Kjaerum, current Director of RWI and former Director of the Danish Institute of Human Rights (DIHR), explained that the Danish Institute for Human Rights (DIHR) initially started out as a research and outreach institution. It was after the Vienna Conference in 1993 that the DIHR was redefined to be a NHRI. The management board is comprised of Danish universities, civil society and parliamentarians, with the pluralistic participation through an advisory board.

The DIHR did not start out with a complaints mechanism. Instead, they were tasked to comment on draft legislations for human rights compliance. The various ministries appreciated this as it heightened the human rights compliance in legislation. The DIHR nowadays deal with complaints handling as well as equality and non-discrimination issues.

▶ ***The Swedish Ombudsman Institutions***

Annika J. Åkerberg, human rights lawyer at Civil Rights Defenders, provided an overview of the three ombudsman institutions currently in existence in Sweden with both a direct or indirect human rights promotion and protection mandate: Equality Ombudsman, the Parliamentary Ombudsman and the Children's Ombudsman.

▶ ***The Equality Ombudsperson (EO)***

The EO reports annually to the government. It does not work with discrimination in the general sense. Instead, its mandate is only limited to what is prescribed within the Non-Discrimination Act and the Parental Leave Act. The Ombudsperson's main task is to observe and identify discrimination, including structural discrimination and to educate society on these aspects. Its role is thus not to promote access to human rights as such, but to prevent discriminatory practices covered under the related legislations. Investigations are sometimes conducted against both public and private actors, including employers. A person who feels that he/she has been discriminated against has a right to make an individual complaint. In reality, few cases are brought to court by the Ombudsperson. This is one of the reasons why some see the Ombudsperson as an inefficient institution. Additionally, the Ombudsperson can also prepare legislative input and give feedback to the government.

► **The Parliamentary Ombudsperson (PO)**

The PO on the other hand has a role to monitor public actors and to ensure that public service staff are following the law. He/ She is appointed by the parliament and is independent from the government apparatus. The mandate is not to promote human rights as such. The Parliamentary Ombudsperson can make investigations, decisions and criticize wrongdoing.

It has been the case that authorities that were found to have overstepped their powers would pay attention to the findings of the Ombudsperson and make the necessary changes. Even though the Ombudsperson is not in a position to provide or recommend compensation, it nonetheless has an impact on changing the practices of public authorities. Public authorities are also legally required to provide information to the Ombudsperson when requested. Additionally, the Ombudsperson acts as the Optional Protocol on the Convention on the Elimination of Torture (OPCAT) investigator, which means that they are able to visit detention institutions and facilities to ensure that detainees are not subjected to torture, cruel or inhuman and degrading treatment. While this mandate is important, there is as yet no systematic review system to check on whether observations and recommendations by the Ombudsperson is indeed carried out by the authorities. This must be improved.

► **The Children's Ombudsperson (CO)**

The CO's work is much more guided by the UN Conventions compared to the other institutions. The Ombudsperson monitors the full implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and has the legal right to ask for information from all public actors in Sweden. The CO also regularly conducts surveys with children and invites them to provide their opinions and solutions on various issues. The Ombudsperson then reports back to the government and provides proposals for actions and legislations based on the views of the child. The CO does not have other legal powers as such but the Ombudsperson has been recognized as an institution that is efficient at collecting information and data on children.

c) Why Do We Need a National Human Rights Institution in Sweden?

This session dealt with the particular needs in Sweden for establishing a NHRI. The intention was to ground the discussion in concrete Swedish experiences and examples of human rights issues that the existing Swedish institutions are not protecting well enough. The starting point for the discussion was a presentation made by Johanna Sjöwall from Malmö municipality, about the human rights situation in the city of Malmö and on the municipal level. The presentation was followed by a discussion among participants.

Sjöwall pointed out that in general there is a noticeable difference in capacity between different municipalities in dealing with human rights issues, which creates an unevenness in terms of protection, promotion and respect for human rights on the local level. There is also a lack of clarity on the roles and mandates assigned to different institutions and bodies working with human rights issues, which creates less efficiency and weaker implementation. This also leads to confusion and lack of understanding among civil servants regarding which human rights issues should be dealt with directly by the state and which should be dealt with on a municipal level.

There is a need for education among local civil servants, politicians and the general public, as well as increased diversity and inclusion in public Swedish institutions. The City of Malmö has actively worked for increased awareness and enhanced knowledge among key actors

to encounter all forms of discrimination for several years. Even if Sweden and Malmö can be said to have advanced significantly in the area of discrimination on the basis of gender, there is less progress to deal with other discrimination grounds (f ex ethnicity, race, and religion). There is a need for greater clarity and stronger institutional capacity when it comes to accountability and protection of rights in Sweden. This applies not least to issues related to discrimination and hate crime on the basis of ethnicity and race.

Key points raised during the discussion that followed:

- ▶ There is a difference between Swedish foreign policy and what is done nationally; human rights are less prioritized in domestic policies and institutions.
- ▶ The lack of clarity regarding what institution to turn to when your rights have been violated leads to a situation where victims do not know where to turn to for redress. As it is today the expectations of being heard and redressed will depend on what entity will handle the case.
- ▶ There is a general need for human rights education in Swedish society.
- ▶ Even if there might be public institutions/CSOs where there is knowledge of a particular human rights instrument, there is little knowledge of how this instrument relates to and work together with other human rights instruments.
- ▶ There is a lack of quality data and statistics on race and ethnicity, making it difficult to deal with issues of discrimination on these grounds.
- ▶ The area of economic, social and cultural rights is a huge problem because they are generally not properly understood as human rights in Sweden.
- ▶ Digital data is often used by public authorities without taking into consideration issues of accessibility for everyone, leading to exclusion.
- ▶ There is a danger of certain groups not being sufficiently protected today since it is not clear what institution/body has the responsibility to guarantee that their rights are not violated, as for instance in the case of EU migrants and refugees that are unaccompanied minors.

Key points made regarding how an NHRI could play a role to solve these issues:

- ▶ Coordinate institutions and organizations in the fragmented human rights landscape that exists in Sweden today, in order to guarantee that there are no “gaps” in terms of protecting and implementing human rights.
- ▶ Be the focal point for human rights in Sweden and set a common standard for municipalities on how to work with human rights.
- ▶ Be a co-sponsor in collecting important data that is currently missing in official Swedish statistics, for instance on ethnicity, race, and disability.
- ▶ Bring a human rights-based approach to the activities of government in order to guarantee that all governmental work is analyzed through the lens of human rights principles and obligations.
- ▶ Carry out public education on human rights.
- ▶ Take a unified and more holistic approach to structural and systemic human rights problems.
- ▶ Take up sensitive human rights issues due to its independent nature and neutral position between the State, CSOs and other actors.
- ▶ Carry out strategic litigation to achieve broader systemic change in the area of human rights.
- ▶ Make human rights a reality on the ground and local level in Sweden.

For a NHRI to play this role it must also be relevant, accountable, legitimate and efficient. This implies having strong political support, economic and administrative resources, and a diverse and plural composition.

d) Quasi-Jurisdictional Competence: The Individual Complaints Handling Mandate of NHRIs

The NHRIs’ investigative function constitutes the core element of their protection mandate. One way of initiating an investigation on situations of human rights violations is by accepting individual complaints². Whether or not a NHRI has an individual complaints handling mechanism depends on its enabling law, and thus varies. This session has as its objective to explore what an effective complaints handling strategy could look like in the Swedish context.

² The protection mandate also includes investigations, alternative dispute resolution and conflict resolution (at both the individual and community levels), public inquiries and monitoring.

► **Complaints handling under the Finnish Model**

The session was initiated by a presentation by Ms. Riitta Länsisyrjä, Principal Legal Adviser at the Finnish Ombudsman, who explained the main characteristics of the Finnish model for complaints handling.

Any private individual or body can complain to the Ombudsman about unlawful actions regardless of nationality. The complaint must be done within two years of the event in question, it is free of charge, and must be done in writing but without requirements as to format. In 2016 the Finnish ombudsman received 4,919 complaints. The three most common categories of cases were: social security, Police, and healthcare. The Ombudsman investigates a complaint if: a) it is within Ombudsman's scope of powers b) gives rise to a suspicion of unlawful conduct or neglect of duty by an official c) an investigation is warranted for some other reason.

The measures taken as a response to the complaint are evaluated from the perspective of compliance with the law, legal remedies, and implementation of fundamental and human rights. The complaints handling procedure consists of the following: written proceedings (obtaining preliminary information/documents; request for reply and/or superior's statement, complainant's reply), drafting by office's lawyers, written/oral discussions between the lawyer and the (deputy) ombudsman. The investigation of a complaint may lead to: prosecution, reprimand, opinion, recommendation, or rectification.

The ombudsman can also take its own initiative to investigate issues. Around 115 such initiatives to investigate were taken by the ombudsman in 2016. These initiatives are often highlighted in the media or arising in the course of on-site inspections. They usually concern a more general type of fault or shortcoming. They are investigated in the same way as complaints and may lead to the same measures.

In the discussion and Q & A that followed several important issues were brought up:

- It was explained how the Ombudsman chooses its cases, and Länsisyrjä underlined that it is important to remember the reason for the breach of the law: if there is no human rights violation it is not necessary that the NHRI should take on the case. The NHRI can also choose the most severe or important cases from a human rights perspective, in order for the impact of the individual complaint to be as profound as possible.
- With regard to the follow-up process in relation to a complaint, it was clarified that there is an established form for follow-up in Finland. The NHRI demands the authority in question to show what they have done when they have been recommended to carry out corrections or amendments. Generally this has proven to have good results. Länsisyrjä emphasized that there is a need for systematic follow-up to complaints handling for it to be effective.
- As a response to the issue if it was possible to use both the judiciary and the ombudsman as avenues for filing a complaint, the recommendation from the ombudsman is to primarily use the court system. In general, more leeway is given to the courts and their discretion, in order to guarantee independence.

- ▶ Clarifications were also made regarding the issue of compensation, which is fairly new in Finland. The Finnish Supreme Court has handed down a judgement where it has been said that compensation is possible also where there is a violation of human rights. The Ombudsman gives a recommendation of compensation but no specification of sum. Usually there will be compensation, but the Ombudsman doesn't have capacity to say how the compensation should be given.
- ▶ Not all cases can succeed. For instance, anonymous complaints cannot be used. But the Ombudsman can take such complaints on as its own initiative. Länsisyrjä stressed that the Ombudsman does not leave anything unattended, it always tries to follow-up.
- ▶ When discussing how good results are guaranteed, it was stated that the follow-up of how recommendations from the Ombudsman are followed will show whether results have been reached or not. And the Ombudsman noted that the follow-up processes show that the results are very good. The annual report of the Ombudsman also lists the worst violations in order to give publicity to them, as well as listing outstanding issues.
- ▶ On the issue of visibility of the Ombudsman, it was noted that with increased visibility of the work of the ombudsman/NHRI, more complaints are also received. Media coverage was considered as quite good but almost always tend to concentrate on a few similar cases of interest. But the Ombudsman also noted that the more press releases are given about their work, the more complaints they receive.

▶ ***Complaints handling and the Commission Model in Southeast Asia***

This part of the session was led by Ms. Sue Anne Teo, Programme Officer at RWI, who explained that a commission consists of persons of high human rights standing within society who typically have oversight responsibilities over a section or division. With regard to specific complaints handling mandates, the competence of the commission is specified in its founding law or the constitution and is further elaborated through rules of procedures.

The procedures for complaints handling can briefly be summarized as follows:

Once a complaint is received, there needs to be a preliminary identification of whether there is a human rights issue. In the initial days of NHRIs, there was confusion on what can be considered a human rights violation, and a lot of private grievances were brought to the commissions. A complaint will not be considered if it is made in bad faith, if there is a more suitable avenue, or if it is not a human rights issue, and if it is not within the NHRIs competence.

If a decision is taken to go ahead and investigate the case, the NHRI starts by writing to the authority or party alleged to have violated those rights. Under the law, these parties are given a limited amount of time to respond, for example in Myanmar, it is 30 days. The level of compliance with this varies, and it is generally poor, especially in the early days of the NHRI.

The investigation into a case can also involve visiting places of confinement, such as prisons and detention centers or places where the alleged violation took place, and compelling the production of documents deemed essential to the case.

Once it has been determined that a violation has occurred, a series of recommendations will be issued by the commission. Sometimes this will take the form of compensation and compelling specific action, for example, reinstatement of position if someone was unfairly dismissed. However these are recommendations, and usually they will contain the finding and remedy.

Statistics from all cases handled by the Commission within a year are compiled in the annual report and sent to parliament to be tabled and or debated. Those cases that were investigated as part of a systematic violation will also be reported to parliament.

Teo also pointed out some specific aspects to a Commission's complaints mandate:

- 1. A Commission cannot investigate cases that are before the courts or that have been decided on by a court of law.**
- 2. A Commission usually does not have any enforcement powers, they are only recommendatory. As such, a commission cannot compel parties to carry out or stop acts. However, findings by the commission carry a lot of moral weight. It also draws upon the media to encourage public pressure on government authorities to act in certain cases.**
- 3. Under a commission's protection mandate, it can also initiate cases on their own - not only responding to specific complaints. This especially concerns systematic violations involving a large or identified section of the population (for example the issue of access to public transportation for disabled persons) and the intervention could take the form of public inquiry or a larger national inquiry. A commission can also detect trends in human rights violations from its outreach work, or complaints received so instead of handling complaints on a case by case basis, it can address systemic violations through an inquiry.**

The discussion about the Commission Model in South East Asia can be summed up in a number of benefits and disadvantages:

Benefits:

1. A commission is a one-stop shop for issues concerning human rights violations. There is no need to approach different agencies or bodies, which leads to less confusion for the persons that have had their rights violated.
2. A commission is not adversarial like a court, it is less accusatory and the point is getting to the bottom of whether a rights violation has occurred. To resolve complaints the commission sends letters to authorities concerned, or could also undergo a conciliation or mediation procedure where parties are brought to the table with the commission acting as the mediator. When done this way, the level of compliance is higher; both parties have to buy into the process. However, not all cases are suitable for this procedure.
3. A decision by the commission carries a lot of moral weight and media picks up on it. This type of soft pressure adds up into political pressure.

4. When a large scale inquiry is held, it motivates authorities to address the problem, especially when media attention is on the matter.

Disadvantages:

1. The commission does not have any enforcement powers, and cannot compel action.
2. Commission reports that are tabled in parliament might not be debated, let alone lead to action by the authorities
3. Soft diplomacy's effect of change is slow, individuals concerned get frustrated. Moral weight is not the equivalent of legal weight which compels action.
4. Arrogance by authorities, especially in countries without a strong human rights culture, but even for those countries who think they know all about human rights

e) The Way Forward for Sweden

Molina Clemente chaired this session. She noted that there are many options for a Swedish NHRI in terms of different models. At the end of the day, a NHRI needs to be efficient and has the capacity to address issues that are systemic within the society, but also address individual rights violations. It should also have the capacity to educate the public, civil servants and politicians and have dialogues with civil society. The NHRI must also meet the structural demands of the Paris Principles and create a real impact in order to make changes on the ground.

Appendix 1: List of participants

Mia Ahlgren, Policy Officer, Handikappsförbunden
Sara Bäckström, Lawyer, Riksförbundet För Sexuell Upplysning (RFSU)
Martha Davis, Affiliated Professor, Raoul Wallenberg Institute
Wilson De los Reyes, Lawyer, RFSU
David Eile, Programme Officer, Raoul Wallenberg Institute
Mark Gibney, Affiliated Professor, Raoul Wallenberg Institute
Emily Hanna, Programme Officer, Raoul Wallenberg Institute
Mikael Johansson, Senior Policy Adviser, Raoul Wallenberg Institute
Annika Jyrwall Åkerberg, Human Rights Lawyer, Civil Rights Defenders
Oliwer Karlsson, Youth Representative, Lund Municipality
Morten Kjaerum, Director, Raoul Wallenberg Institute
Riitta Länsisyrjä, Principal Legal Adviser, the Parliamentary Ombudsman of Finland
Göran Melander, Professor Emeritus, Raoul Wallenberg Institute
Nieves Molina-Clemente, Head of NHRI Unit, Raoul Wallenberg Institute
Sirpa Ratio, Director, Finnish Human Rights Centre
Johanna Sjöwall, Policy development officer, City of Malmö
Sue Anne Teo, Programme Officer, Raoul Wallenberg Institute

Appendix 2: Agenda

Roundtable on 'Swedish NHRI: Exploring Models and Options'

Organised by the Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (RWI)

Venue: Beijing Conference Room, RWI
Stora Gråbrödersgatan 17b, 22105 Lund

Date: 2 June 2016 (11:00 – 17:00)

11:00-11:15 Welcome Remarks
RWI Director, **Morten Kjaerum**

Introduction and purpose of roundtable
Nieves Molina-Clemente, Head of NHRI Unit, RWI

Introduction of participants

11:15-12:15 Protection and Promotion of Human Rights.

An exploration of different NHRI models

- ▶ Swedish model – the Discrimination Ombudsman
- ▶ Finnish Model
- ▶ Danish Model
- ▶ Models of cooperation between institutions (Ombudsman, judiciary, Centre for Human Rights)
- ▶ Advantages/disadvantages of each model
- ▶ Compliance with the Paris Principles

Discussion

Speakers: **Morten Kjaerum**, **Sirpa Rautio**, **Riitta Länsisyrjä**,
and **Annika J Åkerberg**

Facilitator: **Nieves Molina-Clemente**

12:15-13:15 Lunch

13:15-14:30 Why do we need a National Human Rights Institution in Sweden?

An NHRI basic functions:

- a. Advising Function
- b. Research and Education function
- c. Legislative reform function
- d. Reporting and monitoring function.
- e. Cooperation with international bodies.
- f. Interaction with the Judiciary

What are the needs that current institutions are not protecting?

Speakers: **Sirpa Rautio**, Johanna Sjöwall, Emily Hanna

Facilitator: **Nieves Molina-Clemente**

14:30-14:45 Coffee Break

14:45-15:45 Quasi- Jurisdictional Competence: the Individual complaints handling mandate of NHRIs

- ▶ The Finnish experience from the Office of the Parliamentary Ombudsman
- ▶ Global overview on systems for complaints handling

Discussion

Speakers: **Riitta Länsisyrjä**, **Nieves Molina Clemente**,
Sue Anne Teo

Facilitator: **Mark Gibney**

15:45-16:45 Open Discussion - The Way Forward for Sweden

Closing Remarks

Rolf Ring, Deputy Director RWI
Nieves Molina Clemente