



Brussels, New York, Decembre 8th 2008

RE. Joint assessment of the EU-China Human Rights Dialogue ad Legal Expert Seminars

Excellencies,

We are writing to you in order to share with you our assessment of the EU/China human rights dialogue, as well as the EU/China legal experts seminar. This exercise has been going on for ten years, and is in a sense at a critical point. While there has been some progress on the ground in China, overall, the human rights situation remains serious as underscored by the recent concluding findings of the UN CAT review of China's record on torture.

The human rights dialogue itself has been profoundly tarnished by the recent execution of Mr. Wo Weihang, after repeated calls by the European Union and several of its Member States for this execution to be deferred and for the death sentence to be commuted. This execution came "just after the conclusion in Beijing of the EU-China human rights dialogue, in the course of which the EU reiterated its strong opposition to the death penalty and once again raised the case of Mr Wo Weihang and requested that he be pardoned", as noted by the Council of the EU.

As stressed by the EU on several occasions, "the dialogue is an acceptable option only if enough progress is achieved and reflected on the ground"¹. This progress should be assessed within the framework of the announced benchmarks fixed by the EU and supported by concrete data and indicators of progress as outlined by an earlier joint assessment by FIDH and HRIC (2004).

Starting from the next session, the organization of the legal experts seminar will also revert to a network of academic institutions, as was the practice at the beginning of this process. This is therefore a timely opportunity to propose recommendations for

¹EU-China dialogue on human rights, General Affairs Council, 2327th Council meeting - Brussels, 22-23 January 2001, para 8; see also Human rights – China Conclusions, General Affairs Council, 2338th Council meeting - Brussels, 19 March 2001, para 6; and Human rights – China Conclusions, General Affairs Council, 2416th Council meeting - Brussels, 11 March 2002, para 8.

enhancing the relevance and impact of the seminars and contributing to a more result-oriented process for the whole exercise.


We understand that the EU shares our concerns for advancing concrete meaningful progress on the ground and have appreciated the opportunities for participating in and contributing to the exercise in the past. We trust that the present submission will be duly taken into account in the framework of the EU ongoing efforts to improve its human rights dialogue process with China.

Sincerely,



Souhayr Belhassen, President, FIDH

17, passage de la Main d'or
75011, Paris, FRANCE
Tel. +33 1 435-525-18, f. +33 1 425-518-80
<http://www.fidh.org>



Sharon Hom, Executive Director, HRIC

350 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3311
New York, NY 10118, USA
Tel. +1 212-329-4495, Fax. +1 212-239-2561
<http://www.hrichina.org>



**FIDH-HRIC Joint Assessment of the EU-China
Human Rights Dialogue and Legal Expert Seminars**

December 2008

**INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION FOR
HUMAN RIGHTS**

17, passage de la Main d'or
75011, Paris, FRANCE
Tel. +33 1 435-525-18, f. +33 1 425-518-80
<http://www.fidh.org>

HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA

350 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3311
New York, NY 10118, USA
Tel. +1 212-329-4495, Fax. +1 212-239-2561
<http://www.hrichina.org>

The EU/China human rights dialogue has been held for more than ten years since it was initiated in 1996, with one short interruption in 1997 (following the tabling of a resolution on the human rights situation at the UN Commission on Human Rights). In 2001, the EU made public eight benchmarks as a basis to assess the results of its dialogue with China. It subsequently assessed the dialogue's results in 2004, through the evaluation was not made public. Since then, there appears to have been regular internal assessments of the dialogue, but none of these has been made public.

In parallel, the European Parliament has commissioned a study on the impact on human rights of the EU dialogues with third states, as well as specific studies on a number of human rights dialogues, including the EU/China human rights dialogue. This process resulted in September 2007 in the adoption of a resolution on the functioning of the human rights dialogues and consultations on human rights with third countries. That resolution suggested a number of concrete proposals in order to improve the human rights dialogue with China, many of which still remain to be implemented.

However, as stressed by the EU on several occasions, “the dialogue is an acceptable option only if enough progress is achieved and reflected on the ground”². This joint FIDH-HRIC assessment and specific recommendations are submitted as a contribution to advancing a results-oriented process that can contribute more effectively to meaningful change on the ground.

Summary of recommendations

- Increase the **transparency and accountability of the dialogue and seminar process by producing regular assessments based upon the EU benchmarks, supported by substantive indicators, and making these assessments public;**
- Send a strong message of concern and support for rights defenders and their families by continuing to **raise individual cases and consider making the lists of cases submitted public** to enhance impact of increased public attention on releases or improved conditions and treatment.
- Build upon lessons and experience of the past seminars, **strengthen the relevance and impact of the seminars** by:
 - Structurally and more systematically **linking the official dialogue and the seminar.**
 - Enhancing the **concrete outputs** of the seminars and **making the agenda, interventions, and recommendations available in Chinese and English** on the website of the European Commission External Relations DG.
- Strengthen the **role and participation of NGOs, EU experts, and the European Parliament.**

Several practices have also been introduced over the years that have been useful to making the exercise more transparent, accountable, and constructive. We recommend continuing these:

- Briefings and preparatory meetings with NGOs and staff of the European Commission, the General Secretariat of the Council and the Presidency, in advance of the dialogue sessions;
- Briefings between the NGO representatives and the EU experts just before the EU/China seminars.

²EU-China dialogue on human rights, General Affairs Council, 2327th Council meeting - Brussels, 22-23 January 2001, para 8; see also Human rights – China Conclusions, General Affairs Council, 2338th Council meeting - Brussels, 19 March 2001, para 6; and Human rights – China Conclusions, General Affairs Council, 2416th Council meeting - Brussels, 11 March 2002, para 8.

1. Increase the transparency and accountability of the dialogue and seminar process by producing regular assessments based upon the EU benchmarks, supported by substantive indicators, and making these assessments public

The EU Guidelines on Human Rights Dialogues notably recommend a regular assessment, preferably every year, of the EU human rights dialogues. Those regular assessments should be based on the pre-determined benchmarks and their correlated indicators of progress, and involve relevant geographic and thematic working groups of the Council as well as civil society.

- 1.1. An evaluation of the EU/China human rights dialogue has been carried out in 2004. Yet, the results of the assessment were only partially made public. Such an assessment should be made regularly, and be publicly discussed before the European Parliament and national parliaments.
- 1.2. The current benchmarks of the dialogue correspond to specific human rights obligations which are tied to substantive indicators of progress. As the FIDH and HRIC recommended in 2004, these substantive indicators of progress would contribute to the evaluation of progress achieved and a more result-oriented process capable of producing tangible improvements. The need to use specific indicators for each of the eight broader benchmarks has been stressed by the European Parliament as well.³ Examples of these indicators can be found within UNDP statistics, UN treaty bodies and special procedures recommendations, NGOs indexes, available statistics on the death penalty, etc. (FIDH-HRIC Joint Assessment, 2004).

2. Send strong message of concern and support for rights defenders and their families by continuing to raise individual cases and consider making the lists of cases submitted public to enhance impact of increased public attention on releases or improved conditions and treatment.

- 2.1. Some progress has been achieved on the list of individual cases of prisoners of opinion handed to the Chinese authorities at each session of the dialogue. The 27 member states indeed coordinate their information, and those are compiled in one single database handled by the General Secretariat of the Council. NGOs have the possibility to submit cases to the EU or to provide updated information on the cases already included in the list. Under the current practice, the responses of the Chinese authorities (if any) to individual cases raised in the political dialogue are presented to NGOs who have contributed to the elaboration of the said list – which is definitely a progress in comparison with past practices. **Nevertheless, NGOs are still not provided with copies of the list, which would enable them to contribute more effectively to the advocacy on behalf of these individuals.**
- 2.2. However, the list is in itself considered as confidential, for the sake of efficiency of the diplomatic demarches based on the list. In view of the lack of visible result of those demarches (prisoners freed before the end of their prison sentence, e.g.), perhaps making the individual case lists public would produce more effective results. Bringing greater public attention to the persons included on the list, may result in increased attention resulting in early releases, access to lawyers, medical treatment or families. We urge further detailed assessment of the impact achieved as a result of EU pressure and international attention, and that the possibility of making the list public should be considered as a realistic option. Another option in case real impact appears minimal, would be to keep the long list, while focusing more active demarches on prisoners that the UN WGAD has considered arbitrarily detained, and on HR defenders (based on the EU guidelines on HRDs).

³ European Parliament resolution of 6 September 2007 on the functioning of the human rights dialogues and consultations on human rights with third countries, para. 58.

As of December 2008 HRIC has submitted over 55 cases to the Working Group on Arbitrary Decision; with 17 decisions –all finding that the individuals were arbitrarily detained in violation of international human rights standards. The EU should be linking the strategies with regard to individual cases submitted as part of the dialogue process with cases that have received an expert review and decision. At the very least, these cases should be pressed for immediate release.

3. Build upon lessons and experience of the past seminars to strengthen the relevance and impact of the seminars and dialogue

There has been some progress regarding the structure of the EU/China human rights dialogue over the past years. However, much more could be done, including:

3.1. *Link between the China seminars and the dialogue*

Since 2006, the seminars take place just before the official dialogue session, which is a progress. The “technical” debates, through their function of catalyst for discussions, provide guidance on the ways for reforms, that can be heard by the Chinese authorities present in the room, or that can be used by the Europeans in the official dialogue session. In order to do so, certain participants to the dialogue (e.g. the representatives of the previous, the current and the future Presidencies) should systematically attend both exercises.

There is now a clear link between the EU/China seminars and the dialogue itself what has been discussed in the seminars is expressly supposed to feed the official session of the dialogue. The practice, however, shows that the themes addressed during the seminars are not systematically addressed during the subsequent official dialogue session. In 2004, e.g., the themes were the same under the Dutch presidency, but it was not systematically the case anymore during the subsequent sessions. FIDH and HRIC believe that the themes addressed during the seminar should systematically be on the agenda of the official dialogue session and that the conclusions of the seminar feed the official session of the dialogue.

3.2. *NGO Briefings at an early stage of the preparations of the dialogues and afterwards*

We welcome the fact that preparatory meetings with NGOs are organized in advance of the dialogue sessions, with the staff in charge in the European Commission and the General Secretariat of the Council and with the Presidency. This offers an opportunity for input by NGOs at an early stage of preparation of the dialogue sessions - on substance, agenda and on the list of individual cases to be discussed in the political dialogue. A representative of the European Parliament is now associated to those briefings, which marks a progress as well. The same should happen after the dialogue and seminar. In addition, in order to provide relevant input, NGOs should be systematically informed of the agenda of the dialogue and seminar prior to the briefing meeting.

3.3. *EU Experts Briefings just before the seminars*

In addition, briefings between the NGO representatives and the EU experts are organized just before the EU/China seminars. Such an exercise is useful in order to increase the knowledge of the EU experts regarding the general human rights situation in China. This practice should be maintained.

3.4. *Output of the EU/China seminars*

The EU/China legal experts seminars are generally composed of two thematic working groups, gathering Chinese experts, EU experts, NGOs, the European Commission and the Presidency. Even if interesting and genuine exchanges may take place in that framework, those working groups do not systematically adopt recommendations. This occasionally happened in the past, and it seems to be more and more systematic, since it was the case after the legal expert seminars held respectively in May and November 2008.

- Adoption of recommendations should become a systematic practice; in case no agreement can be reached between EU and Chinese participants on certain issues, the contentious points could be adopted separately, as EU participants' recommendations, or as "points of future discussion". Those recommendations/points of agreement/points of further discussion should be translated into Chinese and publicized on the website of the European Commission and of EU member states (see below). This would definitely multiply the impact of such a process, by making the results of the seminars known to a wider public, both in China and in Europe.
- Should the publication render impossible the adoption of joint conclusions, the various interventions available should, at the minimum, be available publicly on-line, in English and in Chinese, in order to keep track of the themes addressed, the agenda and participants.
- Identifying possible actions to improve the situation on the ground, and making them public, would also allow an improved follow-up on a same topic. Indeed, the EU/China seminars should on a regular basis address the same topics. Having previous recommendations as a background document, the participants to the seminars would be able to build on what has already been discussed in a previous session, which would hopefully increase the impact of the whole process.
- An effort should also be made, in the extent possible, to ensure that at least some of the participants be the same in the seminars addressing the same theme, with the view of guaranteeing continuity to a certain degree.

3.5. Output of the EU/China official dialogue sessions

The publication of a press release following the sessions of the EU/China human rights dialogue is systematic since 2005. FIDH believes that in order to increase transparency and to allow democratic control by the Parliament and external scrutiny by civil society of both sides, this practice should be continued as a way to stress the main conclusions of the session. This does not prevent omitting certain details if disclosure would damage the results obtained.

3.6 Outreach of the EU/China human rights dialogue

More generally, the website of the European Commission External Relations DG should devote a specific section to the human rights dialogue as well as EU member States' MFA websites, under the "China" entry. For the time being, there are a plenty of details on a number of thematic dialogues with China, on the various EU/China summits, but no easily available information, in English and Chinese, on the human rights dialogue. This concern should be addressed as a matter of urgency since one may deduce from this presentation that the dialogue may be a way to avoid any reference to human rights in other fora – to the point that it does not appear at all on the page devoted to China.

3.7 Staffing issue of the Secretariat of the EU institutions

FIDH and HRIC believe that more resources should be devoted to the EU/China human rights dialogue and legal experts seminar, and that the team working on this issue should be strengthened. This would allow an increased follow-up as well as greater mainstreaming with other fields of EU/China relations.

4. Strengthening the role and participation of NGOs, EU experts, and the European Parliament in the seminars

While the human rights dialogues involve only the representatives of EU and Chinese authorities, the seminars allow the broadening of the scope of the actors involved. The objective of the seminars is to

feed the official dialogue sessions, to trigger and stimulate debate between European and Chinese participants and to ultimately influence local policy change in China. The dialogue seminars enhance the interaction between Chinese academics and European experts and NGOs, which may contribute to advance the realization of human rights in China.

4.1 By ensuring complementary expertise among the experts and NGOs participating in the seminar, the dialogue can be more in-depth and relevant to the Chinese participants. FIDH and HRIC believe that both generalist and specialist human rights NGOs should be invited at the seminars. Generalist NGOs working on the human rights situation in the country concerned and following closely the dialogue should always be invited in order to ensure consistency between the different sessions. Specialist NGOs should be selected according to the themes on the agenda of the seminars.

4.2 A balance should also be reached between advocacy NGOs and NGOs carrying out cooperation programs in the countries concerned, who do not have the possibility to speak out about the human rights situation since it would jeopardize their staff and their work on the spot. The presence in the seminars of genuine and independent NGOs working on China is key to the effectiveness and the legitimacy of the process. A truly constructive dialogue must involve Chinese human rights advocates and independent social groups. The principle of independent NGOs participation on both sides should be repeatedly asserted. The participants in the seminar should be chosen freely by each party without any veto right. While maintaining strong NGO and experts' involvement in the Beijing seminars, the EU could be more firm with the participants in the European seminars, where fewer practical hurdles occur (visa requirement).

Recent decisions by the EU regarding the organization and scope of civil society participation represent a back-tracking on progress, and the acceptance of constraints which limit the seminars' usefulness as a forum for genuine exchange of views on human rights in China. The EU should stand firm for the principle of inclusion of independent Chinese voices, as was the case in Berlin in 2007 with Human Rights in China and China Labour Bulletin.

4.3 The members of the European Parliament should have an observer status in the seminars, and briefings and de-briefings around the political dialogues. This would contribute to the transparency of the exercise, and allow the Parliament to exert a democratic control on the process. The European Parliament should systematize the organization of a hearing after each session of the seminar/dialogue, in order to ensure public scrutiny.

4.4 It is also necessary to ensure that European participants' interventions are focused and relevant to the Chinese context and contribute to deeper insights and understanding of comparative experience. Presentations that are isolated monologues whereby Chinese participants congratulate themselves for the progress achieved in China, and EU academics deplore the human rights violations taking place in Europe or make theoretical presentations on the international and European human rights instruments, do not advance the purpose of the seminars. The fact that the seminar will be organized again by a network of universities in Europe and in China may allow a more relevant choice of EU participants based exclusively on the added value they can bring to the discussions in terms of substance. This will also allow identification in advance which topics each EU expert is required to address, with an emphasis on exchange of views and experiences within a practical comparative framework.

4.5 In addition, as has been sometimes the practice in the past, relevant background documents should be regularly made available during the seminar. These materials could include relevant UN documents, as well as NGOs documents. HRIC and other independent Chinese NGOs publications could be made available on that occasion, even when they don't participate in the process.

5. Coordination between EU and other States having human rights dialogues with China

5.1 An informal process was launched by Switzerland in 2001, the Bern process, in order to facilitate coordination and exchange of information between various States participating in human rights dialogues with China. The participants in the Bern process met twice a year, and an annual consultation was taking place with NGOs. These meetings were very useful in that they provided a valuable opportunity to discuss individual cases, issues, and strategies, and draw upon NGO expertise.

However, due to unclear reasons, the process has been discontinued at least publicly. In light of the limited availability of effective tools to advance human rights concerns in China, the process provided a useful sharing of information and coordinating strategies to maximize impact.

5.2 Another challenge to be addressed is the multiplication of bilateral human rights dialogues between various EU member states and China, in addition to the EU human rights dialogue. Possible duplication should be avoided in that framework, and the risk of *fatigue* on the Chinese side should not be neglected.

6. Dialogue: one tool among others in the field of human rights

6.1 Human rights dialogue and public scrutiny

The human rights dialogue with China should be part of an integrated strategy. Dialogue and cooperation programs should systematically be backed up with significant pressure, including monitoring of rights violations by raising human rights issues at all bilateral political meetings with Chinese authorities and in multilateral fora. (Please see *appendix 2* for summary of status of China's cooperation with human rights mechanisms and recommendations that need to be implemented).

In that regard, we would like to recall that, according to the EU itself, "*the fact that there is a human rights dialogue between the EU and a third country will not prevent the EU either from submitting a Resolution on the human rights situation in that country (...) nor will the fact that there is a human rights dialogue between the EU and a third country prevent the European Union from denouncing breaches of human rights in that country, inter alia in the appropriate international fora*"⁴. We have repeatedly affirmed that public scrutiny must necessarily complement the dialogue in order to make it result-oriented. This is the position of the European Parliament as well: "it is essential for dialogue or consultation to be backed up by appropriate diplomatic and political pressure at every level, extending to United Nations bodies and its Human Rights Council, in particular"⁵.

FIDH and HRIC believe that the benchmarks and related indicators of the EU/China human rights dialogue should feed the Universal Periodic Review, whereby China will be examined in February 2009. EU member states should definitely prepare together this exercise and make sure that the concerns repeatedly raised on the occasion of the dialogue will be addressed.

6.2 Human rights dialogue and trade

Important as well is the necessity for the EU to ensure that "within the framework of political, economic and trade-related dialogues, respect for human rights should be fundamental to strategic and privileged relations with the EU"⁶. The European Union should assess the human

⁴ European Union guidelines on Human rights dialogues, December 2001, para 9

⁵ European Parliament resolution of 6 September 2007 on the functioning of the human rights dialogues and consultations on human rights with third countries, para. 22

⁶ Ibid, para. 2.

rights (including economic and social rights) impacts of its trade policy with China, notably through human rights impact assessments carried out prior to the conclusion of new trade agreements, and at regular stages in the course of their implementation.

European companies that invest in China can contribute to bringing about a real change by seeking to ensure respect of human rights within their spheres of influence. The European Union should adopt a regulatory framework in order to make sure European companies behave responsibly and in accordance with human rights standards, not benefiting or contributing to human rights abuses, when operating abroad (including in China).

As stressed by the European Parliament, “the fact of conducting a human rights dialogue or consultations with a third country has to lead to systematic mainstreaming of human rights in every sphere of EU cooperation with the country concerned, including the Community's development policy and economic, financial and technical cooperation with third countries, so that the existence of a human rights dialogue or consultations does not constitute an end in itself”.⁷

The European parliament had already expressed the same view in 2006, when it regretted that “increased trade and economic relations with China have brought about no substantial progress in the field of democracy, human rights and the rule of law” and declared that “the development of trade relations with China must go hand in hand with the development of a genuine, fruitful and effective political dialogue”.⁸

This position was reiterated in December 2007, when it urged the EU “to ensure that an improved trading relationship with China is contingent upon human rights reforms, and calls on the Council, in this regard, to make a comprehensive evaluation of the human rights situation before finalising any new Partnership and Cooperation Framework Agreement (PCFA)”.⁹ The European Parliament recommended that “the human rights dialogue should not be treated as separate from the rest of Sino-European relations; to that end, [it] urges the Commission to ensure that its trading relationship with China is linked to human rights reforms, and calls in this regard on the Council to carry out a comprehensive evaluation of the human rights situation before finalising any new partnership and cooperation framework agreement”.¹⁰

FIDH and HRIC fully support this recommendation and believe that human rights must be addressed in a meaningful way within the context of trade and investment.

⁷ Ibid., para. 8.

⁸ European Parliament resolution of 7 September 2006 on EU-China Relations, para. 4.

⁹ European Parliament resolution of 13 December 2007 on the EU-China Summit and the EU/China human rights dialogue, para. 5.

¹⁰ Ibid, para. 59.

APPENDIX 1: General Affairs Council, 2327th Council meeting, Brussels, 22-23 January 2001

In order to make the dialogue more focused and easier to evaluate, the Council has decided to define the specific areas in which the European Union will be seeking progress through the dialogue process, and to make them public. They are:

- ratification and implementation of the Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;
- cooperation with human rights mechanisms (visit by the Rapporteur on Torture, invitation to other Rapporteurs, follow-up to recommendations from conventional mechanisms and recommendations by Rapporteurs, implementation of the agreement with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights);
- compliance with ECOSOC guarantees for the protection of those sentenced to death and restriction of the cases in which the death penalty can be imposed, in keeping with Article 6 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; provision of statistics on use of the death penalty;
- reform of administrative detention; introduction of judicial supervision of procedures; respect for the right to a fair and impartial trial and for the rights of the defence;
- respect for the fundamental rights of all prisoners, including those arrested for membership of the political opposition, unofficial religious movements or other movements, such as the Falun Gong; progress on access to prisoners in Chinese prisons, including in the autonomous regions; constructive response to individual cases raised by the EU;
- untrammelled exercise of freedom of religion and belief, both public and private;
- respect for the right to organise;
- respect for cultural rights and religious freedoms in Tibet and Xinjiang, taking account of the recommendations of the committees of the United Nations Covenants, halt to the “patriotic education” campaign in Tibet, access for an independent delegation to the young Panchen Lama, Gedhun Choekyi Nyima, who has been recognised by the Dalai Lama.

APPENDIX 2: Summary of Country Visits to China by UN Human Rights Special Mechanisms (as of December 2008)

| RAPORTEUR | CHRONOLOGY | STATUS |
|--|--|---|
| Working Group on Arbitrary Detention | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The WGAD conducted a preparatory mission, July 14–21, 1996 (preparatory mission) •The WGAD visited China, October 6–16, 1997 •China promised to extend unconditional invitation to the rapporteur at December 2002 US-China human rights dialogue. •The WGAD conducted a follow up visit, September 18–30, 2004 | Country Report (follow up) (December 29, 2004) |
| Special Rapporteur on Extra-judicial, Summary or Arbitrary Executions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Special Rapporteur requested an invitation in 1992. •The request was repeated in 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and by the new Special Rapporteur in 2005. | No invitation has been issued. |
| Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Visited China, November 19–30, 1994 •This was the first visit to China by a Special Rapporteur •China agreed to invite the Special Rapporteur again in 2003, but the visit has not taken place yet. •The Special Rapporteur sent China a Letter Requesting Dates in September 2006 | SR Report (December 22, 1994) |
| Special Rapporteur on Torture | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Special Rapporteur requested visit in 1995. •China first issued invitation in 1999 but parties could not agree on terms of reference for visit. •Chinese invitation repeated in 2001 to the new rapporteur. China pledged to reissue unconditional invitation to the rapporteur at December 2002 US-China human rights dialogue. •Visit came almost 10 years after the Special Rapporteur first requested for a visit •The Special Rapporteur visited China, November 20–December 10, 2005 | SR Report (March 10, 2006) |
| Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Opinion and Expression | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Rapporteur requested a visit in 1999. •Request was repeated in 2000 and 2001. •The new rapporteur requested a visit in 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006. | No invitation has been issued. |
| Special Rapporteur on the Independence of Judges and Lawyers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •China agreed to consider issuing an invitation at the November 2002 UK-China human rights dialogue. •The Special Rapporteur has not requested a visit (according to the OHCHR website). | <u>No invitation</u> has been issued. |
| Special Rapporteur on the Right to Education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Invitation to the Special Rapporteur originated from the EU-China Human Rights Dialogue under the Danish EU Presidency, 2002 •The Special Rapporteur visited China, September 10-19, 2003. | SR Report (11/21/03) PRC Response (12/11/03) |
| Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Visit requested in 2008. | No invitation has been issued |



**INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION FOR
HUMAN RIGHTS**

17, passage de la Main d'or
75011, Paris, FRANCE
Tel. +33 1 435-525-18, f. +33 1 425-518-80
<http://www.fidh.org>



HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA

350 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3311
New York, NY 10118, USA
Tel. +1 212-329-4495, Fax. +1 212-239-2561
<http://www.hrichina.org>