



**Meeting of the States Parties
to the Convention on the
Rights of the Child**

Distr.: General
17 August 2006
English
Original: French

COMMITTEE ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD

Forty-second session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIRST PART (PUBLIC)*
OF THE (Chamber A) 1139th MEETING**

Held at the Palais Wilson, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 23 May 2006, at 10 a.m.

Chairperson: Mr. DOEK

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS OF STATES PARTIES (*continued*)

Second periodic report of the Marshall Islands

* No summary record was prepared for the second (closed) part of the meeting.

** No summary records were prepared for the 1137th and 1138th meetings.

This record is subject to correction.

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS OF STATES PARTIES (item 4 of the agenda)
(*continued*)

Second periodic report of the Marshall Islands (CRC/C/93/Add.8; core document (HRI/CORE/1/Add.95); list of issues (CRC/C/MHL/2))

1. The CHAIRPERSON pointed out that the Marshall Islands had not sent a delegation for the consideration of its second periodic report. In fact, the Committee had received neither written replies to its list of issues nor any other information from the State party. Even its Permanent Mission to the United Nations in New York, contacted the previous day, had been unable to say whether the State party intended to accept the Committee's invitation.
2. The Committee could proceed with consideration of the report of the State party and draw up concluding observations in the delegation's absence, but it had so little up-to-date information on which to assess the child rights situation in the Marshall Islands that that option was less than satisfactory; it would undoubtedly be preferable to postpone the dialogue to the following session.
3. Ms. ORTIZ said that she had the impression that the only documentation on which the Committee could base its report as such was a UNICEF report. The UNICEF representatives were not present and had not attended the pre-session working group meetings to add any additional information.
4. Ms. AL-THANI, supported by Ms. LEE, suggested mailing a further invitation to the State party, specifying that if the Committee still received no reply, it would consider the report in the delegation's absence in order to send a clear message for the future.
5. Mr. KRAPPMANN said that he did not feel competent, as things stood, to make any recommendations whatsoever to the Government of the Marshall Islands. The Committee could have drawn up concluding observations in the State party's absence, provided it had prepared itself to do so. Given the State party's failure to reply to the Committee's invitation, another solution might be to alter the work programme of the current session so as not to lose a precious working day.
6. The CHAIRPERSON said that, while he too was unhappy about losing a working day, it was difficult to alter the timetable for consideration of reports, which had already been arranged in advance with the States parties.
7. Ms. OUEDRAOGO (Rapporteur for the Marshall Islands) suggested that, as a last resort, the Committee might write to the State party expressing its disappointment at its failure to send a delegation and inviting it to do so at the following session or at its convenience, failing which the report would be considered *in absentia*. However, that measure should be considered only as a last resort.
8. Mr. KOTRANE, fully endorsing what had been said, added that it was not proper to suggest consideration of a report *in absentia* as a punishment, but rather as a handicap for the country. It was the State party, first and foremost, that suffered from a situation in which it had missed out on a dialogue that could have been helpful to it.

9. The CHAIRPERSON said that, since the suggestion had received broad consensus, a letter would be sent to the State party requesting it to say whether it would be able to send a delegation to the September 2006 session.

10. *It was so decided.*

The first (public) part of the meeting rose at 10.30 a.m.