

REPORT No. 31/12
CASE 12.174
FRIENDLY SETTLEMENT
ISRAEL GERALDO PAREDES ACOSTA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
March 20, 2012

I. SUMMARY

1. On May 20, 1999, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (hereinafter the "Commission" or the "IACHR") received a petition in which Mr. Israel Gerardo Paredes Acosta (hereinafter the "petitioner" or "alleged victim") alleged the international responsibility of the Dominican Republic (hereinafter the "State" or the "Dominican Republic") for human rights violations committed against him.

2. The petitioner alleged that on March 6, 1992, while he was at his business working, a group of police officers entered and searched the premises, detained him and seized a number of items. He also reported that other searches of his business were conducted, and that he was paraded before the local and international press as a suspect accused of assembling bombs with which to commit an act of sabotage. He also alleged that he endured torture and cruel and inhuman treatment, and described having been left hanging in a cell, being beaten, and brought to the verge of starvation. By the time the judicial authorities declared his innocence, the alleged victim had spent seven years in prison. As of the date on which the petition was filed, the personal property seized during the searches had not been returned to the alleged victim.

3. The State, for its part, alleged that the national police was entirely willing to hand over the confiscated property to the petitioner, and that two members of the police force were reportedly under disciplinary investigation for the acts committed.

4. On March 15, 2006, the Commission adopted Admissibility Report No. 48/06 on the petition as it pertained to the alleged violations of the rights protected under articles 5, 7, 8, 11, 21 and 25 of the American Convention on Human Rights (hereinafter the "Convention" or the "American Convention"), considered in conjunction with Article 1(1) thereof.¹

5. On August 14, 2008, the parties signed a negotiated settlement and mutually agreed to ask that the IACHR publish the present Friendly Settlement Report once the two sides had honored their commitments under the agreement.

6. As established by Article 49 of the Convention and Article 40.5 of the Commission's Rules of Procedure, the Commission adopts the present report, which summarizes the facts alleged by the petitioners and the friendly settlement reached. Having reviewed the agreement's consistency with the principles of the American Convention, the Commission resolves to notify the parties, make this report public, and include it in its Annual Report to the General Assembly of the Organization of American States.

II. PROCESSING BY THE COMMISSION

7. The petition, dated April 28, 1999, was lodged with the Commission on May 20, 1999. On June 15 of that year, the Commission forwarded the relevant parts of the petition to the State and gave it 90 days in which to submit its observations. The State's response was received on August 18, 2000.

¹ IACHR, Report No. 48/06, Petition 12,174, Admissibility, Israel Gerardo Paredes Acosta, Dominican Republic, March 15, 2006, available at: <http://www.cidh.org/annualrep/2006eng/DOMINICANREPUBLIC.12174eng.htm>.

8. The IACHR received additional information from the petitioner on the following dates: November 3, 1999, April 11, 2000, October 2, 2000, May 29, 2001, August 24, 2001, April 9, 2002,² August 9, 2002, November 27, 2002, February 11, 2003, September 9, 2003, December 8, 2003, March 30, 2004, May 24, 2004, August 4, 2004, October 25, 2004, November 17, 2004, February 25, 2005, May 16, 2005, May 19, 2005, September 19, 2005, February 8, 2006, May 9, 2006, June 22, 2006, June 29, 2006, August 24, 2006, August 28, 2006, October 30, 2006, June 28, 2007, May 19, 2008, July 18, 2008, September 2, 2008, January 12, 2009, and September 15, 2009. Those communications were duly forwarded to the State.

9. The IACHR also received communications from the State on the following dates: December 13, 2001, January 3, 2002, February 14, 2002, September 19, 2002,³ June 5, 2003, January 16, 2004, March 24, 2004, August 16, 2006, September 1, 2006, April 27, 2007, May 29, 2008, September 25, 2008, and August 14, 2009. Those communications were duly forwarded to the petitioner.

10. As for the friendly settlement process, the parties stated that in January 2001, they held a number of meetings but failed to come up with an agreement.

11. On March 15, 2006, the Commission adopted Admissibility Report No. 48/06; on May 10, 2006, in the note it sent to the parties notifying them of the Report, it offered its good offices with a view to reaching a friendly settlement.

12. On August 11, 2008, the petitioner informed the IACHR that he had decided to “settle this case and to come to an agreement with the Dominican State; I will accept the financial offer they are making and will submit a settlement proposal containing a number of demands related to the torture so that the authorities will abandon these horrible barbaric acts.”

13. The petitioner and the State signed a “Settlement Agreement” in the city of Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, on August 14, 2008.

14. On August 19, 2008, the petitioner informed the IACHR that he had signed the agreement and had received a check for the agreed upon amount of compensation.

15. In a communication received on September 25, 2008, the State, too, reported that the agreement had been signed and requested the IACHR’s ratification of the friendly settlement reached, “thereby legally settling the matter and closing the case once and for all.”

² The petitioner's request seeking precautionary measures to protect his life and physical integrity.

³ The State's response concerning the information requested by the IACHR in connection with the request for precautionary measures.

III. THE FACTS

16. Israel Gerardo Paredes Acosta alleged that on March 6, 1992, while he was at work at his advertising photography business “*Soluciones Mágicas C por A*”, located in Santo Domingo, the Dominican Republic, members of the National Police’s Forgery Department searched the premises of his business. Although they found nothing compromising, they confiscated a handgun that he was licensed to carry, \$4,200 pesos, personal papers, between other things. They then proceeded to arrest him.

17. The petitioner reported that his business was searched a second time that same day and again on March 7, 1992. In the March 7 search, a representative of the Santo Domingo District Attorney’s Office stated in his report that “Nothing compromising was found.” The petitioner points out that two other searches had reportedly been conducted by military security A-2 and G-2.

18. As for his arrest, the petitioner states that while in the custody of the Secret Service, he was allegedly interrogated in the presence of the Head of the National Police, General Ramón Alcides Rodríguez Arias, and was brutally beaten while being questioned. Later, he was allegedly locked in a small cell, where they left him hanging from a metal frame, with his hands cuffed; he was bleeding from the ears from the beatings he had endured.

19. The petitioner observes that on March 8 of that year, he was taken in a vehicle to the entrance of the building where his business was located and watched as members of the security forces removed all the business’ equipment and some of his personal effects, which were confiscated and classified as the *corpus delicti*.

20. The petitioner states that he was then taken back to the place where he was being held. Then, at 5:00 a.m. on the morning of Monday, March 9, 1992, they took him to an office and forced him to remain standing for 93 consecutive hours, until on Friday, March 13, he collapsed from dehydration, caused by the fact that he had had nothing to eat or drink. He was taken to the Padre Billini Hospital, where he was treated for starvation. The petitioner adds that the Head of the Secret Service, Colonel Julio César Campusano, was aware of the situation, as the police officers who were guarding the petitioner called Colonel Campusano when the petitioner collapsed to the floor as a result of his physically weakened state.

21. Then, on the 19th day of his detention, he was paraded before the local and international media as a person accused of assembling bombs to sabotage the “Celebration of the Quincentennial of the Discovery and Evangelization of the Americas.” He points out that this was how he learned what crimes he had been charged with.

22. The petitioner reports that he was deprived of his liberty for 32 days, without an order from a court legalizing his detention. During that time, he was hung from a metal frame for three or four hours a day, with his feet almost dangling in the air and handcuffed the entire time. He maintains that it was not until April 7, 1992 that he was brought before a judge, whereupon he was transferred to the “La Victoria” national penitentiary. Upon arriving at the prison, he had to defray some expenses associated with his identification. He describes how incoming inmates at the penitentiary were ordered to form a line and then lie on a wet floor, where they were whipped by the Chief of Police Colonel Benito Díaz Pérez, who wielded a tire strip and steel wiring. He states that while waiting in line, he handed \$200.00 to a policeman who had offered to get him out of the line in exchange for \$150.00. The petitioner was thus able to avoid being whipped.

23. He was then taken to a cell he shared with 189 inmates. There were no beds, which meant that they had to sleep on the floor, practically one atop the other. As described by Mr. Paredes Acosta, living conditions in the penitentiary were subhuman: the bathroom and kitchen services were rudimentary; security guards whipped the inmates as they were eating the food that was served them; on Sundays, they were forced to weed a field of 400 square meters. He also says that over a five-month period the judge hearing a petition of *habeas corpus* filed on his behalf had issued a summons for him to appear, but the police authorities never allowed him to appear in court.

24. The petitioner explains that for the first four years of his seven-year incarceration, no judicial authority ever heard his case. He reports that given the lack of any incriminating evidence against him, the National District Tenth Criminal Court of First Instance cleared him of all the charges against him in a ruling it delivered on April 15, 1999. In their ruling, the court authorities stated that while the case file contained four records of searches, not one of those records showed that any home-made bombs were found in the accused' residence. They expressed concern at that fact that violations of constitutional judicial guarantees and human rights had been committed during the court proceedings, frustrating application of the principle of *in dubio pro reo* to the detriment of Mr. Israel Gerardo Paredes Acosta.

25. The petitioner states that the judgment also ordered that all the materials that the case file recorded as being in the possession of the National Police were to be returned to their rightful owner. He observes, however, that the police authorities ignored the court order, despite the repeated and constant actions taken by Mr. Israel Gerardo Paredes Acosta to retrieve his property.

26. The petitioner states that on July 17, 2001, he filed a civil suit against the National Police for damages and injuries sustained as a result of the failure to comply with the court order to return the property seized during the searches conducted of his business. On September 26, 2004, the Civil and Commercial Bench of the National District Court of First Instance, Third Chamber, delivered a ruling that came down in favor of the National Police, as it declared the suit inadmissible on the grounds that the plaintiff had not filed an (original or certified) copy of the documents entered into evidence; instead, the plaintiff had presented photostatic copies which, in the Court's view, did not constitute proof because it had no way to determine the veracity or authenticity of the statements made in those documents. The petitioner filed an appeal, which was decided by the First Chamber of the National District Civil Court of Appeals on June 8, 2005. In the ruling the appellate court delivered, it not only completely revoked the judgment being challenged, but also nullified the suit the petitioner had filed seeking damages, which it did on the grounds that the National Police did not have legal standing and could not, therefore, be sued in court.

IV. FRIENDLY SETTLEMENT

27. On August 14, 2008, in the city of Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, the petitioner, Mr. Israel Gerardo Paredes Acosta, and the State of the Dominican Republic, represented by National Police Chief Major General Ing. Rafael Guillermo Guzmán Fermín, entered into a settlement agreement whose terms are as follows:

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This document, which may be made public upon simple authentication of signatures and paraphs, contains the agreement signed between the **PARTIES**, the clauses of which read as follows:

ONE: The parties are: First, **THE DOMINICAN STATE**, duly represented by **MAJOR GENERAL ING. RAFAEL GULLERMO GUZMAN FERMIN**, Chief of the National Police, an adult male Dominican citizen, identification and voter registration number 001-1271925-7, domiciled in and a resident of this city of Santo Domingo, National District, who shall henceforth be referred to as the **PARTY OF THE FIRST PART**. Second, **ISRAEL GERARDO PAREDES ACOSTA**, an adult male Dominican citizen domiciled in and a resident of Santo Domingo Este, Province of Santo Domingo, who shall henceforth be referred to as the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART**.

TWO: Background: on March 6, 1992, members of the National Police's Forgery Department entered the business called "*Soluciones Mágicas C por A*," owned by the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART**, and searched the premises. They confiscated several personal effects, including a licensed handgun and 4,200 Dominican pesos; the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** was then taken into custody, after which the Police conducted a second and third search of the premises and claimed to have found a bottle containing powder; the police also confiscated a video camera and tape recorder."

The **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** alleges that he was taken to the Secret Service Department, where he was locked in a small cell, left hanging with his hands cuffed; he "spent the entire night bleeding from the ears" as a result of a series of blows he sustained at the hands of his interrogators, who, he asserts, had beaten him.

The **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** states that after spending a number of days in that condition, they put him in a vehicle and took him to the location of his business; from inside the vehicle, he watched as representatives of the National Police removed all the office and working equipment from his business, which included: a Commodore 128 computer, a photographic enlarger, cameras, personal effects and numerous pieces of equipment. He also states that a number of these articles were never entered into the search records. The **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** also asserts that he later learned that other searches were done of his business by "two military security agencies, called: A-2 and G-2."

The **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** contends that he was again locked in a cell, where he was left without food or water for four days; in the early morning hours of the fifth day, he collapsed and began "crying as if in pain and weeping; because of his condition, he was taken to Padre Billini Hospital, where he was treated for his weakened condition and severe dehydration."

The **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** asserts that on the 19th day of his arrest, he was paraded before the media. It was under these circumstances that he learned that he was being accused of assembling bombs to sabotage the Quincentennial of the "Discovery and Evangelization of the Americas." After being paraded before the media, he was not taken directly to the courts but instead locked up and handcuffed for another 32 days, during which time, he reports, he was threatened with death and subjected to "physical and psychological torture." He states that at no time was he brought before a competent court authority nor was any court order issued to legalize his situation.

The **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** alleges that thereafter, "although he was expecting to be brought before a judge for a *habeas corpus* hearing," he was taken instead to the "La Victoria" Public Prison, where he was registered as an incoming inmate on April 7, 1992.

The **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** states that although he asked to be permitted to file a petition of *habeas corpus*, five months passed and he had still not been brought before a court of law. He asserts that by the time a court authority heard his case, he had spent four years behind bars; and by the time he was released he had been deprived of his liberty for seven years. He adds that on April 15, 1999, the Criminal Chamber of the National District Court of First Instance ordered his release, having delivered a verdict of not guilty by reason of insufficient evidence.

The **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** asserts further that the court ruling also ordered that all his confiscated property was to be returned to him, but to this day, that property has still not been returned to him *in toto*. The **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** states further that in the same decision, the court observes that the case file contained records of four searches, not one of which makes any mention of the 7 home-made bombs that the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** was accused of having assembled. The **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** also states that the court ruling noted an irregularity on the part of the representative from the public prosecutor's office who had claimed the existence of powder in a bottle, but the powder was never properly analyzed.

On August 25, 1999, the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** sent a letter to the Chief of the National Police in which he requested compliance with the court order, namely that all the seized property be returned to him. The **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** states further that on September 27, 1999, the Dominican Human Rights Committee submitted a letter addressed to the President of the Republic informing him of the confiscated property and the acts of torture claimed by the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART**; it asked that said property be returned. Finally, the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** argues that on November 30, 1999, he submitted a letter to the Attorney General of the Republic in which he informed him of the torture he endured and the failure to return his confiscated property. The **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** also mentions letters sent to other State officials, including the Office of the President of the Supreme Court and the Office of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

The **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** contends that in response to a communication from the **PARTY OF THE FIRST PART** urging him to report to the Office of the Chief of the National Police,

he went there on February 15, 2002 and from there was referred to the Department of Internal Affairs; however, he was never given any new information concerning the return of his property.

The **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** states further that on July 17, 2001, he filed a civil suit against the National Police for damages and injuries; heard by the Third Chamber of the National District Civil and Commercial Court of First Instance, the suit claimed acts of torture and a failure to return personal property. On September 26, 2002, the court found the suit to be inadmissible on the grounds that the plaintiff did not file original copies of the documents submitted as evidence, and had instead presented photostatic copies of those documents. The **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** states that his property has still not been returned to him.

The **PARTY OF THE FIRST PART** alleges that the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** was invited to a hearing with high-ranking Police officials, so that the property in question could be returned to him. It asserted that the Police Force was more than willing to comply with the court order mentioned by the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART**, in which the court had mandated that his property was to be returned to him.

The **PARTY OF THE FIRST PART** points out that the National Police had instructed the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** to come to the Headquarters of the National Police to retrieve the property in question. The **PARTY OF THE FIRST PART** stated at the time that it was exploring the possibility of compensating the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** for the wear and tear caused to his confiscated equipment.

The **PARTY OF THE FIRST PART** further states that a Police Disciplinary Tribunal is investigating two members of the National Police suspected of irregularities committed against the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART**.

In response to the acts of harassment and attacks recounted by the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART**, the **PARTY OF THE FIRST PART** asserts that at no time did the Police Force either pursue or harass the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** because the latter is not a suspect in any case pending with the National Police.

THREE: The parties' commitment; I) **COMMITMENTS UNDERTAKEN BY THE PARTY OF THE FIRST PART:** The Dominican State, for its part, pledges faithful and scrupulous compliance with the following:

The **PARTY OF THE FIRST PART** pledges to faithfully and strictly comply with the following obligations within the space of three (03) working days from the date on which the present Friendly Settlement is signed:

- a) To pay the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** the sum of **THREE MILLION THREE HUNDRED FIFTY-EIGHT THOUSAND DOMINICAN PESOS** (RD\$ 3,358,000.00) which represents payment in full for any damages to the property that the National Police confiscated from the business known as **SOLUCIONES MAGICAS C. A.**, owned by the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART**, wear and tear caused by the neglect of that property while it was in the custody of the National Police.
- b) Once the present settlement agreement is signed, the **PARTY OF THE FIRST PART** shall, through the Secretariat of State for Foreign Affairs, notify the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights that petition **12.174, ISRAEL GERARDO PAREDES AGOSTA**, has become the subject of a friendly settlement agreement under Article 41 of the Rules of Procedure of the IACHR, to find a legal solution to the petition in question. This notification shall be made within the three days following the signing of the present agreement.
- c) Once all the commitments undertaken by the two parties have been honored, the **PARTY OF THE FIRST PART** shall, through the Secretariat of State for Foreign Affairs, request that the IACHR issue a Friendly Settlement Report pursuant to Article 49 of the American Convention on Human Rights, so as to bring the case opened under petition **12.174 ISRAEL GERARDO PAREDES ACOSTA** to its legal conclusion.
- d) The **PARTY OF THE FIRST PART** must take all measures to ensure that the type of acts alleged by the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** do not recur and to that end shall: a) keep

up the training provided to members of the National Police Force by its Human Dignity Institute and the training provided to members of the military through the Armed Forces' Military Institute of Human Rights (IMDHFFAA); 2) guarantee that access to the courts is never again obstructed and that prompt remedies are respected.

II) COMMITMENTS OF THE PARTY OF THE SECOND PART: For his part, **ISRAEL GERARDO PAREDES ACOSTA** undertakes to faithfully and strictly comply with the following commitments:

- a) To waive any present or future administrative, judicial or international legal action against the **PARTY OF THE FIRST PART** for violation of the rights protected under articles 1(1), 5, 7, 8, 11, 16, 21 and 25 of the American Convention on Human Rights, whose violation he rightfully denounced to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.
- b) To waive any administrative, judicial or international legal action claiming noncompliance with section three of judgment 174 which the Tenth Criminal Chamber of the National District Court of First Instance delivered on April 15, 1999.
- c) To waive any administrative, judicial or international legal action against the National Police for any damages and injuries caused to his property by virtue of the length of time that property was held in the custody of the National Police and which property is now being returned to him in the form of a cash compensation.
- d) To waive any administrative, judicial or international legal action seeking pecuniary or non-pecuniary damages associated with subparagraphs a) and b) above.
- e) Once the present settlement agreement is signed, to notify the IACHR that **petition 12.174, ISRAEL GERARDO PAREDES ACOSTA v. DOMINICAN REPUBLIC**, has become the subject of a friendly settlement agreement pursuant to Article 41 of the IACHR's Rules of Procedure, to find a legal solution to the petition in question.
- f) Once all commitments undertaken by the two parties have been honored, to request that the IACHR issue a Friendly Settlement Report pursuant to Article 49 of the American Convention on Human Rights, so as to bring the case opened under petition **12.174, ISRAEL GERARDO PAREDES ACOSTA v. DOMINICAN REPUBLIC**, to its legal conclusion.

FOUR: Failure to honor the commitments undertaken: The commitments undertaken in this negotiated settlement shall be carried out within the time period established for each commitment. Failure to honor one, several or all of the commitments undertaken shall end the friendly settlement procedure with the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and both the **PARTY OF THE FIRST PART** and the **PARTY OF THE SECOND PART** shall immediately inform the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights that they are renouncing the friendly settlement, whereupon the IACHR is authorized to resume processing the case and pursue it until it issues the corresponding report and, if deemed appropriate, then refer the matter to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights.

FIVE: Good faith compliance and acceptance: The parties freely accept the terms agreed upon and pledge to honor them strictly and in good faith, in witness whereof they hereby sign this agreement, in five identical copies, each equally authentic.

Major General
ING. RAFAEL G. GUZMAN FERMIN
 Chief of the National Police
 For the **PARTY OF THE FIRST PART**

LIC. ISRAEL GERARDO PAREDES
 Petitioner in Case No. 12.174
 with the Inter-American Commission on
 Human Rights
 For the **PARTY OF THE SECOND
 PART**

V. DETERMINATION OF COMPATIBILITY AND COMPLIANCE

28. The IACHR reiterates that in accordance with Articles 48(1)(f) and 49 of the Convention, the purpose of this procedure is to "reach a friendly settlement of the matter on the basis of respect for

the human rights recognized in the Convention.” The agreement to carry out this process is an expression of the State’s good faith and intent to comply with the purposes and objectives of the Convention, in accordance with the principle of *pacta sunt servanda* under which States must perform the obligations undertaken in treaties in good faith. The Commission also wishes to reiterate that the friendly settlement procedure provided in the Convention allows for the conclusion of individual cases on a non-adversarial basis and has been shown in cases involving various countries to offer an important and effective tool for resolution that can be used by both parties.

29. With regard to the obligations undertaken by the State in the Settlement Agreement signed with Mr. Israel Geraldo Paredes Acosta, which appear in clause three of that agreement, the Commission observes the following:

- a) On August 14, 2008, the State, through the Chief of the National Police, Major General Ing. Rafael Guillermo Guzmán Fermín, delivered to Mr. Paredes Acosta the sum of three million three hundred fifty-eight thousand Dominican pesos (RD\$ 3,358,000) in the form of a check written by the *Banco de Reservas de la República Dominicana* on its own funds.
- b) The State reported that the parties had initiated the friendly settlement process.
- c) The State asked the IACHR to issue a Friendly Settlement Report.
- d) Regarding the fourth commitment, the State reported that in order to ensure that acts of this kind never again happen, the national police and armed forces have educational institutions that specialize in instruction in human rights; these include the National Police Force’s Human Dignity Institute and the Armed Forces’ Military Institute of Human Rights.

30. The IACHR observes also that on August 19, 2008, the petitioner informed the IACHR that he had concluded and signed the agreement and had received a check for the amount of compensation agreed upon.

31. The Inter-American Commission has closely followed the development of the friendly settlement reached in the present case and appreciates both parties’ efforts to arrive at this solution, which the Commission considers to be compatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. Based on the communications received from the parties, its understanding is that the commitments undertaken in the agreement have been honored.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

32. Based on the preceding considerations and pursuant to the procedure spelled out in articles 48(1)(f) and 49 of the American Convention, the Commission wishes to reiterate its profound appreciation for the efforts made by the parties and is gratified that the friendly settlement reached in the present case serves the object and purpose of the American Convention.

33. Based on the considerations and conclusions contained in this report,

THE INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

DECIDES:

1. To approve the terms of the friendly settlement agreement that the parties signed on August 14, 2008.
2. To make this report public and include it in its annual report to the OAS General Assembly.

Done and signed in the city of Washington, D.C., on the 20th day of the month of March 2012.
(Signed): José de Jesús Orozco Henríquez, President; Tracy Robinson, First Vice-President Felipe González, Second Vice-President; Dinah Shelton, Rodrigo Escobar Gil, Rosa María Ortiz, and Rose-Marie Antoine, Commissioners.