

**ORDER OF THE
INTER-AMERICAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
OF SEPTEMBER 4, 2013
REQUEST FOR PROVISIONAL MEASURES AND
MONITORING COMPLIANCE WITH JUDGMENT
WITH REGARD TO THE REPUBLIC OF SURINAME
CASE OF THE SARAMAKA PEOPLE**

HAVING SEEN:

1. The Judgment on preliminary objections, merits, reparations and costs (hereinafter, "the Judgment") delivered by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (hereinafter "the Inter-American Court" or "the Court") on November 28, 2007.
2. The Judgment on interpretation of the Saramaka Judgment delivered by the Court on August 12, 2008.
3. The Order of the President of the Court of April 20, 2010, convening the Republic of Suriname (hereinafter also "the State" or "Suriname"), the representatives of the Saramaka People (hereinafter "the representatives"), and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (hereinafter "the Commission") to a private hearing on monitoring compliance, which was held at the seat of the Court on May 26, 2010.
4. The Order on monitoring compliance with the Judgment issued by the Court on November 23, 2011.
5. The note of the Secretariat of the Court (hereinafter "the Secretariat") of April 16, 2013, in which, on the instructions of the President of the Court, it convened the parties and the Commission to a private hearing on monitoring compliance in this case, to be held on May 28, 2013.
6. The brief of the representatives of the victims of the case of the Saramaka People of May 22, 2013, in which they indicated that "during the last six weeks, the State ha[d] taken coordinated measures to intimidate and coerce the Saramaka to renounce their [legal] representatives in relation to the implementation of the Judgment." Specifically, they indicated that, on several occasions, *Gaama* (Chief) Belfon Aboikoni had been threatened that the State would not continue paying his salary if he did not renounce the representatives of the Saramaka People before the Court. These threats had been made by an adviser to the President of Suriname, and by a Head Captain, member of the State's delegation to the hearing on May 28, 2013. On that occasion, the representatives asked that the Court require the State to abstain

from interfering in the process of selecting the representatives of the Saramaka People, and that it cease all the attempts to intimidate and coerce the Saramaka representatives and authorities.

7. The note of the Secretariat of May 24, 2013, in which, on the instruction of the President of the Court, it reminded the State that, pursuant to Article 53 of the Court's Rules of Procedure, "States may not institute proceedings against witnesses, expert witnesses, or alleged victims, or their representatives or legal advisers, nor exert pressure on them or on their families on account of statements, opinions, or legal defense presented to the Court."

8. The private hearing on monitoring compliance with the Judgment in this case, held on May 28, 2013, which was attended by representatives of the Commission, the State, and the victims. During the hearing, the representatives of the victims referred to specific threats and acts of intimidation against *Gaama* Aboikoni and other Saramaka leaders, and expressly requested that the Court adopt provisional measures (*infra* having seen paragraph 6). The State affirmed that its officials had not made any kind of threat against Saramaka leaders. During this hearing, the President of the Court asked the State to provide, within six weeks, a report on compliance with the Judgment in which it also referred to the facts denounced by the representatives.

9. The note of the Secretariat of June 6, 2013, in which, on the instructions of the Court in plenary, it reiterated to the State the request that it forward a complete and detailed report on compliance with the Judgment, as well as information on the supposed acts of intimidation against Saramaka leaders.

10. The briefs of July 9, 10, 11 and 26, 2013, in which Suriname presented information on compliance with the Judgment and, with regard to the representatives' request, denied that it had given instructions to anyone to put pressure on *Gaama* Aboikoni or Head Captain Wanze to renounce their representatives. The State also asserted that the representatives' allegations were without grounds and that the persons supposedly intimidated had not forwarded specific statements with regard to the said incidents.

11. The brief of August 5, 2013, in which the representatives, among other matters, presented written statements by several Saramaka leaders "confirming" the threats and the acts of intimidation perpetrated by State agents. In this regard, they reiterated their request that the Court adopt measures to protect the personal integrity and safety of the Saramaka leaders and of the representatives while they were working to ensure the implementation of the Judgment, because the State was "carrying out an organized campaign of intimidation and coercion against the Saramaka leaders." In addition, the representatives made another request for provisional measures related to the implementation of a mining exploitation agreement between the company, IAMGOLD,¹ and the State of Suriname, supposedly without the Saramaka People having given their prior informed consent in accordance with their traditions and customs. The representatives argued that the "viability of the Saramaka lands and territory for present and future generations [...] is under imminent threat owing to the award of the mining rights." The implementation of the mining exploitation project in Saramaka territory would result in "grave, irreparable and large-scale damage to the territory and resources of up to 33 Saramaka communities, as well as to the integrity of the Saramaka territory in general." The urgency of the request, according to the representatives, stems from the fact that IAMGOLD could start its operations at any time.

12. The brief of August 23, 2013, in which the Commission indicated that it was crucial that the Court continue monitoring the situation of the Saramaka authorities, and that the essential relationship between tribal and indigenous peoples and their territory could require urgent

¹ International African Mining Gold Corporation.

measures of protection. It also considered that the proceeding of monitoring compliance with Judgment and the provisional measures were not mutually exclusive, because it was possible that the irreparable nature of any damage that occurred could nullify compliance with the substance of the Judgment or the reparations ordered therein.

13. The alleged facts on which the request for provisional measures presented by the representatives are based, namely:

- a) *Gaama* Belfon Aboikoni declared that he had been threatened by another Saramaka leader and by a State official. This included “threats against [his] person, including the threat that [his] salary paid by the State would be terminated if [he] did not revoke said authorization [to his representatives].” Furthermore, he had been “subjected to pressure and threats by the persons mentioned above and [for that reason he] ha[d] significant concerns about [his] personal security.” *Gaama* Aboikoni also declared that he had been threatened on other occasions by the same Saramaka leader in the presence of an official adviser of the State that he “would suffer personal repercussions and substantial problems if [he] failed to cooperate” with the State and that “all the State’s support to the Saramaka People would cease”;
- b) Three Saramaka “Head Captains” testified that, in a meeting held on May 6, 2013, a ‘District Commissioner and the Director of the Ministry of Regional Development clearly and repeatedly threatened that [their] salaries paid by the State would be terminated if they continued their authorization for [...] the Association of Saramaka Authorities [to represent them before the Court].” These “threats caused [them] great concern for their personal safety, because the State officials that made them were clear that there would be consequences if [they] did not comply with their demands”;
- c) These threats were made know on a national level and, in particular, in a television interview with *Gaama* Aboikoni in May 2013;
- d) Suriname awarded the mining rights to IAMGOLD on Saramaka territory without the consent of the Saramaka People and without regularizing this territory. The State allegedly signed the contract with IAMGOLD on June 7, 2013, 10 days after the private hearing before the Court, and
- e) IAMGOLD can start its operations on Saramaka territory at any moment.

14. The arguments of the representatives as grounds for their request for provisional measures, among which they indicated that:

- a) It is the State’s responsibility to adopt safety measures to protect all the persons under its jurisdiction and its obligation is even more evident in relation to those involved in proceedings before organs of the American Convention on Human Rights;
- b) The State’s acts and omissions threaten to cause irreparable damage to the possibility of the Saramaka People to guarantee their rights as ordered by the Court. If the mining exploitation continues and is expanded on Saramaka territory, this will result in grave irreparable and large-scale damage to the traditional lands and resources of up to 33 Saramaka communities, as well as to the integrity and culture of the Saramaka territory in general, which contravenes the Court’s judgment;
- c) “The viability of the Saramaka lands and territory for present and future Saramaka generations – the purpose of the Court’s judgment – is under imminent threat owing to the award of mining rights, and the survival of the Saramaka is threatened in violation of basic standards of State conduct and also of specific orders of the Court in this regard”;
- d) The adoption of provisional measures will permit the Court to improve its supervision of its Order not to authorize concessions on Saramaka territory without an impact assessment. This would reinforce the monitoring of the State’s compliance with both the “preventive and protective” aspect of these measures, and
- e) The recent concession of mining rights also ignored the criterion specifically identified by the Court as a necessary requirements for an exploitation concession on Saramaka territory; in other words, the guarantee of their survival as a tribal people.

CONSIDERING THAT:

1. The Republic of Suriname has been a State Party to the American Convention since November 12, 1987, and, pursuant to Article 62 of the Convention, accepted the contentious jurisdiction of the Court on the same date.

2. Article 63.2 of the American Convention establishes that: “[i]n cases of extreme gravity and urgency, and when necessary to avoid irreparable damage to persons, the Court shall adopt such provisional measures as it deems pertinent, in matters it has under consideration. With respect to a case not yet submitted to the Court, it may act at the request of the Commission.”

3. According to Article 27 of the Court’s Rules of Procedure:

1. At any stage of proceedings involving cases of extreme gravity and urgency, and when necessary to avoid irreparable damage to persons, the Court may, on its own motion, order such provisional measures as it deems appropriate, pursuant to Article 63(2) of the Convention.

2. With respect to matters not yet submitted to it, the Court may act at the request of the Commission. [...]

5. The Court, or if the Court is not sitting, the Presidency, upon considering that it is possible and necessary, may require the State, the Commission, or the representatives of the beneficiaries to provide information on a request for provisional measures before deciding on the measure requested.

6. If the Court is not sitting, the Presidency, in consultation with the Permanent Commission and, if possible, with the other Judges, shall call upon the State concerned to adopt such urgent measures as may be necessary to ensure the effectiveness of any provisional measures that may be ordered by the Court during its next session.

4. The present requests for provisional measures are related to a case being considered by the Court at the stage of monitoring compliance with the Judgment of November 28, 2007.

5. The three conditions required by Article 63(2) of the Convention for the Court to be able to order provisional measures must coexist in any situation in which they are requested.² Based on its competence, in the context of provisional measures, the Court may consider only and strictly those arguments that are directly related to the extreme gravity, urgency and need to avoid irreparable damage to persons. Any other fact or argument can only be analyzed and decided, as appropriate, during the consideration of the merits of a contentious case.³

6. As regards the requirement of “gravity,” for the adoption of provisional measures, the Convention requires that this must be “extreme”; in other words, that it is at its highest and most intense level. The “urgent” nature means that the right or threat involved must be imminent, which requires that the response to remedy them must be immediate. Lastly, regarding the damage, there must be a reasonable probability that it will occur and it should not relate to property or legal interests that can be repaired.⁴

² Cf. *Case of Carpio Nicolle*. Provisional measures with regard to Guatemala. Order of the Court of July 6, 2009, fourteenth considering paragraph, and *Case of Ávila Moreno et al. (Case of Operation Genesis)*. Request for provisional measures with regard to Colombia. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of May 30, 2013, sixth considering paragraph.

³ Cf. *Matter of James et al.*. Provisional measures with regard to Trinidad and Tobago. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of August 29, 1998, sixth considering paragraph, and *Case of Ávila Moreno et al. (Case of Operation Genesis)*, *supra*, sixth considering paragraph.

⁴ Cf. *Matters of the Monagas Detention Center (“La Pica”), the Capital Region Penitentiary Center Yare I and Yare II (Yare Prison), Central Occidental Region Penitentiary Center (Uribana Prison), and the Capital Detention Center El Rodeo I and El Rodeo II*. Provisional measures with regard to Venezuela. Orders of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of November 24, 2009, third considering paragraph, and *Case of Ávila Moreno et al. (Case of Operation Genesis)*, *supra*, seventh considering paragraph.

7. The standard of assessment *prima facie* in a matter, together with the application of presumptions in order to respond to the needs for protection, have led this Court to order measures on different occasions.⁵ Even though, when ordering provisional measures this Court has, in some cases, found it essential to individualize the persons who run the risk of suffering irreparable damage in order to grant them measures of protection,⁶ on other occasions the Court has ordered the protection of a group of individuals who have not been previously named, but who can be identified and determined and who are in a situation of grave danger owing to their membership of a group or community.⁷

8. The Court recalls that, in order to determine whether the situation of extreme gravity and urgency of avoiding irreparable damage exists, it may assess the series of political, historical, cultural or any other type of factors that affect the beneficiaries or place them in a situation of vulnerability at a determined moment, exposing them to the violation of their rights. This situation may increase or decrease over time, depending on numerous variables.⁸

A. Request for provisional measures with regard to the Saramaka leaders and their representatives

9. This request was presented by the organization representing the victims in this case in favor of the leaders of the Saramaka People and of their representatives.

10. In the said request, the representatives referred to meetings held between the Saramaka leaders and State authorities, both in government facilities and on Saramaka territory, during which public officials and a Saramaka leader, who is also a public official, required the said leaders to revoke their legal representation before the Inter-American Court. If they did not comply with this request, the State would terminate the salary payments to the leaders, and there would be "personal repercussions," without these consequences being specified. In addition, the Saramaka leaders indicated in the affidavits provided to the Court that they feared for their personal safety as a result of these threats.

11. For its part, the State indicated its consternation as regards the representatives' communication concerning threats against Saramaka leaders, as well as the information provided during the private hearing in this regard. "[T]he State denie[d] emphatically that it had given instructions to persons or authorities to intimidate and/or put pressure on [Gaama] Aboikoni and Head Captain [...] Wanze, having as a goal to withdraw the power of attorney given to the Association of Saramaka Authorities." Lastly, the State indicated that the Saramaka leaders who alleged that they have been intimidated or coerced never notified the Surinamese judicial authorities about this.

12. Meanwhile, during the private hearing on monitoring compliance with judgment, the Commission expressed its concern owing to the allegations of pressure placed on the Saramaka

⁵ Cf. *Case of Caballero Delgado and Santana*. Request for provisional measures with regard to Colombia. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of December 7, 1994, third considering paragraph, and *Case of Ávila Moreno et al. (Case of Operation Genesis)*, *supra*, eighth considering paragraph.

⁶ Cf. *Case of Haitians and Dominicans of Haitian Origin in the Dominican Republic*. Request for provisional measures with regard to the Dominican Republic. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of August 18, 2000, eighth considering paragraph, and *Case of Ávila Moreno et al. (Case of Operation Genesis)*, *supra*, eighth considering paragraph.

⁷ Cf., *inter alia*, *Matter of the Peace Community of San José de Apartadó*. Provisional measures with regard to Colombia. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of November 24, 2000, seventh considering paragraph, and *Case of Ávila Moreno et al. (Case of Operation Genesis)*, *supra*, eighth considering paragraph.

⁸ Cf. *Case of Carpio Nicolle*, *supra*, twenty-sixth considering paragraph, and *Case of Ávila Moreno et al. (Case of Operation Genesis)*, *supra*, ninth considering paragraph.

leaders and asked the Court to give careful consideration to this information. In its brief of August 23, 2013, the Commission indicated that, owing to the discrepancy between the parties in relation to the description of the events, it was important that the Court continue monitoring the situation of the Saramaka leaders.

13. The Court observes that the request for provisional measures is related to supposed acts of intimidation against the leaders of the Saramaka People, owing to the designation of their representatives for the implementation of the Judgment delivered by the Court in this case. In application of the provisions of Article 63(1) of the Convention and 27(1) of its Rules of Procedure, the Court must define whether the requirements of extreme gravity, urgency and the need to avoid irreparable damage to persons are met (*supra* considering paragraph 5).

14. In this matter, the allegations presented to the Court that the Saramaka leaders have been subjected to pressure to revoke their legal representation under the threat of the termination of their salaries do not reveal a situation of extreme gravity that objectively involves the right to life or to personal integrity of the Saramaka leaders or their representatives. As for the requirement of urgency, the evidence provided to the Court does not reveal a situation of extreme urgency. The Court also considers that the requirement of the irreparability of the damage has not been proved, in relation to the protection, because the supposed risk of a suspension of their salaries is not sufficient to justify the adoption of provisional measures by the Court. Furthermore, the alleged situation of risk to their personal integrity indicated by some Saramaka leaders in their affidavits is not substantiated by the content of their statements or by the description of the alleged acts of intimidation by State officials and another Saramaka leader, particularly as regards how this risk could materialize.

15. Therefore, the Court considers that, in this matter, the three requirements of extreme gravity, urgency and irreparability of damage to life or personal integrity that would justify the adoption of provisional measures have not been substantiated by the presumed acts of intimidation against the Saramaka leaders and their representatives.

16. Thus, the Court reiterates to the State that, pursuant to Article 53 of the Court's Rules of Procedure, "States may not institute proceedings against witnesses, expert witnesses, or alleged victims, or their representatives or legal advisers, or exert pressure on them or on their families on account of statements, opinions, or legal defense presented to the Court."

17. In addition, the Court reiterates that the State has the constant and permanent duty to comply with its general obligations under Article 1(1) of the Convention to respect the rights and freedoms recognized therein and to ensure to all persons subject to their jurisdiction the free and full exercise of those rights and freedoms, in any circumstance.⁹ Consequently, regardless of the existence of specific provisional measures, the State has the special obligation to ensure the rights of individuals in a situation of risk.¹⁰ Moreover, the Inter-American Court emphasizes the particular obligation of protection of States with regard to those whose work involves the defense of human rights.¹¹

⁹ Cf. *Case of Velásquez Rodríguez*. Provisional measures with regard to Honduras. Order of the Court of January 15, 1988, third considering paragraph, and *Case of Ávila Moreno et al. (Case of Operation Genesis)*, *supra*, twenty-third considering paragraph.

¹⁰ Cf. *Case of Velásquez Rodríguez*, *supra*, third considering paragraph, and *Matter of Álvarez et al.* Provisional measures with regard to Colombia. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of May 22, 2013, one hundred and fourth considering paragraph.

¹¹ Cf. *Case of the Monagas Detention Center ("La Pica")*. Provisional measures with regard to Venezuela. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of February 9, 2006, fourteenth considering paragraph, and *Case of Fernández Ortega et al.* Provisional measures with regard to Mexico. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of February 20, 2012, thirty-first considering paragraph.

B. Request for provisional measures in relation to a mining exploitation

18. The representatives' second request for provisional measures refers to a mineral exploitation project that has allegedly been awarded to IAMGOLD, and which could start "at any time," and which would have "severe effects" on the subsistence practices, spiritual freedom, and the land and culture of the Saramaka. In addition, this project would affect the viability of the Saramaka territory for present and future generations, in violation of the requirements of the Court in its Judgment (*supra* having seen paragraphs 14).

19. In this regard, the Court recalls that, in its Judgment, it ruled on this matter in paragraphs 97 to 106, 129 to 137, 140, 143 to 148, 155, 157, 158 and 194, and also determined in the declarative paragraphs that:

5. The State shall delimit, demarcate, and grant collective title over the territory of the members of the Saramaka people, in accordance with their customary laws, and through previous, effective and fully informed consultations with the Saramaka people, without prejudice to other tribal and indigenous communities. Until the said delimitation, demarcation, and titling of the Saramaka territory has been carried out, Suriname must abstain from acts which might lead the agents of the State itself, or third parties acting with its acquiescence or its tolerance, to affect the existence, value, use or enjoyment of the territory to which the members of the Saramaka people are entitled, unless the State obtains the free, informed and prior consent of the Saramaka people [...].

[...]

7. The State shall remove or amend the legal provisions that impede protection of the right to property of the members of the Saramaka people and adopt, in its domestic legislation, and through prior, effective and fully informed consultations with the Saramaka people, legislative, administrative, and other measures as may be required to recognize, protect, guarantee and give legal effect to the right of the members of the Saramaka people to hold collective title to the territory they have traditionally used and occupied, which includes the lands and natural resources necessary for their social, cultural and economic survival, as well as to manage, distribute, and effectively control such territory, in accordance with their customary laws and traditional collective land tenure system, and without prejudice to other tribal and indigenous communities [...].

8. The State shall adopt legislative, administrative and other measures necessary to recognize and ensure the right of the Saramaka people to be effectively consulted, in accordance with their traditions and customs, or when necessary, the right to give or withhold their free, informed and prior consent, with regard to development or investment projects that may affect their territory, and to reasonably share the benefits of such projects with the members of the Saramaka people, should these be ultimately carried out [...].

9. The State shall ensure that environmental and social impact assessments are conducted by independent and technically competent entities, prior to awarding a concession for any development or investment project within traditional Saramaka territory, and implement adequate safeguards and mechanisms in order to minimize the damaging effects such projects may have upon the social, economic and cultural survival of the Saramaka people [...].

20. With regard to the measures ordered in the Judgment, the Court is supervising their implementation by means of the procedure of monitoring compliance with judgment and, in this context, adopted an Order on November 23, 2011. In this Order, the Court declared that the measures described above (*supra* considering paragraph 19) had not been fulfilled and required the State to adopt all necessary measures to comply effectively and promptly with each of the operative paragraphs pending compliance.¹²

¹² Cf. *Case of the Saramaka People v. Suriname*. Monitoring compliance with judgment. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of November 23, 2011, second and third operative paragraphs.

21. Also, in this 2011 Order, the Court indicated that “the award of any new concession in these territories after December 19, 2007, the date of which the Judgment was notified, without the consent of the Saramaka and without previously conducting social and environmental impact assessments, would constitute a direct violation of the Court’s ruling and, consequently, of the international treaty-based obligations of the State.”¹³

22. The Court observes that the information forwarded by the representatives in this regard is closely related to compliance with operative paragraphs 5, 7, 8 and 9 of the Judgment. Furthermore, in this case, since notification of the Judgment, the Court has been monitoring its execution pursuant to the articles of the Convention that regulate this competence.¹⁴ Moreover, within this framework, the Court has even held two private hearings on monitoring compliance (2010 and 2013) in order to supervise implementation of the Judgment, and has also issued an Order in this regard (*supra* having seen paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 8).

23. Consequently, the Court considers that, in the instant case, the analysis and assessment of the information provided concerning the mining exploitation project on Saramaka territory is related to monitoring compliance with the Judgment, so that it is unnecessary to adopt provisional measures in relation to this aspect.¹⁵

24. In this regard, the Court recalls that the States Parties to the Convention that have accepted the Court’s contentious jurisdiction are bound to obey the obligations established by the Court. This requirement includes the State’s obligation to inform the Court of the steps taken to comply with the measures ordered by the Court in its decisions. The prompt observance of the State’s obligation to advise the Court how it is complying with each element ordered by the latter is essential in order to assess the status of compliance with the Judgment as a whole.¹⁶

25. Based on the procedure of monitoring compliance with the Judgment in this case, the State must forward the Court a complete, detailed and specific report on the alleged award of the mining concession on the Saramaka territory to IAMGOLD, in which it must indicate: (a) the scope and content of the said concession, (b) whether the Saramaka People was consulted and what measures were taken to this end; (c) whether the said concession was preceded by environmental and social assessment studies, and (d) if applicable, the benefits for the Saramaka People; all of this pursuant to operative paragraphs 5, 7, 8 and 9 of the Judgment.

THEREFORE:

THE INTER-AMERICAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS,

in exercise of the authority conferred on it by Article 63(2) of the American Convention and Articles 27, 31(2) and 69 of the Rules of Procedure,

¹³ *Case of the Saramaka People v. Suriname*. Monitoring compliance with judgment, *supra*, nineteenth considering paragraph.

¹⁴ *Cf. Case of the Mayagna (Sumo) Awas Tingni Community*. Provisional measures with regard to Nicaragua. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of November 26, 2007, twelfth considering paragraph.

¹⁵ *Cf. Case of the Mayagna (Sumo) Awas Tingni Community, supra*, eleventh considering paragraph.

¹⁶ *Cf. Case of Barrios Altos v. Peru*. Monitoring compliance with judgment. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of September 22, 2005, seventh considering paragraph, and *Case of Abril Alosilla et al. v. Peru*. Monitoring compliance with judgment. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of May 22, 2013, sixth considering paragraph.

DECIDES:

1. To reject the requests for provisional measures filed in favor of the Saramaka leaders and their representatives, and with regard to the Saramaka territory, pursuant to considering paragraphs 10 to 23 of this Order.
2. To continue monitoring the information forwarded by the representatives with regard to the Saramaka territory through the procedure of monitoring compliance with judgment, pursuant to considering paragraphs 20 to 25 of this Order.
3. To require the State to forward a report on the mining concession awarded to a private company by October 25, 2013, in the terms of considering paragraph 25 of this Order. When this report has been received, the President will determine the time frames for the submission of the observations of the representatives of the victims and of the Inter-American Commission.
4. To require the Secretariat to notify this Order to Suriname, the Commission, and the representatives of the victims.

Diego García-Sayán
President

Manuel E. Ventura Robles

Alberto Pérez Pérez

Eduardo Vio Grossi

Roberto F. Caldas

Humberto Antonio Sierra Porto

Eduardo Ferrer Mac-Gregor Poisot

Pablo Saavedra Alessandri
Registrar

So ordered,

Diego García-Sayán
President

Pablo Saavedra Alessandri
Registrar