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The African Commission on Human and People’s Rights, established by ***Article 30 of the African Charter on Human and People’s Rights*** postulates a three- fold obligation which includes: to respect, ensure and fulfil human rights obligations under the charter. This is asserted in *Article 45* of the charter which provides for the mandate of the Commission as including the promotion and protection of human and people’s rights; ***Article 45 (1 &2)***. The African Court of Human and People’s Rights is Established under ***Article 1 of the Protocol to the African Charter on the Establishment of the African Court of Human and People’s Rights***. With the mandate of complementing and reinforcing the protective mandate of the African Commission. The establishment of the Court was a result of one of the major challenges experienced by African Commission.

From the foregoing, the regional institutions have a similar mandate which dwells on the promotion and protection of human rights, thus they experience similar challenges with regards the fulfilment of this mandate. Some of these challenges include:

1. **Recognition of State Parties**: Another major challenge faced by these African institutions is the issue of admissibility. Generally, only state parties are recognised by the organisations to bring communications or complaints. Therefore, when there is a violation of the right of an individual or any non- state party, there tends to be some form of restriction limiting individuals from filing complaints. In the instance of the African Commission, ***Article 55 of the African charter on Human and People’s Rights*** provides that the Commission shall consider communications from persons other than state parties only subject to the acceptance of such communications by a simple majority. This can be limited by broadening the scope of the organisations to allow recognition of individual complainants and non-state parties. For instance, the scope has been modified for ECOWAS Court such that individuals can now bring complaints regarding human rights violations.
2. **Exhaustion of Local Remedies**: Again, most of these public international institutions have the exhaustion of local remedies as a requirement for accepting complaints or communications. Implicitly, a case cannot be brought before these organisations until the complainant is dissatisfied with the decision of the local courts. For Example, ***Article 56 of the ACHPR.*** The purpose for this rule is to establish some form of hierarchy among local and international courts. This can be reviewed by looking into the procedural requirement of the institutions.
3. **Lack of Independence and Limitation of Powers**: These organisations including the African commission on Human and People’s Rights are practically creations of their member states. Therefore, their powers are limited by the laws guiding them. This, it is evident that most of these organisations are dependent on the functions of some authority. For example, ***Article 58 (1)*** of the ACHPR requires the Commission to draw the attention of the Assembly of heads of State and Government to cases involving massive violation of human and people’s rights. Furthermore, ***Article 77 of the ECOWAS Revised Treaty*** gives power to the Authority of heads of States and government to impose sanctions on defaulters.
4. Jurisdiction: As a principle of international law, every state is sovereign and answerable to no one outside it, therefore, depending on the system practiced in a state, international laws would only have persuasive authority, unless otherwise adopted by a state. Consequently, the low rate of ratification of the constitutive elements of some of these organisations has become a prominent issue among public international institutions. This can be checked by reviewing the ratification requirement of these organisations.
5. Enforcement: Similarly, one major limitation experienced by most international human rights institutions is the operation of local judicial sovereignty to ensure that organisational laws are recognised as binding locally and enforced accordingly. The African Court for example is obligated to monitor the execution of its decisions but has no enforcement power. This can be checked through the creation of sub-committees to help ensure the enforcement of decisions.
6. Lack of Awareness: Another major problem that is similar to most of these organisation is one of awareness. In order to effectively fulfil their human rights mandate, there is great need for citizens of member states and other potential beneficiaries to be informed about the establishment and procedures of these organisations. This can be improved by creating awareness programmes.

The establishment of these organisations is seemingly a step in the right direction for the protection and promotion of human rights in Africa, the overall goal which is to generally have institutions which are independent of political pressure, immune to corruption and responsive to the needs of the African populace still seems a stone’s throw away. However, these limitations can be overcome by putting the foregoing suggestions into consideration.