



International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

Distr.: General
27 April 2012
English
Original: English/French

Human Rights Committee

104th session

New York, 12–30 March 2012

Report of the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on concluding observations of the Human Rights Committee (104th session, March 2012)**

The following report sets out the information received by the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on concluding observations and the steps that she took between the 103rd and 104th sessions pursuant to the Human Rights Committee's rules of procedure. All the available information concerning the follow-up procedure used by the Committee since its eighty-seventh session, held in July 2006, is outlined in the table appended as an annex to this report, which covers the measures taken in connection with States parties that have not responded during the period under consideration, States parties with respect to which the Committee has completed its follow-up activities, and States parties whose responses will be considered at the Committee's next session.

* Reissued for technical reasons.

** The annexes to this report have been reproduced in the form and in the language in which they were received.

Evaluation criteria

Reply/action satisfactory

A Response largely satisfactory

Reply/action partially satisfactory

B1 Substantive action taken, but additional information required

B2 Initial action taken, but additional information required

Reply/action not satisfactory

C1 Response received but actions taken do not implement the recommendation

C2 Response received but not relevant to the recommendations

No cooperation with the Committee

D1 No response received within the deadline, or no reply to a specific question in the report

D2 No response received after reminder(s)

Ninety-ninth session (March 2007)**State party: Chile**

COB: CCPR/C/CHL/CO/5

Follow-up paragraphs:

Para. 9: impunity for human rights violations committed during the dictatorship and suitability of persons who have committed human rights violations to hold public office

Para. 19: negotiations with indigenous communities, land rights

State party's first reply: Expected: 26 March 2008;¹ Received: 21 October 2008**Evaluation of State party's first reply:**Paras. 9 and 19: [B2]²**NGO information:**

25 March 2009 Centre for Civil and Political Rights (CCPR Centre) and Centre for Human Rights, Universidad Diego Portales; Observatorio de Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas.

State party's second reply received: 28 May 2010**Evaluation of State party's second reply:**Paras. 9 and 19: [B1]³¹ Two reminders: 11 June 2008 and 22 September 2008.² 10 December 2008: letter sent; 22 June 2009: meeting with the State party requested; two reminders: 11 December 2009 and 23 April 2010.³ 16 December 2010: letter sent; 31 January 2011: letter from the State party requesting clarification on

State party's third reply received: 5 October 2011

Summary of third reply – paragraph 9:

Under article 105 of the Criminal Code, legal prohibitions resulting from the commission of a criminal act shall last for the amount of time set for prescription of the punishment ... This rule does not apply to prohibitions on the exercise of political rights.

Judges can no longer apply mechanisms exempting individuals from criminal responsibility in cases of crimes against humanity, which were declared imprescriptible by the Supreme Court in 2006.

However, the Supreme Court applies the concept of “partial prescription” (*prescripción gradual*) under article 103 of the Criminal Code, considering that “where prescription cannot be applied in criminal proceedings, as it would absolve the individual of criminal responsibility, median, partial or incomplete prescription can be applied, as it constitutes grounds for reducing the sentence ... [its consequences] are completely different [from those of prescription]. It is a mitigating circumstance which allows only for a reduction of the corresponding punishment. While, like extinctive prescription, it is applied on the basis of the passage of time, it cannot be considered to have the same legal status, since extinctive prescription is based on the principle of legal certainty ...”.

Under the principle of the separation of powers, the executive cannot interfere in the decisions of the judiciary. Nevertheless, it continues to work to ensure the incorporation into the legal system of international human rights standards and the duties to punish offences and guarantee rights, which preclude the use of prescription as an automatic exonerating mechanism.

Evaluation – paragraph 9:

[D1]: The State party does not provide any information on banning persons convicted of human rights violations from exercising public functions.

[B1]: Recalling the principles set out in paragraph 4 of general comment No. 31, the State party should be asked to provide additional information in its next periodic report on the manner and circumstances of the application by the Supreme Court of progressive prescription and on measures taken to ensure that it does not give rise to impunity for human rights violations (para. 9).

Summary of third reply – paragraph 19:

Description of the laws adopted to protect the rights of indigenous peoples and to guarantee and respect their integrity, including Act No. 19.253 establishing the National Indigenous Development Corporation. Article 1 of the Act refers to the earth as the cornerstone of Indians' existence and culture and adds that the State and society have a duty to protect Indian lands and to ensure the judicious use of their resources. Article 12 of the Act specifies what land qualifies as Indian land and provides for protection mechanisms, setting limits on legal transactions that might be prejudicial. The Act regulates the division of Indian lands and related rights of succession (the provisions are described in the State party's reply). Between 1994 and 2010, a total of 667,457 hectares were acquired by or transmitted to Indian persons or communities.

what additional information is required; 20 April 2011: letter clarifying what information is required; 2 August 2011: reminder.

Evaluation – paragraph 19:

[A]

Additional information provided – paragraph 7:

Significant amendments have been made to the Counter-Terrorism Act since September 2010. The members of the Mapuche community have been reclassified so that the Counter-Terrorism Act no longer applies to them. The concept of a terrorist act has been defined more restrictively; and changes have been made to the procedure and the military justice system.

Evaluation – paragraph 7:

No follow-up to this paragraph.

Recommended action: Letter reflecting the Committee's analysis and indicating that the supplementary information that has been requested should be included in the periodic report due on 1 March 2012 or in an addendum thereto.

Next periodic report: 1 April 2012

Ninety-third session (July 2008)**State party: France**

COB: CCPR/C/FRA/CO/4, adopted in July 2008

Follow-up paragraphs:

Para. 12: statistical data disaggregated by racial, ethnic and national origin

Para. 18: detention of undocumented foreign nationals and asylum seekers; detention centres

Para. 20: procedure for deporting foreign nationals/asylum seekers

State party's first reply: Expected: 22 July 2009; Received: 20 July 2009

Evaluation of State party's first reply:

Para. 12: [A]

Para. 18 and 20: [B2]⁴

State party's second reply received: 9 July 2010

Evaluation of State party's second reply:

Para. 12: [A]

Paras. 18 and 20: [B2] (para. 20: [A] on the issue of assurances)⁵

State party's third reply received: 8 November 2011

⁴ Letter from the Committee sent on 11 January 2010.

⁵ Letter from the Committee sent on 16 December 2010; 17 January 2011: request for clarification on information required. 20 April 2011: letter clarifying information required; 2 August 2011: reminder.

Summary of third reply – paragraph 18:

The immigration situation is very different in overseas departments, regions and communities (DROM-COM). The Government has built administrative detention centres in DROM-COM with high levels of illegal immigration: Guadeloupe, French Guyana, Réunion and Mayotte. The Government has also built permanent or temporary administrative detention facilities in other locations (statistical information provided on administrative detention centres and facilities in DROM-COM).

Administrative detention is regulated by the Code on the Entry and Residence of Aliens and the Right of Asylum. The Decree of 30 May 2005 sets out the standards for facilities in administrative detention centres, taking into account the recommendations of the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT). A circular dated June 2010 specifies which personal items detainees are allowed to keep with them and the conditions for solitary confinement. It prohibits the use of shackles and handcuffs, apart from in exceptional cases. Since January 2010, the task of providing information and assistance to foreign nationals in detention on the exercise of their rights is shared between five associations. Efforts are also being made to improve training for staff in the centres.

Renovation work has been carried out at the administrative detention centre in Guadeloupe (2009–2010) and French Guyana (2007–2008) (bringing equipment and operations up to standard). CPT visited the administrative detention centre in French Guyana in the autumn of 2008. Its recommendations were taken into account by the Government. The administrative detention centre in Mayotte was renovated in 2008 in anticipation of the construction of a new one by the end of 2014. No renovations were deemed necessary for the administrative detention centre in Réunion.

Evaluation – paragraph 18:

[B2]: The Committee should ask the State party to include in its next periodic report more specific information on the measures taken to improve detainees' exercise of their rights with regard to health, education, work, family and the regularization of their legal situation.

Summary of third reply – paragraph 20:

1. The sole purpose of the bill in question is to transfer to the National Court on the Right of Asylum the responsibility for ruling on appeals against failed asylum applications. The bill gives the judge 72 hours rather than 48 to issue a ruling. It was adopted on first reading by the Senate on 6 May 2009 and has not been discussed by the National Assembly.

The "priority procedure" is in conformity with Community law (Council Directive 2005/85/EC of 1 December 2005). It is employed on an optional basis, in exceptional circumstances as outlined in the Act. It ensures an independent review with appropriate safeguards. It is not used in matters of "national security", but only when "the presence in France of a foreigner poses a serious threat to public order, public safety or State security". The same concept is used to justify the execution of an expulsion procedure. The correct interpretation of the concept is subject to judicial control. The procedure is invoked when the foreign national is from a country regarded as safe, or when the application for asylum is made with a view to overturning an expulsion order.

2. The legislation on the rights of asylum seekers and undocumented foreigners comprises a multitude of different laws, codified in the Code on the Entry and Residence of Aliens and the Right of Asylum. The Act of 16 June 2011 on immigration, integration and nationality introduced further changes. In 2010, France received 52,762 applications for asylum (compared to 47,686 in 2009). The State party accepted more than 2,200 persons under certain special procedures between 2008 and 2010. More than 160,500 persons

benefit from sustainable protection measures.

The Act of 16 June 2011 ensures compliance with Directive 2008/115/EC. It gives priority to the voluntary return of foreigners in an irregular situation. The decision to order a person's expulsion or ban them from re-entering France is taken following an examination of the individual case. In the case of a lengthy stay in France, family ties or special situations, an individual cannot be forced to leave the country. The administrative judge conducts a thorough examination of the measure and can overturn it. Foreign nationals may request repatriation aid to help them return to their country of origin. Statistical information is provided.

NGO information:

24 January 2011: Action by Christians for the Abolition of Torture (ACAT): "Eleven commitments to place human dignity at the heart of political action". Reports multiple restrictions on the right to asylum.

Evaluation – paragraph 20:

[B1]: Additional information is needed on: (i) the frequency with which the "priority procedure" is applied, and the conditions for its use; (ii) the measures taken to ensure that asylum seekers are effectively informed about their rights and obligations once they are in French territory.

Recommended action: Letter reflecting the Committee's analysis.

Next periodic report: 1 November 2012

State party: The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

COB: CCPR/C/GBR/CO/6, adopted in March 2008

Follow-up paragraphs:

Para. 9: inquiries into violations of the right to life in Northern Ireland

Para. 12: procedure in cases of terrorism, diplomatic assurances

Para. 14: investigation and sanction of alleged deaths, torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment in detention facilities in Afghanistan and Iraq

Para. 15: due process for terrorist suspects

State party's first reply: Expected: 18 July 2009; Received: 7 August 2009

NGO information:

1 August 2009 British Irish Rights Watch

24 August 2009 Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission

Evaluation:

Para. 9: [B2]

Para. 12: [C1]

Para. 14: [B2]

Para. 15: [B2]⁶

State party's second reply: 10 November 2010

Evaluation:

Paras. 14, 15: [B1]

Paras. 12, 9: not included in the follow-up procedure⁷

State party's third reply: 19 October 2011

Summary of third reply – paragraph 14:

Updated information on the issues raised is provided in the fifth periodic report of the United Kingdom to the Committee against Torture (see below):

On the Iraq Historic Allegations team at paragraph 445: “Many of the claims of abuse in British custody in Iraq which allege criminal behaviour have arisen years after the event and present difficult investigative challenges. The Iraq Historic Allegations Team (IHAT) ... was set up to commit additional resources to investigations and get to the bottom of the allegations more quickly ... The Head of the IHAT ... was appointed on 6 September 2010 and he leads a team of Royal Military Police and civilian investigators.”

On reparation to victims of deaths in military detention facilities abroad: see paragraphs 125,497 and 498 of report to CAT:

- Reference to a public inquiry into allegations of unlawful killing and mistreatment of Iraqi nationals by British forces in southern Iraq in 2004. The MOD and Army will continue to cooperate fully with the inquiry. Not possible to comment further as the inquiry is ongoing.
- Baha Mousa case: on 27 March 2008 the Secretary of State for Defence admitted substantive breaches of articles 2 and 3 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (ECHR) and of article 3 of ECHR in respect of nine individuals detained at the same time as Baha Mousa. The then Minister for the Armed Forces offered his apologies and sympathy to all the families. On 14 May 2008, the Secretary of State for Defence ordered a public inquiry into the death of Baha Mousa. Case ongoing.

Evaluation:

[B1]: Updated information necessary on the progress and results of the work of the Iraq Historic Allegations team; and on the conclusions and decisions of the Baha Mousa case and of the Al Sweady Inquiry.

Summary of reply – paragraph 15:

Para. 33 of the fifth periodic report of the United Kingdom to the Committee against Torture “The Northern Ireland-specific provisions contained in Part VII of the Terrorism Act 2000 were repealed on 31 July 2007 as part of a security normalisation programme [...]. Terrorism legislation in Northern Ireland is now for the most part identical to the rest of the UK.”

⁶ 26 April 2010: letter sent; 28 September 2010: reminder.

⁷ 20 April 2011: letter sent; 2 August 2011: reminder.

Evaluation:

[B1]: Additional information necessary on the specificities of terrorism legislation in Northern Ireland.

Recommended action: Letter reflecting the Committee's analysis.

Next periodic report: 31 July 2012

State party: Ireland

COB: CCPR/C/IRL/CO/3, adopted in March 2008

Follow-up paragraphs:

Para. 11: definition of "terrorist acts" in its domestic legislation, control of suspicious flights and renditions

Para. 15: conditions of detention

Para. 22: availability of non-denominational primary education

State party's first reply: Expected: 23 July 2009; Received: 31 July 2009

NGO information:

August 2009 Free Legal Advice Centres (FLAC); Irish Council for Civil Liberties (ICCL); Irish Penal Reform Trust (IPRT)

Evaluation:

Paras. 11, 15, 22: [B1]⁸

State party's second reply: 21 December 2010

Evaluation of second reply:

Paras. 15, 22: [A]

Para. 11: [B1]⁹

State party's third reply: 31 January 2012

Summary of third reply – paragraph 11:

(a) The main body of counter-terrorism law comprises the Offences against the State Acts of 1939 and 1998 and the Criminal Justice (Terrorist Offences) Act 2005. Specified offences are terrorist when committed with the intent to seriously intimidate a population, unduly compel a government or international organization to perform or abstain from performing an act, or destabilize or destroy the fundamental political, constitutional, economic or social structures of a State or an international organization.

The 2005 Act gives effect to international antiterrorist instruments. Persons charged with serious terrorist offences are tried before a panel of three judges before a Special Criminal Court. Operates within the general structure of criminal law with procedural guarantees. Appeal to the Irish superior court is possible.

⁸ 4 January 2010: letter sent; 28 September 2010: reminder.

⁹ 25 April 2011: letter requesting additional information on the results of the activities developed by the Cabinet Committee: (a) modalities and frequency of investigation and prosecution of terrorist acts, and length of pretrial detention and access to a lawyer in practice; (b) safeguards in place when relying on official assurances. Two reminders sent: **17 November 2011 - 2 August 2011**.

Persons suspected of offences with terrorist motivation have the same rights of access to a lawyer or legal advice as those suspected of the same offences without such motivation. Solicitors cannot be present during the police interviews. The detainee is informed orally and in writing.

The maximum period of pre-charge detention under the Offences against the State Acts is two days. The Senior Garda Officer can request an extension if there are reasonable grounds to believe that it is necessary for the proper investigation of the offence. Where the legitimacy of any extension is questioned, the Senior Garda Officer involved must stand by the decision before the Courts.

Persons prosecuted in the Special Criminal Court have the same rights to apply for bail as those charged with other offences.

The Act defines as “serious” offences where a person may be sentenced to imprisonment of five years or more. If bail is refused and trial has not commenced within four months of the refusal, a new application can be presented.

From 2009 to 2010, the Special Criminal Court prosecuted 32 persons, and 30 were convicted.

(b) The assurances received in relation to allegations of extraordinary rendition are clear, categorical and reliable.

To enter an aircraft to make an arrest, it is necessary to have reasonable grounds for suspicion that evidence of or relating to the commission of an arrestable offence is on board. No random or routine entry to search civilian aircraft for the purpose of the detection of any offence is permitted.

Investigations have taken place into allegations of extraordinary rendition in Irish airports. No evidence was offered by complainants to support their allegations.

Evaluation:

[B1]: Additional information is necessary on the definition of terrorism.

Recommended action: Letter stating that the answer provided on paragraph 11 is largely satisfactory and recalling that the next periodic report is due on 31 July 2012.

Next periodic report: 31 July 2012

Ninety-fourth session (October 2008)

State party: Nicaragua

COB: CCPR/C/NIC/CO/3, adopted in October 2008

Follow-up paragraphs:

Para. 12: killings of women

Para. 13: legislation on abortion

Para. 17: detention conditions

Para. 19: persecution and death threats against human rights defenders; freedom of expression and association

State party's first reply: Expected: 29 October 2009;¹⁰ Received: 11 October 2011¹¹

Summary of first reply – paragraph 12:

Descriptions are provided of nine projects created to eliminate violence against women, along with their results in the form of the number of persons who visited the Special Police Unit for Women and Children and the number of complaints and decisions adopted.

The Public Prosecution Service has established the Special Unit on Violence and the Office of Specialized Care for Crime Victims. A “directive on domestic violence” and a response protocol to coordinate intervention by judges, prosecutors, police officers and forensic doctors have also been established.

The following actions to promote autonomy among women are described: training sessions; the government policy known as the “Gender Programme” or “Gender Window” launched in 15 cities to build technical capacity among 35,000 women beneficiaries of social programmes.

The Nicaraguan Institute for Women is developing a programme to promote the rights of women in order to strengthen their participation, with a view to reducing poverty and allowing families and communities to flourish.

In September 2010, a bill to combat violence against women, which includes a definition of the offence of femicide, was introduced. In March 2011, the Family Code was approved by the Commission on Justice and Legal Affairs and the Commission on Women, Youth, Children and Family Issues.

NGO information:

The Nicaraguan Centre for Human Rights (CENIDH), the World Organisation against Torture (OMCT), the Red de Centros, the Red de Mujeres contra la Violencia, the Federation of Non-Governmental Organizations working with Children and Adolescents (CODENI), 10 February 2012:

(a) The situation has not improved (length of police investigations, delayed forensic reports, lack of detentions of possible perpetrators, low number of cases finally prosecuted, postponement of hearings and trials, large backlogs for the Prosecution and the Police). The possibility of reconciliation and mediation promotes impunity. There is no budget increase to meet the staff shortage. Additional infrastructure and training are necessary.

(b) Concern about cases defined as “minor sexual offences” by the police: they are not prosecuted ex officio and the victims must initiate the proceedings after exhausting the mediation procedure. Paradoxically, perpetrators will be systematically represented, while victims have to pay a counsel. This procedure discourages victims from bringing their cases to justice.

(c) In 2009 only 1,196 requests for urgent protection were filed. 226 women were returned to their homes (0.6 per cent of the complaints). Civil society runs all the shelters and legal and psychological counselling for victims of sexual violence.

¹⁰ Two reminders: 23 April 2010 and 8 October 2010; meeting with the State party requested: 20 April 2011; positive response from the State party by telephone: 4 May 2011. Meeting scheduled for 18 July 2011. No State party representative appeared.

¹¹ With a note verbale explaining and apologizing for the delegation's absence from the meeting in July.

(d) There is no institutionalized dialogue with human rights activists.

(e) The State report does not mention training to police or other actors working in the administration of justice, the budget allocated to it or cooperation with civil society.

Evaluation – paragraph 12:

[B1] for (d) and (e): additional information is needed on the status of the bill on violence against women and on the results of the programmes described in the State party's reply in terms of reducing gender-based violence and killings of women and of increasing their direct participation and their representation by civil society.

[D1] for (a), (b) and (c).

Summary of first reply – paragraph 13:

The State's position on abortion is an expression of its national sovereignty. Action has been taken at the community and institutional levels to prevent unwanted pregnancies and to promote health care, with emphasis on family planning. Contraceptive pills are provided to women. Doctors are not prohibited from intervening when the mother's life is in danger; in fact they are required to do so.

Projects to improve access to justice play an important role: they create spaces for resolving conflicts and expanding community and restorative justice, as well as access to free justice for disadvantaged individuals.

A department providing specialized psychosocial assistance for victims of trafficking in persons and sexual exploitation has been established within the special police units for women and children.

A national strategy on sexual and reproductive health has been developed to improve the maternal and prenatal health care provided by specialized obstetric units. Standards and protocols have been adopted to serve as guidelines for clinical intervention.

An information programme on gender relations, citizenship, sexuality and values has been included in the educational curriculum. The Ministry of Health received the *Premio América* 2011 for its progress in preventing maternal mortality through the *Casas Maternas* (maternity houses) strategy.

NGO information:

All types of abortion are penalized without exception. On 16 March 2010, 21 MPs presented a motion to reform the Criminal Code and allow for an exception in the case of danger to the mother. It was not discussed in plenary. The Supreme Court is considering the constitutionality of the prohibition of abortion. Professionals conducting abortions are still penalized.

Evaluation – paragraph 13:

[B1]: Progress has been achieved with regard to prevention measures, but additional information is needed on measures taken to ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of the current family-planning programmes and programmes to prevent unwanted pregnancies.

[C1]: The actions taken do not implement the recommendation urging the State party to review its legislation on abortion.

[D1]: No information is provided on the judicial treatment of doctors who attend women requiring care as a result of an "unnatural" abortion.

Summary of first reply – paragraph 17:

The prison system is regulated by the Act on the Prison System and the Execution of Sentences. All related activities must be carried out in accordance with constitutional principles and guarantees, domestic legislation and international instruments. The subject of human rights is included in the educational programmes conducted at the School for Prison Studies.

The Inspectorate-General of the Prison System monitors the actions of prison officials and staff. It receives complaints and recommends disciplinary sanctions. The civil inspectorate of the Ministry of the Interior and the Public Prosecution Service can also monitor the actions of prison staff.

The number of minors currently in detention is provided, and measures taken to ensure special treatment and conditions of detention for minors are described, along with measures to prevent juvenile delinquency.

NGO information:

According to the General Budget for 2011, there is an increase of 6.9 per cent compared to 2010 and of 3.1 per cent compared to 2009. This is insufficient to overcome the overcrowding of more than 6,000 detainees. Police cells are used to shelter more than 100 convicted prisoners on the Caribbean coast. The budget for food has not been increased and there is no budget for health coverage. There are ongoing restrictions on human rights activists visiting places of detention.

Evaluation – paragraph 17:

[C2]: The information received does not make it possible to assess the implementation of the principles of international law in relation to prisons. The only steps mentioned are those taken to improve detention conditions for minors, whereas the recommendation refers to detention conditions in general.

Summary of first reply – paragraph 19:

The preamble of the Constitution recalls the principle of absolute respect for human rights, including the freedoms of opinion, thought, association, expression and assembly.

There is no State policy against human rights defenders. The State recognizes the work of human rights defenders and works in cooperation with more than 4,000 NGOs, 29 of which are specialized.

The criminal case against nine women who defended the rights of women involved in the termination of the pregnancy of an underage girl has been closed.

NGO information:

There is still an active policy of threats, censorship and repression against human rights activists by pro-Government groups and individuals. They have not been punished.

Evaluation – paragraph 19:

[B2]: Information is still needed (i) on the measures adopted to prevent harassment and threats against human rights defenders; (ii) on the investigations launched and the punishments handed out to those responsible for the alleged acts of systematic harassment and death threats against human rights defenders.

Recommended action: Letter reflecting the Committee's analysis.

Next periodic report: 29 October 2012

State party: Spain

COB: CCPR/C/ESP/CO/5, adopted in October 2008

Follow-up paragraphs:

Para. 13: national mechanism for the prevention of torture

Para. 15: length of police custody and pretrial detention

Para. 16: detention and expulsion of foreigners

State party's first reply: Expected: 30 October 2009;¹² Received: 16 June 2010

NGO information:

4 February 2010 NGO Report – CCPR Centre/BEHATOKIA (Basque Observatory of Human Rights)

Evaluation of State party's first reply:

Para. 16: [B1]

Paras. 13, 15: [B2]¹³

State party's second reply received: 29 June 2011

Evaluation:

Paras. 13, 15, 16: [B1]¹⁴

State party's third reply received: 24 October 2011

Summary of third reply – paragraph 13:

The Ministry of the Interior reiterates the information provided in June 2011. The draft bill on a new criminal procedure was adopted on 22 July 2011. It amends the regime of incommunicado detention and provides for audio-visual recordings to be made in cases of incommunicado detention, and for the detainee to be visited every eight hours by a forensic doctor and a person chosen by the national mechanism for the prevention of torture.

Evaluation – paragraph 13:

[B2]: Additional information is needed on the adoption and implementation of the bill on a new criminal procedure and on the main reforms introduced, particularly with regard to the maximum length of police custody and pretrial detention.

Summary of third reply – paragraph 15:

No information on the subject.

Evaluation – paragraph 15:

¹² 23 April 2010: reminder.

¹³ 25 April 2011: letter sent.

¹⁴ 22 September 2011: letter asking the State party to include information *in its next periodic report* on the operation of the national mechanism for the prevention of torture; developments in legislation and in practice regarding the length of police custody and pretrial detention; the annual number since 2009 of: (i) individuals who requested and were granted access to free legal aid; (ii) deportations ordered, and the percentage of those that were suspended in application of the principle of non-refoulement; (iii) persons who benefited from the right to asylum and subsidiary protection.

[D1]

Summary of third reply – paragraph 16:

Number of cases in which international protection (asylum and subsidiary protection) has been granted since 2009:

2009: asylum in 179 cases/subsidiary protection in 162 cases. Total: 341

2010: 245/350/Total: 595

2011: (up to 1 October) 253/407/Total: 660

Evaluation – paragraph 16:

[B1]: The information provided should be updated in the next periodic report.

Recommended action: Letter reflecting the Committee's analysis.

Next periodic report: 1 November 2012

Ninety-fifth session (March 2009)**State party: Australia**

COB: CCPR/C/AUS/CO/5, adopted in March 2009

Follow-up paragraphs:

Para. 11: counter-terrorism legislation and practices

Para. 14: indigenous peoples; NTER measures

Para. 17: violence against women

Para. 23: immigration detention policy

State party's first reply: Expected: 2 April 2010;¹⁵ Received: 17 December 2010

NGO information:

20 November 2009 Human Rights Law Resources Centre

Evaluation of State party's first reply:

Paras. 11, 14, 17: [B2]

Para. 23: [A]¹⁶

Second reply received: 3 February 2012

Summary of second reply – paragraph 11:

The Government maintains that the definition of a terrorist act is not vague. Nonetheless, it underlines the possibility for the recently appointed Independent National Security Legislation Monitor to revise the definition in the context of its mandate. The Council of Australian Governments (COAG) still has not commenced its review of the counter-terrorism laws.

¹⁵ 28 September 2010: reminder.

¹⁶ 19 October 2011: letter sent.

Detention in conditions of secrecy for up to 8 days without a warrant is limited by extensive restrictions and safeguards. A person may only be detained by the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (ASIO) for the purpose of questioning after the issue of a warrant if it substantially assists the collection of relevant intelligence, or when there are reasonable grounds to believe that the person will fail to appear for questioning, will alert a person involved in a terrorism offence that is being investigated, or will destroy or alter a record or thing required to be produced under the warrant. Limitations are tailored to protect national security. The abrogation of the current ASIO questioning and detention powers is not considered.

The expression “for the avoidance of doubt” is interpreted literally. Section 34 ZP aims at ensuring that the questioning can proceed notwithstanding the situation where, for example, a person is prevented from contacting a particular lawyer and refuses to contact any other.

Evaluation:

[C1]: Not implemented: updated information should be included in the next periodic report on the measures taken and conclusions reached by the National Security Legislation Monitor and the Council of Australian Governments (COAG).

Summary of second reply – paragraph 14:

The reinstatement of the Racial Discrimination Act 1975 (RDA) in relation to the Northern Territory Emergency Response (NTER) took effect from December 2010. The provisions are now consistent with the RDA. People have the right to take legal action if they consider any of the NTER provisions discriminatory. No action has been initiated to date.

Under existing legislation and funding arrangements, most NTER measures should cease mid-2012. In June 2011, the Government released the Stronger Futures in the Northern Territory discussion paper as the starting point for consulting with Aboriginal people in the Northern Territory to seek their views on future approaches to addressing their continuing high level of disadvantage. On 23 November 2011, the Government announced its legislative response to the issues identified as the most urgent. The legislation will be subject to public scrutiny through a Parliamentary Committee process before being debated by the Parliament in early 2012. If passed, the legislation will repeal the Northern Territory National Emergency Response Act 2007 and include provisions to ensure that children attend school and to address the serious harm caused by alcohol abuse and make communities safer.

The five-year leases over Aboriginal land that were compulsorily acquired under the initial NTER legislation will be ended in August 2012. The objective is now to negotiate voluntary long-term leases with Aboriginal landowners to ensure secure tenure arrangements for government investment in housing and infrastructure on Aboriginal land.

Evaluation:

[B1]: Updated information necessary on: (i) the progress made for the debate, adoption and implementation of the legislation referred to in the reply; (ii) the decisions taken for the negotiation of voluntary long-term leases with Aboriginal landowners to ensure secure tenure arrangements for government investment in housing and infrastructure.

Summary of second reply – paragraph 17:

Addressing the high levels of violence against women is an ongoing process. National surveys on attitudes towards violence in the community will be conducted from 2012. The Government will report on the results in future communications with the Committee.

The national plan to reduce violence against women and their children (2010–2022) was launched to assist in informing future strategies to prevent violence against women. It

focuses on primary prevention, on improving the service system, building the evidence base and holding perpetrators to account. It seeks to enhance the relationship between government and the non-government sector. The plan will be implemented through a series of three-year action plans around six outcomes, including “indigenous communities are strengthened”. All States and territories will develop implementation plans recognizing the different circumstances and priorities. The implementation will be supervised by the Select Council on Women’s Issues and specialized ministries.

The Plan includes the development of a National Centre of Excellence to develop national research into violence against women from 2012 to inform the design and implementation of future strategies to prevent violence against women.

Evaluation:

[B1]: Progress made in preventing and combating violence against women. The commitment of the State party to report on the outcomes of the surveys it develops is noted.

Information should be included in the next periodic report on action taken for the elimination of violence against indigenous women.

Recommended action: Letter reflecting the Committee’s analysis.

Next periodic report: 30 July 2015

Ninety-sixth session (July 2009)

State party: Chad

COB: CCPR/C/TCD/CO/1, adopted in July 2009

Follow-up paragraphs:

Para. 10: investigation and punishment of human rights violations

Para. 13: forced displacement

Para. 20: investigation and punishment of the events of February 2008

Para. 32: the case of Khadidja Ousmane Mahamat

State party’s first reply: Expected: 29 July 2010; Received: 25 January 2012

Summary of first reply – paragraph 10:

The Judicial Advisory Unit of the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad is carrying out projects to promote the rule of law. Objectives: to promote an independent judiciary; to build the capacity of judicial institutions to operate in a manner which is in accordance with the Chadian Constitution and laws, as well as consistent with international norms and standards; to implement the operational protocol of the Détachement Intégré de Sécurité (Chadian police) regarding arrest and detention.

The Government, with the support of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) through the PRET Project, has implemented a programme in eastern Chad, which focuses on the restoration of the rule of law, local governance and cooperation. Actions carried out: creation of nine legal clinics; establishment of a legal aid fund; training for judicial police officers; support for the Court of Appeal in Abéché to organize circuit courts; logistical support for lawyers in Abéché; establishment of a legal aid office, which provides a framework for conflict resolution. Judicial remedies are recommended to the parties only if mediation and conciliation procedures have failed.

Evaluation:

[B2]: Additional information is needed on the operation of the legal clinics that have been created, on the results of the projects described and on the State party's role and actions concerning their implementation.

[D1]: No information on measures taken to ensure the investigation and punishment of human rights violations, protection for victims, and their access to an appropriate remedy.

Summary of first reply – paragraph 13:

The Government has received assistance from the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to carry out protection activities: legal assistance “for refugees in conflict with the law”; establishment of legal clinics in refugee camps; and support for circuit courts.

The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) conducts activities in the areas of protection, legal assistance and juvenile justice for women and children.

Evaluation:

[B2]: Additional information needed on the results of the projects described and the State party's role and actions concerning their implementation.

[D1]: No information on measures taken to offer lasting solutions for displaced persons, including their voluntary and safe return.

Summary of first reply – paragraph 20:

No information on this paragraph.

Evaluation:

[D1]

Summary of first reply – paragraph 32:

A criminal circuit court is scheduled to rule on this case. “Additional information will be provided in the next report of Chad”.

Evaluation:

[B2]: The Committee takes note of the State party's commitment to provide updated information on the measures taken to protect and assist Khadidja Ousmane Mahamat and to prosecute and punish the perpetrators of the violence.

Recommended action: Letter reflecting the Committee's analysis.

Next periodic report: 31 July 2012

Ninety-ninth session (July 2010)**State party: Estonia**

COB: CCPR/C/EST/CO/3, adopted in July 2010

Follow-up paragraphs:

Para. 5: mandate of Chancellor of Justice

Para. 6: gender discrimination

First reply: Expected: 27 July 2011; Received: 12 August 2011

NGO Information:

5 October 2011 Legal Information Centre for Human Rights (LICHR) and the Centre for Civil and Political Rights (CCPR).

Evaluation:

Para. 5: [B1]

Para. 6: [B2]¹⁷

Second reply: 20 January 2012

Summary of second reply – paragraph 5:

The Office of the Chancellor of Justice enjoys a broad mandate to protect and promote human rights and its activities comply with the conditions of the Paris Principles. Various avenues are being considered with regard to establishing a National Human Rights Institution accredited under the International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions.

No specific information is provided on the areas of intervention of the Chancellor.

Evaluation:

[B2]: Updated information is necessary on the decisions taken, when made, to establish an NHRI.

Summary of second reply – paragraph 6:

Despite overall budgetary constraints, the budget for the Gender Equality and Equal Treatment Commissioner and its office in 2012 remained the same as in 2011. The Ministry of Social Affairs drafted an application for a programme financed by the Norwegian Financial Mechanism. The programme would provide 700,000 euros to the Gender Equality and Equal Treatment Commissioner from autumn 2012 until the end of 2015. The programme should be approved in summer 2012.

The Ministry of Social Affairs should start the negotiations for the creation of the Gender Equality Council in the first half of 2012. The proposal for composition of the Council should be submitted to the Government in 2012.

Evaluation:

[B2]: Updated information is necessary on the status of the application for the programme to be financed by the Norwegian Financial Mechanism, and on the outcome of the negotiations by the Ministry of Social Affairs on the creation of the Gender Equality Council, once finalized.

Recommended action: Letter reflecting the Committee's analysis.

Next periodic report: 30 July 2015

¹⁷ Letter sent: 29 November 2011: additional information requested on the stage of the accreditation process reached by the Office of the Chancellor of Justice; the areas of intervention of the Office (para. 5); additional action taken to improve the financial and human resources to enable the Gender Equality and Equal Treatment Commissioner to fulfil its functions in compliance with the Equal Treatment Act (para. 6).

State party: Colombia

COB: CCPR/C/COL/CO/6, adopted in July 2010

Follow-up paragraphs:

Para. 9: investigation and punishment of violations of human rights and international humanitarian law

Para. 14: extrajudicial executions

Para. 16: intelligence service

State party's first reply: Expected: 28 July 2011; Received: 8 August 2011

Summary of first reply – paragraph 9:

Substantial efforts have been made to conduct a process of reintegration, truth, justice and social reconstruction. The strategies to combat impunity that have been implemented with a view to strengthening institutional capacity to investigate serious human rights violations are described in the report. Colombia has not abstained from criminal prosecution. The armed conflict poses a challenge that requires the development of public policy strategies enabling national reconciliation.

Act No. 975, the Justice and Peace Act, has helped to stem impunity for illegal vigilante groups and allowed victims to actively participate in the process. Initially, the Justice and Peace Act did not achieve the desired results owing to the limits imposed by the interpretation of its provisions, whereby that law could not be applied and charges could not be brought until the Government had specified each and every one of the criminal acts in which a given individual had allegedly been involved. Now that partial charges are allowed, the Public Prosecution Service has charged 405 individuals with 28,432 offences, and many of those persons should soon be sentenced.

The evaluation of the justice and peace process must also take into account the reported victims, confessions, exhumations, identifications of victims, copies of the case files sent to the competent judicial authorities, general or specific information days on cases of enforced disappearance, biological samples taken for reference from more than 15,000 family members of disappeared persons, and the participation of victims in the process. The gene bank project coordinated by the Public Prosecution Service has been initiated.

The application of the principle of discretion to prosecute to demobilized members of an illegal armed group who have not been included by the Government in the justice and peace process has been declared unconstitutional. In order to resolve the legal situation of these demobilized persons, Act No. 1424 of 2010 was adopted in application of the extraordinary regulatory powers held by the President of the Republic. The Act establishes a non-judicial mechanism to promote truth and historical memory; that mechanism does not replace the criminal prosecution of offences.

Act No. 1448 of 2011 establishes all the effective remedies for victims of serious human rights violations and recognizes their right to quick and appropriate reparations.

Other actions have been taken to combat impunity: (i) the establishment of a national unit within the Public Prosecution Service to prosecute crimes of disappearance and forced displacement (November 2010); (ii) the creation of a database on sexual violence perpetrated during the conflict; (iii) the adoption of a coordination agreement between the Public Prosecution Service and the National Reparation and Reconciliation Commission.

NGO information – paragraph 9:

Colombian Commission of Jurists – Colombia-Europe-United States Coordination, 22 September 2011: The recommendation in paragraph 9 has not been implemented, given that: (1) the results of the application of Act No. 975 are not satisfactory; (2) subsequent laws (Act No. 132 of 2009 and Act No. 1424 of 2010) continue to violate the right of victims to truth, justice and reparation; (3) paramilitary groups continue to engage in their activities and to violate the rights of the civilian population, a fact which the Government does not recognize; (4) the Government makes proposals that tend to pave the way for new types of paramilitary groups (strengthening “citizen networks of support and solidarity” that encourage civilians to engage in activities that are the domain of law enforcement officials, thereby connecting surveillance services and private security with the national police force).

Evaluation:

[C1]: The Committee should recognize the State party’s efforts but maintain its concern about the limited results of Act No. 975 with regard to the current levels of impunity, the obstacles to the implementation of the legislative and regulatory provisions of Act No. 1424, and the resulting risks to victims’ access to justice, truth and reparation. Information should be requested on measures taken to ensure that current initiatives and ongoing reforms address the causes of impunity and find ways to resolve them.

Summary of first reply – paragraph 14:

The Ministry of Defence has not issued any policy directive or instruction that might encourage serious human rights violations or infringements of international humanitarian law. The comprehensive human rights policy of the Ministry guides the conduct of law enforcement officials. Measures and monitoring mechanisms have been introduced to prevent such misconduct and facilitate investigations. A committee has been established to follow up on complaints of killings of protected persons. A coordinating body has been set up to facilitate the resolution of conflicts of jurisdiction between the judicial authorities, the Ministry of Defence, the Public Prosecution Service and the Attorney-General’s Office. In 2010 and 2011, the military criminal justice system referred 346 cases to the ordinary courts.

Other measures adopted: (i) plan for conducting investigations within the military criminal justice system; (ii) protocol for recognizing cases of human rights violations and infringements of international humanitarian law, setting out standard criteria for investigations; (iii) analysis of the recent decisions of the Disciplinary Chamber on conflicts of jurisdiction; (iv) training for 90 members of the judiciary to prevent decisions rejecting the competence of the ordinary courts; (v) adoption of Act No. 1407 of 2010 limiting the jurisdiction of the military criminal justice system to offences committed in the performance of military duties and prohibiting it from hearing cases of torture, genocide, forced disappearance, crimes against humanity or infringements of international humanitarian law.

The Ministry of Defence continues to implement the 15 measures adopted to prevent the killing of protected persons, resulting in a drastic reduction of the number of complaints. A project was initiated in cooperation with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in Colombia to evaluate the 15 measures.

In June 2011, the Ministry of Defence adopted 15 measures to combat impunity, which are described in the report.

NGO information – paragraph 14:

Extrajudicial executions directly attributable to law enforcement officials are still carried out. Ministry of Defence directives that could lead to serious human rights violations are still in force. The measures taken by the State party do not guarantee the independence of

investigations and do not reinforce the actions of the Public Prosecution Service and the Attorney-General's Office. The actions of the Military Defence Service (DEMIL) unnecessarily draw out judicial proceedings, hindering the work of prosecutors and judges.

There are no measures in place to protect members of the judiciary or the representatives or family members of victims of human rights violations. There are still 11 units of the Public Prosecution Service housed in military facilities, thus compromising the impartiality of the investigations.

Extrajudicial executions still often go unpunished. The State has not provided clear information on the conflicts of jurisdiction between the military criminal courts and the ordinary criminal courts.

Evaluation:

[B2]: Progress can be seen but remains fragile. The Committee should express its concern regarding the discussions currently under way in Congress to establish a presumption of jurisdiction for the military justice system to investigate cases involving members of the Armed Forces and the police. The general rule should be that jurisdiction belongs to the ordinary criminal justice system. Information should be requested on measures taken to avoid such a setback.

[D1]: No information is provided on measures taken to ensure the safety of witnesses and loved ones in such cases.

Summary of first reply – paragraph 16:

In November 2010 the Constitutional Court declared unconstitutional the Act on Intelligence Archives and its regulations. In the light of the lack of a legal framework and the need to ensure that the problems encountered are not repeated, the Department of National Security (DAS) has adopted a series of measures as described in the report. Internal and external monitoring mechanisms have been introduced to monitor the activities of the intelligence service, and there are plans to set up a purging committee.

A bill establishing a new intelligence agency was adopted in May 2011 (Act No. 1444) and sets a six-month deadline for the President of the Republic to create, eliminate, split and merge the various intelligence departments. Investigations have been carried out within DAS, and a staff purging process has begun.

The Supreme Court prosecutor is investigating illegal surveillance activities and wiretapping committed by some DAS members against social and human rights organizations. Significant progress has been made in these cases, as reflected in the sentences handed down and the measures adopted. The results achieved by the Public Prosecution Service indicate that the judiciary is working effectively to obtain appropriate sentences for those responsible, while ensuring the victims' participation.

NGO information – paragraph 16:

No decision has been taken under Act No. 1444 to reform DAS. Act No. 1444 sets out a general framework for intelligence activities and introduces provisions that do not respect fundamental rights and do not offer any effective remedy to ensure these can be exercised and defended (it places excessive restrictions on access to intelligence documents, makes no provision for any monitoring mechanism, and limits the scope of the Parliamentary Legal Committee established under the 2009 Act). The bill mentions establishing a commission to sort archives for two years, with very limited functions. The Commission should be permanent and its recommendations should give rise to permanent and mandatory regulations. The Government has announced that the purging of archives will not begin until a specific legal framework has been adopted.

Only three sentences were handed down in the cases the State party mentioned (these were plea bargains reached when the accused accepted responsibility). The prosecution was suspended in other cases because the accused agreed to testify.

Complaints have been filed against several DAS and Government officials and former officials, including Mr. Uribe, former President of the Republic, who admitted his responsibility for the conduct of public officials under investigation.

New cases of illegal intelligence activities involving the surveillance of judges, politicians, journalists and human rights defenders are mentioned. A legal framework for the effective and independent monitoring of intelligence activities should be established in consultation with the social organizations victimized by the current strategies.

Evaluation:

[B2]: Progress has been achieved in the form of the investigation and resolution of cases involving illegal intelligence activities, the official closure of DAS in October 2011, and the establishment of the National Directorate of Intelligence. The Committee should express its concern that illegal intelligence activities are still being brought to its attention. Additional information should be requested on measures taken to regulate the military intelligence service and on the sorting of intelligence archives.

Recommended action: Letter reflecting the Committee's analysis.

Next periodic report: 1 April 2014

100th session (October 2010)

State party: Belgium

COB: CCPR/C/BEL/CO/5, adopted in October 2010

Follow-up paragraphs:

Para. 14: use of force and firearms by law enforcement officials

Para. 17: access to legal counsel and a doctor within the first few hours of detention

Para. 21: deportation of foreign nationals; independence of oversight bodies

State party's first reply: Expected: 26 October 2011; Received: 18 November 2011

Summary of first reply – paragraph 14:

The legal requirements for the use of force by police officers are outlined. Statistics are provided on internal and external monitoring, on the number of disciplinary sanctions handed down by the competent authorities, on the judicial investigations carried out by the Police Investigation Service, and on the criminal convictions handed down for acts of "police violence".

An investigation into the complaints lodged in the wake of the events of 29 September to 1 October 2010 was opened by the Police Investigation Service and closed in early June 2011. The recommendations contained in the final report (appended to the reply) were sent to the Minister of the Interior and the police services concerned.

Evaluation:

[B1]: Reply limited to the provisions already in place before the concluding observations were adopted. No mention of new measures to improve the situation, or of the United

Nations Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials. Additional information is needed on measures taken to improve the situation regarding the use of force by police officers, to ensure that investigations are systematically conducted in cases of complaints alleging ill-treatment, and to prosecute and punish those responsible in proportion to the seriousness of their actions (para. 14).

[A]: Regarding the complaints lodged in the wake of the demonstrations held from 29 September to 1 October 2010.

Summary of first reply – paragraph 17:

The Act amending both the Code of Criminal Procedure and the Act of 20 July 1990 was passed in August 2011. It incorporates the principles found in the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights (*Salduz v. Turkey*) and several recommendations made by the United Nations and the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. On 23 September 2011, the Association of Prosecutors-General issued a circular (annexed to the reply) on arranging for a lawyer's assistance from the time of the first hearing.

Evaluation:

[B2]: The legislative amendments adopted rectify the problems concerning access to a lawyer within the first few hours after a person is deprived of his or her liberty and the right of access to a doctor. Additional information is needed on measures taken to ensure that the monitoring of deportations of foreign nationals is independent and objective, to implement the legislation on access to a lawyer and a doctor within the first few hours after a person is deprived of his or her liberty and to ensure that the changes made will be definitive.

Summary of first reply – paragraph 21:

Information on increased monitoring and on the mandate of the General Inspectorate of the Federal and Local Police.

Evaluation:

[B1]: There is no guarantee that the reform will continue beyond 2013. Information is needed on measures taken to maintain the level of operational monitoring when the European Commission project ends.

[A]: On the independence of the oversight body.

Recommended action: Letter reflecting the Committee's analysis.

Next periodic report: 31 October 2015

Annex

87th session: July 2006				
Central African Republic (second report) CCPR/C/CAF/CO/2 §§ 11, 12, 13				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	2007-07-27	NOT SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: new	
Due date for the next periodic report:	2010-08-01	NOT SUBMITTED	periodic report due - no reply received from SP	
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE			
History of the procedure				
28/09/2007-10/12/2007	[HRC] Reminders sent			
20/02/2008	[HRC] Request for SP meeting			
18/03/2008	[HRC] Request for SP meeting			
01/04/2008	[MEET] Meeting during 92 session		No responses provided.	
11/06/2008-22/09/2008	[HRC] Reminders sent			
16/12/2008	[HRC] Request for SP meeting			
29/05/2009	[HRC] Reminder sent			
02/02/2010-25/06/2010	[HRC] Request for SP meeting and reminder			
28/09/2010	[HRC] SP invited to reply to all COB in next periodic report			
13/10/2010	[MEET] Meeting during 100th session.		No reply received.	
Recommended Action: NONE				
USA (second & third report) CCPR/C/USA/CO/3/Rev.1 §§ 12, 13, 14, 16, 20, 26				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	27/07/2007	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: New	
Due date for the next periodic report:	01/08/2010	NOT SUBMITTED	report due	
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE			
History of the procedure				
28/09/2007	[HRC] Reminder sent			
01/11/2007	[SP] FU report	§12	incomplete	[B2]
		§13	incomplete	[B2]
		§14	incomplete	[B2]
		§16	incomplete	[B2]
		§20	complete	[A]
		§26	incomplete	[B2]

11/06/2008	[HRC] Request for SP meeting			
10/07/2008	[MEET] Meeting during 93rd session			
06/05/2009	[HRC] Reminder sent			
15/07/2009	[SP] FU report	§12	satisfactory in parts.	[B2]
		§13	satisfactory in parts.	[B2]
		§14	incomplete	[B2]
		§16	incomplete	[B2]
		§26	incomplete	[B2]
26/04/2010	[HRC] SP invited to reply to all COB in next periodic report	Recommended Action: NONE		
UNMIK CCPR/C/UNK/CO/1 §§ 12, 13, 18				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		27/07/2007	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:		01/08/2010	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		NOT APPLICABLE		
History of the procedure				
Apr. - Sept. 2007	[HRC] Reminders sent (3)			
10/12/2007	[HRC] Request for SP meeting			
11/03/2008	[SP] FU report	§12	incomplete	[B2]
		§13	incomplete	[B2]
		§18	incomplete	[B2]
11/06/2008	[HRC] Request for SP meeting			
22/07/2008	[MEET] Meeting during XX session		Additional info provided - incomplete	N/A
07/11/2008	[SP] FU report	§12	incomplete	[B2]
		§13	incomplete	[B2]
		§18	incomplete	[B2]
03/06/2009	[HRC] Add. info requested			
03/06/2009	[HRC] Reminder sent			
12/11/2009	[SP] FU report	§12	partially implemented	[B2]
		§13	partially implemented	[B2]
		§18	partially implemented	[B2]
28/09/2010	[HRC] Reminder sent			
10/05/2011	[HRC] Reminder sent & Request for meeting			
20/07/2011	[MEET] Meeting during 102 session.		Agreement: UNMIK will send additional information before the October 2011 session.	
09/09/2011	[SP] FU report			
10/12/2011	[HRC] Letter sent to UNMIK.	taking note of the Mission's inability to implement the recommendations of the Committee and of its commitment to coordinate the elaboration of a consolidated report.		

22/12/2011	[HRC] Letter to OLA (Mrs. O'Brien)	Requesting advice on the general status of Kosovo and on the strategy to adopt in the future to maintain the dialogue of the Committee with Kosovo.		
13/02/2012	[UNMIK] Reply	Recommended action: ANALYSE UNMIK'S REPLY AT NEXT SESSION		
HONDURAS CCPR/C/HND/2005/1 §§ 9, 10, 11, 19				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	27/10/2007	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: New report due	
Due date for the next periodic report:	31/10/2010	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE			
History of the procedure				
07/01/2007	[SP] FU report		Answer not relevant to recommendations	[C2]
20/01/2007	[HRC] Add. info requested			
01/01/2008-11/06/2008	[HRC] Reminders sent			
22/09/2008	[HRC] Request for meeting			
15/10/2008	[SP] FU report		Initial actions taken - Implementation still pending	[B2]
10/12/2008	[HRC] Letter sent	Add. info requested on all paragraphs		
06/05/2009-27/08/2009	[HRC] Reminder sent			
02/02/2010-28/09/2010	[HRC] Request for SP meeting and reminder			
Oct. 2010	[EXT] CCPR (CPTRT)	§10		
21/10/2010	[MEET] Meeting during 100th session.		Progress made but additional action required	[B2]
16/12/2010	[HRC] Letter sent	Invitation to reply to COB as a whole in next periodic report.		
		Recommended Action: NONE		
Bosnia and Herzegovina (initial report) CCPR/C/BIH/CO/1 §§ 8, 14, 19, 23				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	01/11/2007	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: New report due	
Due date for the next periodic report:	01/11/2010	SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE			
History of the procedure				
21/12/2007	[SP] FU report	§§ 8, 14, 19, 23	All incomplete	[B2]
17/01/2008	[HRC] Reminder sent			
22/09/2008	[HRC] Request for meeting			
Oct. 2008	[EXT] CCPR (Helsinki Committee)	§§ 8, 14, 19, 23		
31/10/2008	[MEET] Meeting during 94th session		Reply to be submitted after government approval.	
01/11/2008	[SP] FU report	§§ 8, 14, 19, 23	All incomplete	[B2]

04/03/2009	[SP] FU report	§§ 8, 14, 19, 23	All incomplete	[B2]
29/05/2009	[HRC] Letter sent	Add. info requested on all paragraphs		
27/08/2009-11/12/2009	[HRC] Reminders sent			
14/12/2009	[SP] FU report	§8	Implementation begun but not completed	[B2]
		§14	Partially satisfactory	[B2]
		§19	Partially satisfactory	[B2]
		§23	Cooperative but incomplete	[B2]
11/12/2009	[HRC] Invitation to reply to COB as a whole in next periodic report			
Sept. 2010	[EXT] TRIAL	§14	Progress made but additional action required	
Recommended Action: NONE				
Ukraine (sixth report) CCPR/C/BIH/CO/6 §§ 7, 11, 14, 16				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		02/11/2007	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: New report due
Due date for the next periodic report:		02/11/2011	SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		NOT APPLICABLE		
History of the procedure				
17/01/2008	[HRC] Reminder sent			
19/05/2008	[SP] FU report	§§ 7, 11, 14, 16	All incomplete	[B2]
06/05/2008	[HRC] Add. info requested			
Oct. 2008	[EXT] CCPR (UHHRU, International Renaissance Foundation, Donetsk, Vinnytsya Human Rights protection group, Kharkiv Human Rights Group)	§§ 7, 11, 14, 16		
06/05/2009	[HRC] Reminder sent			
28/08/2009	[SP] FU report	§7	Part incomplete, part unimplemented	[B2]
		§11	Part satisfactory, part incomplete	[B2]
		§14	Incomplete	[B2]
		§16	Part satisfactory, part incomplete	[B2]
26/04/2010	[HRC] Letter sent	Requesting supplementary information and underlining unimplemented recommendations		
28/09/2010-19/04/2011	[HRC] Reminders sent			
10/05/2011-02/08/2011	[HRC] Requests for meeting	No reply		
Recommended Action: NONE				
Republic of Korea (third report) CCPR/C/KOR/CO/3 §§ 12, 13, 18				

Status			
Due date for the follow-up report:	02/11/2007	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: New report due - No reply received from SP
Due date for the next periodic report:	02/11/2010	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE		
History of the procedure			
17/01/2008	[HRC] Reminder sent		
25/02/2008	[SP] FU report	§12	Incomplete [B2]
		§13	Incomplete [B2]
		§18	Unsatisfactory [B2]
11/06/2008	[HRC] Request for meeting		
21/07/2008	[MEET] Meeting during 93rd session		Add. Info to be provided in next periodic report
22/07/2008	[HRC] Letter summarizing outstanding issues sent		
06/05/2008-27/08/2009	[HRC] Reminders sent		
Recommended Action: NONE			
89th session: March 2007			
Madagascar (third report) CCPR/C/MDG/CO/3 §§ 7, 24, 25			
Status			
Due date for the follow-up report:	23/03/2008	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: New report due
Due date for the next periodic report:	23/03/2011	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE		
History of the procedure			
11/06/2008-22/09/2008	[HRC] Reminders sent		
16/12/2008	[HRC] Request for meeting		
03/03/2009	[SP] FU report	§7	Incomplete [B2]
		§24	Incomplete [B2]
		§25	Incomplete [B2]
29/05/2009	[HRC] Letter sent	Add. info requested on all paragraphs	
03/09/2009-10/05/2011	[HRC] Reminders sent		
25/06/2010	[HRC] Request for meeting		
28/09/2010-10/05/2011	[HRC] Reminders sent		
17/05/2011	[SP] FU report (dated 2010-09-29)		
Recommended Action: The follow-up replies should be included in the analysis of the next periodic report			
Chile (fifth report) CCPR/C/CHL/CO/5 §§ 9, 19			
Status			

Due date for the follow-up report:	26/03/2008	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:	01/04/2012	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE		
History of the procedure			
11/06/2008-22/09/2008	[HRC] Reminders sent		
21/10/2008	[SP] FU report	§9	Incomplete on certain issues [B2]
31/10/2008		§19	Incomplete on certain issues [B2]
10/12/2008	[HRC] Add. info requested		
25/03/2009	[EXT] CCPR (Centro de Derechos Humanos, Universidad Diego Portales; Observatorio de Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas)	§§9, 19	
22/06/2009	[HRC] Request for meeting		Part incomplete, part unimplemented
28/07/2009	[MEET] Meeting.		Add. info in preparation to be sent ASAP.
11/12/2009-23/04/2010	[HRC] Reminders sent		
28/05/2010	[SP] FU report	§9	Incomplete on certain issues [B2]
		§19	Incomplete on certain issues [B2]
16/12/2010	[HRC] Letter sent	Specifying add. info needed and which recommendations had not been adequately implemented	
31/01/2011	[SP] Letter requesting clarifications on the add. info requested.		
20/04/2011	[HRC] Letter clarifying the add. info requested		
05/10/2011	[SP] FU report	§9	No information on the prohibition to exercise public functions for persons responsible for HR violations [D1] and [B1]
		§19	FU discontinued on the issue [A]
		Recommended action: LETTER REFLECTING COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS	
Barbados (third report) CCPR/C/BRB/CO/3 §§ 9, 12, 13			
Status			
Due date for the follow-up report:	29/03/2008	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: New report due
Due date for the next periodic report:	29/03/2011	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE		
History of the procedure			
11/06/2008-22/09/2008	[HRC] Reminders sent		
16/12/2008	[HRC] Request for meeting		
19/03/2009	[EXT] CCPR (BONGO; GIEACPC; IGLHRC)	§§ 9, 12, 13	

31/03/2009	[SP] Meeting during 95th session. Partial reply received.	§9	Part largely satisfactory, part not implemented	[B1]
		§12	Not implemented	[C1]
		§13	Incomplete and not implemented	[C1]
29/07/2009	[HRC] Letter sent	Add. info requested on all paragraphs		
23/04/2010-28/09/2010	[HRC] Reminders sent			
10/05/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Inviting SP to include requested additional information in next periodic report.		
		Recommended Action: NONE		
90th session: July 2007				
Zambia (third report) CCPR/C/ZMB/CO/3 §§ 10, 12, 13, 23				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		20/07/2008	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: New report due
Due date for the next periodic report:		20/07/2011	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		NOT APPLICABLE		
History of the procedure				
Sep. 2008 - May 2009	[HRC] Reminders sent (3)			
07/10/2009	[HRC] Request for meeting			
28/10/2009	[MEET] Meeting.		Reply in preparation to be sent ASAP.	
09/12/2009	[SP] FU report	§10	No reply	[D1]
		§12	Incomplete	[B2]
		§13	Incomplete	[B2]
		§23	Incomplete	[B2]
25/01/2010	[EXT] CCPR (AWOMI; WILDAF; ZCEA)	§§ 10, 12, 13, 23		
26/04/2010	[HRC] Letter sent	Add. info requested on all paragraphs		
28/09/2010	[HRC] Reminder sent			
28/01/2011	[SP] FU report	§10	Implementation partially initiated (10a)	[B2]
		§12	Further action required	[B2]
		§13	Further action required	[B2]
		§23	Implementation partially initiated (23b)	[B2]
20/04/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Inviting SP to include requested additional information in next periodic report.		
		Recommended Action: NONE		
Sudan (third report) CCPR/C/SDN/CO/3 §§ 9, 11, 17				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		26/07/2008	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: New report due
Due date for the next periodic report:		26/07/2010	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		NOT APPLICABLE		

History of the procedure			
22/09/2008-19/12/2008	[HRC] Reminders sent		
22/06/2009-19/10/2009	[HRC] Requests for meeting		
19/10/2009	[SP] FU report. Annexes have not been received.	§9	Incomplete [B2]
		§11	Incomplete [B2]
		§17	Incomplete [B2]
19/10/2009	[HRC] Note verbale requiring the annexes		
26/02/2010	[HRC] Letter sent	Inviting SP to include requested additional information in next periodic report.	
		Recommended action: NONE	
Czech Republic (second report) CCPR/C/CZE/CO/2 §§ 9, 14, 16			
Status			
Due date for the follow-up report:	25/07/2008	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: New report due
Due date for the next periodic report:	01/08/2011	SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE		
History of the procedure			
June 2008	[EXT] CCPR (Zvule Prava; Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions; European Roma Rights Centre; Peacework Development Fund)	§16	
11/06/2008	[HRC] Reminder sent		
18/08/2008	[SP] FU report	§9	Incomplete [B2]
		§14	Incomplete [B2]
		§16	Incomplete [B2]
10/12/2008	[HRC] Add. info requested.		
06/05/2009-06/10/2009	[HRC] Reminders sent		
Feb. 2010	[HRC] Request for meeting		
22/03/2010 01/07/2010	[SP] FU report	§9	Incomplete [B2]
		§14	Incomplete [B2]
		§16	Incomplete [B2]
20/04/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Considering info satisfactory on 9c, 14a, 14c, 16c, 16d, 16f. Incomplete on 9a, 9b, 16e. 14b not implemented.	
25/11/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Stating that the requested info should be included in the next periodic report	
		Recommended action: NONE	

91st session: October 2007				
Georgia (third report) CCPR/C/GEO/CO/3 §§ 8, 9, 11				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	26/10/2008	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: New report due	
Due date for the next periodic report:	01/11/2011	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE			
History of the procedure				
16/12/2008	[HRC] Reminder sent			
13/01/2009	[SP] FU report	§8	Incomplete	[B2]
		§9	Incomplete	[B2]
		§11	Incomplete	[B2]
29/05/2009	[HRC] Add. info requested.			
27/08/2009	[HRC] Reminder sent			
28/10/2009	[SP] FU report	§8	Incomplete	[B2]
		§9	Incomplete	[B2]
		§11	Incomplete	[B2]
28/09/2010	[HRC] Add. info requested.			
20/04/2011-02/08/2011	[HRC] Reminder sent			
24/11/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Stating that the requested info should be included in the next periodic report		
		Recommended Action: NONE		
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (fourth report) CCPR/C/LBY/CO/4 §§ 10, 21, 23				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	30/10/2008	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: New report due	
Due date for the next periodic report:	30/10/2010	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE			
History of the procedure				
30/10/2008	[EXT] Alkarama for Human Rights	§§ 21, 23		
16/12/2008-09/06/2009	[HRC] Reminders sent			
24/07/2009	[SP] FU report	§10	Part implemented, part incomplete	[B2]
		§21	Part implemented, part incomplete	[B2]
		§23	Part implemented, part incomplete	[B2]
23/04/2010	[HRC] Reminder sent and request for meeting.			
28/09/2010	[HRC] Request for meeting			
12/10/2010	[MEET] Meeting during 100th session		Commitment to communicate Committee's request to the Government	
18/11/2010	[SP] Confirmation letter of outcome of above meeting			

05/11/2010	[SP] FU report (hard copy) received			
18/11/2010	[HRC] Request for FU report in word format			
10/05/2011	[HRC] Reminder sent that periodic report was five months overdue			
Recommended Action: NONE				
Austria (fourth report) CCPR/C/AUT/CO/4 §§ 11, 12, 16, 17				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	30/10/2008	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED:	
Due date for the next periodic report:	30/10/2012	NOT SUBMITTED	Answers largely satisfactory	
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE			
History of the procedure				
15/10/2008	[SP] FU report	§11	Incomplete	[B2]
		§12	Incomplete	[B2]
		§16	Incomplete	[B2]
		§17	Incomplete	[B2]
12/12/2008	[HRC] Add. info requested.			
29/05/2009	[HRC] Reminder sent			
28/10/2009	[SP] FU report	§11	Largely satisfactory	[A]
		§12	Largely satisfactory	[A]
		§16	Largely satisfactory	[A]
		§17	Largely satisfactory	[A]
23/07/2009	[EXT] CCPR (asylkoordination Österreich; Integrationshaus; SOS Mitmensch)			
14/12/2009	[HRC] Letter sent	Stating FU procedure considered completed.		
Recommended Action: NONE				
Algeria (third report) CCPR/C/DZA/CO/3 §§ 11, 12, 15				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	01/11/2008	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: New	
Due date for the next periodic report:	01/11/2011	NOT SUBMITTED	report due	
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE			
History of the procedure				
07/11/2007	[SP] FU report	§11	Partial	[B2]
		§12	Partial	[B2]
		§15	Partial	[B2]
30/10/2008	[EXT] Algeria-Watch	§§11, 12		
05/11/2008	[EXT] Alkarama for Human Rights	§§11, 12, 15		
16/12/2008	[HRC] Reminder sent			

2009-01-14 2009-10-12	[SP] Letter	Repeating position of memorandum, requesting memo to be issued as annex to annual report		
25/06/2010	[HRC] Request for meeting			
27/07/2010	[SP] Communication that SP representatives were available for the 99th session			
28/07/2010	[HRC] Request for meeting			
11/10/2010	[MEET] Meeting during 100th session		Request transmitted to Government. No reply received.	
16/12/2010	[HRC] Invited SP to reply to COB in next periodic report	Recommended Action: NONE		
92nd session: March 2008				
Tunisia (fifth report) CCPR/C/TUN/CO/5 §§ 11, 14, 20, 21				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	28/03/2009	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES	
Due date for the next periodic report:	31/03/2012	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE			
History of the procedure				
07/11/2007	[SP] FU report	§11	Cooperation but incomplete	[B2]
		§14	Not implemented	[C1]
		§20	Acknowledged but imprecise info	[B2]
		§21	Acknowledged but imprecise info	[B2]
11/03/2009	[EXT] Alkarama for Human Rights	§§11, 20		
23/07/2009	[EXT] CCPR/FIDH (CNLT; LTDH)	§§11, 14, 20, 21		
30/07/2009	[HRC] Letter sent	Add. info requested. Some issues not to be considered in the FU process, but should be dealt with in the next periodic report.		
Aug. 2009	[EXT] OMCT	§§ 11, 14, 20, 21		
02/03/2010	[SP] FU report			
04/10/2010	[HRC] Letter noting issues on which FU discontinued and specifying requested info.			
20/04/2011	[HRC] Reminder sent informing that the next periodic report is due 2012-03-31.			
20/09/2011	[SP] Letter	Asking to postpone the examination of Tunisia due to the January 2011 revolution.		
21/11/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Acknowledging SP's request and informing that the next periodic report is now due on 31 March 2014. FU reply remains pending and should be sent within a year.		

08/12/2011	[SP] Letter confirming that the SP periodic report will be sent by 31/3/2014	Recommended Action: NONE		
Botswana (initial report) CCPR/C/BWA/CO/1 §§ 12, 13, 14, 17				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		28/03/2009	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:		31/03/2012	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		NOT APPLICABLE		
History of the procedure				
08/09/2009-11/12/2009	[HRC] Reminder sent			
28/09/2010-19/04/2011	[HRC] Request for meeting			
06/07/2011	[SP] Positive response for meeting (via telephone)			
27/07/2011	[MEET] Meeting with Ambassador.		Info to be sent before the October session 2011.	
05/10/2011	[SP] FU report	§12	Incomplete	[B2]
		§13	Incomplete and not implemented	[B2] and [D1]
		§14	Not implemented	[D1]
		§17	Incomplete	[B2]
24/11/2011	[HR] Letter sent	Requesting additional info in next periodic report on para. 12, 13, 17, and stating that part of 13 and 14 have not been implemented.		
		Recommended Action: NONE		
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (second report) CCPR/C/MKD/CO/2 §§ 12, 14, 15				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		03/04/2009	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:		01/04/2012	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		NOT APPLICABLE		
History of the procedure				
23/07/2009	[EXT] CCPR (Helsinki Committee)	§§12, 14, 15		
27/08/2009	[HRC] Reminder sent			
31/08/2009	[SP] FU report	§12	Incomplete	[B2]
		§14	Part unimplemented, part no reply	[C1]
		§15	Incomplete	[B2]
26/04/2010	[HRC] Letter sent	Requesting additional info on all paragraphs		
28/09/2011-20/04/2011	[HRC] Reminders sent			
04/06/2011	[SP] FU report			
19/09/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Requesting additional info. (paras. 15 and 12) and on 14 in next periodic report and stating that no info was provided on part. of para 12.		

		Recommended Action: NONE		
Panama (third report) CCPR/C/PAN/CO/3 §§ 11, 14, 18				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	03/04/2009	NOT SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES	
Due date for the next periodic report:	01/03/2012	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE			
History of the procedure				
27/08/2009	[HRC] Reminder sent			
11/12/2009	[HRC] Reminder sent			
23/04/2010	[HRC] Reminder sent			
28/09/2010	[HRC] Request for meeting			
19/04/2011	[HRC] Request for meeting			
June-July 2011	[HRC] Four calls to the Perm. Mission but unable to confirm SP meeting.			
19/10/2011	[HRC] Phone call to PM	Recalling the request for a meeting. Said they will consult with the Representative and reply to the request.		
26/10/2011	[MEET] Meeting.		The ambassador, Mr. Navarro, indicated that the info will be provided by the PM in the forthcoming weeks.	
		Recommended Action: REMINDER		
93rd session: July 2008				
France (fourth report) CCPR/C/FRA/CO/4 §§ 12, 18, 20				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	22/07/2009	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES	
Due date for the next periodic report:	31/07/2012	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE			
History of the procedure				
20/07/2009	[SP] FU report	§12	Largely satisfactory	[A]
		§18	Part incomplete	[B2]
		§20	Part incomplete	[B2]
11/01/2010	[HRC] Add. info requested.			
09/07/2010	[SP] FU report	§12	Largely satisfactory	[A]
		§18	Part incomplete	[B2]
		§20	Part incomplete	[B2]
16/12/2010	[HRC] Letter sent	Specifying 12 as complete, add. info requested for certain issues on 18, 20		
17/01/2011	[SP] Clarifications requested by the SP on the request for add. info.			
20/04/2011	[HRC] Letter sent specifying the add. info			

02/08/2011	[HRC] Reminder sent			
08/11/2011	[SP] FU report	§18	Incomplete. See CCPR.C.104.R.1	[B2]
		§20	Incomplete. See CCPR.C.104.R.1	[B1]
		Recommended action: LETTER REFLECTING COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS.		
San Marino (second report) CCPR/C/SMR/CO/2 §§ 6, 7				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		22/07/2009	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: Answers largely satisfactory
Due date for the next periodic report:		31/07/2013	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		ACCEPTED: Adopted Oct. 2011		
History of the procedure				
31/07/2009	[SP] FU report	§6	Largely satisfactory	[A]
		§7	Largely satisfactory	[A]
09/05/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Stating that replies are sufficient to consider the FU procedure completed.		
		Recommended Action: NONE		
Ireland (third report) CCPR/C/IRL/CO/3 §§ 11, 15, 22				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		23/07/2009	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:		31/07/2012	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		NOT APPLICABLE		
History of the procedure				
31/07/2009	[SP] FU report	§11	Incomplete	[B2]
		§15	Incomplete and not implemented	[B2]
		§22	Incomplete	[B2]
Aug. 2009	[EXT] FLAC; ICCL; IPRT	§§ 11, 15, 22		
04/01/2010	[HRC] Request add. info on 11. FU procedure on 15, 22 considered completed			
21/12/2010	[SP] FU report	§11	Incomplete	[B2]
25/04/2011	[HRC] Letter sent requesting add. info on parts of 11.			
02/08/2011 - 17/11/2011	[HRC] Reminders sent			
31/01/2012	[SP] Reply	§11	Satisfactory. See CCPR.C.104.R.1	[A]
		Recommended action: LETTER REFLECTING THE COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS		
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (sixth report) CCPR/C/GBR/CO/6 §§ 9, 12, 14, 15				
Status				

Due date for the follow-up report:	22/07/2009	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:	31/07/2012	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE		
History of the procedure			
Aug. 2009	[EXT] British Irish Rights Watch	§§ 3-4, 6-11, 13-18, 24-39	
07/08/2009	[SP] FU report	§9	Incomplete [B2]
		§12	Parts not replied to [B2]
		§14	Part implemented, but incomplete [B2]
		§15	Part incomplete [B2]
24/08/2009	[EXT] Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission	§9	
26/04/2010	[HRC] Request for add. info on 9, 14, 15		
28/09/2010	[HRC] Reminder combined with request for add. info on 12		
10/11/2010	[SP] FU report	§§ 9, 12	Largely satisfactory [A]
		§§ 14, 15	Incomplete, add. info required [B2]
20/04/2011	[HRC] Request for add. info on 14, 15		
02/08/2011	[HRC] Reminder sent		
19/10/2011	[SP] FU report	§14	Incomplete. See CCPR.C.104.R.1 [B1]
		§15	Incomplete. See CCPR.C.104.R.1 [B1]
Recommended action: LETTER REFLECTING COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS			
94th session: October 2008			
Nicaragua (third report) CCPR/C/NIC/CO/3 §§ 12, 13, 17, 19			
Status			
Due date for the follow-up report:	209-10-29	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:	29/10/2012	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE		
History of the procedure			
23/04/2010-08/10/2010	[HRC] Reminders sent		
20/04/2011	[HRC] Request for meeting		
04/05/2011	[SP] Positive response for meeting (via telephone). Meeting set to 2011-07-18, but no representative showed up.		

02/08/2011	[HRC] Reminder sent expressing regret that no representative showed up and requesting new meeting.			
11/10/2011	[SP] FU report and note verbale explaining and apologizing for their absence at the July meeting.			
10/02/2012	[EXT] CENIDH, OMCT, la Red de Centros, la Red de Mujeres contra la violencia, CODENI			
		§12 d, e	Incomplete. See CCPR.C.104.R.1	[B1]
		§12 a, b, c	No info provided	[D1]
		§13	See CCPR.C.104.R.1	[B1] [C1] [D1]
		§17	Reply does not provide the information requested. See CCPR.C.104.R.1	[C2]
		§19	Incomplete. See CCPR.C.104.R.1	[B2]
		Recommended action: LETTER REFLECTING COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS		
Monaco (second report) CCPR/CMCO/CO/2 § 9				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		28/10/2009	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: Answers largely satisfactory
Due date for the next periodic report:		28/10/2013	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		ACCEPTED: Adopted Oct. 2011		
History of the procedure				
26/03/2010	[SP] FU report	§6	Largely satisfactory	[A]
08/10/2010	[HRC] Letter sent	Stating FU process completed and inviting SP to keep Ctte informed on developments of specific forms of violence + training of judges and officials.		
		Recommended Action: NONE		
Denmark (fifth report) CCPR/C/DNK/CO/5 §§ 8, 11				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		28/10/2009	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: Answers largely satisfactory
Due date for the next periodic report:		31/10/2013	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		ACCEPTED: Adopted Oct. 2011		
History of the procedure				
04/11/2009	[SP] FU report	§8	Incomplete	[B2]
		§11	Largely satisfactory	[A]
201-01-28	[EXT] CCPR (The Danish Institute for Human Rights)	§11		
26/04/2010	[HRC] Letter sent	Stating FU procedure complete for 11, request add. info on 8.		

28/09/2010-20/04/2011	[HRC] Reminders sent			
05/08/2011	[SP] FU report	§8	Largely satisfactory	[A]
22/11/2011	[HRC] Letter sent.	Informing that the FU procedure has come to an end and taking note of the SP acceptance of the LOIPR procedure.		
		Recommended action: NONE		
Japan (fifth report) CCPR/C/JAP/CO/5 §§ 17, 18, 19, 21				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	29/10/2009	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: New report due	
Due date for the next periodic report:	29/10/2011	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE			
History of the procedure				
01/12/2009	[EXT] JWCHR; JLAF; KYUENKAI; League Demanding State Compensation for the Victims of the Public Order Maintenance Law	§§19, 21		
21/12/2009	[SP] FU report	§17	Part unimplemented, part incomplete	[B2]
		§18	Incomplete	[B2]
		§19	Part implemented	[B2]
		§21	Part unimplemented, part satisfactory	[B1]
22/01/2010	[EXT] Japan Federation of Bar Associations	§§17, 18, 19, 21		
28/09/2010	[HRC] Letter sent	Add. info necessary on 17,18,19, and specifying parts unimplemented in 17,19,21		
28/11/2011	[HRC] letter sent.	Stating that FU procedure has come to an end, and that the requested FU info should be included in the next periodic report due since 29/10/2011.		
		Recommended Action: NONE		
Spain (fifth report) CCPR/C/ESP/CO/5 §§ 13, 15, 16				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	30/10/2009	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES	
Due date for the next periodic report:	01/11/2012	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE			
History of the procedure				
04/02/2010	[EXT] CCPR (BEHATOKIA)	§§11, 13, 14, 15, 19		
23/04/2010	[HRC] Reminder sent			
16/06/2010	[SP] FU report	§13	Implementation not completed	[B2]
		§15	Implementation not completed	[B2]
		§16	Implementation not completed	[B2]
25/04/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Noting the initial implementation of 16 and requesting add. info on 13, 15.		

29/06/2011	[SP] Reply with add. info on §§ 13, 15, 16				
22/09/2011	[HRC] Letter sent.	Requesting updated info to be included in next periodic report on progresses realized on para. 16; and additional info on 13; and stating that para. 15 not implemented.			
24/10/2011	[SP] FU report		See CCPR.C.104.R.1		
		§13	Incomplete.		[B2]
		§15	No information provided		[D1]
		§16	Up dated information should be provided in the next periodic report.		[B1]
		Recommended action: LETTER REFLECTING COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS			
95th session: March 2009					
Australia (fifth report) CCPR/C/AUS/CO/5 §§ 11, 14, 17, 23					
Status					
Due date for the follow-up report:		02/04/2010	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES	
Due date for the next periodic report:		01/04/2013	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status		ACCEPTED			
History of the procedure					
20/11/2009	[EXT] Human Rights Law Resources Centre Ltd	§§9-15, 17-21, 23, 25, 27			
28/09/2010	[HRC] Reminder sent				
17/12/2010	[SP] FU report	§11	Implementation begun but not completed		[B2]
		§14	Implementation begun but not completed		[B2]
		§17	Implementation begun but not completed		[B2]
		§23	Implementation begun but not completed		[A]
19/10/2011	[HRC] Letter sent requesting additional info on the implementation of 11, 14, 17				
03/02/2012	[SP] FU reply		See CCPR.C.104.R.1		
		§11	Not implemented		[C1]
		§14	Incomplete		[B1]
		§17	Incomplete		[B1]
		Recommended action: LETTER REFLECTING THE COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS			
Rwanda (third report) CCPR/C/RWA/CO/3 §§ 12, 13, 14, 17					
Status					
Due date for the follow-up report:		02/04/2010	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES	
Due date for the next periodic report:		01/04/2013	NOT SUBMITTED		

LOIPR status		UNDECIDED	
History of the procedure			
28/09/2010	[HRC] Reminder sent		
21/12/2010	[SP] FU report		
25/04/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Requesting additional info on 12, 13, 14, 17	
19/10/2011	[HRC] English translation of letter previously sent in French (after request from SP)		
		Recommended action: REMINDER	
Sweden (sixth report) CCPR/C/SWE/CO/6 §§ 10, 13, 16, 17			
Status			
Due date for the follow-up report:		02/04/2010	SUBMITTED
Due date for the next periodic report:		01/04/2014	NOT SUBMITTED
LOIPR status		UNDECIDED	
History of the procedure			
18/03/2010	[SP] FU report	§10	Largely satisfactory
		§13	Largely satisfactory
		§16	Incomplete
		§17	Part implemented, part without response
28/09/2010	[HRC] Letter sent	Stating that FU procedure is completed for 10, 13, requesting add. info for 13,17, highlight that 17 is not implemented.	
24/10/2010	[EXT] CCPR (Swedish Disability Federation)		
20/04/2011	[HRC] Reminder sent		
05/08/2011	[SP] FU report	§17	Largely satisfactory
27/11/2011	[HR] Letter sent.	Stating that the answers provided are largely satisfactory and the FU procedure has come to an end.	
		Recommended action: NONE	
96th session: July 2009			
United Republic of Tanzania (third report) CCPR/C/RWA/CO/3 §§ 12, 13, 14, 17			
Status			
Due date for the follow-up report:		28/07/2010	NOT SUBMITTED
Due date for the next periodic report:		01/08/2013	NOT SUBMITTED
LOIPR status		UNDECIDED	
History of the procedure			
16/12/2010- 20/04/2011	[HRC] Reminders sent		
02/08/2011	[HRC] Request for meeting		
19/10/2011	[HRC] Phone call to PM	Asking for reply to the request for a meeting. Said they would consult with the Representative, but that the person in charge of HR issues is away until the end of November.	

17/11/2011	[HRC] Reminder sent			
21/02/2012	[HRC] Phone call to PM	Checking on option for meeting. All correspondence sent back to the PM at their request. No reply.		
		Recommended action: REMINDER		
Kingdom of the Netherlands (fourth report) CCPR/C/NLD/CO/4 §§ 7, 9, 23				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	28/07/2010	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES	
Due date for the next periodic report:	01/07/2014	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	UNDECIDED			
History of the procedure				
16/12/2010-20/04/2011	[HRC] Reminders sent			
20/07/2011	[SP] Phone call of Perm. Mission.		Reply should be sent before Oct. 2011 session.	
16/09/2011	[SP] FU report	§7	Not implemented	[C1]
		§9	Partially satisfactory	[B2]
		§23	Partially satisfactory	[B2]
21/11/2011	[HRC] Letter sent.	Requesting additional info on para.9 and part of 23; updated info on part of para. 23; and stating that para.7 has not been implemented.		
		Recommended action: REMINDER		
Chad (initial report) CCPR/C/TCD/CO/1 §§ 12, 13, 14, 17				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	29/07/2010	NOT SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES	
Due date for the next periodic report:	31/07/2012	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE			
History of the procedure				
16/12/2010-20/04/2010	[HRC] Reminders sent			
02/08/2011	[HRC] Request for meeting			
19/10/2011	[HRC] Phone call to the Permanent Mission	Recalling the request for a meeting. Said they will consult with the Representative and reply to the request.		
27/10/2011	[MEET] Meeting with SP	The First Secretary, Mr. Awada, informed that he will insist to get the reply from Chad as soon as possible.		
25/01/2012	[SP] FU report		See CCPR.C.104.R.1	
		§10	Incomplete and not implemented	[B2] - [D1]
		§13	Incomplete and not implemented	[B2] - [D1]
		§20	No information provided	[D1]
		§32	Incomplete	[B2]
		Recommended action: LETTER REFLECTING COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS		

Azerbaijan (third report) CCPR/C/AZE/CO/4 §§ 9, 11, 15, 18				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	30/07/2010	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES	
Due date for the next periodic report:	01/08/2013	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	REFUSED			
History of the procedure				
06/07/2010	[SP] FU report (sent to translation and received in June 2011)	§9	Add. info necessary	[B2]
		§11	Add. info necessary	[B2]
		§15	Add. info necessary	[B2]
		§18	Add. info necessary	[B2]
30/10/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Requesting additional information on all paragraphs.		
Recommended action: REMINDER				
97th session: October 2009				
Switzerland (third report) CCPR/C/CHE/CO/3 §§ 10, 14, 18				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	27/10/2010	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED: replies largely satisfactory	
Due date for the next periodic report:	01/01/2015	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	UNDECIDED			
History of the procedure				
01/11/2010	[SP] FU report			
22/02/2011	[EXT] Humanrights.ch/MERS; Schweizerische Flüchtlingshilfe	§§10, 14, 18		
25/04/2011	[HRC] Letter sent.	Stating that 18 and parts of 14 are satisfactory. Requesting add. info on 10, 14.		
30/08/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Stating that the reply was not satisfactory. Request for additional information (§§14, 10)		
20/09/2011	[SP] FU report	§10	Largely satisfactory	[A]
		§14	Largely satisfactory	[A]
27/11/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Informing that the FU procedure has come to an end, and recalling that the next periodic report is due on 1/1/2015.		
Recommended action: NONE				
Republic of Moldova (second report) CCPR/C/MDA/CO/2 §§ 8, 9, 16, 18				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	29/10/2010	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES	
Due date for the next periodic report:	31/10/2013	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	ACCEPTED: Adopted Oct. 2011			
History of the procedure				
03/12/2010	[SP] FU report	§8	Implementation begun but not completed	[B2]
		§9	Implementation begun but not completed	[B2]

		§16	Implementation begun but not completed	[B2]
		§18	Implementation begun but not completed	[B2]
05/03/2011	[EXT] Legal Resources Center (LCR), La Strada, Doina Ioana Straistenau Human Rights Lawyer, Promo Lex			
06/06/2011	[EXT] UNCT			
19/09/2011	[HRC] Letter sent		Requesting additional info. on para. 9a, 9b, 16, 18b and stating that no info was provided on para. 8b and 18 (recommendation not implemented).	
		Recommended Action: REMINDER		
Croatia (second report) CCPR/C/HRV/CO/2 §§ 5, 10, 17				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	28/10/2010	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES	
Due date for the next periodic report:	30/10/2013	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	ACCEPTED			
History of the procedure				
17/01/2011	[SP] FU report	§5	Part satisfactory, part incomplete	[B2]
		§10	Incomplete	[B2]
		§17	Incomplete	[B2]
09/05/2011	[HRC] Letter sent		Stating that implementation had begun but not completed. Add. info requested on 5, 10. Init. info requested on 17.	
14/06/2011	[SP] FU report	§5	Incomplete	
		§10	10(c) largely satisfactory, 10(a) and (b) incomplete	[A]/[B2]
		§17	Not implemented	[C1]
21/11/2011	[HRC] letter sent		Informing that the reply was largely satisf. for 10(c), that 17 has not been implemented, and requesting add. info. on 5, 10(a), 10(b).	
		Recommended action: REMINDER		
Russian Federation (sixth report) CCPR/C/RUS/CO/6 §§ 13, 14, 16, 17				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	28/10/2010	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES	
Due date for the next periodic report:	01/11/2012	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	NOT APPLICABLE			
History of the procedure				
22/10/2010	[SP] FU report	§13	Not implemented	[C1]
		§14	Not implemented	[C1]
		§16	Not implemented	[C1]
		§17	Not implemented	[C1]
01/03/2011	[EXT] CCPR (Memorial; AGORA; International Youth Human Rights Movement; Civil Assistance)	§§14, 16, 17		

Feb. 2011	[EXT] Amnesty International	§§13, 14, 16		
19/10/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Requesting additional information on para. 13, 14, 16.		
		Recommended Action: REMINDER		
Ecuador (fifth and sixth reports) CCPR/C/RUS/CO/5 §§ 9, 13, 19				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	29/10/2010	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES	
Due date for the next periodic report:	30/10/2013	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	UNDECIDED			
History of the procedure				
10/05/2011	[HRC] Reminder sent			
31/05/2011	[SP] FU report	§9	Incomplete	[B2]
		§13	Incomplete	[B2]
		§19	Incomplete	[B2]
20/09/2011	[EXT] CCPR (Comisión Ecuménica de Derechos Humanos)	§§9, 13, 19		
22/11/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Requesting additional information on paras. 9, 19 and 13.		
		Recommended action: REMINDER		
98th session: March 2010				
New Zealand (fifth report) CCPR/C/NZL/CO/5 §§ 12, 14, 19				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	25/03/2010	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES	
Due date for the next periodic report:	30/03/2015	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	ACCEPTED			
History of the procedure				
19/04/2011	[SP] FU report			
02/08/2011	[HRC] Reminder sent			
11/04/2011	[SP] FU report (not received until August 2011)	§12	Incomplete	[B2]
		§14	Incomplete	[B2]
		§19	Incomplete	[B2]
20/10/2011	[EXT] AIR Trust	§§12, 14, 19	(19 erroneously labelled as 16)	
03/01/2012	[HRC] Letter sent.	Requesting additional information on paras. 12, 14 and 19.		
12/02/2012	[SP] Reply	Recommended action: ANALYSE REPLY AT NEXT SESSION		
Mexico (fourth report) CCPR/C/MEX/CO/4 §§ 8, 9, 15, 20				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:	23/03/2011	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES	
Due date for the next periodic report:	30/03/2014	NOT SUBMITTED		
LOIPR status	UNDECIDED			
History of the procedure				

21/03/2011	[SP] FU report	§8	Largely satisfactory	[A]
		§9	Largely satisfactory	[A]
		§15	Incomplete	[B2]
		§20	Incomplete	[B2]
		§§12, 14, 19	(19 erroneously labelled as 16)	
22/09/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Requesting additional information on 15, 20. Updated info requested in next periodic report on 8, 9.		
		Recommended Action: REMINDER		
Argentina (fourth report) CCPR/C/ARG/CO/4 §§ 17, 18, 25				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		23/03/2011	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:		30/03/2014	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		UNDECIDED		
History of the procedure				
24/05/2011	[SP] FU report	§17	Incomplete	[B2]
		§18	Incomplete	[B2]
		§25	Incomplete	[B2]
29/06/2011	[EXT] La Memoria de la Provincia de Buenos Aires	§§17, 18		
30/06/2011	[EXT] CELS	§§17, 18, 25		
18/07/2011	[EXT] Ministry of Justice and Human Rights, Mendoza Province			
22/09/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Requesting additional information on paras. 17, 18, 25		
		Recommended action: REMINDER		
Uzbekistan (third report) CCPR/C/UZB/CO/3 §§ 8, 11, 14, 24				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		24/03/2011	NOT SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:		30/03/2013	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		REFUSED		
History of the procedure				
02/08/2011 - 17/9/2011	[HRC] Reminders sent			
01/02/2012	[SP] Reply. Sent to translation	Recommended Action: ANALYSE REPLY AT THE NEXT SESSION		
99th session: July 2010				
Cameroon (fourth report) CCPR/C/CMR/CO/4 §§ 8, 17, 18				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		29/07/2011	NOT SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE DISCONTINUED. No SP reply received. LOIPR upcoming.
Due date for the next periodic report:		30/07/2013	NOT SUBMITTED	

LOIPR status		ACCEPTED: Adopted Oct. 2011		
History of the procedure				
28/11/2011	[HRC] Letter sent		Informing that, in the absence of a reply to FU questions, the Committee will maintain them in the LOIPR.	[D1]
		Recommended action: LETTER REFLECTING COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS		
Colombia (sixth report) CCPR/C/COL/CO/6 §§ 9, 14, 16				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		28/07/2011	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:		01/04/2014	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		UNDECIDED		
History of the procedure				
08/08/2011	[SP] FU report			
18/09/2011	[MEET] Meeting of the secretariat with the Comisión Colombiana de Juristas			
22/09/2011	[EXT] Comisión Colombiana de Juristas	§§9, 14, 16		
			See CCPR.C.104.R.1	
		§9	Not implemented	[C1]
		§14	Incomplete and part not implemented	[B2] and [D1]
		§16	Incomplete	[B2]
		Recommended action: LETTER REFLECTING COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS		
Estonia (third report) CCPR/C/EST/CO/3 §§ 5, 6				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		27/07/2011	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:		30/07/2015	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		UNDECIDED		
History of the procedure				
12/08/2011	[SP] FU report	§5	Incomplete	[B2]
		§6	Incomplete	[B2]
05/10/2011	[EXT] Legal Information Centre for Human Rights	§§5, 6		
29/11/2011	[HRC] Letter sent	Requesting additional information on paras. 5-6		
		See CCPR.C.104.R.1		
20/01/2012	[SP] FU reply	§5	Incomplete	[B2]
		§6	Incomplete	[B2]
		Recommended action: LETTER REFLECTING COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS		

Israel (third report) CCPR/C/ISR/CO/3 §§ 8, 11, 22, 24			
Status			
Due date for the follow-up report:	29/07/2011	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:	30/07/2013	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status	ACCEPTED		
History of the procedure			
01/08/2011	[EXT] Defence for Children International	§22	
26/08/2011	[EXT] BADIL	§§8, 24	
30/08/2011	[EXT] CCPR (Negev Coexistence Forum for Civil Equality)	§24	
31/08/2011	[EXT] CCPR (Adalah)	§§8, 11, 22, 24	
31/10/2011	[SP] FU report		
Recommended Action: ANALYSE REPLY AND NGO INFORMATION AT THE NEXT SESSION			
100th session: October 2010			
El Salvador (sixth report) CCPR/C/SLV/CO/6 §§ 5, 10, 14, 15			
Status			
Due date for the follow-up report:	27/10/2011	NOT SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:	01/07/2014	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status	UNDECIDED		
History of the procedure			
Recommended Action: REMINDER			
Poland (sixth report) CCPR/C/POL/CO/6 §§ 10, 12, 18			
Status			
Due date for the follow-up report:	26/10/2011	NOT SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:	26/10/2015	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status	UNDECIDED		
History of the procedure			
03/04/2012	[SP] FU report		
Recommended Action: ANALYSE REPLY AT THE NEXT SESSION			
Belgium (fifth report) CCPR/C/BEL/CO/5 §§ 14, 17, 21			
Status			
Due date for the follow-up report:	26/10/2011	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:	31/10/2015	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status	UNDECIDED		
History of the procedure			
		See CCPR.C.104.R.1	

18/11/2011	[SP] FU report	§14	Incomplete. Satisfactory on the outcome of investigation on complaints following the 29 Sept. and 1 Oct. 2010 manifestations.	[B1] - [A]
		§17	Incomplete.	[B2]
		§21	Incomplete.	[B1]
Recommended action: LETTER REFLECTING COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS				
Jordan (third report) CCPR/C/JOR/CO/3 §§ 5, 11, 12				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		27/10/2011	NOT SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:		27/10/2014	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		UNDECIDED		
History of the procedure				
28/02/2011	NGO report: Amman Centre for Human Rights Studies			
Recommended Action: REMINDER				
Hungary (fifth report) CCPR/C/HUN/CO/5 §§ 6, 15, 18				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		27/10/2011	NOT SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:		29/10/2014	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		UNDECIDED		
History of the procedure				
Recommended Action: REMINDER				
101st session: March 2011				
Serbia (second report) CCPR/C/SRB/CO/2 §§ 12, 17, 22				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		29/03/2012	NOT SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:		01/04/2015	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		UNDECIDED		
History of the procedure				
Recommended Action:				
Slovakia (third report) CCPR/C/SVK/CO/3 §§ 7, 8, 13				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		28/03/2012	SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:		01/04/2015	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		UNDECIDED		
History of the procedure				

28/03/2012	[SP] FU report			
Recommended Action: ANALYSE REPLY AT THE NEXT SESSION				
Mongolia (fifth report) CCPR/C/MNG/CO/5 §§ 5, 12, 17				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		30/03/2012	NOT SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:		01/04/2015	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		UNDECIDED		
History of the procedure				
Recommended Action:				
Seychelles (in the absence of a report)				
Togo (fourth report) CCPR/C/TGO/CO/4 §§ 10, 15, 16				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		28/03/2012	NOT SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:		01/04/2015	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		UNDECIDED		
History of the procedure				
06/03/2012	Common report of NGO coalition	§10	B2 / C	
		§15	B2 / C	
		§16	B2 / C	
17/04/2012	[SP] FU report			
Recommended Action: Analyse reply at the next session				
102nd session: July 2011				
Ethiopia (initial report) CCPR/C/ETH/CO/1 §§ 16, 17, 25				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		25/07/2012	NOT SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:		28/07/2014	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		UNDECIDED		
History of the procedure				
Recommended Action:				
Kazakhstan (initial report) CCPR/C/KAZ/CO/1 §§ 7, 21, 25, 26				
Status				
Due date for the follow-up report:		26/07/2012	NOT SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:		29/07/2014	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status		UNDECIDED		
History of the procedure				
Recommended Action:				

Bulgaria (third report) CCPR/C/BGR/CO/3 §§ 8, 11, 21			
Status			
Due date for the follow-up report:	25/07/2012	NOT SUBMITTED	PROCEDURE CONTINUES
Due date for the next periodic report:	29/07/2015	NOT SUBMITTED	
LOIPR status	UNDECIDED		
History of the procedure			
	Recommended Action:		
