GAMBIA

Follow-up - State Reporting
Action by Treaty Bodies

CCPR, A/61/40 vol. I (2006)

CHAPTER VII. FOLLOW-UP TO CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

234. In chapter VII of its annual report for 2003 (A/58/40, vol. I), the Committee described the framework that it has set out for providing for more effective follow-up, subsequent to the adoption of the concluding observations in respect of States parties' reports submitted under article 40 of the Covenant. In chapter VII of its last annual report (A/60/40, vol. I), an updated account of the Committee's experience in this regard over the last year was provided. The current chapter again updates the Committee's experience to 1 August 2006.

235. Over the period covered by the present annual report, Mr. Rafael Rivas Posada continued to act as the Committee's Special Rapporteur for follow-up to concluding observations. At the Committee's eighty-fifth, eighty-sixth and eighty-seventh sessions, he presented progress reports to the Committee on intersessional developments and made recommendations which prompted the Committee to take appropriate decisions on a State-by-State basis.

236. For all reports of States parties examined by the Committee under article 40 of the Covenant over the last year, the Committee has identified, according to its developing practice, a limited number of priority concerns, with respect to which it seeks the State party's response, within a period of a year, on the measures taken to give effect to its recommendations. The Committee welcomes the extent and depth of cooperation under this procedure by States parties, as may be observed from the following comprehensive table. Over the reporting period, since 1 August 2005, 14 States parties (Albania, Belgium, Benin, Colombia, El Salvador, Kenya, Mauritius, Philippines, Poland, Serbia and Montenegro, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Togo and Uganda) have submitted information to the Committee under the follow-up procedure. Since the follow-up procedure was instituted in March 2001, only 11 States parties (Equatorial Guinea, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Mali, Moldova, Namibia, Suriname, the Gambia, Uzbekistan and Venezuela) have failed to supply follow-up information that has fallen due. The Committee reiterates that it views this procedure as a constructive mechanism by which the dialogue initiated with the examination of a report can be continued, and which serves to simplify the process of the next periodic report on the part of the State party.

237. The table below details the experience of the Committee over the last year. Accordingly, it contains no reference to those States parties with respect to which the Committee, upon assessment of the follow-up responses provided to it, decided to take no further action prior to the period covered by this report.

State party	Date information due	Date reply received	Further action
...			
Eighty-first session (July 2004)			
...			
The Gambia Situation examined in the absence of a report[2]			The Committee requested the State party to provide its replies to its concluding observations by 31 December 2002. Replies have not yet been received. Consultations have been scheduled for its eighty-eighth session.
...			

[2] Pursuant to rule 70, of its rules of procedure, the Committee decided to make public the provisional concluding observations on the Gambia adopted and transmitted to the State party during its seventy-fifth session.

CCPR, A/62/40 vol. I (2007)

CHAPTER VII. FOLLOW-UP ON CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

220. In chapter VII of its annual report for 2003 (A/58/40, vol. I), the Committee described the framework that it has set out for providing for more effective follow-up, subsequent to the adoption of the concluding observations in respect of States parties' reports submitted under article 40 of the Covenant. In chapter VII of its last annual report (A/61/40, vol. I), an updated account of the Committee's experience in this regard over the last year was provided. The current chapter again updates the Committee's experience to 1 August 2007.

221. Over the period covered by the present annual report, Mr. Rafael Rivas-Posada continued to act as the Committee's Special Rapporteur for follow-up to concluding observations. At the Committee's eighty-fifth, eighty-sixth and eighty-seventh sessions, he presented progress reports to the Committee on intersessional developments and made recommendations which prompted the Committee to take appropriate decisions State by State. In view of Mr. Rivas-Posada's election to the Chair of the Committee, Sir Nigel Rodley was appointed the new Special Rapporteur for follow-up on concluding observations at the Committee's ninetieth session.

222. For all reports of States parties examined by the Committee under article 40 of the Covenant over the last year, the Committee has identified, according to its developing practice, a limited number of priority concerns, with respect to which it seeks the State party's response, within a period of a year, on the measures taken to give effect to its recommendations. The Committee welcomes the extent and depth of cooperation under this procedure by States parties, as may be observed from the following comprehensive table. [1] Over the reporting period, since 1 August 2006, 12 States parties (Albania, Canada, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Slovenia, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Uganda, Uzbekistan and Venezuela) have submitted information to the Committee under the follow-up procedure. Since the follow-up procedure was instituted in March 2001, only 12 States parties (Brazil, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Mali, Moldova, Namibia, Surinam, Paraguay, the Gambia, Surinam and Yemen) and UNMIK have failed to supply follow-up information that has fallen due. The Committee reiterates that it views this procedure as a constructive mechanism by which the dialogue initiated with the examination of a report can be continued, and which serves to simplify the process of the next periodic report on the part of the State party.

223. The table below takes account of some of the Working Group's recommendations and details the experience of the Committee over the last year. Accordingly, it contains no reference to those States parties with respect to which the Committee, upon assessment of the follow-up responses provided to it, decided before 1 August 2006 to take no further action prior to the period covered by this report.

...

Seventy-second session (July 2001) (all States parties have been considered)
Seventy-third session (October 2001) (all States parties have been considered)
Seventy-fourth session (March 2002) (all States parties have been considered)
Seventy-fifth session (July 2002)

...

State party: Gambia*

* Pursuant to article 69A, paragraph 3, of its rules of procedure, the Human Rights Committee decided to publish the provisional concluding observations on Gambia that were adopted and transmitted to the State party at its seventy-fifth session.

Report considered: Consideration of the situation in the absence of a report (15 and 16 July 2002).

Information requested:

Para. 8: Detailed information on the crimes for which capital punishment may be imposed, the number of death sentences handed down since 1995, and the number of prisoners currently detained on death row (art. 6.2).

Para. 12: Detailed information about conditions in detention at Mile Two prison (art. 10).

Para. 14: Explanation of the basis for the establishment and operation of military courts, and whether the operation of these military courts is in any way linked to the existence of a state of emergency (arts. 7 and 10).

Para. 24: Measures taken to implement article 27 of the Covenant.

Date information due: 31 December 2002

Date information received: NONE RECEIVED

Action taken:

17 October 2006 A reminder was sent to the State party.

5 February 2007 A reminder was sent.

29 June 2007 A further reminder was sent to the State party.

Recommended action: Consultations should be scheduled for the ninety-first session.

Next report due: 31 December 2002

...

Note

1/ The table format was altered at the ninetieth session.

CCPR, CCPR/C/SR.2533 (2008)

Human Rights Committee
Ninety-second session

Summary record of the 2533rd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 2 April 2008, at 11 a.m.

...

Follow-up to concluding observations on State reports and to Views under the Optional Protocol

Progress report of the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on concluding observations

1. Sir Nigel Rodley (Special Rapporteur for follow-up on concluding observations), introducing an updated English version of his earlier report (CCPR/C/92/R.1) tracking the changes made in the light of developments since its publication, said that he had consulted with representatives of the Central African Republic, Mali, Namibia, Sri Lanka and Suriname and would soon be meeting with representatives of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Regrettably, it had not been possible to meet with representatives of the Gambia and Namibia, which had not been forthcoming in making the necessary arrangements.

2. The Special Rapporteur's role was to urge States to provide prompt feedback on the points raised by the Committee in its concluding observations. Such efforts were counter-productive, however, if requests for information were made year after year and a subsequent periodic report of the State party was due or overdue. In those cases, the State party should be encouraged to submit a report rather than respond to concerns paragraph by paragraph. Nevertheless, failing the submission of a report, a response to the individual paragraphs would be better than nothing.

3. He hoped that the updated version of his report could be reformatted to make it more reader-friendly. Concerning overdue responses to concluding observations, he recommended, with respect to Moldova and Uzbekistan, that no further action should be taken in view of the States parties' submission of periodic reports.

...

11. [Sir Nigel Rodley] With respect to the recommended action for the Gambia, he emphasized the unprecedented, strong wording used. It had failed to send a representative to meet with the Committee when the Committee had considered the situation in the absence of a report in 2002. All subsequent efforts to encourage the Gambia to submit a report or to respond to requests for a meeting with a representative of the State party, including during the current session, had been fruitless. Given that it had a Permanent Mission in New York, the State party had missed an opportunity to cooperate with the Committee. He therefore suggested that the State party should be notified of the Committee's intention to declare it in breach of its obligation to cooperate with the Committee under part IV of the Covenant.

12. Mr. Shearer recalled that the Committee had been awaiting a delegation from the Gambia in Geneva in 2002 to consider the situation in the absence of a report when the State party had first announced that the delegation had been delayed in the Gambia and subsequently cancelled the visit. He would support the recommended action, as the case was an exceptional one of non cooperation with the Committee. He assumed that the recommendation would be included in the Committee's forthcoming annual report. The State party should be informed of that step in advance and advised that it would be the first occasion on which the Committee had ever used such terminology or highlighted the failure of a State party to cooperate with it in its annual report.

13. Mr. Lallah enquired whether the Committee should specify which articles of the Covenant it was addressing, as part IV comprised various articles.

14. Sir Nigel Rodley said that the recommended action referred to article 40. It would have less impact if the Committee were to declare the State party to be in violation of that provision alone rather than of part IV, which was the section of the Covenant that established the Committee in general and set forth its functions.

15. Mr. Amor, concurring with the proposals by Sir Nigel Rodley and Mr. Shearer, said that the Committee's annual reports were not widely read. He therefore suggested that it should also issue a press release if the State party's non-compliance with its obligations continued.

16. Mr. Iwasawa and Mr. Bhagwati said that the State party should be reminded of the importance of responding to the Committee by the ninety-third session.

17. Mr. O'Flaherty said that he could support the proposals made by Sir Nigel Rodley and Mr. Amor.

18. Ms. Wedgwood said that, in view of the blatant failure of the Gambia to cooperate with the Committee, a press release would be in order.

19. Mr. Lallah said that the Committee should first warn the State party that it was thinking of issuing a press release. As for the recommended action, it would be preferable to say that the State party was "in breach of its obligation to cooperate with the Committee in the performance of its functions under part IV of the Covenant", rather than simply "in breach of its obligation to cooperate with the Committee under part IV of the Covenant".

20. *Mr. Khalil (Vice-Chairperson) took the Chair.*

21. Sir Nigel Rodley accepted Mr. Lallah's proposal to amend the wording of the recommended action. With regard to the question of a press release, the State party could be contacted informally in that regard, but allowed a further opportunity to respond before the ninety-third session. The Committee should not give the impression that it was taking its own functions more seriously than the human rights situation on the ground.

22. The Chairperson said he took it that the Committee agreed that it would, if necessary,

reconsider the question of a press release at a later stage.

...

33. *The recommendations contained in the progress report of the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on concluding observations, as amended, were approved.*

The meeting was suspended at 12.30 p.m. and resumed at 12.35 p.m.

...

CCPR, CCPR/C/SR.2564/Add.1 (2008)

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE
Ninety-third session
SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SECOND PART (PUBLIC)* OF THE 2564th MEETING
Held at the Palais Wilson, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 23 July 2008 at 11.25 a.m.

...

FOLLOW-UP TO CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS ON STATE REPORTS AND TO VIEWS UNDER THE OPTIONAL PROTOCOL

...

Report of the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on concluding observations (CCPR/C/93/R.1)

1. Sir Nigel RODLEY, Special Rapporteur for follow-up on concluding observations, introduced his report contained in document CCPR/C/93/R.1.

2. Commenting first on Equatorial Guinea and the Gambia, which had never submitted a report, he recommended that both States parties should be declared to be in breach of their obligation to cooperate with the Committee in the performance of its functions under part IV of the Covenant.

...

14. [Ms. CHANET] The situation in Equatorial Guinea and the Gambia had been considered by the Committee in the absence of a report. If the two States parties persisted in ignoring the Committee's requests for a report, the situation should be considered again.

...

27. The CHAIRPERSON said that clarification was needed on the methods which might be used to declare a State party to be in breach of its obligation to cooperate with the Committee in the performance of its functions under part IV of the Covenant.

28. Sir Nigel RODLEY said he had assumed that if his report was adopted, the Committee would take a decision declaring a State party to be in breach of its obligations under the Covenant, which would be communicated to that State party. It might be desirable to indicate in the executive summary that such steps had been taken.

...

31. Concerning her question about the two States parties to be declared in breach of their obligations to cooperate with the Committee under part IV, the Committee could request a new report and hold another hearing in the absence of a report if it did not receive one. The issue was for the Committee as a whole to decide. However, further consideration should be given to reverting to States parties on which there had already been hearings, as there were many other States which required attention.

32. As to the format of the report, instead of several lines indicating that reminders had been sent to the State party concerned, there could be one sentence which said "Reminders had been sent on the following dates". That would facilitate the work of researchers...

...

37. Mr. LALLAH, referring to the Chairperson's question concerning how to deal with a State party's breach of its obligation to cooperate with the Committee, said that members should decide on the matter at the current meeting. He suggested adding a part C to chapter III of the annual report of the Committee, which would cover States parties that had not met that obligation. That could resolve the perennial problem of when and how to take non-cooperating States to task and publicize that fact.

38. Mr. JOHNSON LÓPEZ said that it might be useful to include in the report the names or posts of the representatives of States parties failing to provide requested information who had been contacted by the Special Rapporteur. The task forces might also include in the country files and make public the status of implementation of the obligations by a particular State party. Given that there had been sessions in which there was no problem of late submission of information, it might also be helpful to list the States which had met their obligations on time.

39. The draft report of the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on concluding observations was adopted.

...

CCPR, A/63/40 vol. I (2008)

CHAPTER VII. FOLLOW-UP TO CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

194. In chapter VII of its annual report for 2003, [20] the Committee described the framework that it has set out for providing for more effective follow up, subsequent to the adoption of the concluding observations in respect of States parties' reports submitted under article 40 of the Covenant. In chapter VII of its last annual report (A/62/40, vol. I), an updated account of the Committee's experience in this regard over the last year was provided. The current chapter again updates the Committee's experience to 1 August 2008.

195. Over the period covered by the present annual report, Sir Nigel Rodley acted as the Committee's Special Rapporteur for follow-up on concluding observations. At the Committee's ninety-first, ninety-second and ninety third sessions, he presented progress reports to the Committee on inter-sessional developments and made recommendations which prompted the Committee to take appropriate decisions State by State.

196. For all reports of States parties examined by the Committee under article 40 of the Covenant over the last year, the Committee has identified, according to its developing practice, a limited number of priority concerns, with respect to which it seeks the State party's response, within a period of a year, on the measures taken to give effect to its recommendations. The Committee welcomes the extent and depth of cooperation under this procedure by States parties, as may be observed from the following comprehensive table. [21] Over the reporting period, since 1 August 2007, 11 States parties (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (China), Mali, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Togo, United States of America and Ukraine), as well as the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), have submitted information to the Committee under the follow up procedure. Since the follow up procedure was instituted in March 2001, 10 States parties (Barbados, Central African Republic, Chile, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Honduras, Madagascar, Namibia and Yemen) have failed to supply follow up information that has fallen due. The Committee reiterates that it views this procedure as a constructive mechanism by which the dialogue initiated with the examination of a report can be continued, and which serves to simplify the process of the next periodic report on the part of the State party.

197. The table below takes account of some of the Working Group's recommendations and details the experience of the Committee over the last year. Accordingly, it contains no reference to those States parties with respect to which the Committee, upon assessment of the follow up responses provided to it, decided before 1 August 2007 to take no further action prior to the period covered by this report.

198. The Committee emphasizes that certain States parties have failed to cooperate with it in the performance of its functions under Part IV of the Covenant, thereby violating their obligations (Gambia, Equatorial Guinea).

20/ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 40* (A/58/40), vol. I.

21/ The table format was altered at the ninetieth session.

Seventy-fifth session (July 2002)

...

State party: Gambia*   * Pursuant to rule 69A, paragraph 3, of its rules of procedure, the Human Rights Committee decided to publish the provisional concluding observations on the Gambia that were adopted and transmitted to the State party at its seventy-fifth session.
Report considered: Consideration of the situation in the absence of a report (15 and 16 July 2002).
Information requested: Para. 8: Detailed information on the crimes for which capital punishment may be imposed, the number of death sentences handed down since 1995, and the number of prisoners currently detained on death row (art. 6).   Para. 12: Detailed information on the conditions of detention at Mile Two prison (art. 10).   Para. 14: Guarantee security of tenure of judges; clarify the basis for the establishment and operation of military courts, and whether the operation of these military courts is linked to the existence of a state of emergency (arts. 7 and 10).   Para. 24: Measures to implement article 27 of the Covenant.
Date information due: 31 December 2002
Date information received: NONE RECEIVED
Action taken: Between October 2006 and September 2007, four reminders were sent.   17 January 2008 The Special Rapporteur requested a meeting with a representative of the State party.14 March 2008 The Special Rapporteur requested a meeting with a representative of the State party.

11 June 2008 A further reminder was sent and the State party was informed that, in the absence of a response by the ninety-third session, it will be declared to be in breach of its obligation to cooperate with the Committee in the performance of its functions under Part IV of the Covenant.
Recommended action: The Committee should declare the State party to be in breach of its obligation to cooperate with the Committee in the performance of its functions under Part IV of the Covenant.
Next report due: 31 December 2002
...

CCPR, A/64/40, vol. I (2009)

VII. FOLLOW UP TO CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

237. In chapter VII of its annual report for 2003, [20] the Committee described the framework that it has set out for providing for more effective follow up, subsequent to the adoption of the concluding observations in respect of States parties' reports submitted under article 40 of the Covenant. In chapter VII of its last annual report (A/63/40, vol. I), an updated account of the Committee's experience in this regard over the last year was provided. The current chapter again updates the Committee's experience to 1 August 2009.

238. Over the period covered by the present annual report, Sir Nigel Rodley acted as the Committee's Special Rapporteur for follow-up on concluding observations. At the Committee's ninety-fourth, ninety-fifth and ninety-sixth sessions, he presented progress reports to the Committee on inter-sessional developments and made recommendations which prompted the Committee to take appropriate decisions State by State.

239. For all reports of States parties examined by the Committee under article 40 of the Covenant over the last year, the Committee has identified, according to its developing practice, a limited number of priority concerns, with respect to which it seeks the State party's response, within a period of a year, on the measures taken to give effect to its recommendations. The Committee welcomes the extent and depth of cooperation under this procedure by States parties, as may be observed from the following comprehensive table. [21] Over the reporting period, since 1 August 2008, 16 States parties (Austria, Barbados, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, France, Georgia, Honduras, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (China), Ireland, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Tunisia, Ukraine and United States of America), as well as the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), have submitted information to the Committee under the follow up procedure. Since the follow up procedure was instituted in March 2001, 11 States parties (Botswana, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Namibia, Panama, Sudan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Yemen and Zambia) have failed to supply follow up information that has fallen due. The Committee reiterates that it views this procedure as a constructive mechanism by which the dialogue initiated with the examination of a report can be continued, and which serves to simplify the process of the next periodic report on the part of the State party. [22]

240. The table below takes account of some of the Working Group's recommendations and details the experience of the Committee over the last year. Accordingly, it contains no reference to those States parties with respect to which the Committee, upon assessment of the follow up responses provided to it, decided before 1 August 2008 to take no further action prior to the period covered by this report.

241. The Committee emphasizes that certain States parties have failed to cooperate with it in the performance of its functions under Part IV of the Covenant, thereby violating their obligations (Gambia, Equatorial Guinea).

Seventy-fifth session (July 2002)

State party: Gambia*

* Pursuant to rule 69A, paragraph 3, of its rules of procedure, the Human Rights Committee decided to publish the provisional concluding observations on the Gambia that were adopted and transmitted to the State party at its seventy-fifth session.

Report considered: Consideration of the situation in the absence of a report (15 and 16 July 2002).

Information requested:

Para. 8: Detailed information on the crimes for which capital punishment may be imposed, the number of death sentences handed down since 1995, and the number of prisoners currently detained on death row (art. 6).

Para. 12: Detailed information on the conditions of detention at Mile Two prison (art. 10).

Para. 14: Guarantee security of tenure of judges; clarify the basis for the establishment and operation of military courts, and whether the operation of these military courts is linked to the existence of a state of emergency (arts. 7 and 10).

Para. 24: Measures to implement article 27 of the Covenant.

Date information due: 31 December 2002

Date information received: NONE RECEIVED

Action taken:

Between October 2006 and September 2007, four reminders were sent.

17 January 2008 The Special Rapporteur requested a meeting with a representative of the State party.

14 March 2008 The Special Rapporteur requested a meeting with a representative of the State party.

11 June 2008 A further reminder was sent and the State party was informed that, in the absence of a response by the ninety-third session, it will be declared to be in breach of its obligation to cooperate with the Committee in the performance of its functions under Part IV of the Covenant.

22 September 2008 The Special Rapporteur informed the State party that, at its ninety-third

session, the Committee had declared the State party to be in breach of its obligation to cooperate with the Committee in the performance of its functions under Part IV of the Covenant.

February 2009 The matter has been referred to the High Commissioner for Human Rights.

Recommended action: No further action is recommended.

Next report due: 31 December 2002

...

20/ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 40* (A/58/40), vol. I.

21/ The table format was altered at the ninetieth session.

22/ As the next periodic report has become due with respect to the following States parties, the Committee has terminated the follow-up procedure despite deficient information or the absence of a follow-up report: Mali, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Namibia, Paraguay, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

CCPR, A/65/40 vol. I (2010)

...

Chapter VII: Follow-up to Concluding Observations

203. In chapter VII of its annual report for 2003,[16] the Committee described the framework that it has set out for providing for more effective follow-up, subsequent to the adoption of the concluding observations in respect of States parties' reports submitted under article 40 of the Covenant. In chapter VII of its last annual report,[17] an updated account of the Committee's experience in this regard over the last year was provided. The current chapter again updates the Committee's experience to 1 August 2010.

204. Over the period covered by the present annual report, Mr. Abdelfattah Amor acted as the Committee's Special Rapporteur for follow-up on concluding observations. At the Committee's ninety-seventh, ninety-eighth and ninety-ninth sessions, he presented progress reports to the Committee on intersessional developments and made recommendations which prompted the Committee to take appropriate decisions State by State.

205. For all reports of States parties examined by the Committee under article 40 of the Covenant over the last year, the Committee has identified, according to its developing practice, a limited number of priority concerns, with respect to which it seeks the State party's response, within a period of a year, on the measures taken to give effect to its recommendations. The Committee welcomes the extent and depth of cooperation under this procedure by States parties, as may be observed from the following comprehensive table.[18] Over the reporting period, since 1 August 2009, 17 States parties (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Georgia, Japan, Monaco, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Zambia), as well as the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), have submitted information to the Committee under the follow-up procedure. Since the follow-up procedure was instituted in March 2001, 12 States parties (Australia, Botswana, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Namibia, Nicaragua, Panama, Rwanda, San Marino and Yemen) have failed to supply follow-up information that has fallen due. The Committee reiterates that it views this procedure as a constructive mechanism by which the dialogue initiated with the examination of a report can be continued, and which serves to simplify the preparation of the next periodic report by the State party.[19]

206. The table below takes account of some of the Working Group's recommendations and details the experience of the Committee over the last year. Accordingly, the report does not cover those States parties with respect to which the Committee has completed its follow-up activities, including all States parties which were considered from the seventy-first session (March 2001) to the eighty-fifth session (October 2005).

207. The Committee emphasizes that certain States parties have failed to cooperate with it in

the performance of its functions under Part IV of the Covenant, thereby violating their obligations (Equatorial Guinea, Gambia).

---

[16] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 40*, vol. I (A/58/40 (vol. I)).

[17] Ibid., *Sixty-Fourth Session, Supplement No. 40*, vol. I (A/64/40 (vol. I)).

[18] The table format was altered at the ninetieth session.

[19] As the next periodic report has become due with respect to the following States parties, the Committee has terminated the follow-up procedure despite deficient information or the absence of a follow-up report: Austria, Brazil, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Hong Kong (China), Mali, Namibia, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Suriname and Yemen.