

## **SLOVAKIA**

### **Follow-up - Jurisprudence Action by Treaty Bodies**

#### **CERD, A/60/18 (2005)**

...

#### **CHAPTER VI. CONSIDERATION OF COMMUNICATIONS UNDER ARTICLE 14 OF THE CONVENTION**

...

#### **Follow-up to Opinions adopted by the Committee under article 14 of the Convention**

...

449. On 9 June 2005, the Government of Slovakia presented its follow-up observations on the Committee's Opinion in case No. 31/2003 (*L.R. v. Slovakia*), adopted during the sixty-sixth session. The Government stated that the Opinion had been translated and distributed to relevant government offices and State authorities, including municipalities and the National Centre for Human Rights; in particular, the Opinion had been transmitted to the town of Dobšiná and the Rožnava District Prosecutor, pointing out that the Slovak Republic had the obligation to provide the petitioners with an effective remedy, and that measures should be taken to return the petitioners to the situation they were in when the Municipal Council of Dobšiná adopted the first resolution. On 26 April 2005 the Council, taking into consideration the Committee's Opinion, decided to cancel both resolutions and reached an agreement that it would become engaged in proposals related to low-cost housing in the concerned area. In that context, the Council would pay serious attention to the housing problems of the Roma community with a view to the practical realization of their right to housing. Regarding the alleged discriminatory petition of the inhabitants of Dobšiná, legal proceedings had been initiated against the five-member "petition committee", under section 198a of the Penal Code (inciting to ethnic or racial hatred).

450. The State party also indicated that the preparation of the National Action Plan for the Prevention of All Forms of Discrimination, Racism, Xenophobia, Anti-Semitism and Other Expressions of Intolerance for the period 2006-2008 was under way. In that context, the Foreign Ministry had proposed the inclusion in the Plan of activities aiming at disseminating the work of CERD, its competence under article 14 and its jurisprudence.

**Chapter VII. Follow-up to Individual Communications**

...

487. The table below shows a complete picture of follow-up replies from States parties received up to 18 August 2006, in relation to cases in which the Committee found violations of the Convention or provided suggestions or recommendations in cases of non-violation. Wherever possible, it indicates whether follow-up replies are or have been considered satisfactory or unsatisfactory, or whether the dialogue between the State party and the Rapporteur for follow-up continues. This table, which will be updated by the Rapporteur on an annual basis, will be included in future annual reports of the Committee.

488. The categorization of follow-up replies by States parties is not always easy. It is therefore not possible to provide a neat statistical breakdown of follow-up replies. Many replies received may be considered satisfactory, in that they display the willingness of the State party to implement the Committee's recommendations or to offer an appropriate remedy to the complainant. Other replies cannot be considered satisfactory because they either do not address the Committee's recommendations at all or only relate to certain aspects of these recommendations.

489. At the time of adoption of the present report, the Committee had adopted final opinions on the merits with respect to 22 complaints and found violations of the Convention in 9 cases. In 8 cases, the Committee provided suggestions or recommendations although it did not establish a violation of the Convention.

**Follow-up received to date for all cases of violations of the Convention and cases in which the Committee provided suggestions or recommendations in cases of no violation**

<b>State party and number of cases with violation</b>	<b>Communication, number, author and location</b>	<b>Follow-up response received from State party</b>	<b>Satisfactory response</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory response</b>	<b>No follow-up response received</b>	<b>Follow-up dialogue still ongoing</b>
...						
Slovakia (2)	13/1998, Anna Koptova	X (A/61/18)				X
	31/2003, L.R. et al.	X (A/61/18)				X

**Petitions in which the Committee found no violations of the Convention but made recommendations**

<b>State party and number of cases with violation</b>	<b>Communication, number, author and location</b>	<b>Follow-up response received from State party</b>	<b>Satisfactory response</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory response</b>	<b>No follow-up response received</b>	<b>Follow-up dialogue still ongoing</b>
...						
Slovakia (1)	11/1998, Miroslav Lacko				X (never requested by the Committee)	

...

## Annex V

### Cases in which the Committee adopted recommendations and follow-up information provided in relation thereto

...

State party	Slovakia
Case and No.	Anna Koptova, 13/1998
Opinion adopted on	8 August 2000
Issues and violations found	Equal right to movement and residence for Roma - article 5(d)(1)
Remedy recommended	The Committee recommends that the State party take the necessary measures to ensure that practices restricting the freedom of movement and residence of Romas under its jurisdiction are fully and promptly eliminated.
Date of examination of report(s) since adoption	Second and third on 3 and August 2000 Fourth and fifth on 9 and 10 August 2004
Due date for State party response	None
Date of reply	5 April 2001
State party response	By note verbale of 5 April 2001, the State party forwarded the text of a proclamation of the Committee for Human Rights and Nationalities of the National Council of the Slovak Republic, which stated, inter alia, that the Government, other public authorities, as well as the Committee for Human Rights and Nationalities of the National Council of the Slovak Republic, even before the publication of the opinion of the Committee, had started taking specific legislative measures, as well as measures to provide suitable accommodation for the Romani families staying in provisional dwellings within the village of Cabiny. The Committee for Human Rights and Nationalities expressed appreciation for the decision of the Government to free up funds for the renovation of a building in Medzilaborce, where social flats for the families concerned will be created.

	The Committee made no comment on the information provided, which was reflected in its report to the General Assembly at its fifty-sixth session.
Author's response	None
Further action/Committee's recommendation	On 8 March 2006, the State party was requested to provide an update.
<b>State party</b>	<b>Slovakia</b>
Case and No.	Mrs. L.R. et al., 31/2003
Opinion adopted on	7 March 2005
Issues and violations found	Municipal Council's act of cancelling its resolution to build low-cost housing for Roma was racially discriminatory - articles 2 (1) (a), 5 (d) (iii) and 6
Date of examination of report(s) since adoption	Report due on 28 May 2008
Due date for State party response	6 June 2005
Date of reply	9 June 2005
State party response	<p>The Government of Slovakia presented its follow-up observations on the Committee's opinion in case No. 31/2003 (<i>L.R. v. Slovakia</i>), adopted at the sixty-sixth session. The Government stated that the opinion had been translated and distributed to relevant government offices and State authorities, including municipalities and the National Centre for Human Rights; in particular, the opinion had been transmitted to the town of Dobšiná and the Rožnava District Prosecutor, pointing out that the Slovak Republic had the obligation to provide the petitioners with an effective remedy, and that measures should be taken to return the petitioners to the situation they were in when the Municipal Council of Dobšiná adopted the first resolution. On 26 April 2005 the Municipal Council, taking into consideration the Committee's opinion, decided to cancel both resolutions and reached an agreement to become involved in proposals relating to low-cost housing in the concerned area. In</p>

	<p>that context, the Council would pay serious attention to the housing problems of the Roma community with a view to the practical realization of their right to adequate housing. Regarding the alleged discriminatory petition of the inhabitants of Dobšiná, legal proceedings had been initiated against the five-member “petition committee”, under section 198 (a) of the Penal Code (incitement to ethnic or racial hatred).</p>
Author’s response	<p>By letter of 22 July 2005, counsel commented on the State party’s reply of 9 June 2005. They note that, notwithstanding that the Municipal Council of Dobšiná was under the obligation to “take measures to ensure that the petitioners are placed in the same position that they were in upon adoption of the first [housing] resolution”, the Council’s new resolution, which wrongly cancelled both housing resolutions (Nos. 251-20/III-2002-MsZ and 288/5/VIII-2002-MsZ) on 26 April 2005, only makes a passing reference to the Committee’s opinion without creating the conditions necessary for the long-term resolution of the Roma’s housing situation in the municipality. According to counsel, the petitioners are thus worse off than before. A municipal councillor allegedly went on record to state that the facts “had been examined by all relevant State authorities and [did not prove] any violation of the rights of any particular group”. A meeting with the Deputy Mayor on 18 July 2005 disclosed additional problems: the Council’s urban development plan (10-15 years) with areas designated for low-cost housing for the Roma (referred to in the conversation as “socially inadaptatable”) apparently does not take into account the Committee’s opinion. This plan is to be put to referendum after December 2005, which would thus remove the Council’s responsibility for its failure to provide low-cost housing. The Deputy Mayor noted that compliance with the Committee’s opinion required the cancellation of both resolutions; the opinion implied no further obligation to adopt a low-cost housing plan. With respect to the prosecution of the “petition committee”, counsel argue that the State party has been vague about the kind of legal action taken against members of this committee.</p>
Further action and Committee’s recommendation	<p>At the sixty-seventh session, the Committee noted the State party’s observations and expressed the hope that the State party’s authorities would continue to keep it informed of any further developments in the case.</p> <p>On 8 March 2006, the State party was requested to comment on the petitioner’s response and to provide an update on action taken to provide the petitioners with a remedy.</p>

...

**Cases in which the Committee found no violation of the Convention but made recommendations**

...

State party	Slovakia
Case and No.	Miroslav Lacko, 11/1998
Opinion adopted on	9 August 2001
Issues	Discrimination in access to public accommodation
Remedy recommended	Acting under article 14, paragraph 7 (b), of the Convention, the Committee recommends to the State party that it complete its legislation in order to guarantee the right of access to public places in conformity with article 5 (f) of the Convention and to punish the refusal of access to such places on racial grounds. The Committee also recommends that the State party take the necessary measures to ensure that the procedure for the investigation of violations is not unduly prolonged.
Due date for State party response	None
Date of reply	N/A
State party response	None
Author's response	None
Further action/Committee's recommendation	No action required

...

**VII. FOLLOW-UP TO INDIVIDUAL COMMUNICATIONS**

...

523. The table below shows a complete picture of follow-up replies from States parties received up to 17 August 2007, in relation to cases in which the Committee found violations of the Convention or provided suggestions or recommendations in cases of non-violation. Wherever possible, it indicates whether follow-up replies are or have been considered satisfactory or unsatisfactory, or whether the dialogue between the State party and the Rapporteur for follow-up continues. This table, which will be updated by the Rapporteur on an annual basis, will be included in future annual reports of the Committee.

524. The categorization of follow-up replies by States parties is not always easy. It is therefore not possible to provide a neat statistical breakdown of follow-up replies. Many replies received may be considered satisfactory, in that they display the willingness of the State party to implement the Committee's recommendations or to offer an appropriate remedy to the complainant. Other replies cannot be considered satisfactory because they either do not address the Committee's recommendations at all or only relate to certain aspects of these recommendations.

525. At the time of adoption of the present report, the Committee had adopted final opinions on the merits with respect to 23 complaints and found violations of the Convention in 10 cases. In eight cases, the Committee provided suggestions or recommendations although it did not establish a violation of the Convention.

...



**Follow-up received to date for all cases of violations of the Convention and cases in which the Committee provided suggestions or recommendations in cases of no violation**

State party and number of cases with violation ...	Communication, number, author and location	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No follow-up response received	Follow-up dialogue still ongoing
Slovakia (2)	13/1998, Anna Koptova	X (A/61/18)				X
	31/2003, L.R. et al.	X (A/61/18)				X

**Petitions in which the Committee found no violations of the Convention but made recommendations**

State party and number of cases with violation ...	Communication, number, author and location	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No follow-up response received	Follow-up dialogue still ongoing
Slovakia (1)	11/1998, Miroslav Lacko				X (never requested by the Committee)	

## Annex VI

### FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION PROVIDED IN RELATION TO CASES IN WHICH THE COMMITTEE ADOPTED RECOMMENDATIONS

This annex compiles information received on follow-up to individual communications since the last annual report (A/61/18), as well as any decisions made by the Committee on the nature of those responses.

...	
State party	Slovakia
Case and No.	Anna Koptova, 13/1998
Opinion adopted on	8 August 2000
Issues and violations found	Equal right to movement and residence for Roma - article 5 (d) (1)
Remedy recommended	The Committee recommends that the State party take the necessary measures to ensure that practices restricting the freedom of movement and residence of Roma under its jurisdiction are fully and promptly eliminated.
Date of examination of report(s) since adoption	Second and third reports on 3 and 4 August 2000Fourth and fifth reports on 9 and 10 August 2004
Due date for State party response	None
Date of reply	7 May 2007 (the State party had previously responded on 5 April 2001)
State party response	<p>On 5 April 2001, the State party had forwarded the text of a proclamation of the Committee for Human Rights and Nationalities of the National Council of the Slovak Republic, which stated, inter alia,</p> <p>“that the government of the Slovak Republic, other public authorities, as well as the Committee for Human Rights and Nationalities of the National Council of the Slovak Republic already before the publication of the opinion of the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination started</p>

	<p>taking specific measures in the field of legislature, as well as in the interest of providing suitable accommodation for the Romany families staying in provisional dwellings in the cadastre of the village of Cabiny. The Committee esteems the decision of the Government to free up funds for the reconstruction of a building in Medzilaborce, where social benefit flats for the families concerned will be created".</p> <p>This information was presented in the Committee's annual report to the General Assembly at its fifty-sixth session (A/56/18). The Committee made no comment on the information provided.</p> <p>Following a request from the Committee for an update on the implementation of this case, the State party responded on 7 May 2007, that resolutions Nos. 21 and 22 which were the subject matter of the complaint had been abolished, that freedom of movement and residence was guaranteed under article 23 of the Constitution, that it had adopted an Anti-Discrimination Act which was considered in August 2004 during the consideration of its fourth and fifth periodic reports, and that since 2000 the State party has continued to issue National Action Plans for the Prevention of All Forms of Discrimination, Racism, Xenophobia, Anti-Semitism and Other Expressions of Intolerance. For these reasons, it considered that it has satisfactorily taken into account the Committee's Opinion.</p>
State party	Slovakia
Case and No.	Mrs. L.R. et al., 31/2003
Opinion adopted on	7 March 2005
Issues and violations found	Municipal Council's act of cancelling its resolution to build low-cost housing for Roma racially discriminatory - articles 2, 1 (a), 5 (d) (iii), and 6.
Date of examination of report(s) since adoption	
Due date for State party response	6 June 2005
Date of reply	7 May 2007 (the State party had responded on 9 June 2005)
State party response	On 9 June 2005, the State party provided its follow-up observations

	<p>stating that the Opinion had been translated and distributed to relevant government offices and State authorities, including municipalities and the National Centre for Human Rights; in particular, the Opinion had been transmitted to the town of Dobšiná and the Rožnava District Prosecutor, pointing out that the Slovak Republic had the obligation to provide the petitioners with an effective remedy, and that measures should be taken to return the petitioners to the situation they were in when the Municipal Council of Dobšiná adopted the first resolution. On 26 April 2005 the Municipal Council, taking into consideration the Committee's Opinion, decided to cancel both resolutions and reached an agreement that it would become engaged in proposals related to low-cost housing in the concerned area. In that context, the Council would pay serious attention to the housing problems of the Roma community with a view to the practical realization of their right to housing. Regarding the alleged discriminatory petition of the inhabitants of Dobšiná, legal proceedings had been initiated against the five-member "petition committee", under section 198 (a) of the Penal Code (inciting to ethnic or racial hatred).</p> <p>On 7 May 2007, and following the Committee's request of 8 March 2006 to comment on the petitioner's response of 22 July 2005, the State party informed the Committee that the Municipal Council of Dobšiná had passed a resolution (No. 20-1/III-2007-MsZ) on 1 March 2007, which approved a new zoning plan for the town, including the identification of a location for the construction of low-cost housing. In its view, the town of Dobšiná has fulfilled its obligation to make the construction of social housing possible, thus satisfying the Committee's recommendation.</p>
Petitioner's response	<p>By letter of 22 July 2005, counsel commented on the State party's reply of 9 June 2005. He noted that, notwithstanding that the Municipal Council of Dobšiná was under the obligation to "take measures to ensure that the petitioners are placed in the same position that they were in upon adoption of the first [housing] resolution", the Council's new resolution, which wrongly cancelled both housing resolutions (Nos. 251-20/III-2002-MsZ and 288/5/VIII-2002-MsZ) on 26 April 2005, only makes a passing reference to the Committee's Opinion without creating the conditions necessary for the long-term resolution of the Roma's housing situation in the municipality. According to counsel, the petitioners were thus worse off than before. A municipal councillor allegedly went on record to state that the facts "had been examined by all relevant state authorities and [did not prove] any violation of</p>

the rights of any particular group". A meeting with the Deputy Mayor on 18 July 2005 disclosed additional problems: the Council's urban development plan (10-15 years) with areas designated for the low-cost housing for the Roma (referred to in the conversation as "socially inadapttable") apparently did not take into account the Committee's Opinion. This plan was to be put to referendum after December 2005, which would thus remove the Council's responsibility for its failure to provide low-cost housing. The Deputy Mayor noted that compliance with the Committee's Opinion required the cancellation of both resolutions under dispute; the Opinion implied no further obligation to adopt a low-cost housing plan. With respect to the prosecution of the "petition committee", counsel argued that the State party has been vague about the kind of legal action taken against members of this committee.

On 9 July 2007, the petitioners provided their comments in relation to the State party's submission of 7 May 2007. They state that the plan to build low-cost housing is of a general nature only and no concrete steps have been made to pursue the plan. In fact, having had three meetings with the Council authorities (the last one on 6 July 2007) the petitioners are of the view that the Municipality of Dobšiná believes to have fulfilled the requirements of the Committee by cancelling both resolutions and that there is no obligation on its part to approve or design a plan for low-cost housing. During their third meeting with the Mayor of Dobšiná they were told that there was no time frame for the construction, that the Municipality's immediate plans involved the building of a cultural centre and improvements to the town infrastructure, and that in his view the situation of the Roma was not that "dramatic" compared to other inhabitants of Dobšiná. The petitioners went on to describe the current living conditions of the Roma: there is only one source of water for approximately 150 families and it is secured by a stream, which the Sanitation Department tested and found to be not drinkable; there are apparently cases of hepatitis and dysentery among the children; they are forced to get the water with buckets and bottles from the stream; and the area near their settlement is used as a dumping place for the town's garbage, including chemical waste. The petitioners also informed the Committee that they requested an expert legal opinion on the observance of the Equal Treatment Act with respect to the Roma from the Slovak Human Rights Centre, which concluded that housing issues do not fall within the scope of the Act. Thus, the action of the Municipality of Dobšiná would not be considered a violation of equal treatment as defined by the Anti-Discrimination Act. Despite this response a complaint was brought before the Rožnava Regional Court on

	5 December 2006, and a hearing is expected to take place in the autumn.
--	---

## **CHAPTER VII. FOLLOW-UP TO INDIVIDUAL COMMUNICATIONS**

536. In the past, the Committee only informally monitored whether, how or the extent to which States parties implemented its recommendations adopted following the examination of communications from individuals or from groups of individuals. In light of the positive experiences of other treaty bodies, and following a discussion based on a background paper prepared by the Secretariat (CERD/C/67/FU/1, available on the OHCHR website), the Committee decided, at its sixty-seventh session,<sup>1</sup> to establish a procedure to follow up on its opinions and recommendations adopted following the examination of communications from individuals or groups of individuals.

537. Also at its sixty-seventh session, the Committee decided to add two new paragraphs to its rules of procedure.<sup>2</sup> On 6 March 2006, at its sixty-eighth session, Mr. Linos-Alexandre Sicilianos was appointed Rapporteur for follow-up to opinions. He presented a report to the Committee with recommendations on further action to be taken. This report, which was adopted by the Committee at its sixty-ninth session, has been updated (see annex V) and reflects all cases in which the Committee found violations of the Convention or where it provided suggestions or recommendations although it did not establish a violation of the Convention. During the seventy-second session Mr. Régis de Gouttes was appointed Rapporteur for follow-up to opinions.

538. The table below shows a complete picture of follow-up replies from States parties received up to 17 August 2007, in relation to cases in which the Committee found violations of the Convention or provided suggestions or recommendations in cases of non-violation. Wherever possible, it indicates whether follow-up replies are or have been considered satisfactory or unsatisfactory, or whether the dialogue between the State party and the Rapporteur for follow-up continues. This table, which will be updated by the Rapporteur on an annual basis, will be included in future annual reports of the Committee.

539. The categorization of follow-up replies by States parties is not always easy. It is therefore not possible to provide a neat statistical breakdown of follow-up replies. Many replies received may be considered satisfactory, in that they display the willingness of the State party to implement the Committee's recommendations or to offer an appropriate remedy to the complainant. Other replies cannot be considered satisfactory because they either do not address the Committee's recommendations at all or only relate to certain aspects of these recommendations.

540. At the time of adoption of the present report, the Committee had adopted final opinions on the merits with respect to 25 complaints and found violations of the Convention in 10 cases. In eight cases, the Committee provided suggestions or recommendations although it did not establish a violation of the Convention.

---

1/ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixtieth Session, Supplement No. 18 (A/60/18)*, annex IV, sect. I.

2/ Ibid., annex IV, sect. II.



**Follow-up received to date for all cases of violations of the Convention and cases in which the Committee provided suggestions or recommendations in cases of no violation**

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication, number, author and location	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory or incomplete response	No follow-up response received	Follow-up dialogue still ongoing
...						
Slovakia (2)	13/1998, Anna Koptova	X (A/61/18) A/62/18				X
	31/2003, L.R. et al.	X (A/61/18) A/62/18				X
...						

**Petitions in which the Committee found no violations of the Convention but made recommendations**

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication, number, author and location	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No follow-up response received	Follow-up dialogue still ongoing
...						
Slovakia (1)	11/1998, Miroslav Lacko				X (never requested by the Committee)	

...

## **Chapter VII Follow-up to Individual Communications**

64. At its sixty-seventh session,<sup>1</sup> following a discussion based on a background paper prepared by the Secretariat (CERD/C/67/FU/1), the Committee decided to establish a procedure to follow up on its opinions and recommendations adopted following the examination of communications from individuals or groups of individuals.

65. At the same session, the Committee decided to add two new paragraphs to its rules of procedure setting out details of the procedure.<sup>2</sup> On 6 March 2006, at its sixty-eighth session, Mr. Sicilianos was appointed Rapporteur for follow-up to opinions, succeeded by Mr. de Gouttes with effect from the seventy-second session. The Rapporteur for follow-up to opinions regularly presents a report to the Committee with recommendations on further action to be taken. These recommendations, which are annexed to the Committee's annual report to the General Assembly, reflect all cases in which the Committee found violations of the Convention or otherwise provided suggestions or recommendations.

66. The table below provides an overview of follow-up replies received from States parties. Wherever possible, it indicates whether follow-up replies are or have been considered satisfactory or unsatisfactory, or whether the dialogue between the State party and the Rapporteur for follow-up continues. Such categorization is not always easy. In general, replies may be considered satisfactory if they reveal a willingness by the State party to implement the Committee's recommendations or to offer an appropriate remedy to the complainant. Replies which do not address the Committee's recommendations or only relate to certain aspects of these recommendations are generally considered unsatisfactory.

67. At the time of adoption of the present report, the Committee had adopted final opinions on the merits with respect to 27 complaints and found violations of the Convention in 10 cases. In nine cases, the Committee provided suggestions or recommendations although it did not establish a violation of the Convention.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixtieth Session, Supplement No. 18 (A/60/18)*, annex IV, sect. I

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., annex IV, sect. II.

**Follow-up received to date for all cases of violations of the Convention and cases in which the Committee provided suggestions or recommendations in cases of no violation**

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication, number, author and location	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory or incomplete response	No follow-up response received	Follow-up dialogue still ongoing
...						
Slovakia (2)	13/1998, Anna Koptova	X (A/61/18) A/62/18				X
	31/2003, L.R. et al.	X (A/61/18) A/62/18				X

**Petitions in which the Committee provided suggestions or recommendations in cases of no violation**

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication, number, author and location	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory or incomplete response	No follow-up response received	Follow-up dialogue still ongoing
...						
Slovakia (1)	11/1998, Miroslav Lacko				X (never requested by the Committee)	

...

## **Chapter VII Follow-up to Individual Communications**

68. At its sixty-seventh session,<sup>1</sup> following a discussion based on a background paper prepared by the Secretariat (CERD/C/67/FU/1), the Committee decided to establish a procedure to follow up on its opinions and recommendations adopted following the examination of communications from individuals or groups of individuals.

69. At the same session, the Committee decided to add two new paragraphs to its rules of procedure setting out details of the procedure.<sup>2</sup> On 6 March 2006, at its sixty-eighth session, Mr. Sicilianos was appointed Rapporteur for follow-up to opinions, succeeded by Mr. de Gouttes with effect from the seventy-second session. The Rapporteur for follow-up to opinions regularly presents a report to the Committee with recommendations on further action to be taken. These recommendations, which are annexed to the Committee's annual report to the General Assembly, reflect all cases in which the Committee found violations of the Convention or otherwise provided suggestions or recommendations.

70. The table below provides an overview of follow-up replies received from States parties. Wherever possible, it indicates whether follow-up replies are or have been considered satisfactory or unsatisfactory, or whether the dialogue between the State party and the Rapporteur for follow-up continues. Such categorization is not always easy. In general, replies may be considered satisfactory if they reveal a willingness by the State party to implement the Committee's recommendations or to offer an appropriate remedy to the complainant. Replies which do not address the Committee's recommendations or only relate to certain aspects of these recommendations are generally considered unsatisfactory.

71. At the time of adoption of the present report, the Committee had adopted final opinions on the merits with respect to 28 complaints and found violations of the Convention in 11 cases. In nine cases, the Committee provided suggestions or recommendations although it did not establish a violation of the Convention.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixtieth Session, Supplement No. 18 (A/60/18)*, annex IV, sect. I.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., annex IV, sect. II.

**Follow-up received to date for all cases of violations of the Convention and cases in which the Committee provided suggestions or recommendations in cases of no violation**

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication, number, author and location	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory or incomplete response	No follow-up response received	Follow-up dialogue still ongoing
...						
Slovakia (2)	13/1998, Anna Koptova	X (A/61/18) A/62/18				X
	31/2003, L.R. et al.	X (A/61/18) A/62/18				X

**Petitions in which the Committee provided suggestions or recommendations in cases of no violation**

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication, number, author and location	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory or incomplete response	No follow-up response received	Follow-up dialogue still ongoing
...						
Slovakia (1)	11/1998, Miroslav Lacko				X (never requested by the Committee)	

