

## EL SALVADOR

### Follow-up - State Reporting

#### Action by Treaty Bodies, Including Reports on Missions

CCPR A/59/40 vol. I (2004)

#### CHAPTER VII. FOLLOW-UP TO CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

...

260. 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. Of the 27 States parties (detailed below) that have been before the Committee under the follow-up procedure over the last year, only one (Republic of Moldova) has failed to provide information at the latest after dispatch of a reminder. 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.

261. 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.

<u>State party</u>	<u>Date information due</u>	<u>Date reply received</u>	<u>Further action</u>
--------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

...

*Seventy-eighth session (October 2003)*

El Salvador	7 August 2004	-	-
-------------	---------------	---	---

CHAPTER VII. FOLLOW-UP TO CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

...

233. 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 comprehensive table presented below. Since 18 June 2004, 15 States parties (Egypt, Germany, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Morocco, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Sweden, Togo and Venezuela) have submitted information to the Committee under the follow-up procedure. Since the follow-up procedure was instituted in March 2001, only six States parties (Colombia, Israel, Mali, Republic of Moldova, Sri Lanka and Suriname) have failed to supply follow-up information that had 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.

224. 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.

<u>State Party</u>	<u>Date Information Due</u>	<u>Date Reply Received</u>	<u>Further Action</u>
...			
<i>Seventy-eighth session ([July] 2003)</i>			
El Salvador	7 August 2004	12 November 2003 (partial reply)  22 December 2003 (further partial reply)	A complete response was requested to supplement the partial replies. Consultations have been scheduled for the eighty-fifth session.

**CCPR, CCPR/C/SR.2367 (2006)**

Human Rights Committee

Eighty-sixth session

Summary record of the 2367th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 31 March 2006, at 10 a.m.

Chairperson: Ms. Chanet

Follow-up on concluding observations on State reports

Progress report of the Special Rapporteur for Follow-up on Concluding Observations

...

10. Mr. Rivas Posada (Special Rapporteur for Follow-up on Concluding Observations) said that he had also contacted the delegations of El Salvador and the Republic of Moldova. The Salvadorian delegation had produced a complete reply three days previously, and his recommendation was that no further action should be taken with regard to that country. He had not been able to contact Mali or Namibia as of yet.

...

**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
<p>...</p> <p><i>Seventy-seventh session (March 2003)</i></p> <p>...</p>			
<p>El Salvador</p> <p>Third, fourth and fifth periodic reports examined</p>	<p>7 August 2004</p> <p>Paras. 7, 8, 12, 13 and 18</p>	<p>12 November 2003 (partial reply)</p> <p>Paras. 8 (military courts), 12 (right to life (art. 6) and torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment and abuse of authority)</p>	<p>A complete response was requested to supplement the partial replies. A reminder was dispatched.</p>
		<p>22 December 2003 (further partial reply) Paras. 13 (independence of the Procurator) and 18 (criminalization of torture)</p>	<p>At its eighty-fifth session, the Special Rapporteur held consultations with representatives of the State party, who informed him that consultations have been held between the State party's institutions in order to submit follow-up replies as soon as possible.</p> <p>Last reminder was dispatched on 21 February 2006.</p>
		<p>27 March 2006 (complete reply)</p> <p>Para. 7 (investigations on the killing of Mgr. Oscar Romero)</p>	<p>At its eighty-sixth session, the Special Rapporteur held consultations with a representative of the State party.</p> <p>At its eighty-sixth session, the Committee decided to take no further action.</p>
<p>...</p>			