

## SLOVENIA

### **Follow-up: State Reporting Action by treaty bodies**

#### **CCPR, CCPR/C/SR.2392 (2006)**

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE  
Eighty-seventh session  
SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 2392<sup>nd</sup> MEETING  
Held at the Palais Wilson, Geneva,  
on Wednesday, 26 July 2006, at 11 a.m.

...

FOLLOW-UP TO CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS ON STATE REPORTS AND TO  
VIEWS UNDER THE OPTIONAL PROTOCOL (agenda item 7)

...

Report of the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on concluding observations  
(CCPR/C/87/CRP.1/Add.7)

...

[Mr. RIVAS POSADA, speaking as Special Rapporteur for follow-up on concluding observations]

55. The deadlines set at the Committee's eighty-fourth session in July 2005 for the submission of additional information had just passed or fell that week. Tajikistan's response had been received and was currently being translated. Reminders would be sent to Slovenia, the Syrian Arabic Republic, Thailand and Yemen.

...

**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.

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

...

*Eighty-fourth session (July 2005)*

...

Slovenia	24 July 2006	-	A reminder will be dispatched.
Second periodic report examined	Paras. 11 and 16		

...

## 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.

...

**Eighty-fourth session (July 2006)**

...

**State party: Slovenia**

**Report considered:** Second periodic (due since 1997), submitted on 23 August 2004.

**Information requested:**

Para. 11: Measures to combat trafficking in women and children and prosecute and punish those responsible; protection of victims (arts. 3, 8, 24, 26).

Para. 16: Measures to eradicate discrimination within the Roma minority; improving living conditions for the Roma and encouraging their involvement in public life (arts. 26 and 27).

**Date information due:** 24 July 2006

**Action taken:**

20 September 2006 A reminder was sent to the State party.

9 October 2006 The State party informed the Committee that the Interdepartmental Commission on Human Rights was preparing the follow-up replies, which would be forwarded by the end of the year.

9 October 2006 The State party informed the Committee that the concluding observations had been translated into Slovenian and requested an extension in order to submit the replies in the coming months.

**Date information received:** 10 April 2007, complete response.

**Recommended action: No further action.**

**Next report due:** 1 August 2010

...

Note

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