



General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/HRC/WG.6/5/SVK/3
19 February 2009

Original: ENGLISH

HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Fifth session
Geneva, 4-15 May 2009

**SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR
HUMAN RIGHTS, IN ACCORDANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 15 (C) OF THE
ANNEX TO HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL RESOLUTION 5/1***

Slovakia

The present report is a summary of seven stakeholders' submissions¹ to the universal periodic review. It follows the structure of the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council. It does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), nor any judgement or determination in relation to specific claims. The information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes and, to the extent possible, the original texts have not been altered. Lack of information or focus on specific issues may be due to the absence of submissions by stakeholders regarding these particular issues. The full texts of all submissions received are available on the OHCHR website. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the four-year periodicity of the first cycle of the review.

* The present document was not edited before being sent to the United Nations translation services.

I. BACKGROUND AND FRAMEWORK

A. Scope of international obligations

1. Amnesty International (AI) recommended that the Government of Slovakia ratify the Revised European Social Charter (RESC), including Article 31 on the right to housing, and the Optional Protocol providing for a system of collective complaints.² The Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights (The CoE Commissioner) urged the Slovak authorities to ratify the Protocol 12 to the European Convention on Human Rights relating to non-discrimination.³

B. Constitutional and legislative framework

2. The Institute on Religion and Public Policy pointed out that article 11 of the Slovak constitution places international human rights instruments above State law if they guarantee greater human rights than those included in domestic law.⁴

3. AI stated that the European Commission instituted infringement procedures against Slovakia in 2007 because the 2004 Anti-Discrimination Act still failed to fully conform to the EU Race Equality Directive. AI reported that Slovakia recently adopted amendment to the Anti-Discrimination Act, which needs to be assessed.⁵ In that regard, the CoE Commissioner considered that affirmative action, which was removed from this Act after a decision of the Constitutional Court, can be an effective tool for addressing long-standing discrimination.⁶ In addition, AI highlighted that the 2008 Act on Upbringing and Education (the Schools Act), prohibits "all forms of discrimination, mainly segregation", but does not include concrete, targeted and effective measures to eliminate the discrimination faced by Roma in the area of education. AI also mentioned that this Act does not remove the concept of "socially disadvantaged children", which led to the de facto placement of Roma children in special schools and classes⁷. AI therefore recommended that the Government of Slovakia amend the law to require that "socially disadvantaged pupils" be educated in integrated, mainstream elementary schools, unless they have a physical or proven mental disability.⁸

4. Sexual Rights Initiative (SRI) recommended that the Government of Slovakia adopt a comprehensive law regulating the gender-reassignment procedures by eliminating all requirements that infringe upon individual rights, such as forced sterilization.⁹

C. Institutional and human rights infrastructure

5. The CoE Commissioner highlighted that the Office of the Public Defender of Rights and its nine regional offices have come to assume an important place in the Slovak legal and administrative framework.¹⁰ In addition, the CoE Commissioner commended the new procedure for constitutional complaints regarding alleged violation of constitutional rights or of human rights as provided for in international instruments.¹¹

6. The Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (ACFC) noted that the National Human Rights Centre was tasked to monitor the 2004 Anti-Discrimination Act implementation, develop awareness-raising activities about the fight against discrimination and arrange legal aid to victims of discrimination and expressions of intolerance and recommended that the Slovak authorities provide it with the necessary support.¹²

D. Policy measures

7. The Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions and Milan Šimečka Foundation (COHRE/MSF) pointed out that several strategic documents (such as the Longterm Conception of Housing for Marginalized Groups of Population and the 2008 Midterm Conception of Roma National Minority Development – Solidarity-Integrity-Inclusion), are of low quality and that their implementation is slow and inconsistent.¹³ Regarding the second document, AI acknowledged that this document does not constitute a comprehensive strategy to address the systemic causes of the social exclusion faced by the Roma minority and does not identify the bodies responsible for its implementation nor the financial resources.¹⁴

8. In the same vein AI stated that Slovakia joined in 2005 the Decade of Roma Inclusion, for which purpose the Government adopted a National Action Plan. However, AI and Franciscans International (FI) recommended this National Action Plan to be implemented¹⁵, while AI pointed out that it does not include indicators or specify concrete measures to achieve its goals.¹⁶

II. PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS ON THE GROUND

A. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

9. COHRE/MSF and AI recalled that, in 2005, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination found that Slovakia violated international law because of the cancellation by the municipality of Dosbina of a social housing project in favour of Roma.¹⁷ ACFC, in its second opinion in 2005, noted that, apart from a follow-up seminar, very little had been done in terms of awareness-raising on the monitoring results of the first cycle.¹⁸

B. Implementation of international human rights obligations

1. Equality and non discrimination

10. In spite of the 2004 Anti-Discrimination Act, COHRE/MSF recalled that discrimination against the Roma minority is widespread, notably in employment, education, healthcare and housing.¹⁹ FI recommended that the Government of Slovakia develop campaigns and programs in order to improve access to health services, employment and housing for Roma persons effectively and raise awareness about available services within the Roma population.²⁰ ACFC noted that it was worth underlining the establishment, in 2003, of a Department of Equal Opportunities and Anti-discrimination within the Social Inclusion Division of the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Family, which took an active part in the implementation of strategies on the Roma.²¹

11. FI pointed out that the media usually portrays Roma matters in a negative way, which further exacerbates prejudice against Roma population²². In addition, FI recalled that Roma persons had been targeted by skinhead groups. While the authorities have addressed violence, FI highlighted the fact that they did not tackle its root causes.²³ FI recommended that the Government of Slovakia empower the Roma population to participate in the decision-making process to better reply to their needs and ensure respect for social and cultural differences; and run awareness raising programs on non-discrimination and equality of rights for State representatives as well as awareness raising and educational programs at schools and in the media.²⁴ ACFC stressed that the contribution of the Council of National Minorities and Ethnic Groups could be more significant and recommended that the Government of Slovakia revisit its status, composition and working methods and strengthen its resources.²⁵

12. COHRE/MSF reported that a large number of Roma in Slovakia are unable to access a range of basic services because they lack a residence permit in the place of their factual residence²⁶, such as the right to financial assistance for education and training.²⁷ Lack of residence permits also preclude them from exercising fundamental political rights, such as the right to vote or to stand in local elections.²⁸ COHRE/MSF explained that many Roma persons, who emigrated from Slovakia were not issued residence permit on their return, as municipalities are not obliged to do so according to the law.²⁹

13. SRI recommended that the Government of Slovakia develop and implement a plan of action aimed at lowering society's negative attitudes towards lesbian and gays, and to promulgate legislation to protect the civil rights of same-sex couples.³⁰

2. Right to life, liberty and security of the person

14. The CoE Commissioner underlined that police behaviour continues to raise concerns, as harassment and ill-treatment during police investigations, particularly of Roma suspects, were still reported and recommended efforts to be strengthened in this area.³¹ The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe recommended that the Slovak Republic redouble efforts to fight more vigorously ethnically motivated crimes at all levels, including through the consistent application, by law enforcement officers and prosecution bodies, of reinforced criminal provisions.³²

15. The Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) stated that corporal punishment of children is prohibited by law in the penal system and in alternative care settings and considered as unlawful in schools but still allowed in homes in spite of recommendations made by the Committee on the rights of the Child on two occasions and by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women and the European Committee of Social Rights. In 2005, the Government stated its intention to prohibit corporal punishment in the home but studies revealed that this practice remains accepted in the country.³³

16. SRI noted that the low rate of reported cases of sexual violence against women and girls might be linked to the nature of the legal procedures and therefore recommended that the Government of Slovakia review the procedures in rape court hearings, establish special centres for counselling and support for victims of rape and sexual abuse, and develop and implement an awareness-raising campaign aimed at women to encourage them to report cases of abuse.³⁴ The CoE Commissioner commended the adoption of the 2003 domestic violence legislation facilitating prosecutions and providing greater protection to victims of domestic violence and the police training on domestic violence.³⁵

3. Administration of justice and the rule of law

17. The CoE Commissioner welcomed the establishment of the Slovak Judicial Council and the Act on Judges and Lay Judges, which have significantly improved the independence of the judiciary.³⁶

18. CPT pointed out that a significant amount of information related to ill-treatment by law enforcement agencies remained, mainly related to the time of arrest but also during police custody. CPT therefore recommended that the Government of Slovakia continue to give high priority to police training in this regard.³⁷ CPT also recommended that when a complaint of ill-treatment is received by the competent authorities, the necessary steps should be taken to ensure

that the allegations are properly investigated, such as forensic medical examination or the immediate notification of the relevant prosecutors.³⁸

19. While welcoming the amendment of the Police Act, CPT recommend that the rights of notification of custody and of access to a lawyer become effective.³⁹ CPT also recommended that the Slovak authorities vigorously pursue the adoption and implementation of a coherent strategy designed to combat prison overcrowding and, as a matter of priority, to devise and implement a comprehensive regime of out-of-cell activities for remand prisoners.⁴⁰

4. Freedom of religion or belief

20. IRPP pointed out that the Slovak Constitution guarantees freedom of religion (article 1) and prohibits discrimination based on religion (articles 12 and 13).⁴¹ According to IRPP religious organisations must register to obtain legal status and other legal rights such as build places of worship and hold public services. IRPP mentioned that there were 18 registered religious groups in the Slovak Republic and about 30, which are not registered.⁴²

21. Nevertheless, IRPP highlighted that a 2007 amendment to the law imposes stricter regulations for the registration of religious groups, notably a membership of at least 20,000 permanent residents, the highest requirement in the OSCE region. IRPP is of the view that this rule discriminates against religious groups, which do not have such a membership and quoted the 2007 State Department's International Religious Freedom Report, which indicated that the amendment was presented by Slovak authorities as a preventative measure to avoid the "uncontrolled registration" of new religious groups, which are often "considered to be harmful sects".⁴³ Therefore, IRPP recommended that the Government of Slovakia repeal this amendment.⁴⁴

5. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

22. The unemployment rate for Roma is about six times of the circa 14 per cent unemployment rate of the population at large according to COHRE/MSF.⁴⁵ FI referred to even higher differences and mentioned, among the causes, the lack of access to professional education, the use of non-Romani language in the employment sector and the refusal of non-Roma employers to employ Roma workers, largely based on negative stereotypes. FI recalled that the National Action Plan on Social Inclusion makes reference to double marginalisation because of the place, where they live and the difficulties in entering in the labour market.⁴⁶ FI recommended that the Government of Slovakia disseminate information and implement effective policies on the prohibition of discrimination and the principle of equal treatment in the labour market among employers, workers and the Slovak population, as well as within the Roma population itself.⁴⁷

23. The European Committee on Social Rights (ECSR), in its 2007 conclusions, considered that the minimum wage amounting to about 45 per cent of the net average wage was not sufficient, in addition to deductions from wage, which may also deprive workers of a minimum level of income to ensure the means of subsistence for themselves and their families.⁴⁸ ESCR stated that the Slovak legislation was not in conformity with ESC regarding the permitted daily working time and regarding the compensatory time off and remuneration for overtime hours.⁴⁹

6. Right to social security and to an adequate standard of living

24. AI recommend to the Government of Slovakia to stop and prevent forced evictions of Roma; to ensure the genuine participation of Roma communities in determining the upgrading or

relocation of their communities to give effect to their rights to adequate housing, water and sanitation and to ensure that any agreement on rehousing complies with international human rights standards.⁵⁰

25. COHRE/MSF reported on the housing situation of Roma living in slum settlements ("osady"), predominantly in eastern and central Slovakia, which are characterized by substandard or extremely substandard housing with a prevalence of environmental hazards. A national survey conducted in 2003-2005 indicated that 46 out of 787 segregated or ethnically homogenously concentrated settlements were in a state of humanitarian urgency with a lack of basic services, such as electricity, sewerage or fresh drinking water.⁵¹ An estimated 120,000 Roma person are living in such settlements according to COHRE/MSF⁵², 234,036 according to FI.⁵³ In addition, FI highlighted that children and youth represent the larger number of inhabitants of these settlements, who cannot expect an equal integration into social life, particularly with regard to education and employment.⁵⁴

26. COHRE/MSF also provide examples of municipalities, which have developed housing projects aimed at moving Roma away from urban settlements and key public services or which obstructed efforts carried out by foreign organizations in order to reduce housing segregation.⁵⁵ COHRE/MSF stated that, in a number of areas, historic segregation has not even been challenged due to a widespread perception among Roma that it would be fruitless to even attempt to move out of segregated housing.⁵⁶ COHRE/MSF highlighted that a 2008 survey carried out by MSF found out that new housing for Roma was usually as segregated as previous settlement or even more so.⁵⁷ COHRE/MSF highlighted that decentralization laws resulted in the lack of powers for the national authorities in implementing human rights in housing policy at the local level.⁵⁸

27. COHRE/MSF made reference to the 1998 Act on local registration, which eventually entered into force in 2006 and made it easier for people without standard housing to register their permanent residence. However, in 2007, following strong pressure by municipalities, conditions obstructing registration for persons in irregular housing conditions have been reintroduced.⁵⁹

28. COHRE/MSF indicated that some regions and municipalities have adopted rules on access to social housing aimed at precluding Roma from having access to social housing. COHRE/MSF also stated that Roma in Slovakia frequently report being blocked by vigilante local action, sometimes carried out with the active or passive complicity of local authorities, when trying to rent or purchase property outside segregated settlements. In the same vein, COHRE/MSF and FI reported that Roma reportedly face denial or obstruction of planning permission in a number of municipalities across Slovakia⁶⁰, particularly in rural settlements.⁶¹ COHRE/MSF also indicated that, after amendments to the civil code to reduce the rights of tenants, forced evictions of Roma has been rising over the past decades in various cities in Slovakia despite efforts undertaken by the civil society.⁶² COHRE/MSF provide a non-exhaustive list of forced evictions of Roma, which took place in various cities between September 2006 to September 2007.⁶³ As a result of these forced evictions, homelessness is also on the increase according to COHRE/MSF⁶⁴ and some municipalities have actively created Roma ghettos, such as the municipality of Košice since 1995⁶⁵. On the other hand, the CoE Commissioner referred to positive examples, such as the municipality of Zborov, which started a housing project in 2004.⁶⁶ AI referred to a resolution on forced evictions of non-payers of rent adopted in January 2008 by the Slovak Parliamentary Committee for Human Rights, Nationalities and the Status of Women, which called on the Government to undertake a range of measures to guarantee protection against poverty and social exclusion and the right to adequate housing.⁶⁷

29. COHRE/MSF pointed out that concerns were expressed at the high rents charged for social housing, particularly since social reforms undertaken by the Slovak Government in 2004 which slashed social assistance dramatically.⁶⁸
30. Regarding health, FI noted that access to healthcare remains poor for Roma, with discriminatory practices apparent in the health sector, including segregation of patient and Roma parents are often hesitant to access full healthcare for their children, unless their children's situation is serious.⁶⁹
31. SRI recommended that the Government of Slovakia develops and implements, in consultation with relevant civil society actors and by associating the media, a comprehensive and culturally sensitive sexuality education program.⁷⁰
32. SRI also noted that data on the use of contraceptives demonstrates a major problem in that almost 20 per cent of all pregnancies are unwanted, notably due to a limited access to contraception by teenage women and lack of adequate counselling but illegal abortions are rare. In addition, the Government has made efforts, through economic incentives to promote population growth. SRI therefore recommended that the Government of Slovakia develop and implement a plan of action to increase awareness and utilization of contraceptive methods, with special attention to the Roma community.⁷¹
33. SRI noted that the incidence of STDs is on the increase and recommended the development and implementation of a campaign to raise awareness among the population about the need to treat STDs and to amend the current legislation, which required from infected persons to provide health professionals with information on all sexual partners.⁷² SRI pointed out the very low incidence rate of HIV/AIDS and looked over the policy and programmes established in the country. SRI recommended that the Government of Slovakia draft and promulgate a comprehensive law to guarantee the rights of HIV positive individuals in terms of non-discrimination at all levels and develop and implement a sensitivity campaign in this regard aimed at the general public in addition to an awareness raising campaign on HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted infections in high schools, colleges and Universities throughout the country.⁷³
34. SRI also noted that sexual behaviour and sexual problems of mentally and physically handicapped persons are rarely mentioned in public and recommended that the Government of Slovakia, in collaboration with relevant civil society actors make a survey on these issues and develop a plan of action in this regard.⁷⁴ SRI also recommended that the Government of Slovakia reconfigure the "Elderly Houses" in such a way that elderly couples can engage in intimate relationships there.⁷⁵

7. Right to education and to participate in the cultural life of the community

35. FI noted that a very high number of Roma children drop out of schools, that they rarely attend classes in high school, and very few are enrolled in universities.⁷⁶ FI explained this situation by internal factors, such as the lack of academic tradition within Roma households or the lack of financial resources.⁷⁷ FI recommended to address the reasons for the large amount of school dropouts of Roma children, by running campaigns emphasizing the need for children to attend schooling, whilst at the same time being sensitive to the needs and concerns expressed by Roma parents and children.⁷⁸

36. COHRE/MSF and FI pointed out external factors, such as the fact that a large and disproportionate number of pupils in schools for disabled children are Roma children.⁷⁹ AI indicated that these schools follow a greatly simplified curriculum, which reduces future employment prospects for Roma children in addition to other hindrances faced by Romany children to attend schools.⁸⁰

37. AI was concerned that some Roma children are segregated in Roma-only mainstream schools. FI reported that Roma children are segregated in ordinary public schools (they are taught in separate classrooms or segregated in a different part of the classroom) and are reportedly given lunch at a different times from other students in a number of schools.⁸¹

38. AI was concerned that disproportionate number of Roma children are placed in preparatory classes in special schools for disabled children without clearly defined selection criteria, nor effective independent complaint mechanisms for parents.⁸² AI recommended that the Government of Slovakia amend the law to strictly and explicitly limit preparatory classes in special schools only for children with physical or serious mental disability.⁸³ FI reported that more than 7,000 Roma children attended special schools in 2004⁸⁴. FI recommended the development and implementation of a strategy to address the reasons for the disproportionate enrolment of Roma children in comparison to disabled children in special schools.⁸⁵ AI further recommended that all children currently in special schools and special remedial classes be assessed regularly to ensure their swift reintegration in mainstream education as appropriate; to adopt the necessary legal or administrative measures to redress any erroneous placement of children in special schools, and prevent and sanction all forms of racial segregation in education; and to review the mandate of the Slovak National Centre for Human Rights in order to enable it to monitor anti-discrimination legislation and its implementation, and to investigate individual complaints, to initiate its own investigations, or to recommend remedies in individual cases of violations of the right to education.⁸⁶ FI also recommended the development of strategies to use the education system as an opportunity to build bridges and common understanding between the Roma and the rest of the community, rather than perpetuating discrimination.⁸⁷

8. Minorities and indigenous peoples

39. AI pointed out that Slovakia failed to collect disaggregated data, notably ethnically disaggregated data, in spite of recommendations made by the Advisory Committee of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM) or the Committee on the Rights of the Child but acknowledged the publication in 2004 of a demographic study on Roma settlements in Slovakia.⁸⁸ AI recommended that the Government of Slovakia systematically gather statistical information and data, disaggregated on the basis of sex and ethnicity with due regard to European standards concerning the protection of personal data and the right to self-identification⁸⁹, as spelled out by the ACFC in 2005.⁹⁰ FI further recommended to produce statistics which reflect the actual number of Roma currently living in Slovakia, as well as increase research on specific categories regarding the enjoyment of various human rights.⁹¹

40. COHRE/MSF and AI mentioned coercive sterilization of Roma women by medical professionals which had occurred in recent years. Although COHRE/MSF and AI reported that the Slovak Government acknowledged "procedural shortcomings", they stated that victims were not offered any redress.⁹² COHRE/MSF reported that, in 2003, the Slovak authorities threatened to prosecute the authors of a report on coercive sterilization, whatever the veracity of their findings. In addition, COHRE/MSF stated that Slovak authorities had taken a number of actions aimed at obstructing justice in this context.⁹³ AI recommended that the Government of Slovakia

ensure impartial, thorough and effective investigations into allegations of forced sterilization of Roma women; ensure that the victims promptly receive appropriate compensation; and fully examine the circumstances under which consent to sterilization was given.⁹⁴ While sharing some of these concerns, the CoE Commissioner welcomed the adoption of the Public Health Act in 2005, which enshrines provisions on sterilization, informed consent and access to medical record.⁹⁵

41. COHRE/MSF indicated that the application of comprehensive reforms to the welfare system in 2003/2004, which include provisions specifically designed to preclude Roma access to housing benefits, intensified racial segregation of Roma.⁹⁶

42. The CoE Commissioner indicated that an agreement signed in 2003 between Slovakia and Hungary on the mutual support for national minorities in the field of education and culture has further strengthened the protection of the largest minority in the Slovak Republic, the Hungarians, who represent almost 10% of the state's population. In addition, he noted that the legislative framework for minority protection and combating discrimination has been improved considerably.⁹⁷

43. ACFC also noted existing plans to draft law on national minorities as well as to initiate the modification of several sectoral legislative provisions but pointed out that they were not well known among representatives of national minorities and NGOs.⁹⁸ ACFC also recommended that the Government of Slovakia develop more detailed legislative guarantees in order to consolidate the existence of schools providing minority language teaching and expand certain guarantees in this field to other minorities not explicitly mentioned in the current provisions.⁹⁹

9. Migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers

44. The CoE Commissioner welcomed the adoption of the 2003 Act on Asylum, which regulates the asylum procedure but noticed that statistics on asylum applications do not suggest that asylum is any easier to obtain than before and recommended that greater administrative resources to be allocated.¹⁰⁰

III. ACHIEVEMENTS, BEST PRACTICES, CHALLENGES AND CONSTRAINTS

N/A.

IV. KEY NATIONAL PRIORITIES, INITIATIVES AND COMMITMENTS

N/A.

V. CAPACITY-BUILDING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

N/A.

Notes

¹ The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org. (One asterisk denotes a non-governmental organization in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council. Two asterisks denote a national human rights institution with "B" status).

Civil society

COHRE/MSF	Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions*, Geneva, Switzerland; and Milan Šimečka Foundation, Bratislava, Slovak Republic
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London, United Kingdom
FI	Franciscans International*, Geneva, Switzerland
AI	Amnesty International*, London, United Kingdom
IRPP	Institute on Religion and Public Policy, Washington D.C., USA
SRI	Sexual Rights Initiative, Ontario, Canada

Regional intergovernmental organization

CoE	Council of Europe, Strasbourg, France, submission consisting of: Committee of Ministers, Resolution ResCMN (2006)8 on the implementation of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities by the Slovak Republic, 21 June 2006 Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Second Opinion on the Slovak Republic, 26 May 2005 Report to the Government of the Slovak Republic on the visit to Slovakia carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT), February 2006, CPT/Inf (2006) 5 European Committee on Social Rights, Conclusions XVIII-2 (2007) Follow-Up Report on the Slovak Republic (2001-2005) – Assessment of the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, 29 March 2006 Table of treaties signed European Social Charter fact sheet
-----	--

² AI, p. 6.³ The CoE Commissioner, para. 17.⁴ IRPP, p. 2.⁵ AI, p. 3.⁶ The CoE Commissioner, para. 16.⁷ AI, p. 4.⁸ AI, p. 6.⁹ SRI, p. 3.¹⁰ The CoE Commissioner, para. 4.¹¹ The CoE Commissioner, para. 6.¹² ACFC, Second Opinion, p. 11-12¹³ COHRE/MSF, p.9.¹⁴ AI, p. 3.¹⁵ AI, p. 3 ; FI, p. 6.¹⁶ AI, p. 3.¹⁷ COHRE/MSF, p. 3; AI, p. 5.¹⁸ ACFC, Second Opinion, p.4.¹⁹ COHRE/MSF, p. 3; AI, p. 5.²⁰ FI, p. 6.²¹ ACFC, Second Opinion, p. 11.²² FI, p. 3.²³ FI, p. 3.

- ²⁴ FI, p. 5-6.
- ²⁵ AFCF, Second Opinion, paras. 117 and 119.
- ²⁶ COHRE/MSF, p. 8.
- ²⁷ ECSR, Conclusions XVIII-2. p. 29.
- ²⁸ COHRE/MSF, p. 8.
- ²⁹ COHRE/MSF, p. 8.
- ³⁰ SRI, p. 3.
- ³¹ The CoE Commissioner, para. 56.
- ³² Resolution ResCMN (2006)8
- ³³ GIEACPC, p. 2.
- ³⁴ SRI, p. 4.
- ³⁵ The CoE Commissioner, paras. 40-44.
- ³⁶ The CoE Commissioner, para. 53.
- ³⁷ CPT, paras. 14-17.
- ³⁸ CPT, paras. 25 and 28.
- ³⁹ CPT, paras. 30-32.
- ⁴⁰ CPT, paras. 37-39 and 46.
- ⁴¹ IRPP, p. 1.
- ⁴² IRPP, p. 2.
- ⁴³ IRPP, p. 2.
- ⁴⁴ IRPP, p. 3.
- ⁴⁵ COHRE/MSF, p. 3.
- ⁴⁶ FI, p. 3-4.
- ⁴⁷ FI, p. 6.
- ⁴⁸ ECSR, Conclusions XVIII-2. p. 15-16 and 19.
- ⁴⁹ ECSR, Conclusions XVIII-2. p. 6 and 17.
- ⁵⁰ AI, p. 7.
- ⁵¹ COHRE/MSF, p. 4; AI, p. 5.
- ⁵² COHRE/MSF, p. 5.
- ⁵³ FI, p. 4.
- ⁵⁴ FI, p. 4.
- ⁵⁵ COHRE/MSF, p.7.
- ⁵⁶ COHRE/MSF, p. 8.
- ⁵⁷ COHRE/MSF, p. 8.
- ⁵⁸ COHRE/MSF, p. 9.
- ⁵⁹ COHRE/MSF, p.9.
- ⁶⁰ COHRE/MSF, p. 6-7; FI, p.4.
- ⁶¹ COHRE/MSF, p. 6-7.
- ⁶² COHRE/MSF, p. 5.

- ⁶³ COHRE/MSF, p. 5-6.
- ⁶⁴ COHRE/MSF, p. 6.
- ⁶⁵ COHRE/MSF, p. 7.
- ⁶⁶ The CoE Commissioner, para. 26.
- ⁶⁷ AI, p. 5.
- ⁶⁸ COHRE/MSF, p. 7.
- ⁶⁹ FI, p. 3.
- ⁷⁰ SRI, p.1
- ⁷¹ SRI, p. 5.
- ⁷² SRI, p. 5-6.
- ⁷³ SRI, p. 6-7.
- ⁷⁴ SRI, p.1-2
- ⁷⁵ SRI, p. 2.
- ⁷⁶ FI, p. 5.
- ⁷⁷ FI, p.5.
- ⁷⁸ FI, p. 6.
- ⁷⁹ COHRE/MSF, p. 3 ; FI, p. 5.
- ⁸⁰ AI, p. 4.
- ⁸¹ FI, p. 5.
- ⁸² AI, p. 5.
- ⁸³ AI, p. 6.
- ⁸⁴ FI, p. 5.
- ⁸⁵ FI, p. 6.
- ⁸⁶ AI, p. 6.
- ⁸⁷ FI, p. 6.
- ⁸⁸ AI, p. 4.
- ⁸⁹ AI, p. 6
- ⁹⁰ ACFC, Second Opinion, p.9.
- ⁹¹ FI, p. 6.
- ⁹² COHRE/MSF, p. 3; AI, p. 6.
- ⁹³ COHRE/MSF, p. 4.
- ⁹⁴ AI, p. 7.
- ⁹⁵ The CoE Commissioner, paras. 32-38.
- ⁹⁶ COHRE/MSF, p. 9.
- ⁹⁷ The CoE Commissioner, paras. 7-17.
- ⁹⁸ ACFC, Second Opinion, paras. 62-64.
- ⁹⁹ ACFC, Second Opinion, para. 109.
- ¹⁰⁰ The CoE Commissioner, paras. 45-51.