



General Assembly

Distr.: General
25 July 2014

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twentieth session
27 October–7 November 2014

Summary prepared by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21

Bosnia and Herzegovina*

The present report is a summary of 16 stakeholders' submissions¹ to the universal periodic review. It follows the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council in its decision 17/119. 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. As provided for in Human Rights Council resolution 16/21, where appropriate, a separate section is provided for contributions by the national human rights institution of the State under review that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles. The full texts of all submissions received are available on the OHCHR website. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the periodicity of the review and developments during that period.

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



I. Information provided by the national human rights institution of the State under review accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles

1. The Ombudsman Institution (Ombudsman) stated that there had been a visible lack of effective measures aimed at the implementation of recommendations made in the first UPR.²

2. In relation to Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on Sale of Children, the Ombudsman noted amendments to the criminal legislation. However the Government had not taken adequate measures to ensure the application of the laws and education of professionals in areas covered by the Optional Protocol.³

3. A national action plan on human rights with a strategic approach that would ensure protection and improvement of human rights had still not been adopted.⁴

4. The National Preventive Mechanism defined in Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment had not been established, despite the Government's decision to do so. Adequate resources were a pre-condition for its realization.⁵

5. There was a lack of the direct application of international standards resulting from insufficient training of officials, especially police, judges, prosecutors and social workers.⁶

6. Consolidation of the new unified Ombudsman Institution ended in 2010, but there had been a trend of providing decreasing resources to it, despite the additional mandates it was receiving.⁷ A new parliamentary procedure that would ensure its financial independence was needed.⁸ Government needed to show more understanding of the recommendations of the International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions in order for it to retain its "A" Status.⁹

7. The Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination (LoPD) included an obligation to create a separate budget for the work of the Ombudsman's Anti-Discrimination Department, but that this had never been implemented.¹⁰ Judges lacked of awareness of the LoPD and there was limited jurisprudence.¹¹

8. Ethnic issues dominated public discourse, this marginalized gender equality, including the implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women.¹²

9. Many women were engaged in "black market" employment in the service sectors and had limited access to managerial and other well-paid positions.¹³ Affirmative action was not used and employment stimulation programmes were not adapted to women.¹⁴

10. In 2010 prohibition of hate crimes was incorporated into the Criminal Codes of the Republika Srpska and Brčko District. Adoption of similar amendments in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (the Federation) would contribute to addressing insecurity and mistrust between communities.¹⁵ The authorities should consider measures, including an awareness-raising campaign on complaints procedures under the LoPD, to combat hate speech.¹⁶

11. There was no unified reliable database on women victims of rape and other forms of violence committed during the 1992-1995 war.¹⁷ The Criminal Codes were not harmonized in this area and prosecutions proceeded slowly.¹⁸ A programme to improve the position of women victims of sexual violence and torture had not been adopted, although a draft law had been prepared.¹⁹ There was a lack of judicial investigations into threats made to victims

after they had testified.²⁰ The State should establish and adequately fund a national network to support victims and witnesses of sexual violence using the experience of non-governmental organizations (NGOs).²¹

12. The State Strategy on Transitional Justice had not been adopted.²² Progress had been made in records and databases within the National Strategy for War Crimes, however, efforts were needed in relation to witness protection and regular reporting to see full implementation of the Strategy.²³

13. The system of safe houses for survivors of domestic violence was unsustainable; responses were ineffective, often resulting in deaths.²⁴ There was a lack of awareness about the existence of protection mechanisms and slow procedures caused victims to fear reporting acts of violence.²⁵

14. Increased resources and support were needed for social work centres and there was insufficient sensitivity on the part of teachers and professionals to the needs of children, particularly in the detection and prevention of violence against children.²⁶

15. Measures were needed to protect religious freedom including reporting on attacks on religious sites and increasing community education on the issue in places affected by frequent attacks.²⁷ Measures to establish trust between communities and overcome divisions should be intensified. Programmes should be included within school curricula.²⁸

16. The Ombudsman was concerned about initiatives to amend the Freedom of Access to Information Act which would significantly limit its application.²⁹

17. Attacks on journalists and human rights defenders were increasingly frequent. Most cases of attacks on the latter remained unresolved.³⁰ It was necessary to investigate them rapidly and transparently.³¹ Whistle-blowers needed protection through legislation.³²

18. Discrimination against women was seen in the appointments to leadership positions in state-owned companies and women were not sufficiently represented in political decision-making.³³

19. The Poverty Reduction Strategy adopted ten years ago had not been implemented.³⁴ More attention was needed to address issues of economic and social rights.³⁵

20. There were no measures to ensure equal access to healthcare. Access differed according to the place of residence.³⁶

21. There were numerous problems in education which required a strategic approach to eliminate discrimination, segregation, assimilation and politicization.³⁷

22. There were no uniform definition of disability and no accurate statistics on persons with disabilities.³⁸ Persons with disabilities who had adapted to life in the community were being returned to closed facilities.³⁹ Laws on standards for physical access to public buildings were not being interpreted in the best interest of persons with disabilities.⁴⁰

23. The Ombudsman's 2013 special report on the situation of the Roma included recommendations to all levels of government on their rights to employment, healthcare and education.⁴¹

24. The Ombudsman was still receiving complaints under Annex VII of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Dayton Peace Agreement) relating to the right to return of refugees and internally displaced persons, because the political, economic and social conditions were not being fulfilled.⁴²

II. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Background and framework

1. Scope of international obligations

25. Joint Submission 6 (JS6) noted that in 2012 Bosnia and Herzegovina ratified the Council of Europe (CoE) Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse.⁴³ Joint Submission 2 (JS2) stated that nothing had been done to publicly promote the content of this convention.⁴⁴

2. Constitutional and legislative framework

26. Numerous submissions referred to the 2009 Grand Chamber judgment of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) in the case of *Sejdić and Finci v. Bosnia and Herzegovina* and called for its implementation so as to remove discriminatory provisions limiting the rights of persons not belonging to the three named “constituent peoples” (Bosniaks, Croats and Serbs) to stand for election to the House of Peoples of the Parliament and Presidency.⁴⁵ Minority Rights Group (MRG) mentioned the consequent political marginalization of minority groups; the link to the sustainable return of displaced persons; and that at least 20 laws and regulations needed to be amended.⁴⁶ According to the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC-NRC), the Government reported the preparation of changes to the Constitution and Electoral Law at the first UPR, but as at the end of 2013 the changes had still not been made.⁴⁷

27. JS6 and JS2 noted that further changes were necessary to harmonize legislation with international standards in the area of protection of children from sexual abuse.⁴⁸

3. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures

28. JS2 stated that the country had not shown willingness to implement the human rights standards which it had committed itself to.⁴⁹ Joint Submission 5 (JS5) stated that the coordinating body for the monitoring of the implementation of UPR recommendations had not been established and that the failure to implement UPR recommendations was a result of the lack of political will and poor coordination.⁵⁰

29. JS6 mentioned that civil society organisations were still faced with inadequate legislation and an unfavourable legal position, although they had been major driving forces behind activities for the protection of children’s rights.⁵¹

30. JS2 stated that nothing had been done to improve the situation of the Ombudsman Institution⁵² and MRG that it was unable to carry out its mandate.⁵³ The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina (OSCE-BIH) called for the Ombudsman to be given adequate resources and for local authorities to recognize its mandate.⁵⁴

B. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Equality and non-discrimination

31. Mentioning discrimination in employment, health and social protection in particular, JS2 stated that not enough had been done to fulfil the recommendations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women and the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.⁵⁵ The Law on Gender Equality was not being implemented.⁵⁶

OSCE-BIH noted that discrimination continued to be institutionalized⁵⁷ and JS2 that a system of collecting and recording incidents of discrimination had not been established.⁵⁸

32. JS5, OSCE-BIH and MRG observed that implementation of the LoPD had been limited.⁵⁹ MRG noted that despite widespread discrimination against members of minorities, very few of them had brought cases under the Law.⁶⁰ It was concerned about the general lack of understanding of the Law and the concepts it included among officials, the public and minority communities.⁶¹ There was a lack of protection from victimisation for participants in proceedings.⁶² JS5 noted that few cases had been brought on grounds of discrimination based on gender, social class, race or disability although such discrimination was common.⁶³ OSCE-BIH considered that the lack of a comprehensive legal aid system contributed to the weak implementation.⁶⁴ Joint Submission 4 (JS4) noted that disability was not listed as one of the prohibited grounds for discrimination.⁶⁵ JS5 considered that the definitions of “sexual orientation” and “gender expression” in the LoPD were erroneous and that discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation was not adequately recognized.⁶⁶

33. OSCE-BIH noted the Gender Action Plan (2013-2017) and recommended providing adequate resources for its implementation.⁶⁷ JS2 noted that a large number of measures in the previous Plan were delayed or unimplemented and observed the continuing discrimination against women.⁶⁸

34. Human Rights Watch (HRW) stated that discrimination, threats, and attacks against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people and activists remained a concern.⁶⁹ JS2 noted the lack of prosecutions and public condemnation of the incidents.⁷⁰ JS5 called for amendments to the criminal codes to make hate speech based on sexual orientation a criminal offence.⁷¹

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

35. CoE referred to the considerable number of allegations of severe physical ill-treatment by police, particularly at the Banja Luka Central Police Station, and the lack of follow-up when complaints were made.⁷²

36. CoE stated that with the exception of Banja Luka prison hardly any allegations of ill-treatment by prison staff were received.⁷³ It referred to concerns on prison conditions, including the need to improve healthcare services and introduce systematic procedures for recording and reporting injuries.⁷⁴ Concerns were also mentioned over overcrowding, staffing levels and other safeguards in three psychiatric units.⁷⁵

37. OSCE-BIH noted that combatting domestic violence was a priority and had been articulated through strategies at state and entity level.⁷⁶ JS2 highlighted differences between recently-adopted laws in the entities which resulted in legal uncertainty and inequality in the protection of victims.⁷⁷ Prison sentences were seldom imposed resulting in questionable preventive effects.⁷⁸ Measures needed to be applied equally to protect women from certain vulnerable groups.⁷⁹ A lack of systematized data collection also hindered the prevention of violence against women.⁸⁰

38. JS2 noted the Action Plan for Children (2011-2014), but stated that funding had not been provided at any level of government.⁸¹ JS6 called for adequate resourcing of and full implementation of the Strategy to Combat Violence against Children (2011-2015).⁸² The Council for Children for Bosnia and Herzegovina was functioning, but JS2 was concerned that it depended on UNICEF budget support in 2014.⁸³

39. The Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children stated that while the laws in the Republika Srpska clearly stated that parents must not impose physical punishment on children, the same clarity had not been achieved in the legislation of the Federation and Brčko district.⁸⁴

40. JS6 was concerned that the decentralization of social services had implications for the protection of children at risk of committing violence and abuse in homes and schools.⁸⁵ The majority of cases of violence involving children were going unreported.⁸⁶ The increasing danger of cyber bullying was unrecognized.⁸⁷ Easy access to small weapons was also increasing the potential for violence.⁸⁸

41. JS2 noted discrepancies between the legal protection of street children between the the different jurisdictions.⁸⁹ The only data on street children was being compiled by NGOs which themselves relied largely upon international donors to provide support to these children.⁹⁰

42. JS2 stated that the basic provisions of the criminal codes had been harmonised with international standards in relation to trafficking in human beings, but human trafficking was not a criminal act in the Criminal Code of the Federation.⁹¹ IDMC-NRC indicated that trafficking victims were increasingly internally-displaced women from female-headed households as well as Roma women and girls.⁹² CoE and IDMC-NRC called for increased attention to the identification of victims.⁹³ CoE mentioned child victims in particular.⁹⁴

43. JS2 noted the Mine Action Strategy (2009-2019). The affected area had reduced significantly by 2013. International donors had fully complied with their obligations, but domestic resources were substantially below the planned level.⁹⁵ IDMC-NRC and OSCE-BIH noted that lack of mine clearance was an obstacle to the return of displaced persons.⁹⁶

3. Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law

44. JS5 stated that interference in the work of the judicial institutions by the executive and legislative bodies had been a significant problem, particularly in relation to the prosecution of current or former highly-positioned officials.⁹⁷ The complexity of the legal system and its financing also resulted in influence from the executive.⁹⁸

45. JS5 referred to the use of the Constitutional Court beyond its defined appellate jurisdiction in the absence of a state-level supreme court which resulted in a lack of harmony in the interpretation of entity laws and inequality in access to justice.⁹⁹

46. JS5 considered that the lack of harmonisation between the laws in the entities and of a state-level law on free legal aid had resulted in discrimination in the very legislation that regulated access to legal aid.¹⁰⁰ It called for a state-level law on legal aid; recognition of the role of NGOs in providing legal aid; and legal aid for victims and witnesses in criminal cases.¹⁰¹

47. JS5 noted the lack of execution of court decisions and the number of complaints received by the Ombudsman Institution for non-enforcement of decisions where the judgment was against a municipality, canton or entity. The failure to enforce decisions of the Constitutional Court was a particular problem. It called for the prosecution of officials who fail to enforce court decisions.¹⁰²

48. JS5 stated that access to justice was also impeded by lengthy court proceedings and called for the introduction of employee performance evaluations, sanctions and career advancement measures.¹⁰³

49. Amnesty International (AI) and JS1 noted that the Draft State Strategy on Transitional Justice, referred to in recommendations from the first UPR, had still not been adopted.¹⁰⁴

50. JS1 noted moderate progress in the implementation of the National War Crimes Prosecution Strategy. It called for resources to be allocated to guarantee that the pace of proceedings increases and for victims to be guaranteed to receive information on the investigations.¹⁰⁵ HRW and AI observed that progress had been slow in prosecuting war

crimes.¹⁰⁶ AI noted the lack of political will and highlighted concerns relating to crimes of sexual violence in particular.¹⁰⁷ HRW recommended that the entity justice systems be equipped with adequate staff.¹⁰⁸

51. AI stated that none of the legal and policy documents on reparations for survivors of war crimes and sexual violence initiated following the first UPR had been adopted.¹⁰⁹ JS1 called for the Programme for Improvement of the Status of Survivors of Conflict related Sexual Violence to be approved without further delay.¹¹⁰

52. Several submissions referred to the jurisprudence of the ECtHR and the Constitutional Court concerning the retroactive application of the 2003 Criminal Code and the imposition of penalties differing from those under the Criminal Code of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.¹¹¹ JS1 called on the authorities to ensure that those accused of crimes committed during the war, in particular of genocide, are prosecuted pursuant to the 2003 Criminal Code and that the implementation of the ECtHR judgment is not used as the basis for reopening all cases where the 2003 Criminal Code was applied.¹¹² It also called for all necessary measures to be taken to ensure the continued detention of those convicted while awaiting a new examination of their cases.¹¹³ HRW noted the release of a number of defendants pending retrial in these cases. It called for the harmonization of the criminal code applied and the revisiting of verdicts to ensure timely retrials in cases where the ECtHR judgment applied.¹¹⁴ With reference to the above issue, and noting separate Government proposals to allow pardons or reduced sentences, JS1 called on the authorities to guarantee that those convicted for genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity do not enjoy exemption from sanctions.¹¹⁵ It also observed that perpetrators were receiving increasingly lower sentences.¹¹⁶ AI called for the 2003 Criminal Code to be applied in all jurisdictions when prosecuting war crimes of sexual violence.¹¹⁷

53. JS1 considered that the criminal framework on sexual violence, torture and enforced disappearance were inadequate at the state and entity levels and the definitions included were not in conformance with international standards and called for amendments.¹¹⁸ AI had similar observations.¹¹⁹

54. IDMC-NRC stated that the vast majority of female victims of sexual and gender-based violence during the war were still awaiting justice. An unknown number remained displaced out of fear of confronting the perpetrators upon return.¹²⁰

55. CoE urged improvements in the witness protection system and prompt investigation and prosecution of all reported cases of threats and intimidation of witnesses.¹²¹ JS1 called for urgent enactment of the law on a witness protection programme.¹²² It noted that witness support departments had been set up in some cantonal courts, but were dependent on donor resources.¹²³

56. JS1 noted that parts of the 2004 Law on Missing Persons had not been implemented, including the creation of the Central Record of Missing Persons and the Fund for the Support of Relatives of Missing Persons. Its non-implementation meant that a number of related decisions of the Constitutional Court had not been implemented.¹²⁴ CoE recommended continuing with determination to identify about 10,000 pending cases of missing persons from the war.¹²⁵

57. JS6 considered that the previous UPR recommendation on juvenile justice had only been partially implemented.¹²⁶ New laws in the entities had offered more opportunities to divert juveniles away from formal proceedings, but the measures were rarely used. It also called for the entities and Brčko District to create the conditions to refer cases to mediation.¹²⁷

58. JS1 was concerned about the policy of “anonymization” applied in the Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina in which details (including the names of those accused, suspected

of, or convicted for war crimes or the places where the crime has happened) were redacted from documents and called for the policy to be changed to enable victims to realize their right to the truth.¹²⁸

59. CoE referred to the 2013 compliance report of the Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) which concluded that Bosnia and Herzegovina had satisfactorily implemented or satisfactorily dealt with only 4 of the 22 recommendations contained in its 2011 report.¹²⁹

4. Right to family life

60. JS6 called for strategies for the de-institutionalization of childcare and reallocation budgets towards family-based care; development of services and capacities for childcare professionals and an explicit ban on placing children under three years of age in any form of residential care.¹³⁰

5. Freedom of religion or belief, expression, association and peaceful assembly, and right to participate in public and political life

61. The OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights reported hate crimes targeting Islamic and Christian sites and symbols and physical assaults against Christians.¹³¹

62. JS2 stressed that the situation of freedom of speech, peaceful assembly and association had deteriorated since the first UPR and that human rights defenders were increasingly and more vehemently targeted by the authoritarian government.¹³²

63. HRW documented nineteen cases of excessive use of force by police against protestors during demonstrations and in detention in February 2014 in Tuzla and Sarajevo. The protests were against layoffs, unpaid salaries and high severance pay for directors following the privatization of several large companies in Tuzla. They started there and spread nationwide.¹³³ HRW also referred to journalists who were beaten while covering the demonstrations.¹³⁴

64. JS1 noted restrictions on freedom of expression and assembly in Prijedor, in particular when public commemorations of the 20th anniversary of mass atrocities were formally prohibited in May 2012 and it was announced that any use of the term “genocide” when referring to the crimes committed at Omarska would be prosecuted. It referred to other incidents in Prijedor, including attacks on the offices of NGOs. No one had been prosecuted for the attacks.¹³⁵ JS2 referred to other incidents involving restrictions on protests in Sarajevo and in Republika Srpska.¹³⁶

65. JS5 stated that the implementation of the Freedom of Access to Information Act was inconsistent with the more successful implementation at the state- than the other levels. The fees were high and there were no sanctions for the institutions which did not respond.¹³⁷

66. JS2 stated that, despite legislative change in 2013, women were not equal to men in public and political life and described the low or absent representation of women as ministers and in the presidential positions. It also referred to the lack of women in the management of public companies.¹³⁸ OSCE-BIH recommended designing measures to increase the number of women in decision-making positions.¹³⁹

67. JS4 stated that the legislation did not ensure the right of persons with disabilities to political participation. It noted segregated voting and the lack of use of assistive technologies.¹⁴⁰

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

68. CoE mentioned the 2012 conclusion of the European Committee of Social Rights (CoE-ECSR) that it had not been established that employment policy efforts have been adequate in combatting unemployment and promoting job creation.¹⁴¹

69. JS2 highlighted long-standing discrimination against women in accessing the right to maternity leave and pay.¹⁴² It described issues affecting women's access to employment, affordable childcare and access to complaint mechanisms in case of discrimination or sexual harassment.¹⁴³

70. HRW noted that the 1991 census undercounted Roma and other national minorities with the result that they were disproportionately excluded from civil service positions.¹⁴⁴ JS2 mentioned the lack of results of activities for the advancement or the employment of Roma women.¹⁴⁵

71. OSCE-BIH stated that lack of employment remained the main impediment to sustainable returns.¹⁴⁶

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

72. CoE mentioned the 2013 conclusion of CoE-ECSR that the duration of unemployment benefit was too short.¹⁴⁷

73. OSCE-BIH noted that while new laws had been adopted to equate the rights to social assistance of civilian victims of the war to those of military victims, in line with the 2006 Concluding Observations of the Committee on Economic Social and Cultural Rights; differential treatment was still evident within the system.¹⁴⁸

74. OSCE-BIH stated that the legal framework which established the social protection system focussed on the status of its beneficiaries rather than on their need. Some groups such as war veterans, families of fallen soldiers or of civilians who died or disappeared during the war were de facto privileged categories in the distribution of social assistance.¹⁴⁹ It provided further information and stated that a higher share of social benefits was reaching the richer segment of the population.¹⁵⁰

75. OSCE-BIH stated that the pension and benefits system remained divided and disharmonized between the entities, but noted a Federation law of 2012 allowing returnees from the Republika Srpska to access pension benefits and the implementation of related judgments of the ECtHR.¹⁵¹ IDMC-NRC noted that entitlements could be lower in the area of return if returnees moved from Republika Srpska to the Federation.¹⁵²

76. IDMC-NRC highlighted the failure of the Federation to implement the ECtHR decision requiring remedies for wartime confiscation of semi-privatised military apartments.¹⁵³

77. IDMC-NRC and HRW referred to the dire housing conditions of Roma refugees or IDPs who were living in informal settlements and were vulnerable to evictions.¹⁵⁴

8. Right to health

78. The International Baby Food Action Network provided recommendations on the promotion and support of breastfeeding.¹⁵⁵

79. JS3 stated that access to family planning was limited and not readily available to vulnerable groups or the general population and noted that women were discriminated against.¹⁵⁶ It provided recommendations on ensuring access to sexual health services and modern contraceptive methods in the entities, particularly for youth and including awareness-raising campaigns.¹⁵⁷

80. JS3 provided recommendations on providing comprehensive sexuality education and increasing support for youth-friendly healthcare.¹⁵⁸

9. Right to education

81. Several submissions referred to the issue of ethnic segregation and ethnic divisions within education, including the practice of “two schools under one roof”, and provided recommendations on the ending of the practice and the integration of schools.¹⁵⁹ IDMC-NRC noted that the practice had originally been intended as a temporary measure to facilitate the return of displaced persons in the minority.¹⁶⁰ MRG stated that pupils from minority communities attending unified schools often found that they could not learn their own language or be taught through a curriculum that promoted knowledge of their own culture, history and religion.¹⁶¹

10. Persons with disabilities

82. JS4 recommended conducting an urgent review of all current and planned legislation (including the relevant definitions) and practice to bring it into line with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.¹⁶²

83. JS4 and JS2 noted the establishment of the National Disability Council, but there were problems with its independence, funding and effectiveness.¹⁶³ JS4 recommended the creation of a national action plan for persons with disabilities¹⁶⁴ and highlighted other issues including discrimination, limited employment possibilities, lack of government awareness-raising programmes, poor physical access to public facilities and lack of adaptation of services, particularly in relation to healthcare and education.¹⁶⁵ There was no automatic right to public healthcare on the basis of disability and limited guaranteed rehabilitative services. A 2011 investigation found that two-thirds of adults with disabilities lived below the poverty line. JS4 also recommended establishing a minimum income for persons with disability, taking into account the additional costs associated with their disabilities.¹⁶⁶ The media portrayed persons with disabilities inappropriately.¹⁶⁷ Special schools were funded, but not inclusive education and children continued to be segregated unnecessarily.¹⁶⁸

84. JS6 was alarmed that many children with disabilities in specialized care facilities were housed alongside adults.¹⁶⁹ JS4 stated that the lack of a state-level legal framework for institutions to provide support to children with disabilities resulted in discrimination on a territorial basis.¹⁷⁰

11. Minorities

85. JS2 stated that programmes for combatting prejudice against ethnic minorities or monitoring mechanisms had not been established.¹⁷¹

86. CoE highlighted the problems experienced by the Roma, including extreme poverty and marginalization compounded by prejudice and discrimination and inadequate housing. Roma children were less likely to attend or complete school. Along with other visible minorities, Roma were subject to ethnic profiling by the police.¹⁷² JS2 considered that the Government’s attitude to Roma had been reduced to accession to the Roma Decade and forming the Council of Roma. The latter had been inactive for nearly two years, lacked funds and was ignored, including by the Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees.¹⁷³ IDMC-NRC noted the action plans on Roma Housing, Employment, Healthcare and education and the accession to the Roma decade, but these initiatives had not solved the problems of Roma displaced persons.¹⁷⁴ Roma faced particular problems in property issues because of lack of documentation, discrimination or relative poverty.¹⁷⁵

87. JS6 recommended promoting the accessibility and availability of education for the Roma children and removing barriers leading to school dropout or early marriage by

addressing external factors, including poverty, by raising awareness among Roma women of human rights and other specific issues.¹⁷⁶

12. Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers

88. Several submissions highlighted the obstacles to the sustainable return of internally displaced persons and refugees to their homes or home communities with particular reference to those returning to a situation where they would be in a minority.¹⁷⁷ OSCE-BIH recommended that the Law on Refugees, Returnees and Displaced Persons should be amended to reflect the 2010 Revised Strategy for the Implementation of Annex VII of the Dayton Peace Agreement and ensure equal access to their rights, irrespective of their place of residence.¹⁷⁸ HRW mentioned that implementation of the 2010 strategy remained slow.¹⁷⁹ IDMC-NRC, noted that a revised law had been read in the assembly in 2013 but not adopted due to political divisions.¹⁸⁰ Beyond housing, more resources should be devoted to their health, social protection and employment.¹⁸¹ Many lacked access to infrastructure, including water, roads and sanitation. Many also lived in segregated, inaccessible settlements, far from employment opportunities, schools, health and emergency services. They also suffered high levels of discrimination in accessing these and other rights.¹⁸² IDMC-NRC recommended a study on the situation of returnees to determine the degree to which return has been sustainable and any outstanding barriers to return.¹⁸³ It noted that hate crimes continued to manifest themselves in areas where displaced persons had returned and are in a post-war minority.¹⁸⁴

13. Internally displaced persons

89. IDMC-NRC stated that temporary occupation of the homes of IDPs had been a common occurrence and that the right of a temporary occupant to receive compensation or necessary expenses should not undermine or prevail over the rights of displaced persons to exercise their right to return.¹⁸⁵ It noted that there were approximately 410 cases pending before the Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina with the former Commission for Real Property Claims of Displaced Persons and Refugees as respondent, but that no action had been taken since the commission's mandate expired in 2009.¹⁸⁶

14. Human rights and counter-terrorism

90. HRW stated that two men had been in detention since 2008 or 2009 under a 2008 law allowing for the indefinite detention of non-citizens on national security grounds. Neither had been charged with a crime and neither they nor their lawyers knew the reasons for their detention as the evidence was secret. It noted that a 2012 judgment of the ECtHR relating to one of them had found that his deportation should be halted and he should either be charged, found a safe third country for resettlement or released. HRW called, inter alia, for the revocation of the 2008 law.¹⁸⁷

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.

* denotes a national human rights institution with “A” status.

*Civil society**Individual submissions*

AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
HRW	Human Rights Watch, Geneva (Switzerland);
IBFAN	International Baby Food Action Network, Geneva (Switzerland);
IDMC-NRC	Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre - Norwegian Refugee Council, Geneva (Switzerland);
MRG	Minority Rights Group International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);

Joint submissions:

JS1	Joint submission 1, submitted by: TRIAL (Track Impunity Always), Geneva (Switzerland), Association of the Concentration Camp-Detainees Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo, Association of Detained – Association of Camp-Detainees of Brčko District, Brčko, Union of Concentration Camp-Detainees of Sarajevo-Romanija Region, Rogatica, Association of Concentration Camp-Detainees from the Homeland War in Vareš, Vareš, Regional Association of Concentration-Camp Detainees in Višegrad, Višegrad, Association of Families of Killed and Missing Defenders of the Homeland War from Bugojno Municipality, Bugojno, Association of Families of Missing Persons in Ilijaš, Ilijaš, Association of Families of Missing Persons in Kalinovik (“Istina-Kalinovik ‘92”), Ilidža, Sarajevo, Association of Families of Missing Persons of the Sarajevo-Romanija Region, Lukavica, East Sarajevo, Association of Relatives of Missing Persons of the Vogošća Municipality, Vogošća, Association Women-Victims of War, (Pofalići) Sarajevo - Novo Sarajevo, Croatian Association of Concentration Camp-Detainees of Central Bosnia Canton, Busovača, Association Women from Prijedor - Izvor, Prijedor, Naš Glas, Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Prijedor 92, Prijedor, Section of Women Victims of War in Republika Srpska, Banja Luka, Sumejja Gerc (also known as Centre for Victims of the Vojno Concentration Camp), Mostar, Potoci, Vive Žene Tuzla, Tuzla, Women’s Section of the Concentration Camp Torture Survivors Canton Sarajevo, Saraći, Sarajevo (all from Bosnia and Herzegovina);
JS2	Joint submission 2, submitted by: Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Rights for All, Landmine Survivors Initiative, Sarajevo Open Centre, Country of Children, ICVA, My Right - Empowers People with Disabilities, Association of Roma Women Better Future, Human Rights House Sarajevo, Renaissance, SGV-PR, Women for Women, ELSA, Impakt, HAC Woman of Trnovo, Ceterum Censeo, CIPP (All from Bosnia and Herzegovina);
JS3	Joint submission 3, submitted by: Dzenan Karic and Sexual Rights Initiative Coalition Ottawa (Canada), comprised of: Action Canada for Population and Development (ACPD), Akahatá – Equipo de Trabajo en Sexualidades y Géneros, Coalition of African Lesbians (CAL), Creating Resources for Empowerment in

JS4	Action (CREA) (India), Federation for Women and Family Planning (Poland), Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights (EIPR); Joint submission 4, submitted by MyRight, Sarajevo, (Bosnia and Herzegovina), comprised of: Kolosi BN Coalition, Bijeljina, Coalition from Doboj, Coalition from Tuzla, Sarajevo Canton Coalition, Zajedno smo jači coalition, Herzegovina-Neretva Canton (all from Bosnia and Herzegovina);
JS5	Joint submission 5, submitted by: Justice Network in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo (Bosnia and Herzegovina), comprised of: Association for Democratic Initiatives (ADI) Sarajevo, Information and Legal Aid Center Zvornik, Center for Investigative Reporting, Human Rights Center University of Sarajevo, Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Republika Srpska, Youth Initiative for Human Rights Bosnia and Herzegovina, Track Impunity Always (TRIAL), Association “Lawyer”, Sarajevo, Association of Prosecutors the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Association of Legal Associates and Advisors in Courts and Prosecutors’ Offices in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Association of Judges Bosnia and Herzegovina, Association for International Law in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Association of Women Judges in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Women to Women Association;
JS6	Joint submission 6, submitted by: Bosnia and Herzegovina Working Group on Child Rights Protection, Sarajevo (Bosnia and Herzegovina), comprised of: Hope and Homes for Children, Save the Children, SOS Children’s Villages, World Vision and UNICEF in cooperation with the Coalition of local organizations: “Stronger Voice for Children”: Naša djeca, Sarajevo; Zdravo da ste, Banja Luka; Fondacija lokalne demokratije, Sarajevo, Budimo aktivni, Sarajevo, Naša djeca, Zenica, Budućnost, Modriča, Center for Education Initiatives „Step by Step“, Sarajevo, Sretni Romi, Tuzla, Zemlja djece, Tuzla, Svjetionik, Prijedor, Association helping persons with mental difficulties, Banja Luka, Sunce nam je zajedničko, Trebinje, Child Rights Centre, Konjic; Association of parents and friends of people with special needs “Sunce”, Mostar; VESTA Association, Tuzla (all from Bosnia and Herzegovina);
<i>National human rights institution:</i>	
Ombudsman	Ombudsman Institution for Human Rights*, Sarajevo (Bosnia and Herzegovina);
	<i>Attachments:</i>
	Special Report on the status of Roma in Bosnia and Herzegovina (2013);
<i>Regional intergovernmental organizations:</i>	
CoE	Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France);
	<i>Attachments:</i>
	(CoE-Commissioner) Report by Thomas Hammarberg, Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe Following his visit to Bosnia and Herzegovina on 27-30 November 2010, Strasbourg, 29 March 2011, CommDH(2011)11;
	(CoE-CPT(2012)) Report to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina on the visit to Bosnia and Herzegovina carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) from 5 to 14 April 2011, Strasbourg, 26 April 2012, CPT/Inf (2012) 15;

(CoE-CPT(2013) Report to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina on the visit to Bosnia and Herzegovina carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) from 5 to 11 December 2012, Strasbourg, 12 September 2013, CPT/Inf (2013) 25;

(CoE-ECRI(2011) ECRI Report on Bosnia and Herzegovina (fourth monitoring cycle), Adopted on 7 December 2010, Published on 8 February 2011, (CRI(2011)2);

(CoE-ECRI(2014)) ECRI Conclusions on the Implementation of the Recommendations in Respect of Bosnia and Herzegovina Subject to Interim Follow-Up, Adopted on 5 December 2013, (CRI(2014)4);

(CoE-GRETA) Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (GRETA) - Report concerning the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings by Bosnia and Herzegovina - First evaluation round, Strasbourg, 14 May 2013, GRETA(2013)7;

(CoE-GRECO(2011-I)) Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) - Third Evaluation Round Evaluation Report on Bosnia and Herzegovina, Incriminations (ETS 173 and 191, GPC 2) (Theme I), Adopted by GRECO at its 51st Plenary Meeting Strasbourg, 23-27 May 2011;

(CoE-GRECO(2011-II)) GRECO Third Evaluation, Round Evaluation Report on Bosnia and Herzegovina on Transparency of Party Funding (Theme II), Adopted by GRECO at its 51st Plenary Meeting Strasbourg, 23-27 May 2011;

(CoE-GRECO(2013)) GRECO Third Evaluation Round, Compliance Report on Bosnia and Herzegovina, Adopted by GRECO at its 61st Plenary Meeting (Strasbourg, 14-18 October 2013);

(CoE-ECSR(2011)) European Committee of Social Rights (ECSR) Conclusions 2011, (Bosnia and Herzegovina), Articles 7, 8, 16 and 17 of the Revised Charter;

(CoE-ECSR(2012) ECSR Conclusions 2012 (Bosnia and Herzegovina), Articles 1, 9 and 20 of the Revised Charter;

(CoE-ECSR(2013) ECSR Conclusions 2013 (Bosnia and Herzegovina), Articles 11, 12, 13,14 and 23 of the Revised Charter;

OSCE-BiH

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe – Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo (Bosnia and Herzegovina);

OSCE-ODIHR

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) – Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, Warsaw (Poland);

Attachments:

(OSCE-ODIHR (Hate Crimes)) Hate Crimes in the OSCE Region: Incidents and Responses, Annual Report for 2012;

(OSCE-ODIHR (Roma and Sinti)) Implementation of the Action Plan on Improving the Situation of Roma and Sinti within the OSCE Area, Status Report 2013.

² Ombudsman, p. 1. See also, A/HRC/14/16, paras. 90.1-90.125 and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1.

³ Ombudsman, p. 9. See also, JS2, p. 9; A/HRC/14/16, para. 90.6 and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 3.

⁴ Ombudsman, p. 1.

⁵ Ombudsman, p. 1. See also A/HRC/14/16, para. 90.17 and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 4.

⁶ Ombudsman, p. 2. See also, p. 5; A/HRC/14/16, para. 90.19 and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 6.

- ⁷ Ombudsman, p. 1. See also, JS5, p. 12; OSCE-BIH, pp. 4-5; A/HRC/14/16, paras. 90.9-90.13; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 5.
- ⁸ Ombudsman, p. 2.
- ⁹ Ombudsman, p. 2.
- ¹⁰ Ombudsman, p. 3.
- ¹¹ Ombudsman, p. 3.
- ¹² Ombudsman, p. 6.
- ¹³ Ombudsman, p. 4.
- ¹⁴ Ombudsman, pp. 3-4.
- ¹⁵ Ombudsman, p. 6.
- ¹⁶ Ombudsman, p. 6.
- ¹⁷ Ombudsman, p. 4.
- ¹⁸ Ombudsman, p. 5.
- ¹⁹ Ombudsman, p. 4. See also, AI, p. 1 and 3-4; A/HRC/14/16, paras. 90.67-90.68; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 8.
- ²⁰ Ombudsman, p. 4.
- ²¹ Ombudsman, p. 5. See also, AI, pp. 1, 3 and 5; A/HRC/14/16, para. 90.68; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 8.
- ²² Ombudsman, p. 4. See also, A/HRC/14/16, para. 90.77 and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 7.
- ²³ Ombudsman, p. 4.
- ²⁴ Ombudsman, p. 3. See also, JS2, p. 4 and OSCE-BIH, p. 2.
- ²⁵ Ombudsman, p. 3.
- ²⁶ Ombudsman, p. 9.
- ²⁷ Ombudsman, p. 5.
- ²⁸ Ombudsman, p. 5.
- ²⁹ Ombudsman, p. 6. See also, JS5 p. 3.
- ³⁰ Ombudsman, pp. 6 and 9. See also, JS5, p.11; A/HRC/14/16, paras. 90.86-90.97; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 9.
- ³¹ Ombudsman, p. 9. See also, p. 6.
- ³² Ombudsman, p. 9.
- ³³ Ombudsman, p. 6-7. See also, JS2, p. 3 and OSCE-BIH, p. 2.
- ³⁴ Ombudsman, p. 7.
- ³⁵ Ombudsman, p. 7.
- ³⁶ Ombudsman, p. 7.
- ³⁷ Ombudsman, p. 7.
- ³⁸ Ombudsman, p. 7.
- ³⁹ Ombudsman, p. 8.
- ⁴⁰ Ombudsman, p. 7.
- ⁴¹ Ombudsman, p. 8. See also, Ombudsman, Special Report on the Situation of Roma in Bosnia and Herzegovina, CoE, pp. 3 and 6; HRW, pp. 1-2; and OSCE-ODIHR (Roma and Sinti).
- ⁴² Ombudsman, p. 8.
- ⁴³ JS6, para. 10.
- ⁴⁴ JS2 p.10.
- ⁴⁵ MRG, pp. 2- 4, 6 and 7, JS5 p. 7; HRW, p. 1-2; JS2, p. 6; OSCE-BIH, p. 1; OSCE-ODIHR, p. 2; IDMC, p. 4; and CoE, pp. 5-6. See also, Ombudsman, p. 2; A/HRC/14/16, paras. 90.31 and 90.98-90.102; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, pp. 4 and 9.
- ⁴⁶ MRG, pp. 2-4 and 7.
- ⁴⁷ IDMC-NRC, p. 4. See also, MRG, p. 3.
- ⁴⁸ JS6, p.3, See also, JS2, p. 9 and Ombudsman, p. 9.
- ⁴⁹ JS2, p.1. See also, Ombudsman, p. 9.
- ⁵⁰ JS5, p. 2.
- ⁵¹ JS6, p. 2.
- ⁵² JS2, p. 6.
- ⁵³ MRG, p. 5.
- ⁵⁴ OSCE-BIH, p. 5. See also, MRG, pp. 5 and 7.
- ⁵⁵ JS2, p. 2.

- ⁵⁶ JS1, p.5.
- ⁵⁷ OSCE-BIH, p. 1.
- ⁵⁸ JS2, p. 6. See also, JS5, p. 6.
- ⁵⁹ JS5, pp. 5-6; OSCE-BIH, p. 1; MRG, p. 4. See also, A/HRC/14/16, para. 90.31; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 4.
- ⁶⁰ MRG, p. 4.
- ⁶¹ MRG, pp. 4-5. See also, JS5, p. 6 and CoE-ECRI (2014), pp. 5.
- ⁶² MRG, pp. 4-5.
- ⁶³ JS5, p. 6.
- ⁶⁴ OSCE-BIH, p. 1.
- ⁶⁵ JS4, p. 2, See also, IRHCR, p. 5 and A/HRC/14/16, paras. 90.32 and 90.45; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 4.
- ⁶⁶ JS5, p. 7. See also, A/HRC/14/16, paras. 90.34 and 90.48-90.51; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, pp. 5-6.
- ⁶⁷ OSCE-BIH, p. 2.
- ⁶⁸ JS2, pp. 2-3.
- ⁶⁹ HRW p. 5. See also, OSCE-ODIHR, p. 7, JS2, p.6; A/HRC/14/16, paras. 90.34 and 90.49; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 5.
- ⁷⁰ JS2, p.7. See also, HRW p. 5; Ombudsman, p. 3; CoE, p. 4 and CoE-Commissioner, pp.12-13 and 15.
- ⁷¹ JS5, p. 7.
- ⁷² CoE, pp. 1-2. See also, CoE-CPT(2012); CoE-CPT(2013); and HRW, pp. 4-5.
- ⁷³ CoE, p. 1. See also, CoE-CPT(2012).
- ⁷⁴ CoE, p. 2. See also, CoE-CPT(2012).
- ⁷⁵ CoE, p. 1. See also, CoE-CPT(2012).
- ⁷⁶ OSCE-BIH, p. 2. See also, Ombudsman, p. 3.
- ⁷⁷ JS2, p. 4.
- ⁷⁸ JS2, p. 4.
- ⁷⁹ JS2, p. 4.
- ⁸⁰ JS2, pp. 4-5.
- ⁸¹ JS2, p. 10.
- ⁸² JS6, para. 18. See also, JS2, p. 10. See also, A/HRC/14/16, paras. 90.27, 90.61 and 90.75; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, pp. 5-7.
- ⁸³ JS2, p. 9.
- ⁸⁴ GIEACPC, pp. 2-4. See also, JS6, pp. 3-4; Ombudsman, p. 9, CoE; p. 10 and CoE-ECSR (2011), p. 22.
- ⁸⁵ JS6, para 21. See also, p. 3.
- ⁸⁶ JS6, pp. 3-4.
- ⁸⁷ JS6, p. 4.
- ⁸⁸ JS6, p. 3.
- ⁸⁹ JS2, p. 10.
- ⁹⁰ JS1, p. 10.
- ⁹¹ JS2, p. 9.
- ⁹² IDMC-NRC, p. 6. See also, CoE, p. 8 and CoE-GRETA, pp. 7, 10 and 22.
- ⁹³ CoE, p. 8 and IDMC-NRC, p. 7.
- ⁹⁴ CoE, p. 8, See also, CoE-GRETA, p. 22.
- ⁹⁵ JS2, pp. 8-9.
- ⁹⁶ IDMC-NRC, p. 5 and OSCE-BIH, p. 4.
- ⁹⁷ JS5, p. 8, See also, JS2, p. 1; CoE, p. 4; CoE-Commissioner, p. 33; A/HRC/14/16, paras. 90.76 and 90.81; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 6.
- ⁹⁸ JS5, p. 8.
- ⁹⁹ JS5, p. 4.
- ¹⁰⁰ JS5, pp. 4-5.
- ¹⁰¹ JS5, p. 5.
- ¹⁰² JS5, p. 8.
- ¹⁰³ JS5, pp. 3-4.
- ¹⁰⁴ AI, pp. 2 and 4; JS1, p. 4. See also, Ombudsman, p. 4; A/HRC/14/16, para. 90.77; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 7.

- 105 JS1, p. 3. See also, A/HRC/14/16, para. 90.77 and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 7.
106 HRW, p. 3 and AI, pp. 1-2.
107 AI, pp. 1-2.
108 HRW, p. 3; AI, p. 2. See also, CoE, p. 3 and CoE-Commissioner, p. 3.
109 AI, p. 1. See also, JS1, p. 4.
110 JS1, p. 6.
111 JS1, pp.10-11; AI, p. 1-2; HRW, pp. 3-4. See also, CoE, (Case of Maktouf and Damjanovic v. Bosnia and Herzegovina), p. 5.
112 JS1, p. 12.
113 JS1, pp. 11-12. See also, CoE, (Case of Maktouf and Damjanovic v. Bosnia and Herzegovina), p. 5.
114 HRW, p. 3-4.
115 JS1, p. 12.
116 JS1, p. 3-4.
117 AI, p. 4.
118 JS1, p. 12-13. See also, p. 5.
119 AI, p. 1-2.
120 IDMC-NRC, p. 6.
121 CoE, p. 4. See also, HRW, p. 3.
122 JS1, p. 3. See also, A/HRC/14/16, para. 90.82; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 7.
123 JS1, p. 3.
124 JS1, pp. 7-8. See also CoE, p. 4 and CoE-Commissioner, p. 3 and 31-33.
125 CoE, p. 4, see also CoE-Commissioner p. 3.
126 JS6, p. 4.
127 JS6, pp. 4-5. See also, A/HRC/14/16, para. 90.74; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 6.
128 JS1, p. 10.
129 CoE, p. 4. See also, CoE-GRECO (2013);, JS5, pp. 12-13; A/HRC/14/16, para. 90.84; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 7.
130 JS6, pp. 5-6. See also, A/HRC/14/16, para. 90.29; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 5.
131 OSCE-ODIHR, p. 4. See also, OSCE-ODIHR (Hate Crimes); JS5, pp. 9-10; A/HRC/14/16, para. 85; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 8.
132 JS2, p. 1.
133 HRW, pp. 4-5.
134 HRW, p. 5. See also, A/HRC/14/16, paras. 90.86-90.87; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 9.
135 JS1, pp. 6-7.
136 JS2, pp. 6-7.
137 JS5, p. 3. See also, Ombudsman, p. 6.
138 JS2, pp. 2-3. See also, Ombudsman, p. 4.
139 OSCE-BIH, p. 2. See also, Ombudsman, p. 4.
140 JS4, pp. 6-7.
141 CoE, p. 9. See also, CoE-ESCR (2012), pp. 5-6.
142 JS2, p. 2. See also, CoE, p. 10; CoE-ESCR (2011), pp. 14-15; and Ombudsman, p. 4.
143 JS1, p. 2. See also, CoE, p. 9; CoE-ESCR (2012), p. 19; and Ombudsman, p. 4.
144 HRW, p. 1.
145 JS2, p. 2. See also, OSCE-ODIHR (Roma and Sinti), p. 41.
146 OSCE-BIH p. 4.
147 CoE, p. 9. See also CoE-ECSR (2013), p. 17.
148 OSCE-BIH, p. 3.
149 OSCE-BIH, p. 3.
150 OSCE-BIH, pp. 2-3.
151 OSCE-BIH, p. 4.
152 IDMC-NRC, p. 4.
153 IDMC-NRC, p. 6. See also CoE, p. 5 and CoE-Commissioner, p. 48.
154 IDMC-NRC, p. 4; HRW, p. 2. See also CoE, p. 10; CoE-ECSR (2011), p. 21; and OSCE-ODIHR(Roma and Sinti), pp. 31-32 and 55.
155 IBFAN, pp. 1-2.
156 JS3, pp. 4-5. See also, A/HRC/14/16, para. 90.106.

- ¹⁵⁷ JS3, p. 5.
¹⁵⁸ JS3, p. 5.
¹⁵⁹ See JS6, p. 8; JS2, p. 7; IDMC-NRC, pp. 6-8; MRG, p. 6-7; CoE, pp. 3 and 7; CoE-ECRI (2014), p.5; and OSCE-BIH, p.4. See also, A/HRC/14/16, paras. 90.46-90.47; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, pp. 2-3.
¹⁶⁰ IDMC-NRC, p. 6.
¹⁶¹ MRG, p. 6.
¹⁶² JS4, pp. 2-3 and 6. See also, A/HRC/14/16, paras. 90.1-90.2 and 90.4-90.5; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 2.
¹⁶³ JS4, p. 2. See also, JS2, p. 5; A/HRC/14/16, para. 90. 43; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 2.
¹⁶⁴ JS4, p. 3.
¹⁶⁵ JS4, pp. 2-3 and 7.
¹⁶⁶ JS4, p. 4. See also, A/HRC/14/16, paras. 90.42 and 90.44; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 2.
¹⁶⁷ JS4 p. 7.
¹⁶⁸ JS4, p. 3. See also, pp. 4 and 7.
¹⁶⁹ JS6, p. 6.
¹⁷⁰ JS4, p. 7.
¹⁷¹ JS2, p. 8.
¹⁷² CoE, p. 6. See also, CoE-ECRI (2011) and CoE-ECRI (2014).
¹⁷³ JS2, p. 9.
¹⁷⁴ IDMC-NRC, p. 3. See also, OSCE-ODIHR (Roma and Sinti), p. 85.
¹⁷⁵ IDMC-NRC, p. 3.
¹⁷⁶ JS6, p. 2. See also, A/HRC/14/16, paras. 90.30, 90.36 and 90.108; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, pp. 2, 4 and 6.
¹⁷⁷ MRG, pp. 6-7; OSCE-BIH, pp. 3-4; IDMC. pp. 1-8; CoE, pp. 3 and 6; HRW, pp. 2-3; and Ombudsman, p. 8. See also, A/HRC/14/16, paras. 90.117-90.122; and A/HRC/14/16/Add.1, p. 10.
¹⁷⁸ OSCE-BIH, pp. 3-4.
¹⁷⁹ HRW, p. 3.
¹⁸⁰ IDMC-NRC, p. 2.
¹⁸¹ OSCE-BIH, p. 4.
¹⁸² MRG, p. 6.
¹⁸³ IDMC-NRC, p. 7.
¹⁸⁴ IDMC-NRC, p. 3.
¹⁸⁵ IDMC-NRC, pp. 5-6.
¹⁸⁶ IDMC-NRC, p. 5.
¹⁸⁷ HRW, p. 4.
-