



General Assembly

Distr.: General
24 July 2012

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review

Fourteenth session

Geneva, 22 October – 5 November 2012

Summary prepared by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in accordance with paragraph 5 of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 16/21

Czech Republic*

The present report is a summary of 9 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 Resolution 16/21 of the Human Rights Council, 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 other accredited national human rights institutions and other stakeholders

A. Background and framework

1. Scope of international obligations

1. Joint Submission 1 (JS1) recommended that the Czech Republic ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography and the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children, supplementing the UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime.²

2. JS1 further recommended the ratification of the Council of Europe (CoE) Convention on the Protection of Children Against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse, the CoE Convention on Trafficking in Human Beings, and the CoE Convention on Cybercrime, as well as cooperation with the CoE towards the implantation of human rights instruments both in the Czech Republic and in other CoE Member States.³

2. Constitutional and legislative framework

3. Amnesty International (AI) noted that in 2009, the Parliament adopted the Anti-Discrimination Act and expressed concerns that the Act has shortcomings, which may affect its effectiveness in ensuring access to remedies for Roma families who experience discrimination.⁴ Open Society Justice Initiative (OSJI) noted a similar concern regarding the practical application of the Anti-Discrimination Act.⁵ Joint Submission 2 (JS2) recommended strengthening anti-discrimination legislation to enable positive action leading to the abolition of segregated settings and the achievement of better education outcomes for children from Roma communities and children with disabilities, and clearly defining in the law segregation as one of the forms of discrimination.⁶

4. Joint Submission 3 (JS3) noted that the Criminal Code defined specific bias-motivated acts as separate offences and it contained provisions by which racist or other bias motivations can be considered as a specific aggravating circumstance in the commission of certain offences. However, according to JS3, this general aggravating circumstance is considered against extenuating circumstances, and has little impact on the final sentencing.⁷ Joint Submission 4 (JS4) also noted a similar concern particularly regarding crimes motivated by hate towards a real or said sexual orientation of the victim.⁸

5. According to JS3, the implementation of hate crime legal provisions remains inadequate as there are considerable obstacles and challenges to a better overall response to hate crime, including significant underreporting of hate crimes, limiting data collection mechanisms, low rates of criminal prosecutions in which hate crime statutes are applied.⁹

6. JS1 noted that while a new definition of trafficking in human beings introduced in Section 232(a) of the 2004 Criminal Code provides for a definition of trafficking in children, it falls short of international standards in defining trafficking in children as the term “exploitation” does not include prostitution and other forms of sexual exploitation of children.¹⁰

7. JS1 stated that the Czech Criminal Code lacked a clear definition of child pornography that would be consistent with the provisions of relevant international and regional legal standards. JS1 further stated that this was a major legal gap, which encourages the production of child abuse materials in the country.¹¹

8. OSJI noted that two amended administrative decrees: 72/2005 on the provision of counselling services in schools and school counselling facilities and 73/2005 on the education of children, pupils and students with special educational needs and exceptionally gifted children, pupils and students, entered into force. OSJI further noted that section 3 of Decree 73/2005 still allowed for children with social disadvantages to be placed in separate classes for children with disabilities for up to five months if such children fail to cope in mainstream school over an extended period.¹²

9. While noting the Czech school system provides no systemic support to assist children with social disadvantages in mainstream schooling, OSJI stated that, to the extent that a disproportionate number of Roma children may fall into this socially disadvantaged category and may hence have difficulty in mainstream schools absent any additional support, placement in segregated classes with a limited curriculum may prove even more disruptive to their schooling and further hinder their ability to catch up with their mainstream peers upon return to regular classes.¹³

3. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures

10. JS1 recommended the establishment of an Ombudsperson for children noting that the present Public Defender of Rights (Ombudsman) has limited control over cases of children rights.¹⁴

11. JS1 recommended integration of the issue of child trafficking in the National Action Plan and any national policy targeted human trafficking.¹⁵

12. JS1 stated that action plans for addressing commercial sexual exploitation of children were expert-oriented and not adequately accessible to all children, their parents and the general public.¹⁶

13. AI noted that in March 2010, the Government adopted the National Action Plan for Inclusive Education (NAPIE) which aims to address shortcomings in access to education for Roma children¹⁷ recommending that the Ministry of Education confirm the commitment to implementing it.¹⁸ The Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights (CoE/Commissioner) welcomed the adoption of this National Action Plan while noting that statistics indicating that Roma children were still 12 times more likely than their non-Roma peers across the country to be educated in special schools offering inferior education and much more likely than that in certain regions.¹⁹ OSJI also stated that the NAPIE was not a comprehensive programme of action but an intention to create a plan with no concrete targets, no defined or identified funding and an unacceptably long timeframe for implementation. In addition, OSJI stated that the NAPIE in its current form did little to end discrimination and segregation of Roma children.²⁰ AI further recommended ensuring its effective implementation, including by making available the necessary human and other resources and by adequate funding from the Ministry of Education and other relevant government agencies.²¹

14. JS2 noted the Strategy for the Fight Against Social Exclusion 2011 -2015 adopted in 2011, many key provisions of which such as the need to abolish the system of practical schools were subsequently repudiated by Ministry of Education officials. JS2 also noted that no budget had been allocated to put the Strategy into practice.²²

B. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

1. Cooperation with special procedures

15. OSJI recommended that the Czech Republic request technical assistance and/or country visits by the Special Rapporteur on the right to education and the Independent

Expert on Minority Issues to help address persistent discrimination against Roma in education.²³

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations

1. Equality and non-discrimination

16. AI was extremely concerned that the Czech Republic had failed to take the necessary measures that would effectively address the problem of discrimination and segregation of Roma pupils in school.²⁴ AI further considered that the measures adopted by the Ministry of Education so far, specifically the amendments to Decrees no. 72/2005 on the provision of counselling services in schools and 73/2005 on the education of children, pupils and students with special education needs, were not sufficient to end illegal practices. Nor did they tackle the underlying causes of discrimination in access to education in a consistent and effective manner.²⁵

17. The CoE/Commissioner noted that there had been virtually no change on the ground in the Czech Republic since the European Court of Human Rights found in 2007 that the country had discriminated against Roma children by educating them in schools for children with mental disabilities. The CoE/Commissioner further stated that the implementation of the landmark judgment (*D.H. and Others v Czech Republic*) was worryingly delayed and it was not clear whether this would change in the near future.²⁶

18. The CoE/Commissioner noted that Roma persons remained the main target of hate crime. The CoE/Commissioner further noted that the Czech authorities had taken a more proactive approach to investigations, prosecutions and sentencing in recent years. The CoE/Commissioner further stated that these efforts must be built upon and sustained in accordance with European regional standards on recording racist incidents and responding to racist offences. The CoE/Commissioner emphasized the importance of ensuring that efforts to counter hate crimes are not limited to crimes committed by members of extremist groups.²⁷

19. STP noted that in a textbook for the second grade called “*Citanka*” used since 2005, there was an anti-Roma text in which a mother says to her daughter that she should not talk to Roma children since they are “dirty, smell and steal.”²⁸

20. The CoE Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities indicated that the Czech Republic should increase efforts to combat all forms of intolerance, racism, and xenophobia; take further legislative measures and policies to combat racist manifestations, in particular against Roma, including in the media and in the political arena.²⁹

2 Right to life, liberty and security of the person

21. Referring to a recommendation³⁰ of the first cycle UPR, JS2 noted that there had been increasing numbers of violent attacks and regular anti-Roma marches organized by a reinvigorated Neo-Nazi movement in the Czech Republic.³¹ JS3 also noted that bias-motivated violence and harassments were a serious problem particularly having devastating effects on Roma communities, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) persons, the Jewish community, and other vulnerable minorities.³²

22. With respect to hate crime in the Czech Republic, JS3 recommended, among others: that senior government officials should speak out against hate crime incidents and ensure that there is a rapid response of the law enforcement and the criminal justice authorities; the Government should seek to establish guidelines and best practices for public officials at all levels to prevent statements that incite violence or promote acts that would curtail the enjoyment of rights by others; the Ministry of Interior improve efforts to collect

comprehensive disaggregated data on hate crime attacks; the authorities ensure thorough investigations and prosecution of any reports of police misconduct or abuse; the law enforcement agencies be trained in cultural sensitivity and their approach should avoid and repeat victimization; and the Ministry of Justice authorities train prosecutors and judges on recognizing and prosecuting bias-motivated offences to ensure the systematic use of penalty enhancement provisions in appropriate cases.³³

23. The CoE/Commissioner noted that the situation of women sterilized in the past without informed consent, the majority of who are Roma, had registered a positive development in November in 2009 with the Czech Government's expression of regrets over unlawful instances of sterilization. The CoE/Commissioner however noted that notably due to legal obstacles, difficulties in obtaining evidence, and the absence of an out-of-court settlement mechanism, these women were unable in practice to obtain compensation for what happened to them.³⁴ Additionally, JS2 stated that significant barriers to access to justice persisted for the victims of coercive sterilization, mostly Roman women. The primary challenge was that the three-year statute of limitations dating from the moment of sterilization prevented the majority of victims from bringing civil claims for damages.³⁵

24. JS2 further noted that to date, there had been only three court cases where forced or coercively sterilized women had been financially compensated. Two cases were considered by the European Court of Human Rights and one by the domestic court. The women sterilized in 1997, 2001 and 2003 were already compensated either by the court decision or in an extrajudicial settlement.³⁶ In this regard, JS2 recommended granting compensation to all victims of coercive sterilization in the Czech Republic irrespective of the date of sterilization, ethnicity, nationality or age.³⁷

25. The CoE/Commissioner was informed during a mission to the country in November 2010 that long-awaited legal changes to healthcare legislation on sterilization and informed consent were expected to be adopted in the first semester of 2011.³⁸

26. While noting that surgical castration was carried out not only on violent sex offenders but also on persons who had committed non-violent crimes such as exhibitionism, the CoE Committee for the Prevention of Torture (CoE/CPT) stated that surgical castration of detained sex offenders amounted to degrading treatment calling on the Czech authorities to end immediately this practice.³⁹ JS4 also stated that the condition of sterilization before the official change of gender was the only case of forced sterilization required in Czech law at present.⁴⁰

27. According to the CoE, there is no explicit prohibition in legislation of corporal punishment in the home, in schools and in other institutions.⁴¹ Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) noted more specifically that corporal punishment was lawful in the home while it was unlawful in schools under article 31 of the Education Act, which provides that "especially rude verbal or intentional physical assault of a pupil or student" is "a serious wilful violation of duties." In the penal system, corporal punishment was unlawful as a sentence for crime under the Criminal Code and the Juvenile Justice Act No. 218/2003. In alternative care settings, corporal punishment was unlawful in institutions under the Act on Institutional Care (Act No. 102/2002, as amended in 2005), which specifies the permitted means of correction. However, the Act does not explicitly prohibit corporal punishment. On the other hand, corporal punishment was lawful in non-institutional forms of care.⁴² In this regard, GIEACPC recommended that legislation be enacted to explicitly prohibit corporal punishment of children in all settings, including the home as a matter of priority.⁴³

28. While noting that the Criminal Code does not provide a clear and comprehensive definition of child prostitution, JS1 stated that any other forms of gratification in exchange of sexual activity with a child should also be included in the Criminal Code. JS1 further

expressed concern that children between 15 and 18 years of age can legally engage in prostitution.⁴⁴

29. JS1 also stated that an elaborate, unified and coordinated system of crisis intervention, long-term care for victims, and rehabilitation was not in place. There was no special support or rehabilitation programme for commercial sexual exploitation of children victims available in such institutions and many children managed to run away and became re-victimized. In this regard, JS1 recommended developing a rehabilitation and reintegration support programme for child victims of trafficking and establishing more care centres providing tailored support to child victims of prostitution and pornography.⁴⁵

30. JS1 recommended providing capacity building to law enforcement officials as well as workers on the identification of child victims of commercial sexual exploitation and on measures to protect children from commercial sexual exploitation, for instance, child-friendly procedures within the justice system.⁴⁶

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

31. According to AI, the ability of the above-referred Anti-Discrimination Act to provide effective remedies for victims is compromised through its failure to provide for public interest litigation. The exclusion of the possibility for NGOs and other actors to bring such claims without the permission of the victim would significantly undermine the effectiveness of the Act, in protecting marginalized and vulnerable groups and individuals who have difficulties in securing access to justice.⁴⁷ In this regard, AI recommended strengthening the enforcement of anti-discrimination in securing access to justice for victims by allowing NGOs and other actors to bring cases of discrimination to courts through public interest litigation (*action popularis*).⁴⁸

32. JS1 stated that the Czech Republic had no separate justice system to adjudicate cases involving persons under the age of 18. JS1 further stated that the law in the area of juvenile justice was rather ambiguous as it did not clearly distinguish between punitive measures imposed on children in conflict with the law and protection measures applicable to child victims.⁴⁹

4. Right to privacy, marriage and family life

33. JS4 noted that under the 2006 Law on Registered Partnership, registered partners of the same-sex were not entitled to adopting children, not even the biological child of the other partner. JS4 further noted that the 2012 new Civil Code to come into effect on 1 January 2014 had omitted the institution of registered partnership, as a result of which registered partners are not eligible for consideration as family.⁵⁰

34. JS4 also noted that a new Law on International Private Law along with the Civil Code would not recognize adoption performed abroad by Czech same-sex couples, which would lead to a legal vacuum regarding the legal status of the adopted child.⁵¹

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

35. The CoE noted that daily working hours might be extended to 16 hours in various occupations.⁵² According to the CoE, it has not been established that depriving members of the Security and Intelligence Service from the right to form trade unions, and prohibiting them from forming any type of association to protect their economic and social interests was justified.⁵³

36. The CoE further noted that all strikes were prohibited at nuclear power stations, oil or gas pipelines, in the fire service and by air traffic controllers.⁵⁴

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

37. The CoE noted that the levels of the minimum old-age, invalid and survivors pensions as well as the level of unemployment benefit were manifestly inadequate.⁵⁵ The CoE further noted that it had not been established that the developments in the sickness insurance and in the old age pensions schemes had maintained a sufficiently comprehensive basic compulsory social security system.⁵⁶ In addition, the CoE stated that the granting of social assistance to foreign nationals was subjected to an excessive length of residence requirement.⁵⁷

38. The Council of Europe Commission against Racism and Intolerance (CoE/ECRI) strongly urged the Czech authorities to develop and put in place, as a matter of high priority, a coherent system of social housing, including a clear definition both of the concept of social housing itself and of the social criteria to be applied in allocating it to persons in need.⁵⁸

7. Right to health

39. JS2 noted that child victims of commercial sexual exploitation were granted neither legal nor psychological assistance nor adequate social rehabilitation support system.⁵⁹ In this regard, JS2 recommended strengthening the provision of holistic and long-term psychological support to child victims of sexual abuse.⁶⁰

8. Right to education

40. JS2 stated that the National Action Plan of Inclusive Education adopted in 2010 failed to embrace the fundamental principle of inclusive education whereby all children, Romani and non-Romani, those with disabilities and those without, should be educated together in a mainstream school setting with appropriate support and not separated out into schools or classes that carry the stigma of inferiority.⁶¹ OSJI noted the Grand Chamber judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in *D.H. and others v Czech Republic* holding that the Czech Government's disproportionate assignment of Roma children to separate and inferior schools and classes violated their right to education and the European Convention's prohibition against discrimination. OSJI further stated that despite the above-noted legal victory, discrimination and segregation of Roma children continued.⁶²

41. As such, OSJI stated that there had been little change on the ground while referring to the recommendations⁶³ of the first UPR cycle in this respect.⁶⁴ OSJI further specified that since its last review by the UPR in 2008, Roma children were still disproportionately languishing in inferior quality practical schools and segregated classes in mainstream schools. Though some changes had been made, they were largely cosmetic. The Government had yet to propose, let alone to institute, the fundamental structural changes to the Czech schooling system needed to stop and redress the violation of Roma children's rights to education and freedom from discrimination in policy, law and practice.⁶⁵

42. AI stated that the above-mentioned National Action Plan for Inclusive Education was not being implemented and the Ministry of Education lacked capacity and political will to put an end to discrimination in access to education.⁶⁶ AI further expressed concern that Roma children continue to experience widespread and systematic discrimination in their access to education.⁶⁷

43. OSJI noted that the Czech Government was failing to spend all the EU Structural Funds available to it for inclusive education purposes. OSJI also noted that since 2010, the Ministry of Education had systematically cut resources and expertise from its department set up to address inclusive education leaving little technical expertise to ensure that anti-discrimination policies can be effectively implemented in practice.⁶⁸

44. AI further stated that as a result of the lack of government action, Roma children continued to be disproportionately represented in “practical” elementary schools (the former “special schools”) and in classes teaching an inferior curriculum. AI noted that the name change from special to practical schools had not been accompanied by any measures to ensure that children who had been wrongly placed in the special schools were transferred to schools corresponding to their actual abilities and skills.⁶⁹ JS2 noted that lack of data on the placement of Roma children into practical schools was an ongoing issue, which hinders effective decision-making and policy development.⁷⁰ Society for Threatened Peoples (STP) quoted the official estimation of the Czech Education Authority that 35 per cent of the children diagnosed with a slight mental handicap belong to the Roma ethnic group. According to STP, the assessment method of psychologists in the centres for educational advice that excludes Roma children from regular classes refusing them access to higher education.⁷¹

45. AI recommended: provision of the necessary resources to ensure that additional support is immediately available for children who need it to effectively participate in and develop to their fullest potential within the mainstream elementary school system; development of a concrete timeline for the transfer of all Romani children erroneously placed in practical schools to mainstream schools containing a mix of Roma and non-Roma pupils; development of a comprehensive plan and timeline with clear, achievable and ambitious annual targets to eliminate the segregation of Roma children within the mainstream education system; and ensuring that the Office of Public Defender of Rights is adequately resourced to monitor the desegregation of schools and the integration of children from practical elementary schools into mainstream elementary schools.⁷² OSJI made similar recommendations in this regard.⁷³

46. In addition, CoE-ECRI urged the authorities at the relevant levels to transfer substantial numbers of Roma children from specialized primary schools to ordinary education based on clear and ambitious targets. The implementation of these targets should be monitored and a national supervisory mechanism set up to ensure that the relevant authorities are held to account for the results achieved.⁷⁴ The CoE/Commissioner and the CoE Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities made a similar recommendation.⁷⁵

47. JS2 stated that a new testing regime proposed to be implemented in 2013 could also encourage segregation as tests will only assess aggregated school results from each school, not taking into account the learning difficulties of individual children. According to JS2, this broad testing methodology may have an impact on school’s efforts towards inclusion. Further, schools may be even more reluctant to accept children from socially disadvantaged backgrounds for fear of losing funding if they don’t score well on the tests.⁷⁶

9. Cultural rights

48. In 2009, the CoE Committee of Ministers called on the Czech Republic to promote awareness and tolerance *vis-à-vis* the regional or minority languages as an integral part of the cultural heritage of the country both in the general curriculum at all states of education and in the media. It further urged the Czech Republic to adopt a structured policy for the protection and promotion of Romani and German, and to create favourable conditions for their use in public life ensuring that speaking Romani at school is not prohibited or discouraged.⁷⁷

10. Persons with disabilities

49. The Council of Europe noted that there was no legislation explicitly prohibiting discrimination in employment on the ground of disability.⁷⁸

11. Minorities

50. Furthermore, the CoE Committee of Ministers called on the Czech Republic to improve legislation concerning the composition and powers of committees for national minorities, including the creation of regional or minority language schools and the use of Polish place names in topographical signs. It also called on the Czech Republic to take measures to make available teaching in or of Slovak, Romani and German in cooperation with the speakers.⁷⁹

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.

Civil society

AI	Amnesty International London, (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Island);
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Island);
STP	Society for Threatened Peoples, Göttingen (Germany);
OSJI	Open Society Justice Initiative, New York (United States of America);
JS1	Joint submission submitted by Ecumenical Network for Youth Action (ENYA), Prague (Czech Republic) and ECPAT-International, Bangkok (Thailand);
JS2	Joint submission submitted by European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC), Life Together and the Group of Women Harmed by Forced Sterilization;
JS3	Joint submission submitted by IUSTITIA, Prague (Czech Republic) and Human Rights First, Washington D.C. and New York (United States of America);
JS4	Joint submission submitted by ILGA-EUROPE, Brussels (Belgium) and LGBT and Their Friends' Association Platform for Equality, Diversity and Recognition (PROUD), Prague (Czech Republic).

Regional intergovernmental organization

CoE	The Council of Europe, Strasbourg, France.
-----	--

² JS1, p. 2.

³ JS1, p. 3.

⁴ AI, p. 1.

⁵ OSJI, p. 5.

⁶ JS2, p. 7.

⁷ JS3, para 4.

⁸ JS4, p. 2.

⁹ JS3, para 6.

¹⁰ JS1, p. 3.

¹¹ JS1, p. 3.

¹² OSJI, p. 5.

¹³ OSJI, p. 5.

¹⁴ JS1, p. 5.

¹⁵ JS1, p. 8.

¹⁶ JS1, p. 5.

¹⁷ AI, p. 1.

¹⁸ AI, p. 3.

¹⁹ CoE, p. 2.

²⁰ OSJI, p. 4.

²¹ AI, p. 3.

²² JS2, p. 4. See also OSJI, p. 5.

²³ OSJI, p. 2.

²⁴ AI, p. 1.

- ²⁵ AI, p. 2.
- ²⁶ CoE, p. 2.
- ²⁷ CoE, p. 3.
- ²⁸ STP, para 5.
- ²⁹ CoE, p. 3.
- ³⁰ See para 44.2. of A/HRC/8/33, “to develop appropriate training and awareness-raising measures towards the Roma, ethnic minorities and other marginalized groups and to create a justice system complying with international standards and ensuring that the perpetrators can be brought to justice (Algeria, Russian Federation).
- ³¹ JS2, pp. 4 - 5.
- ³² JS3, para 4. See also STP, paras 6 – 8.
- ³³ JS3, paras 22 – 28.
- ³⁴ CoE, p. 3. See also STP, para. 2.
- ³⁵ JS2, p. 6.
- ³⁶ JS2, p. 6.
- ³⁷ JS2, p. 8.
- ³⁸ CoE, p. 3.
- ³⁹ CoE, p. 5.
- ⁴⁰ JS4, p. 3.
- ⁴¹ CoE, p. 6.
- ⁴² GIEACPC, pp. 2 – 3.
- ⁴³ GIEACPC, p. 1.
- ⁴⁴ JS1, p. 3.
- ⁴⁵ JS1, pp. 6 – 7.
- ⁴⁶ JS1, p. 9.
- ⁴⁷ AI, p. 1.
- ⁴⁸ AI, p. 3.
- ⁴⁹ JS1, p. 5.
- ⁵⁰ JS4, pp. 1- 2.
- ⁵¹ JS4, p. 3.
- ⁵² CoE, p. 6.
- ⁵³ CoE, p. 7.
- ⁵⁴ CoE, p. 7.
- ⁵⁵ CoE, p. 6.
- ⁵⁶ CoE, p. 6.
- ⁵⁷ CoE, p. 6.
- ⁵⁸ CoE, p. 2.
- ⁵⁹ JS2, p. 6.
- ⁶⁰ JS2, p. 7.
- ⁶¹ JS2, p. 3.
- ⁶² OSJI, p. 2.
- ⁶³ Reference was made to the following recommendations Nos. 20, 21, 22, 24, and 30 in A/HRC/8/33 :*to complete the drafting of the anti-discrimination act as soon as possible to ensure that Roma will not be discriminated in the field of employment, health care, education, housing and the administration of justice (China); to provide a follow-up report about the strengthening of the efforts and actions taken on the ground to ensure the rights of minorities, and specifically Roma (the Netherlands); to consider additional steps to improve conditions for children from vulnerable backgrounds (United Kingdom); in the implementation of public policy for Roma, to take into account ethnic and cultural diversity and the specificities, needs, lifestyles and identity of the beneficiaries and to consider the possibility of establishing bilingual compensatory school programmes for Roma children (Mexico); and to take appropriate and effective measures to fight discrimination and violence against Roma and ensure their equal access to education, housing, health care and employment (Algeria, Romania).*
- ⁶⁴ OSJI, p. 3.
- ⁶⁵ OSJI, p. 4.
- ⁶⁶ AI, p. 1.

- ⁶⁷ AI, p. 2.
⁶⁸ OSJI, p. 6.
⁶⁹ AI, p. 2.
⁷⁰ JS2, p. 4.
⁷¹ STP, para 4.
⁷² AI, p. 3.
⁷³ OSJI, p. 2.
⁷⁴ CoE, p. 2.
⁷⁵ CoE, pp. 2 – 3.
⁷⁶ JS2, p. 4.
⁷⁷ CoE, p. 4.
⁷⁸ CoE, p. 6.
⁷⁹ CoE, p. 4.
-