

SEEKING UNIVERSALITY
OF THE ROME STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT
THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

During the 1st cycle of the United Nations Human Rights Council's Universal Periodic Review (UPR) (2008-2011), States Parties to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC) made more than 100 recommendations to more than 60 States in relation to the ICC– the majority of recommendations were regarding ratification of the Rome Statute.

In advance of the 2nd cycle of the UPR (which started with the 13th session taking place from 21 May-4 June 2012), the Coalition launched a focused campaign to encourage ICC States Parties to make ICC-related recommendations to other States coming under review, in particular on accession to/ratification of the Rome Statute and of the APIC as well as their implementation in national legislations (if relevant).

19th session of the UN Human Rights Council Universal Periodic Review
(Working Group: 28 April – 9 May 2014)¹

At the 19th session of the Universal Periodic Review (28 April- 9 May 2014), 36 States Parties to the Rome Statute made 95 recommendations in relation to the ICC to 13 States under review. The final outcome of the UPR was adopted at the 27th session of the Human Rights Council in September 2014. Full details are available below.

The following 14 States were under review: Albania, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), Dominica, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal and Qatar.

ICC-RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES AT THE 19TH SESSION OF THE UPR:

As of 23 September 2014:

- 5 States have accepted ICC-related recommendations (Albania, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)⁽¹⁾, and Portugal);
- 8 States have rejected ICC-related recommendations (Brunei Darussalam, the DRC⁽¹⁾, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Norway and Qatar);
- 1 State noted ICC-related recommendations (Bhutan);
- 1 State received no ICC-related recommendation (Dominica).

(1) The DRC accepted 13 recommendations and rejected one.

¹ The information herein has been noted and compiled by the Coalition for the International Criminal Court. Any errors are unintentional. Updates or corrections are welcome.

STATES UNDER REVIEW AT THE 19TH SESSION OF THE UPR:

Albania ‘accepted’ the following 2 recommendations:

- “104.11 Effectively integrate the Rome Statute and the Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearances in its domestic legislation (Uruguay);
- 104.12 Fully align its national legislation with the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC) and the Kampala Amendments, including by incorporating provisions to cooperate promptly and fully with the ICC and to investigate and prosecute genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes effectively before its national courts (Estonia)”.

Bhutan ‘took note²’ of the following 8 recommendations:

- “120.10. Consider ratifying the main international human rights instruments not ratified, including the Rome Statute, (Paraguay); Continue extending its international commitments and consider ratification of Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Latvia); Take into consideration the possibility to accede to the major international human rights treaties, including the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Italy); Ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Austria); Ratify the Rome Statute (Tunisia); Accede to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC) (Botswana); Accede to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Australia); Accede to and fully align its national legislation with the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC), including by incorporating provisions to cooperate promptly and fully with the ICC and investigate and prosecute genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes effectively before its national courts, and accede to the Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the Court (Netherlands)”.

Note: During the interactive dialogue, Mexico “expressed concern regarding the lack of ratification of international instruments, including ICCPR, CAT and the Rome Statute.”

In the Addendum to the Report of the Working Group on the UPR³ (A/HRC/27/8/Add.1), Bhutan noted that it “will consider possibility of acceding to international human rights instruments taking into account the need and priorities of the Government.”

Brunei Darussalam ‘rejected’ the following 4 recommendations:

- “113.10. Ratify the ICCPR, ICESCR, CERD, CAT and the Rome Statute (Tunisia);
- 113.11. Accede to the ICCPR, the ICESCR, the CAT, and the Rome Statute of the ICC (Australia);
- 113.20. Ratify the core international human rights conventions to which it is not a party and the Rome Statute (Slovenia);
- 113.21. Consider acceding to the ICCPR, the ICESCR and the ICC Rome Statute by the next review (Italy)”.

Note: In the Addendum to the Report of the Working Group on the UPR (A/HRC/27/11/Add.1), Brunei Darussalam noted that it “does not accept 78 recommendations because they may be contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam; the official religion of Brunei Darussalam; its national legislation; and without prejudice to the generality of the recommendations.” and that “Brunei Darussalam remains committed to its international obligations. Brunei Darussalam is already party to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW); and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC); and is looking to ratify the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD); and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of Children in Armed Conflict (OP-CRC-AC).”

² All recommendations not clearly ‘accepted’ (similarly to ‘enjoy support’) or ‘rejected’ by a State will be classified as ‘noted’.

³ Addendum to the Report of the Working Group on the UPR including the Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review

Costa Rica ‘accepted’ the following 2 recommendations:

- “129.20.Fully align its national legislation with the Rome Statute of the ICC (International Criminal Court) and to ratify the Kampala Amendments to the Rome Statute (Estonia);
- 129.21.Achieve the harmonization of the national legislation with the Rome Statute (Tunisia)”.

Note: During the Interactive dialogue, Liechtenstein “urged Costa Rica to ratify the Kampala amendments to the Rome Statute as soon as possible.”

In the Addendum to the Report of the Working Group on the UPR (A/HRC/27/12/Add.1), Costa Rica noted that the draft law 18514 concerning the amendments is already within Parliament, following its due course.

Côte d’Ivoire ‘accepted’ the following 13 recommendations:

- “128.10.Accede to the Agreement on privileges and Immunities of the International Criminal Court (Slovakia);
- 128.22.Review its national legislation in order to ensure its full alignment with obligations under the Rome Statute, in particular by incorporating provisions enabling cooperation with the Court (Latvia);
- 128.23.Fully align its national legislation with the Rome Statute of the ICC and accede to the Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the Court (APIC) (Estonia);
- 128.24.Fully align its national legislation with the Rome Statute, including by incorporating provisions to cooperate promptly and fully with ICC and to investigate and prosecute genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes effectively before its national courts (Liechtenstein);
- 128.25.Continue its full cooperation with ICC (Burkina Faso);
- 128.26.Introduce legislative measures to strengthen the rule of law and consolidate cooperation between national and international mechanisms to fight against impunity notably between the ICC, the Special Investigation Unit, and the military court (Canada);
- 128.27.Quickly complete the alignment of the national legislation with the provisions of the Rome Statute (Tunisia);
- 128.28.Adopt legislative measures for an effective implementation of the Rome Statute (Uruguay);
- 128.29.Revise its legislation to bring into line with the requirements of the Rome Statute, so that, for example, statutes of limitations are not applicable to crimes against humanity, ensuring that all persons regardless of their position or rank are liable to prosecution as well as including responsibility of superior officers for crimes against humanity and war crimes committed with their knowledge (Belgium);
- 128.113.Thoroughly investigate human rights violations perpetrated by all sides after the 2010 presidential elections and fully cooperate with the ICC’s investigations (Czech Republic);
- 128.136.Continue to fight impunity by pursuing crimes that occurred during or in conjunction with the post-electoral conflict and previous conflicts in the country, regardless of which side in the conflicts the perpetrators belonged to. This includes continuing cooperation with the International Criminal Court (Sweden);
- 128.142.Continue to prioritise the investigation and prosecution of serious international crimes regardless of political affiliation and cooperate with the International Criminal Court in this regard (Australia);
- 129.1.Ratify the Kampala amendments to the Rome Statute, if possible with a view to contributing to the activation of the jurisdiction of the ICC over the crime of aggression at the beginning of 2017 (Liechtenstein)”.

Note: During its presentation, Côte d’Ivoire noted that it “ had adopted the law on the insertion of article 85 bis into title VI of the Constitution and on the ICC” and that “the recommendations regarding the country’s political situation and overcoming the crisis had been implemented fully, as was demonstrated by the adoption of the following measures: (...) the creation of the Dialogue, Truth and Reconciliation Commission, the ratification of the Rome Statute and full cooperation with the ICC, the establishment of a national post-crisis commission of inquiry, the establishment of a special investigation unit, (...).”

During the interactive dialogue, several States (Australia, France, Ghana, Ireland, Latvia, Mauritania, The Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, The Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Tunisia, and Uruguay) welcomed the ratification of the Rome Statute and cooperation with the Court (Belgium, Slovenia).

Montenegro “requested details on efforts to improve cooperation with the ICC and to strengthen national institutions, including the judiciary and police.” Côte d’Ivoire replied that “with regard to the level of cooperation between Côte d’Ivoire and the ICC since the ratification of the Rome Statute, he said that there was good cooperation. A cooperation agreement had been in place since before the ratification, and Côte d’Ivoire was prepared to cooperate with the Court”.

Paraguay also “encouraged the harmonization of domestic legislation with that document.” Côte d’Ivoire replied that “.Côte d’Ivoire had ratified the Rome Statute on 15 February 2013” and “had signed the bilateral immunity agreements on 30 June 2003 and planned to ratify the Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the ICC and implement the Rome Statute in national law.”

In the Addendum to the Report of the Working Group on the UPR (A/HRC/27/6/Add.1), Côte d’Ivoire noted that “concerning the Kampala amendments relating to the ICC, it must be borne in mind that it refers to a voluntary commitment by member States to strengthen the Rome Statute system, including its jurisdiction over the crime of aggression. Adopted by consensus on 11 June 2010 by the States present in Kampala, the crime of aggression will effectively come under the Court’s jurisdiction only as of 1 January 2017. Côte d’Ivoire acceded to the Rome Statute on 15 January 2013 and intends to continue its cooperation with this important instrument in the fight against impunity. Accordingly, it undertakes to adopt the necessary measures to extend the Court’s jurisdiction to crimes of aggression. The same goes for the amendment extending to non-international conflicts the ban on certain weapons already applicable to international conflicts.”

The Addendum also includes progress on the implementation of the accepted recommendations, in particular “Justice, fight against impunity, and security: Pursuit of the process of national reconciliation. Investigations have taken place on the ground to determine the responsibilities and the harm suffered by the victims of the crisis. To this end, the Dialogue, Truth and Reconciliation Commission is preparing to start up public hearings.”

The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) ‘accepted’ the following recommendation:

-“132.8. Adopt legislation in accordance with the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and have a thorough discussion in Parliament on the establishment of mixed chambers, in order to guarantee fair trials for those who committed crimes against humanity (Netherlands)”.

The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) ‘accepted’ the following 12 recommendations, which it considers already implemented or in the process of implementation:

-“133.5. Implement the Rome Statute into domestic law, as recommended previously (Australia);

-133.6. Implement the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court in law and practice (Botswana);

-133.7. Fully align its national legislation with the Rome Statute, including by incorporating provisions to cooperate promptly and fully with the ICC and to investigate and prosecute individuals found guilty of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes effectively before its national courts (Estonia);

-133.8. Adopt national legislation implementing the Rome Statute of the ICC (Finland);

-133.9. Take necessary measures to combat impunity, by incorporating the Rome Statute into domestic legislation (France);

-133.10. Align its national legislation with all obligations under the Rome Statute, including by incorporating the provisions enabling cooperation with the Court (Latvia);

-133.11. Incorporate expeditiously in domestic law the Rome Statute, to which the DRC is party (Luxembourg);

-133.12. Fully cooperate with the International Criminal Court for all open cases, especially for the execution of arrest warrants issued by the Court (Switzerland);

- 133.13. Conclude quickly the alignment of its domestic legislation with the provisions of the Rome Statute (Tunisia);
- 133.14. Adopt legislation for the implementation of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Paraguay);
- 133.15. Fully implement the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Poland);
- 133.42. Cooperate with the International Criminal Court (Uruguay)”.

The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) ‘rejected’ the following recommendation:

- “135.25. Adopt urgently legislation for complementarity with the Rome Statute and provide means for implementation (Sweden)”.

Note: During its presentation, the DRC stated that “In response to advance questions from a number of States, the delegation mentioned that a bill to incorporate the Rome Statute of the ICC into national legislation had been submitted to parliament.”

During the interactive dialogue, Argentina “noted its cooperation with the ICC”, Chile “encouraged the country to, in particular, to enact legislation to implement the Rome Statute of the ICC” and Ghana “commended the ratification of the Rome Statute”. Switzerland “stressed the importance of cooperation with the ICC.”

The Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) ‘rejected’ the following 7 recommendations:

- “125.1. Prioritize the need to become party to the following important human rights treaties, namely: ICERD; CAT and OP-CAT; ICRMW; and the Rome Statute on the International Criminal Court (ICC) taking into account the fact that the DPRK has already acceded to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide since 1989 (Ghana);
- 125.2. Accede to and fully align its national legislation with the Rome Statute of the ICC, including by incorporating provisions to cooperate promptly and fully with the International Criminal Court (Netherlands);
- 125.3. Accede to and fully align its national legislation with the Rome Statute of the ICC (Montenegro);
- 125.4. Accede and fully align its national legislation with the Rome Statute of the ICC and accede to the Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the Court (APIC) (Estonia);
- 125.5. Accede to and fully align its national legislation with the Rome Statute of the ICC, including by incorporating provisions to cooperate promptly and fully with the ICC in investigations and prosecutions and accede to the Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the Court (APIC) (Sweden);
- 125.6. Ratify the Rome Statute and cooperate fully with the International Criminal Court in order, inter alia, to hold to account those responsible for crimes against humanity (Greece);
- 125.7. Ratify the Rome Statute of the ICC and fully align its national legislation with all obligations under the Rome Statute (Latvia)”.

In the Addendum to the Report of the Working Group on the UPR, including the Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review (A/HRC/27/10/Add.1), the DPRK noted that “For instance, recommendations such as 124.7 contain elements not acceptable; however, it decided to accept other elements contained therein such as ratification of the CRPD proceeding from its position to respect views of those countries that made these recommendations and in the hope that deepening the understanding of the DPRK would help to remove the prejudiced misunderstanding in the future.”

Dominica received no ICC-related recommendations.

Equatorial Guinea 'rejected' the following 9 recommendations (concerning ratification of the Rome Statute):

- “135.1.Ratify the *International Convention on the rights of Persons with Disabilities, the International Convention for the Protection of all Persons from Enforced Disappearance, the Optional Protocol to the Convention on Torture, as well as the Rome Statute* (Tunisia);
- 135.5.Ratify *the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities as well as the Rome Statute* (Paraguay);
- 135.6.Sign or ratify the regional and international human rights instrument which it is not yet a party to, in particular: the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, *the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the African Union Convention on Preventing and Combatting Corruption*. (Madagascar);
- 136.1.Ratify the Rome Statute on the International Criminal Court (Ghana);
- 136.2.Ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and ensure its implementation (Botswana);
- 136.3.Ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Uruguay);
- 136.4.Accede to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and fully align its national legislation with the Rome Statute (Montenegro);
- 136.5.Accede to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and to the Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the Court (Estonia);
- 136.6.Ratify the Rome Statute on the International Criminal Court as well as the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (France)”.

Note: During its presentation, Equatorial Guinea noted that “On the Rome Statute, the Government of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea endorsed the Declaration of the African Union in this regard.”

Ethiopia 'rejected' the following 10 recommendations:

- “158.2.Ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, OP-CAT, the Rome Statute and the UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education (Tunisia);
- 158.10.Ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Uruguay);
- 158.11.Ratify the Rome Statute establishing the International Criminal Court as well as the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (France);
- 158.12.Ratify the Rome Statute and the Optional Protocols to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (Madagascar);
- 158.13.Ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture (Paraguay);
- 158.14.Considering ratifying the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and ensure its implementation (Botswana)/Accede to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and fully align its national legislation with the Rome Statute (Latvia);
- 158.15.Accede to the Rome Statute of the ICC and fully align its national legislation with the Rome Statute, including by incorporating provisions to cooperate promptly and fully with the ICC and to investigate and prosecute genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes effectively before its national courts (Liechtenstein);
- 158.16.Accede to the Rome Statute of the ICC and to the Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the Court (Estonia)/Accede to the Rome Statute of the ICC and implement it fully at national level and accede to the Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the Court as recommended in the first UPR cycle (Slovakia)”.

Nicaragua 'rejected' the following 19 recommendations:

- “116.1. Take necessary measures in order to ratify core international human rights instruments such as the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and the Optional Protocol to CEDAW (Romania);
- 117.1 Reassess the possibility of signing and ratifying the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Mexico);
- 117.2. Consider acceding to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Uruguay);
- 117.3. Take steps to ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Trinidad and Tobago);
- 117.4. Promptly accede to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and implement it in national law (Lithuania);
- 117.5. Accede to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and to the Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the Court (Estonia);
- 117.6. Accede to the Rome Statute of the ICC and implement it fully at the national level and accede to the Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the Court (Slovakia);
- 117.7. Accede to and fully align the national legislation with the Rome Statute of the ICC, including by incorporating provisions to cooperate promptly and fully with the ICC in investigations and prosecutions, and accede to the Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the Court (Sweden);
- 117.8. Ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Australia) (Costa Rica) (Portugal) (Ghana) (Montenegro) (Austria) (Honduras) (Tunisia);
- 117.9. Ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, as recommended previously (Chile);
- 117.10. Ratify the Rome Statute on the creation of the International Criminal Court as well as the International Convention for the Protection of all Persons from Enforced Disappearance (France);
- 117.11. Ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, as well as the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (Switzerland)”.

Note: During its presentation, Nicaragua noted that it “maintained its position not to ratify the Rome Statute. The ICC had not demonstrated sufficient impartiality. Amnesties carried out by Nicaragua had not excluded any type of offence, and crimes falling under the scope of the ICC were categorized in Nicaragua’s Criminal Code.”

The following paragraph is included in the Report of the Working Group on the UPR: “Concerning recommendations 117.10 and 117.11, put forward by France and Switzerland respectively, Nicaragua would have preferred that they be split into two because it has different positions regarding the two international instruments listed therein. Since this was not possible, the delegation had been forced to place both recommendations in the group of those which do not enjoy the support of Nicaragua and, thus, are noted. The Nicaraguan State has a transparent and well-known position on the Rome Statute of the ICC, for which it cannot accept any recommendation that requires the accession to that international instrument. Nonetheless, the State will sovereignly consider the possibility of becoming a party to the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.”

In the Addendum to the Report of the Working Group on the UPR (A/HRC/27/16/Add.1), Nicaragua noted that (in Spanish) “El Estado de Nicaragua en uso de su soberanía considera que no es el momento para sumarse a nuevos compromisos internacionales que suponen una carga administrativa y presupuestaria adicional para el país. El gobierno de Nicaragua está convencido de la necesidad de proteger y promover los derechos humanos en todas sus esferas y para ello ha establecido una serie de prioridades nacionales en cuales está trabajando.”

Norway 'rejected' the following recommendation:

- “131.40. Ratify the Kampala Amendments to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court on the crime of aggression (Estonia)”.

Portugal ‘accepted’ the following 3 recommendations, which it considers are already implemented or in the process of implementation:

-“127.3. Rapidly complete the alignment of national legislation with the provisions of the Rome Statute (Tunisia);

-127.4. Fully align its national legislation with the Rome Statute, by incorporating provisions to cooperate promptly and fully with the International Criminal Court and ratify the Kampala Amendments to the Rome Statute (Estonia);

-127.5. Fully align its national legislation with the Rome Statute, through the incorporation of provisions to fully and promptly cooperate with the International Criminal Court (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)”.

Note: During its presentation, Portugal noted that “Portugal strongly supported the ICC and is deeply committed to cooperating with the Court. Portugal amended the Constitution prior to the ratification of the Rome Statute. It also amended the relevant national criminal legislation. The internal process for the ratification of Kampala amendments is ongoing.”

Qatar ‘rejected’ the following 3 recommendations:

-“124.1. Ratify the ICCPR & ICESCR, the Rome Statute, the International Convention on Enforced Disappearance, the OP-CAT and the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (France);

-124.14. Ratify the ICCPR and ICESCR as well as the Rome Statute of the ICC (Austria);

-124.20. Ratify the optional protocol to the convention against torture, and The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Tunisia)”.

Note: In the Addendum to the Report of the Working Group on the UPR (A/HRC/27/15/Add.1), Qatar included the following reason: “With regard to ratification of other instruments and protocols, the State confirms its political will to accede to the international conventions since it believes in their importance. However, accession to a large number of conventions in a short period of time places pressure and a burden on the State’s legislative authorities and, therefore, the State is not currently considering accession to those instruments.”

LIST OF STATES PARTIES TO THE ROME STATUTE OF THE ICC THAT MADE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ICC:

The following 36 ICC States Parties made recommendations:

- Australia made 5 recommendations;
- Austria made 3 recommendations;
- Belgium made 1 recommendation;
- Botswana made 4 recommendations;
- Burkina Faso made 1 recommendation;
- Canada made 1 recommendation;
- Chile made 1 recommendation;
- Costa Rica made 1 recommendation;
- Czech Republic made 1 recommendation;
- Estonia made 10 recommendations;
- Finland made 1 recommendation;
- France made 5 recommendations;
- Ghana made 3 recommendations;
- Greece made 1 recommendation;
- Honduras made 1 recommendation;
- Italy made 2 recommendations;
- Latvia made 5 recommendations;
- Liechtenstein made 3 recommendations;
- Lithuania made 1 recommendation;
- Luxembourg made 1 recommendation;
- Madagascar made 2 recommendations;
- Mexico made 1 recommendation;
- Montenegro made 3 recommendations;
- Netherlands made 3 recommendations;
- Paraguay made 4 recommendations;
- Poland made 1 recommendation;
- Portugal made 1 recommendation;
- Romania made 1 recommendation;
- Slovakia made 3 recommendations;
- Slovenia made 1 recommendation;
- Sweden made 4 recommendations;
- Switzerland made 2 recommendations;
- Trinidad & Tobago made 1 recommendation;
- Tunisia made 10 recommendations;
- United Kingdom made 1 recommendation;
- Uruguay made 6 recommendations.

Contact:

Virginie Amato
Senior Advocacy and Programme Officer for Europe
Coalition for the International Criminal Court (CICC)
c/o HRW, Avenue des Gaulois, 7 - 1040 Bruxelles, Belgium
Tel. + 32 (0)2 502 62 15 Fax + 32 (0)2 502 62 38
amato@coalitionfortheicc.org | www.coalitionfortheicc.org

As the largest partnership in the world advancing the cause of international justice (with more than 2,500 member organizations from 150 countries), the Coalition for the International Criminal Court (CICC) is leading the global fight to end genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity through a commitment to the core values of human rights and justice.

The Coalition works to promote accountability for gross human rights violations and redress for the victims of such crimes, by working to strengthen international cooperation with the ICC; ensure that the Court is fair, effective, and independent; make justice both visible and universal; and advance stronger national laws that deliver justice to victims of war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide.