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Consideration of reports of States parties (continued)

Initial report of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography
The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

Consideration of reports of States parties (continued)

Initial report of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography (CRC/C/OPSC/BIH/1; CRC/C/OPSC/BIH/Q/1, and Add.1)

1. At the invitation of the Chairperson, the delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina took places at the Committee table.

2. Ms. Djuderija ( Bosnia and Herzegovina) recalled that the report of Bosnia and Herzegovina had been prepared by the relevant ministries in conjunction with non-governmental organizations (NGOs), as detailed in section I of the report.

3. Mr. Kotrane (Country Rapporteur for the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography (OPSC)) asked whether Bosnia and Herzegovina was planning to ratify the Convention on Protection of Children and Co-Operation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption. He asked what action was being taken with regard to organized begging and the protection of Roma children. He also wanted to know how the various sectoral plans were coordinated and funded and whether the State party had considered implementing just one national plan that covered different categories. He asked whether studies had been carried out that could provide data to inform national strategies and plans of action.

4. He asked whether forced labour was criminalized in Bosnia and Herzegovina and sanctioned accordingly. Was the Protocol a sufficient legal basis for sanctioning forced labour or the mediation of illegal adoption as forms of sale of children?

5. He asked for information on the involvement of police officers and public officials in offences under the Protocol and whether any investigations or prosecutions had been carried out in that regard. He also asked about the extent to which national jurisdiction could be applied outside the national territory for offences committed by or against citizens or residents of Bosnia and Herzegovina. He asked whether the State party was planning to conclude extradition agreements with Serbia and Croatia and whether, in the absence of such agreements, any extradition requests had been made on the basis of the Protocol. Lastly, he requested information on cooperation between police in Bosnia and Herzegovina and neighbouring countries.

6. Mr. Pūras asked about the extent to which the centres for social work were involved in addressing issues related to the Protocol and about their role in the national structure. He also asked if there were any other specialized services available for victims of offences under the Protocol, such as shelters and centres offering psychosocial rehabilitation, and, if so, how many there were, what standard of assistance they provided, who ran them and who funded them.

7. He requested information on how much the State party had invested in awareness-raising among all stakeholders, including children, regarding the Protocol and how civil society was involved in the prevention of offences under the Protocol and assisting victims of those offences.

8. What steps had the State party taken to raise awareness of sex tourism in the country and what measures had it implemented to address that issue? What had been done to increase birth registrations and carry out retroactive registrations for unregistered children? How did the State party prevent children in institutions becoming victims of the offences under the Protocol? Was it aware of the risk of that occurring? Did the delegation know of any such cases?
9. Ms. Aidoo asked for information on the central bureau of statistics and whether it would be strengthened to improve the collection of data relevant to the Convention and Optional Protocols. She also asked if data on children’s rights was available from any sources other than federal ones. Noting the lack of harmonization in criminal laws within the State party and the different sanctions applied in different areas, she asked what action would be taken to ensure that crimes under the Protocol would be classified and sanctioned in a uniform manner throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina. She asked for clarification on paragraph 62 of the written replies: did it mean that child victims of trafficking and offences under the Protocol were treated as children with socially negative behaviour? Lastly, she asked whether the State party was considering setting up a hotline for children who were victims of offences under the Protocol.

10. Mr. Citarella asked where the international instruments annexed to the national Constitution were placed in the hierarchy of laws in Bosnia and Herzegovina. He also wondered whether the crime of sale of children had been incorporated in national criminal legislation and if it could therefore be sanctioned in court. He requested information on practical action taken to limit the availability of child pornography on the Internet.

11. The Chairperson asked which ministry was in charge of implementing the Protocol and how coordination and cooperation took place between the ministries and with the municipal authorities.

The meeting was suspended at 3.40 p.m. and resumed at 4 p.m.

12. Ms. Djuderija (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that the Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees was responsible for overseeing the implementation of the Optional Protocol, while the Ministry of Security was responsible for the prevention of trafficking in persons, including children.

13. The Chairperson asked what the other functions of the Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees were, whether it had the necessary human and financial resources at its disposal to fulfil its mandate, and how it guaranteed that children’s issues would always be a top priority.

14. Ms. Djuderija (Bosnia and Herzegovina) explained that the functions of the Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees had two facets: firstly overseeing implementation of Bosnia and Herzegovina’s international obligations, and secondly overseeing the promotion and protection of human rights at the national level. The Ministry had the capacity to launch programmes and projects to improve certain aspects of the protection of children’s rights, in particular the rights of vulnerable categories of children. The Ministry had developed a mechanism for the protection and support of child victims in criminal cases such as violence or exploitation. It also played a coordinating role and provided support for institutions, such as social work centres, at the local level. The Ministry could allocate funds to those institutions to enable them to provide adequate protection to vulnerable groups. It only intervened in particularly serious cases pertaining to exploitation, sexual violence and forced labour, at the request of the institution or NGO caring for the victims. Under the intervention procedure, a social work centre or NGO would submit a request for intervention, on the basis of which the Ministry would decide how to assist and what resources should be allocated. The Ministry focused on providing services that small communities or institutions could not provide in serious criminal cases involving child victims, such as placement in foster families and other forms of physical protection.

15. Ms. Al-Asmar asked what role NGOs played in prevention of trafficking in children and the sale of children, and how NGO activities were funded.

16. Ms. Djuderija (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that NGOs had their own programmes and initiatives and had entered into memoranda of understanding with the
Government. The Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees would intervene to assist in programmes to reintegrate children who had been victims of trafficking. Each NGO would submit a victim reintegration plan to the Ministry, with a list of funding requirements, which the Ministry would assess. The Ministry and NGOs worked with victims for periods of between six months and one year, after which those victims would become the responsibility of the local authorities. Any organization could propose an integration plan in the framework of that cooperation agreement, and apply for a small grant, which would enable them to begin implementing the plan. The Ministry issued separate funding to organizations that could offer sustainable intervention, in particular repatriation programmes. Grants were issued to victims of trafficking to enable them to access public services such as health care and education.

17. The majority of victims of crimes of trafficking were Roma. Efforts to protect the Roma community included the launch of a birth registration programme in collaboration with the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), which included the registration of unregistered children, as well as the registration of newborns. A further programme had been launched to improve the situation of Roma housing and health care. Needs assessments were being conducted among the Roma population, which included visits to Roma communities to assess obstacles to birth registration. One particular obstacle that had been identified was that parents did not wish to register the births of their children on account of their nomadic lifestyle. New regulations had been instituted, including fines for parents and guardians who did not register the birth of their children, as well as an obligation for health-care institutions to register births ex officio. Efforts would continue in that regard, particularly in light of the European Decade of Roma Inclusion, 2005–2015.

18. Ms. Aidoo welcomed the efforts to register the births of Roma children, and asked what measures were being taken to ensure that Roma children attended schools.

19. Ms. Djuderija (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that efforts were being made to improve Roma inclusion in the formal education system. Access to housing was linked to access to education. Housing had recently been provided for 150 Roma families, as a result of which the children of those families had been automatically registered at their local schools. There were 20,000 Roma registered in Bosnia and Herzegovina, for whom the Government was working to provide health care, housing and education. Financial incentives were provided for families whose children attended school regularly. Positive results had been witnessed in increasing school attendance rates especially in Sarajevo, Tuzla and Zenica, which had particularly high concentrations of Roma.

20. Ms. Aidoo asked whether measures were being taken to eliminate stereotyping of minorities in school textbooks, and to promote a culture of peace, particularly among children.

21. Ms. Djuderija (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that there were few cases of discrimination and stereotyping of Roma in schools. While all types of racial and ethnic discrimination could never be eliminated altogether, efforts were being made to raise awareness of the importance of Roma integration among children and parents alike. Inclusive education was part of Bosnia’s history, and although the war had changed attitudes in some communities, very few communities rejected Roma children in schools.

22. Turning to the subject of the crimes of trafficking in children and the sale of children, she pointed out that in Bosnia and Herzegovina’s domestic law, trafficking in children, sexual exploitation of children and the sale of children for adoption or any other purpose were included in the crime of trafficking in persons. The crime of trafficking in children, including the sale of children, was punishable by a minimum sentence of 5 years’ deprivation of liberty.
23. Since 2008, a system of data collection for trafficking cases had been developed, and had been functioning since 2009. A national strategy to prevent violence against children was being implemented, which included annual data collection at the national level in order to prepare a national report on violence against children, trafficking in children, use of children for begging, and sexual and other forms of violence against children.

24. Ms. Aidoo asked when the Government intended to conduct a national census, since the most recent census had taken place in 1991.

25. Ms. Djuderija (Bosnia and Herzegovina) explained that while the Government recognized that a census should be conducted, the method of data collection was the subject of considerable political disagreement.

26. Mr. Rizvo (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that the Council of Ministers had adopted a decision in 2003 on coordinating measures to combat trafficking in persons and had appointed a National Coordinator to oversee the implementation of that decision. Other ministries involved in combating trafficking in persons were also asked to appoint a representative to work with the National Coordinator on all issues pertaining to trafficking in persons. Those representatives and the State coordinator had drafted a strategy and plan of action, which had been submitted to the Council of Ministers for approval. The third such plan of action was currently being implemented. The National Coordinator and the appointed representatives were also responsible for aligning their ministries’ activities and those of NGOs dealing with trafficking with Bosnia and Herzegovina’s international obligations. Considerable progress had been made, owing to the fact that there had been no political disagreements regarding the measures to be taken to overcome trafficking in persons, including the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography.

27. A task force to coordinate prosecution, police and tax services in Bosnia and Herzegovina was responsible for organizing and harmonizing criminal investigations in all cases pertaining to trafficking in persons. All the Government’s efforts to combat trafficking had delivered positive results, which had been recognized by the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children, in 2006. Bosnia and Herzegovina had been the first State to be the subject of a visit and report by the Special Rapporteur.

28. Mr. Citarella said that under the Optional Protocol, the sale of children and trafficking in children were not defined in the same way. While the State party had good legislation in place on trafficking, he asked whether it would also consider including a specific definition of the sale of children in its criminal law.

29. Ms. Aidoo said that the Committee had received exports of cases of internal trafficking, in which the sale of children had taken place for the purposes of forced labour, including begging and domestic work. She asked whether the Government had made any efforts to investigate that phenomenon and address it.

30. Ms. Taraba (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that the direct application of the Convention in cases of the sexual abuse of children was problematic, since domestic law differentiated between children aged below 14 years, children aged 14 to 16 years and those aged 16 to 18 years. Some of the State party’s domestic legislation had been brought into line with the Optional Protocol; for example, any person found to have purchased a child for the purposes of adoption, organ transplant or exploitation would receive a minimum sentence of 5 years’ deprivation of liberty. The involvement of children in forced labour was not, however, a separate criminal offence under domestic law.

31. Mr. Kotrane (Country Rapporteur for OPSC) said that the laws of Bosnia and Herzegovina did not employ the same definitions as the Protocol to the Convention, which
created confusion. In the Protocol, forced labour was tantamount to the sale of children. He urged the Government to incorporate the language of the Protocol in domestic law.

32. Ms. Jurić (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that the international definition of trafficking had been fully incorporated in domestic law, with additions regarding other aspects of the crime, such as forgery of passports, infliction of bodily or psychological harm and confiscation of the proceeds of the crime.

33. There were still differences between the entities’ legislations, although some progress had been made in standardization. Republika Srpska in August 2010 had made an amendment to the criminal code harmonizing punishment for trafficking in persons with the legislation of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and had recently amended its legislation to include provisions on pornography.

34. With regard to the juvenile justice system, Republika Srpska had developed a draft law on the protection and treatment of juveniles in criminal proceedings that would go into effect in January 2011. Under that law, judges, prosecutors, social workers and police officers would receive special training enabling them to assist minors in cases involving the trial of adults charged with offences against them.

35. The Chairperson wished to know what legislation protected the victims of child sales, prostitution and pornography, as it was not clear in the written replies.

36. Ms. Djuderija (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that child victims were previously seen as children neglected by parents or legal guardians and deprived of an education. The definition of neglected children covered children in need of special care. The law had since been amended, however, aligning the definition of child victims of trafficking with that of international law. Those were no longer considered to be neglected children.

37. The Chairperson wished to know what treatment and measures were available to ensure that such child victims received appropriate social and psychological recovery assistance. Were they afforded the same treatment as juvenile delinquents?

38. Ms. Djuderija (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that the treatment of child victims of crimes under the Optional Protocol was different from that provided for juvenile delinquents. Efforts were currently being made to persuade services to apply new standards to comply with the Optional Protocol, so that child victims of any type of violence, and in particular of crimes under the Protocol, should be treated as victims, not as neglected children.

39. Ms. Aidoo wished to know what support was being provided to parents, families and communities to prepare them for the reintegration of children who had been victims of crimes under the Optional Protocol. While the new 2009 health insurance law covering all children in Bosnia and Herzegovina — including child victims of crimes under the Optional Protocol — was a welcome development, she wished to know whether the Government had issued regulatory instructions enabling social services to apply those provisions.

40. Ms. Djuderija (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that much had been done for child victims in her country, in order to improve professional standards, to provide guidelines for social workers and police officers, and to implement practices in the best interests of children. Because some victimized children were not ready to return to their families, communities were developing comprehensive services to help them achieve the transition. Although community centres for child victims did an excellent job, it was often difficult dealing with uncooperative parents who failed to take their responsibilities or with poor parents who could not ensure a suitable family environment.

41. Ms. Taraba (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that the Council for Children of Bosnia and Herzegovina had in 2005 launched a series of workshops for children on the
Convention on the Rights of the Child and its Optional Protocol on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, and a conference for ministers of education using children as human rights monitors. Surprisingly, many children had heard about the Convention through projects sponsored by non-governmental organizations, but there was a general lack of knowledge of the Convention in most schools.

42. Various awareness-raising activities had been held with a view to preventing violence against children. The Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees jointly with Save the Children Norway in 2008 had issued a picture book providing guidelines to children and teachers for discussion of child abuse, the sale of children and violence against children at school and in the home, while the Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees with the assistance of Save the Children UK had carried out a campaign in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 2008 to 2010 promoting cultural differences. That had led to a nationwide violence-prevention programme in all schools involving teachers, parents and children, and to the publication of three key documents aimed at children aged 6 to 9, 9 to 12 and 12 to 14.

43. It was true that the Government had no census, but because there was no ministry of health and education and social policy at the level of Bosnia and Herzegovina, such issues depended on the entity legislation ministries. The Ministry of Civil Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina played a coordinating role but had no responsibilities. However, the entity ministries had adopted and endorsed the outcomes of the above-mentioned conferences and activities, which was important. In addition a pressure group for the prevention of trafficking of children had issued a book and guidelines on the prevention of that crime for primary and secondary school students and parents.

44. A revised action plan for the education needs of Roma children, passed in June 2010 and developed by representatives of the Roma people, entity ministries and teachers, would guarantee the inclusion of all Roma children in compulsory primary school education as of September 2010, taking them off the street and into the classroom. In that connection, the Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees had organized a two-day training course on the inclusion of Roma in the education process, which had concluded that Roma children did not suffer from discrimination or stereotyping in the schools.

45. Ms. Mutevelić (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that the criminal procedure code contained no special provisions for plaintiffs who were victims of crimes under the Optional Protocol, except for a witness protection law, according to which vulnerable witnesses were entitled to special hearing procedures. The draft law on juveniles awaiting adoption by the parliament of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina held promise for improvements in criminal proceedings against juvenile offenders and the treatment of child plaintiffs. It included a definition of 23 offences relating to children and minors, as well as a procedure for treating victims of such offences.

46. Ms. Aidoo, referring to a case reported by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, expressed concern about inequalities arising from differences in criminal law at the entity level, ways in which cases were heard and differences in sanctions. One case involved a child whose evidence, which had been used by the prosecutor as the main evidence for the violation of the child’s rights, had been thrown out, as a result of which the alleged perpetrator had been freed. She wished to know whether such occurrences were still common.

47. Ms. Djuderija (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that the case had involved a child with disabilities, which posed a legal problem as to whether the child’s statement, notwithstanding the issue of victimization, could be accepted. Since the child did not have the mental capacity to understand the circumstances of the case, there were no other witnesses and the forensic evidence had been inconclusive, it was not possible to prove that
sexual violence had been committed. She assured the Committee, however, that statements provided by children were fully admissible in court.

48. **Ms. Mutevelić** (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that, according to the Criminal Procedure Code (art. 100, para. 5), plaintiffs of legal age or minors who had been victims of offences such as rape or other forms of sexual violence could not be interrogated about their sex life previous to the offence. Victims’ statements were taken by qualified forensic experts.

49. **Ms. Djuderija** (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that a separate unit was being set up within the Prosecutor’s Office for cases involving children and special training would be provided for judges and prosecutors on how to address minors.

50. **Ms. Aidoo** asked whether the State party took account of article 9, paragraph 4, of the Optional Protocol, which provided that all child victims of trafficking, pornography and prostitution should have access to adequate procedures to seek, without discrimination, compensation for damages from those legally responsible.

51. **Ms. Mutevelić** (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that the Criminal Procedure Code included provision for compensation. The amount was decided as part of the criminal proceedings if there was sufficient time. If not, compensation went to civil litigation and cases involving child victims were prioritized.

52. **Ms. Djuderija** (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that efforts were being made to expedite compensation claims.

53. **Ms. Horić** (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that, under the Criminal Code, domestic criminal legislation was applicable outside the national territory to any individual who committed an offence against the integrity of the country. Domestic legislation also applied to nationals of Bosnia and Herzegovina who committed offences outside the national territory against the country or its citizens, and to foreign nationals who committed offences outside the national territory against the country or its citizens and who then entered the country. Legislation adopted in 2009 on international legal assistance in criminal matters regulated the procedures for providing such assistance, and the requirements and procedures for extradition. Where there was no bilateral agreement on extradition, international instruments could be used as the basis for extradition. Bosnia and Herzegovina had bilateral agreements with many States in the region, some of which had been amended in 2009 to introduce the possibility of conducting joint investigations.

54. **Mr. Rizvo** (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that efforts to combat human trafficking were fully coordinated with those taken to prevent the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, as those crimes were regarded as among the most serious manifestations of trafficking in persons.

55. The police cooperated actively with Interpol, Europol and other international police cooperation agencies. The police force of Bosnia and Herzegovina was a major player in the Southeast Europe Cooperative Initiative Regional Center for Combating Trans-border Crime, which ran a task force on trafficking in persons. Bosnia and Herzegovina had also concluded bilateral agreements on police cooperation with all the countries of South-East Europe and many European Union and other States. All the agreements provided for the exchange of information and joint planning and implementation of investigations, including those on trafficking in persons.

56. Since 2007, the Government had redoubled its efforts to protect children from exploitation and abuse using new information and communication technology. The Action Plan for the Improvement of the System for Protection of Children from Child Pornography and Other Forms of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse of Children through Information and Communication Technologies in Bosnia and Herzegovina 2010–2012 ensured compliance
with the provisions of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and its two optional protocols, the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and its protocols, and the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings and its Convention in Cybercrime. With assistance from the non-governmental sector, much progress had been made in harmonizing criminal legislation and building the capacity of the relevant bodies to provide care for victims and carry out preventive work. There were two telephone hotlines for trafficking in persons, one for child pornography and Internet abuse and a web hotline entitled “Safe Child” (www.sigurnodijete.ba), which had one page for children and one for parents. Moreover, a campaign had been launched, drawing children’s attention to the dangers of child pornography by engaging the assistance of a popular hip-hop star.

57. Ms. Aidoo asked whether all children in the State party had access to those hotlines.

58. Mr. Rizvo (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that all the hotlines were operated on a national basis.

59. Ms. Djuderija (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that the issue of begging was addressed alongside trafficking in persons, since most children who engaged in that activity were obliged to do so by organized groups. Research had revealed that removing child beggars from the streets for their own safety was ineffective, because they were swiftly replaced by other children and, once released, the children went back to begging elsewhere. The authorities’ new approach — still at the pilot stage — had been to stop forcibly removing children found begging to police stations and to take those who were willing to day-care centres, where they could choose to stay. The centres provided them with food and bathing facilities and the opportunity to participate in recreational activities. Professionals tried to gather information on how they had ended up begging on the streets. The pilot scheme had been conducted in Sarajevo and Tuzla, and had met with a degree of success, some children having been sent to school and their families given help to provide them with a stable home.

60. The Chairperson asked whether the day-care centres were run by the State and whether they existed throughout the country.

61. Ms. Djuderija (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that the day-care centres were currently run by local communities, but the Government was going to introduce State funding to support the programme. There were plans to open similar centres in other large towns such as Banja Luka and Mostar.

62. Ms. Jurić (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that in 2009, the Council of Ministers had appointed a commission to monitor residential children’s centres. The inspections it had conducted to date had revealed no cases of abuse.

63. Mr. Kotrane (Country Rapporteur for OPSC) requested additional details of any reported cases, investigations, prosecutions and convictions for the offences of sale of children, child prostitution or child pornography against the members of the police and staff of private security companies.

64. Ms. Djuderija (Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that, while her country was not immune to corruption among the police and other security forces, there had been few serious cases in recent years. According to her data, there had been no indications that police officers or government officials had been involved in any way in offences involving abuse of children since the police force had been restructured in 2005.

65. The Government was aware of the risks of sex tourism; it ensured that inspections of tourist facilities were conducted and that hotels and other tourist facilities implemented preventive measures. By law, persons under the age of 18 were not allowed to leave the country without the consent of their parents or guardians.
66. The Government had begun the process of ratification of the Hague Convention on the Protection of Children and Cooperation in respect of Intercountry Adoption. Over the previous 10 years, only 20 children had been adopted outside Bosnia and Herzegovina, and all the families involved had close connections either with the adopted children or with the country.

67. **Mr. Kotrane** (Country Rapporteur for OPSC) said that the afternoon’s dialogue had clearly indicated the State party’s political will to continue making progress in implementing the provisions of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography. The action plans the Government was implementing to prevent the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography would need strengthening and should be better coordinated in order to ensure that its scarce resources were put to the most effective use. He recommended that the State party redouble its efforts to harmonize its criminal legislation with the provisions of the Optional Protocol, strengthen the capacity of the different actors in the field, extend the competence of the courts to cover the crimes enumerated in the Optional Protocol and increase its cooperation with international organizations such as the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Labour Organization (ILO).

68. **Ms. Djuderija** (Bosnia and Herzegovina) welcomed the Committee’s suggestions and assured members of the Government’s determination to improve children’s rights throughout the country.

*The meeting rose at 6 p.m.*