



Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Forty-first session
7–18 November 2022

Summary of stakeholders' submissions on Philippines*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 58 stakeholders' submissions¹ for the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints. A separate section is provided for the contribution by the national human rights institution that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the outcome of the previous review.²

II. Information provided by the national human rights institution accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles

2. CHRP stated that the Philippines should take time-bound and tangible actions to implement the recommendations made by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in her report to the Human Rights Council.³

3. Referring to supported recommendations from the previous review, CHRP stated that the human right agenda should be set through a national human rights action plan.⁴

4. The withdrawal of the Philippines from the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court was regrettable; ICPPED, OP-ICESCR, OP-CRC-IC and OP-CRPD had not been ratified; and despite ratification of OP-CAT, no law had been enacted establishing a national preventative mechanism.⁵

5. Attempts to reintroduce the death penalty should cease. The systematic "red-tagging"⁶ of and disinformation about activists, human rights defenders and civil society organizations, including members of indigenous peoples' communities, by the National Task Force to End Local Communist Armed Conflict (NTF-ELCAC), had resulted in threats, harassment, and targeted killings. Counter-terrorism measures must respect fundamental freedoms and should not be used against legitimate dissenters and human rights activists.⁷

* The present document is being issued without formal editing.



6. Journalists and media workers, human rights defenders and critics of government policies had been subjected to reprisals and killings. Acts of intimidation against diplomatic actors, donor organizations and international organizations supportive of human rights advocacy, had been observed.⁸

7. CHRP stated that that continued incitement to kill suspected drug offenders from the highest levels of the government had invalidated efforts towards strengthening accountability mechanisms.⁹

8. The severe overcrowding in detention facilities should be addressed, and accountability for alleged cases of torture and other cruel, inhuman, degrading treatment should be pursued.¹⁰

9. The punitive response to the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) had exacerbated existing inequalities, affecting persons and groups already facing multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination.¹¹

10. The barriers that prevent access to reproductive health services for women and girls must be addressed and the public must be education on reproductive health rights.¹²

11. Technology and the internet have been used to perpetrate online sexual abuse and exploitation of children and efforts must be intensified to ensure the safety of vulnerable groups, especially children.¹³

12. In relation to Overseas Filipino workers, the Philippines should work closely with receiving countries to recognize the disproportionate application of the death penalty against migrant workers; and should assist those who have been repatriated.¹⁴

13. Durable solutions had yet to be found for thousands of persons that had been displaced by Typhoon Haiyan and the Zamboanga Siege in 2013, as well for those displaced by the Marawi Crisis in 2017.¹⁵

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations¹⁶ and cooperation with human rights mechanisms

14. HRF noted that no significant progress had been made in implementing the supported recommendations from the previous review.¹⁷

15. JS13 stated that at the three previous reviews, recommendations to ratify ICPED, had not enjoyed the support of the Philippines. This was a departure from the official statement made by the Philippines during its candidature to the Human Rights Council in 2007, where it had made a voluntary pledge to strengthen domestic support for the signing and ratification of this Convention.¹⁸

16. HRW stated that the Philippines had declined a request by the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions to visit the country.¹⁹

B. National human rights framework

1. Constitutional and legislative framework

17. JS6 stated that following opposition from an association of Catholic schools and universities, the Senate had suspended plenary debates on Senate Bill No. 1334, which provided, inter alia, for a comprehensive, age-appropriate sexuality education.²⁰

18. JS7 stated that a bill regulating public assemblies had been adopted by the House of Representatives and was currently before the Senate. Concerns had been raised that this bill prohibited people under the age of 15 years from organizing a public assembly.²¹

19. JS32 stated that there were 13 draft bills before the House of Representatives and 11 draft bills before the Senate proposing the death penalty for a range of offences including drug offences, treason, plunder, rape and murder.²²

20. JS15 stated that House Bill 7814, which was under discussion at the Senate, establishes a presumption of guilt for persons charged with certain drug-related activities, in violation of fair trial rights, and envisages the reinstatement of the death penalty.²³

21. JS5 stated that none of the bills addressing anti-discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression and sex characteristics had been approved by the Senate and the House of Representatives.²⁴

2. Institutional infrastructure and policy measures

22. AI expressed concern over the lack of progress in establishing a national preventative mechanism in compliance with OP-CAT, which had been ratified.²⁵

C. Promotion and protection of human rights

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

Equality and non-discrimination

23. GABRIELA stated that on several occasions, President Rodrigo Roa Duterte had exhibited a feudal-patriarchal attitude treating women as inferior and as sex objects and had used public events to denigrate women, particularly women political dissenters. This misogynist attitude would have contributed to a culture of impunity.²⁶

Right to life, liberty and security of person, and freedom from torture

24. JS20 stated that despite numerous recommendations in the previous review, killings, enforced disappearances, arbitrary arrests and detention, torture, threats and harassment, had continued with impunity.²⁷

25. JS3 stated that the extrajudicial killings of suspected drug offenders had been linked to orders given to the police by President Duterte with the assurance of immunity for their actions.²⁸ Referring to a number of alleged raids and operations, DPN stated that summary executions and mass arrests had been carried out under the pretext of serving search warrants.²⁹ JS1 stated despite statements by Government officials that the drug watch list, which had contained the names and aliases of alleged drug users in the community, had not operated as a hit-list for the police, the families believed that once a person was on that list, that person was likely to be targeted.³⁰ JS1 considered relevant supported recommendations from the previous review to have not been implemented.³¹

26. JS15 stated that the trend of outsourcing drug law enforcement to non-state actors had intensified with the announcement of the creation of a militia of armed citizens to support drug control efforts by President Duterte in 2021.³²

27. L4L stated that the extrajudicial killings of lawyers had continued unabated and in most of these cases, lawyers had been killed as a result of them discharging their professional duties.³³

28. JS23 stated that torture had continued to be frequent and committed with impunity, and that the campaign against illegal drugs had left a trail of torture and extrajudicial killings, with the main perpetrators being law enforcement personnel and vigilante groups.³⁴

29. JS13 called for accountability for human rights abuses in the implementation of the COVID-19 protocols, stating that the government had calibrated its response to the COVID-19 pandemic with its counter-terrorism strategy, and its campaign against illegal drugs.³⁵ JS10 stated health protocols had been enforced by the police, with the authority to warn, fine or arrest individuals. Punishments had varied, with some having significant psychological or

emotional impact, and others constituting physical harm such as torture and gender-based violence.³⁶

30. JS23 stated that most places of detention were severely overcrowded which resulted in conditions that amounted to ill-treatment and in some cases torture. There was also an increasing number children in detention.³⁷

International humanitarian law

31. DPN stated that in the context of its counter-insurgency campaign, the Philippines had violated the Geneva Conventions and their Additional Protocols, the ICCPR and international customary law, particularly in its treatment of civilians, non-combatants and hors de combat. On 15 August 2018, a joint police-military operation in Antique province had led to the killing of 7 unarmed members of the National Democratic Front of the Philippines. The Government's claim that all 7 persons had been killed in a firefist, was inconsistent with the autopsy reports.³⁸

32. JS11 considered a supported recommendation from the previous review relating to children affected by armed conflict, to have not been implemented, noting that millions of children were living in conflict zones, with some as young as 15 years of age recruited as child soldiers³⁹

33. Noting that the Philippines had withdrawn from the International Criminal Courts, JS1 stated that cases up until the withdrawal in March 2019, would still be subject to the jurisdiction of the court and should be investigated. However, such cases had been suspended due to a request for a deferral by the Government.⁴⁰

Human rights and counter-terrorism

34. ECLJ stated that since the previous review, Islamic State affiliated terrorism had taken root in the south regions of the Philippines.⁴¹

35. JS21 stated that the NTF-ELCAC was the official machinery for the counter-insurgency campaign;⁴² and according to DPN, had been given a wide berth in crafting and implementing its programmes and policies.⁴³ JS24 stated that instead of addressing the root causes of the armed conflict and building durable peace, the NTF-ELCAC had remained militaristic in its approach with a focus on the annihilation of the revolutionary movement.⁴⁴

36. JS3 stated that the Anti-Terrorism Act⁴⁵ contained a vague definition of terrorism undermined the presumption of innocence and allowed for the Anti-Terrorism Council to declare individuals and organizations as "terrorists" without any evidence. Also, bank accounts of suspected organizations could be frozen without due process.⁴⁶

37. JS24 stated that the "red-tagging" campaign had become the de facto justification for a series of killings that targeted not just combatants in the armed struggle, but also unarmed peace consultants, as well as those not directly involved in the conflict such as activists, community organizers, and members of indigenous peoples' groups, among others.⁴⁷

38. JS20 stated that as of December 2021, it had documented 427 victims of extrajudicial killings that had allegedly been committed under the counter-insurgency campaign. Prior to the killings, victims or their organizations had been labelled as "members," "supporters," or "front organizations" of the Communist Party of the Philippines or the New People's Army.⁴⁸

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

39. JS1 considered that relevant supported recommendations from the previous review had not been implemented.⁴⁹ DPN stated that court proceedings were slow and marred by the frequent adjournments, with trials and bail proceedings lasting for years.⁵⁰ NUPL1 stated prolonged pre-conviction detention had forced detainees to plea-bargain for reduced sentences.⁵¹

40. NUPL1 stated that the writ of habeas corpus had proven to be ineffective because security forces had undermined this recourse by rushing the filing of indictments based on manufactured evidence. The courts had automatically dismissed victims' petitions for being "moot and academic" and had refused to address the illegality of the arrest.⁵²

41. JS1 stated, in the context of the campaign against illegal drugs, the authorities had utilized the “palit-ulo” scheme, under which the police had threaten to imprison or kill individuals who had often been illegally arrested, unless those individuals identified other persons who could replace them. This scheme was in violation of the right to due process.⁵³

42. NUPL1 stated that state security forces and agencies had routinely filed trumped-up charges against human rights defenders, activists, political opposition, critics and dissenters, through shortcuts and legal anomalies in blatant disregard of due process.⁵⁴ JS3 stated that there had been reports of prosecutors and judges being pressured into upholding unfounded charges, which violated the independence of the judiciary.⁵⁵ ICHRP stated that the employment of legal processes as a weapon against the rights of the people undermined the credibility and stability of proper judicial functions and the fair trial of an accused.⁵⁶

43. L4L stated that lawyers representing clients accused of terrorist or drug-related offences, as well as government critics, were particularly at risk of being attacked or killed.⁵⁷ Lawyers had been “red-tagged” and publically branded as “communists”, “leftists” or “terrorists”, regardless of their actual beliefs or affiliations.⁵⁸

44. Noting that at the previous review, recommendations to combat impunity had not enjoyed the support of the Philippines, JS3 stated that impunity had remained a major problem in the country.⁵⁹ ICHRP stated that the climate of impunity had contributed to the occurrence of extrajudicial killings, enforced disappearances, torture and other human rights abuses.⁶⁰

Fundamental freedoms

45. HRF stated that, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the government had used strict lockdowns and curfews to clampdown on freedoms and civil liberties.⁶¹ JS27 stated that during these lockdowns, churches had provided humanitarian aid to underprivileged and underserved communities, resulting in some church leaders being labelled “leftist”.⁶²

46. JS33 stated that the Revised Penal Code provided for “Crimes against religious worship”, and “Offending the religious feelings” which it considered to be a de facto blasphemy law; and highlighted cases of related religious-motivated violence.⁶³

47. JS14 stated that libel had been used to suppress freedom of expression.⁶⁴ JS3 stated that libel, as defined in the Revised Penal Code, was problematic, in light of the presumption that every defamatory imputation was malicious, even if it was true, thus placing the burden of proof on an accused.⁶⁵

48. JS7 stated that Karapatan, a human rights group, had experienced cyberattacks on its website. The attack in August 2020 had been traced by a Sweden-based media foundation to Bright Data, an Israel-based company that offered proxy networks and data services to corporate clients. Other cyberattacks to the websites of Karapatan, and two alternative media organizations, had been traced to the Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence of the Philippine Army and the Department of Science and Technology.⁶⁶

49. HRF stated that reporting had become increasingly difficult for the media, as journalists had been subjected to harassment, threats, arbitrary arrest, and even extrajudicial killings.⁶⁷

50. JS3 stated one of the major driving forces behind threats to human rights defenders had been conflicts over agrarian land and natural resources, including mining projects and related environments issues. These threats had been exacerbated by the recent lifting of the moratorium on new mining contracts. Also, human rights defenders who had been falsely accused of being members of, or supporting the New People’s Army had been particularly threatened.⁶⁸

51. NUPL1 stated that a de facto nationwide crackdown against activists and progressive organizations was being carried out as “anti-crime”, “counter-insurgency” or “counter-terrorism” operations.⁶⁹

Right to privacy

52. JS14 stated that the multiple databases that had been created for contact tracing during the COVID-19 pandemic, had exposed the personal data of millions of people to a heightened risk of unauthorized use.⁷⁰

53. JS26 stated that the Privacy Data Act did not effectively regulate the processing of API⁷¹ and PNR⁷² data.⁷³

Right to marriage and family life

54. JS5 stated that the family code did not give the same legal recognition to same-sex or transgender-heterosexual marriages, as compared to marriages between heterosexual couples.⁷⁴

Prohibition of all forms of slavery, including trafficking in persons

55. JS31 stated that there was an increase in prosecution for trafficking in persons, but that there was a lack of prevention, protection, and redress. Violations of economic, social and cultural rights of women and the demand for prostitution were the root causes of trafficking.⁷⁵

56. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, JS11 stated that online sexual abuse and exploitation, especially to children, had been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic with reports of significant increases in such abuse.⁷⁶

57. PIMAHT stated that poverty was a driving force behind migration, subjecting Overseas Filipino Workers to the vulnerabilities of human trafficking, highlighting the cases of the 53 Filipino women who had been recruited in a third country and trafficked to another country as maids.⁷⁷

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

58. IBON stated the enforcement of COVID-19 related lockdowns had resulted in the Philippines having the highest unemployment increase in South East Asia. JS21 stated that although unemployment gradually declined in January 2022 due to a relaxation of travel and work restrictions, many of those employed were in temporary jobs or in elementary occupations, were below minimum wage earners and in unpaid family work.⁷⁸

59. JS2 stated that amid the increasing cases of COVID-19 in March 2020, the government had neglected the safety and protection of health care workers by failing to provide sufficient supply of personal protective equipment.⁷⁹

60. JS21 stated that the Inter Agency Task Force had issued a ruling that unvaccinated workers would not be allowed to work which had led to thousands of workers losing their jobs. Economic zone workers had been mandated to work even during the lockdown, which had led to workers contracting the Covid-19 virus at work.⁸⁰

61. JS21 stated that workers had been paid a wage based on workers output and not on hours of work, which discriminated against women and older people. Contractualization violated workers' right to security of tenure and circumvented their right to self-organize and to collective bargaining.⁸¹

62. ICTUR stated that trade unions had experienced stigmatisation that had been perpetuated by the police and the military.⁸² JS18 stated that the Philippines was notorious for repressing and intimidating worker efforts to organize and collectively bargain.⁸³

Right to social security

63. IBON stated that despite having the resources, the government had implemented insufficient measures to mitigate the social and economic distress caused by the COVID-19 related lockdowns.⁸⁴

64. Salinlahi stated that the poverty alleviation programs such as the conditional cash transfer for the indigent families, had not significantly lowered the number of children suffering from poverty and inequalities.⁸⁵

Right to an adequate standard of living

65. JS8 stated that the COVID-19 pandemic had reinforced the economic marginalization of the poor, who had lost their incomes and jobs as a result of the lock-downs with limited and selective assistance from the government.⁸⁶

66. Salinlahi stated that access to clean and safe water had remained a problem, especially in rural areas. The privatization of water services had led to the supply of water being expensive, particularly for poor families.⁸⁷

67. CWR-PH stated that the conversion of the use of land had displaced families from their sources of livelihood and threatened their communities and the country's food security. Farmer families had received very little government support.⁸⁸

68. SEARICE stated that the imposition of intellectual property rights had prohibited the age-old practice of farmers saving, sharing, and using seeds. The Magna Carta for Small Farmers should be amended in conformity with UNDROP;⁸⁹ and the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety should be ratified. Legislation on liability and redress for damage arising from genetically modified organisms should be adopted.⁹⁰

Right to health

69. JS4 stated only 4.8 percent of the national budget for 2022 had been allocated to the health sector, which equated to 1.25 percent of the gross domestic product for 2021.⁹¹

70. JS10 stated that there had been a massive cut for epidemiology and disease surveillance in the health budget for 2020, which had contributed to a COVID-19 pandemic response that could not immediately and adequately prevent, treat, and control the spread of epidemics. Access to testing, contact tracing, quarantine, treatment and vaccinations had remained inequitable for many parts of the population.⁹²

71. JS10 stated that the chronic neglect of the health infrastructure, and an overwhelmed health system, brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic, had resulted in an increasing number of people being unable to access essential and immediate care.⁹³ CWR-PH stated that essential healthcare services became limited, with quarantine restrictions affecting the delivery and utilization of maternal health care.⁹⁴

72. FPOF stated that there was a lack of access to sexual and reproductive health.⁹⁵ JS11 stated that access to sexual and reproductive health services for adolescents had not been facilitated by The Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act of 2012 and considered relevant supported recommendations from the previous review to have not been implemented.⁹⁶

73. JS6 stated that the maternal mortality ratio had remained high and was one of the top five causes of death among adolescent girls. The Philippines had failed to guarantee pregnant women access to misoprostol, as recommended by the World Health Organization.⁹⁷ JS6 stated that adopted additional measures had been adopted to further restrict access to abortions.⁹⁸

74. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, JS6 stated that the COVID-19 pandemic had significantly impaired access to contraception and with the decline in modern contraceptive use, there was likely to be a significant increase in unintended pregnancies, unsafe abortions and maternal deaths.⁹⁹

75. JS1 stated that the use of illegal drugs had not been recognised as a public health issue, and there were no programmes for drug users.¹⁰⁰

76. JS5 stated that the Philippines had consistently failed to protect the sexual and reproductive health rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer persons.¹⁰¹

77. JS2 stated that at the community level there was rampant corruption and poor governance in the health care system. Physicians who attempted to institute reforms to address systematic corruption had become targets of those who had benefitted from the existing practices.¹⁰²

Right to education

78. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, JS16 stated that despite the enactment of laws and policies, challenges had remained in relation to the quality of education and access to education.¹⁰³

79. JS29 stated that that public education only received 3 percent of the gross domestic product, and considered relevant supported recommendations from the previous review to have not been implemented.¹⁰⁴

80. JS16 expressed concern about the negative impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the enjoyment of the right to education.¹⁰⁵ JS8 stated that the shift to online learning had burdened the economically disadvantaged children who had no access to the internet and personal computers.¹⁰⁶

81. JS29 stated that the implementation of the Alternative Learning System had not been widespread and had not covered senior high school.¹⁰⁷

82. BCN noted the lack of access to quality education for persons with disabilities.¹⁰⁸

83. CRCN-P noted the occupations of schools by the military and that children and teachers had been threatened and physically armed by military personnel. These violations had escalated following the order of President Duterte to bomb and close the indigenous peoples' schools in Mindanao.¹⁰⁹

Development, the environment, and business and human rights

84. JS17 stated that economic targets had favoured businesses and had allowed the expansion of foreign and private large-scale projects for mining, hydropower dams, infrastructure, agribusiness, and logging, all of which had threatened Indigenous Peoples' land rights and had undermine indigenous customary land practices.¹¹⁰

85. JS19 stated that the Philippines had been ravaged by storms, experiencing on average of 20 typhoons annually. The dismal preparation and response of the Government in light of climate change-induced disasters had led to massive relocation, loss of livelihoods and homes, and deaths of hundreds of people since the previous review.¹¹¹

86. JS19 stated that substantial deforestation had occurred in many critical watersheds, with 130 of the 142 critical watersheds in the county already degraded.¹¹²

87. Referring to a relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, JS3 stated that the Mining Act had not been reviewed. Mining companies have been granted the rights to logging and to the use of water, which compromised the socio-economic rights of indigenous communities. In 2021, the moratorium on new mines, which had been in place since 2012, had been lifted, leading to an increase in mining activities, which could further endangered the rights and lives of indigenous peoples.¹¹³

88. JS12 stated, in relation to the mining of black sand at the mouth of the Alusiis river, that the offshore exploitation of black sand would pave the way for coastal erosion, flooding, changes in water flows, increased intensity of tropical storms, drying rivers, diminished harvests, higher salinity in ground water and arable land, loss of marine life and loss of revenues for sustainable farming communities, the tourism industry and conservation groups.¹¹⁴

89. JS4 stated that tax avoidance and evasion by corporation and wealthy individuals and other types of illicit financial flows had resulted in staggering amounts of foregone revenues.¹¹⁵

90. JS4 stated that the two tax reform packages namely, the Tax Reform for Acceleration and Inclusion (TRAIN) and the Corporate Recovery and Tax Incentives for Enterprises (CREATE) had eroded the Government's capacity to mobilize domestic resources, had limited the fiscal space, and had put into question the capacity for progressive budget spending. In addition, CREATE had fallen short in terms of distributive justice and was set to exacerbate inequalities, as it, inter alia, functioned as tax relief for incorporated businesses, equivalent to a subsidy and left little gains for microenterprises and unincorporated small and medium enterprises. Both TRAIN and CREATE had reinforced the tax system's overreliance

on regressive taxes, such as indirect taxes, which were burdensome to ordinary people and disproportionately affected the poor. TRAIN had weakened people's purchasing power, negatively impacted household spending.¹¹⁶

91. JS9 stated that in 2021, the Philippines' Commission on Audit revealed that several Government agencies had mismanaged their COVID-19 response funds.¹¹⁷

2. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women

92. GABRIELA stated that the COVID-19 pandemic and the economic crisis had created conditions for increased violence against women.¹¹⁸ Referring to a supported recommendation from the previous review on ending violence against vulnerable groups, particularly women and children, JS11 stated that implementation of plans of action to address this issue had been delayed by the impact of the pandemic.¹¹⁹ CWR-PH stated that poor women had been more vulnerable to violence.¹²⁰

93. JS14 stated that the rapid development of technology had given rise to different and new manifestations of violence against women. Cases of online gender-based violence had been continuously rising, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic.¹²¹

Children

94. JS8 stated that the campaign against illegal drugs had violated the rights of those suspected of being involved with drugs, including children;¹²² and that children had reportedly been targeted and had not merely been collateral damage as stated by the Government.¹²³

95. JS8 stated that the Government's militarist approach in response to the COVID-19 pandemic had led to children being arrested and tortured for curfew and health protocol violations.¹²⁴

96. JS11 stated that implementation of the Philippine Plan for Action to End Violence Against Children (PPAEVAC) 2017-2022 had been adversely impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.¹²⁵

97. EV stated that corporal punishment was lawful in the home. The consolidated bill to prohibit corporal punishment that had been adopted by the House of Representative and the Senate during a bicameral committee conference had been vetoed by President Duterte.¹²⁶

98. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation from the previous review, JS16 expressed concern about the insufficient efforts made by the Philippines to combat child labour.¹²⁷ There had been challenges in the effective enforcement of the legislation which protected children from economic exploitation.¹²⁸ Child labour had increased during the COVID-19 pandemic.¹²⁹

99. JS11 stated that the Anti-Child Marriage Law (RA 11596), which prohibits the facilitation, arrangement, and solemnization of child marriage, and cohabitation of an adult with a child outside of wedlock, had been met with resistance from a significant number of members of the Bangsamoro Transition Authority, the interim regional government of the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao, issuing a resolution appealing to the President to stop its implementation.¹³⁰

100. JS5 stated that discriminatory policies coupled with social stigma had translated into acts of violence against gender-diverse children. Intersex children had continued to be at risk of forced medical interventions which aimed to align their body with normative definitions of 'male' and 'female'.¹³¹

101. JS11 stated that the forced removal of children from the streets and their placement in centres outside their city of residence, without parental knowledge or consent, had led to the disruption of family connections and education.¹³²

Older persons

102. JS9 stated that older persons were particularly vulnerable during the COVID-19 pandemic and that there was no government programmes to provide efficient social services to older persons.¹³³

Persons with disabilities

103. JS11 stated that children with disabilities were less likely to attend school, access medical services, or have their voices heard in society. They were also at a higher risk of physical abuse and discrimination, and often did not receive proper nutrition and humanitarian assistance in emergencies. JS11 considered relevant supported recommendations from the previous review to have been partially implemented.¹³⁴

Indigenous peoples

104. JS28 stated that the Philippines had not taken decisive steps to implement supported recommendations from the previous review relating, inter alia, to the effective implementation of laws, policies and programmes to protect the human rights of indigenous peoples.¹³⁵

105. JS17 stated that the situation of Indigenous Peoples had not improved since the previous review and had, in fact, worsened with the onslaught of the COVID-19 pandemic, highlighting the Government's failure to deliver adequate and basic services to Indigenous Peoples during this health crisis.¹³⁶

106. JS3 stated indigenous peoples had been harassed, vilified as terrorists and murdered because they had defended their right to their ancestral lands. Their schools had been attacked and denounced as terrorist hubs and they had been caught in the middle of the conflict between the Government and the New People's Army.¹³⁷

107. JS22 stated that the Dumagat-Remontado indigenous people had protested against the memorandum of agreement for the controversial Kaliwa Dam project, which had not fulfilled the "Free, Prior and Informed Consent" requirement. In the northern part of the Philippines, Tuwali-Ifugao indigenous peoples had continued to oppose the operation of the multinational mining giant OceanaGold. In southern part of the Philippines, the Tampakan mining project threatened rich biodiversity and integral headwaters of multiple communities in various provinces.¹³⁸

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons

108. JS5 stated that Revised Penal Code had been used to criminalize the activities of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer persons; and transgender or gender diverse people had been prevented from using their "lived" names.¹³⁹

109. JS11 stated that lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer/questioning children had experienced verbal harassment, neglect and sexual assault, often been perpetrated by parents, siblings and relatives, which went unreported.¹⁴⁰

110. JS30 highlighted that transgender men had not been accepted by their families, colleagues and fellow church; their work policies were not inclusive of transgender experiences; and social services did not provide for their needs and the health care centres were not transgender friendly.¹⁴¹

Migrants

111. MI stated that many Filipino migrants who had experienced violations of their human rights while overseas, were denied their right to consular protection, access to justice, comprehensive social and welfare protection. During the COVID-19 pandemic, consular services had been inaccessible to hundreds of Filipino migrant seafarers who had been strand on fishing vessels.¹⁴²

Internally displaced persons

112. JS28 stated that the militarization of indigenous communities through a heavy deployment of troops and prolonged combat operations, had resulted in the displacement of indigenous peoples.¹⁴³

113. JS22 stated that in 2021, in the southern part of the Philippines, a series of bombings in Mt. Firis and its surrounding areas, as part of the intensified military operations against the Bangsamoro Islamic Freedom Fighters, had resulted in 250 families from the Teduray, Lambangian and Dulangan Manobo Non-Moro indigenous communities being forced to evacuate from their homes, leaving behind their farms and their livestock.¹⁴⁴

114. JS24 stated that the Lumad had long been the victims of displacement and forced evacuation due to large-scale corporate mining, and were being targeted by the military and paramilitary groups.¹⁴⁵

Notes

- ¹ The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org (one asterisk denotes a national human rights institution with “A” status).

*Civil society**Individual submissions:*

AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
BAYAN	Bagong Alyansang Makabayan, Quezon City (Philippines);
BCN	Broken Chalk, Amsterdam (Netherlands);
BCU	The UPR Project at BCU, Centre for Human Rights, School of Law, Birmingham City University, Birmingham (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
CRCN-P	Children’s rehabilitation Center, Quezon City (Philippines);
CWR-PH	Center for Women’s Resources, Quezon City (Philippines);
DPN	Defend Panay Network, Iloilo City (Philippines);
ECLJ	European Centre for law and Justice, Strasbourg (France);
EV	Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children, New York (United States of America);
FPOF	The Family Planning Organization of the Philippines, Quezon City (Philippines);
GABRIELA	GABRIELA Alliance of Filipino Women, Quezon City (Philippines);
HRF	Human Rights Foundation, New York (United States of America);
HRW	Human Rights Watch, Geneva (Switzerland);
IBON	IBON Foundation, Quezon City (Philippines);
ICHRP	International Coalition for Human Rights in the Philippines-Canada, Ottawa (Canada);
ICTUR	The International Centre for Trade Union Rights, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
IFI-RPRD	Iglesia Filipina Independiente’s Ramento Project for Rights Defenders, Mandaluyong City (Philippines);
L4L	Lawyers for Lawyers, Amsterdam (Netherlands);
MI	Migrante International, Quezon City (Philippines);
NUPL1	National Union of Peoples’ Lawyers, Quezon City (Philippines);
PIMAHT	Philippine Interfaith Movement Against Human Trafficking, Quezon City (Philippines);
RU	Rise Up for Life and For Rights, Quezon City (Philippines);
Salinlahi	Salinlahi Alliance for Children’s Concerns, Quezon City (Philippines);
SEARICE	Southeast Asia Regional Initiatives for Community Empowerment, Quezon City (Philippines).

Joint submissions:

JS1	The Advocated for Human Rights, Minneapolis (United States of America) and The Initiatives for Dialogue and Empowerment
-----	---

- through Alternative Legal Services, Inc., Manila (Philippines) (Joint Submission 1);
- JS2 The Alliance of Health Workers, Quezon City (Philippines), Health Action for Human Rights, Community Medicine Practitioners and Advocates Association, and Filipino Nurses United (Joint submission 2);
- JS3 Aktionsbündnis Menschenrechte – Philippinen (Action Network Human Rights – Philippines), Köln (Germany) comprising of Amnesty International Germany, Brot für die Welt, International Peace Observers Network, MISEREOR, Missio Munich, philippinenbüro e.V. im Asienhaus, and the United Evangelical Mission (Joint submission 3);
- JS4 Asian Peoples’ Movement on Debt and Development, Quezon City (Philippines) and ORIANG (Joint Submission 4);
- JS5 ASEAN Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Expression (SOGIE) Caucus, Quezon City (Philippines), Metro Manila Pride, Pioneer Filipino Transgender Men Movement, GALANG Philippines, Lagablab LGBT Network, Babaylanes, Inc., Transman Equality and Awareness Movement, BISDAK Pride, Mujer-LGBT Organization, Inc., Side B Philippines, Rainbow Rights Philippines, The Philippine LGBT Chamber of Commerce and Intersex Philippines (Joint Submission 5);
- JS6 Center for Reproductive Rights, New York (United States of America), in partnership with: The Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women, Catholics for Reproductive Health, Family Planning Organization of the Philippines – Davao, Filipino Freethinkers, The Graciella Collective, Liyang Network, Woman Health Philippines Inc., Women’s Clinic Pilipinas, and Women’s Global Network for Reproductive Rights (Joint Submission 6);
- JS7 CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Johannesburg (South Africa), Karapatan Alliance Philippines (Joint Submission 7);
- JS8 Bahay Tuluyan, Inc., Manila (Philippines), Balay ehabilitation Center, Inc., Quezon City (Philippines), Child Alert Mindanao, Inc., Davao City (Philippines), Children’s Legal Rights and Development Center, Inc., Quezon City (Philippines), KnK-Children Without Borders, Caloocan City (Philippines), Panaghiusa Alang Sa Kaugalingnan Ug Kalingkawasan, Inc., Philippine Human Rights Information Center, Inc., Save the Children Philippines, Quezon City (Philippines), Alay Mindanao, Children International Manila (Joint Submission 8);
- JS9 The Coordinating Council for People’s Development and Governance, Inc., Quezon City (Philippines), Ibon International Foundation, Inc., Quezon City (Philippines), Assert Socio-Economic Initiatives Network, Quezon City (Philippines) (Joint Submission 9);
- JS10 Coalition for People’s Right to Health, Quezon City (Philippines), Council for Health and Development, Quezon City (Philippines), and Health Alliance for Democracy, Quezon City (Philippines) (Joint Submission 10);
- JS11 Civil Society Coalition on the Convention on the Rights of the Child, comprising of Child Fund Philippines, Consuelo Foundation, ECPAT Philippines, ERDA Foundation, Salinlahi Alliance for Children’s Concerns, and Save the Children, Manila (Philippines) (Joint Submission 11);
- JS12 Dominicans for Justice and Peace (Order of Preachers), Geneva (Switzerland), Franciscans International, Maderazo, Valerio and Partners, Dominican Family in the Philippines for Justice and Peace and Care for Creation, Save Zambales Kalikasan Movement, Task Force Detainees for the Philippines, Conference of Major Superiors of the Philippines, Swiss Catholic Lenten Fund, Philippines Movement of Climate Justice,

- Dreikönigsaktion, Hilfswerk der Katholischen Jungschar (Joint Submission 12);
- JS13 Families of Victims of Involuntary Disappearance, Quezon City (Philippines) and the Asian Federation Against Involuntary Disappearances (Joint Submission 13);
- JS14 The Foundation for Media Alternatives, Quezon City (Philippines), Association for Progressive Communications, Access Now, and the Women's Legal and Human Rights Bureau (Joint Submission 14);
- JS15 Philippine Alliance of Human Rights Advocates, NoBox Transitions Foundation, Inc., International Drug Policy Consortium, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and Harm Reduction International Manila (Philippines) (Joint Submission 15);
- JS16 Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Geneva (Switzerland), International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education, and Laura Vicuña Foundation Philippines (Joint Submission 16);
- JS17 Philippine Network to Uphold Indigenous Peoples Rights, Quezon City (Philippines) and Indigenous Peoples Rights International, Baguio City (Philippines) (Joint Submission 17);
- JS18 The International Trade Union Confederation, Brussels (Belgium), The Federation of Free Workers, Manila (Philippines), Kilusang Mayo Uno, Quezon City (Philippines), Sentro ng mga Nagkakaisa at Progresibong Manggagawa, Quezon City (Philippines), and Trade Union Congress of the Philippines, Quezon City (Philippines) (Joint Submission 18);
- JS19 Kalikasan People's Network for the Environment and Center for Environment Concerns - Philippines Inc., Quezon City (Philippines) (Joint Submission 19);
- JS20 Karapatan Alliance Philippines, Tanggol Bayi (Defend Women) Philippines, Samahan ng Ex-detainees Laban sa Detensyon at Aresto, Desaparecidos, and Hustisya, Quezon City (Philippines) (Joint Submission 20);
- JS21 Center for Trade Union and Human Rights, Quezon City (Philippines), Women Wise3 – Women Workers in Struggle for Employment, Empowerment and Emancipation, Quezon City (Philippines), and May First Movement, Quezon City (Philippines) (Joint Submission 21);
- JS22 Timuay Justice and Governance, T'boli-Manobo S'daf Claimants Organisation, Didipio Earth Savers Multipurpose Association, Legal Rights and Natural Resources Center-Kasama sa Kalikasan, Quezon City (Philippines) (Joint Submission 22);
- JS23 United Against Torture Coalition, World Organization Against Torture, Geneva (Switzerland) and International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims (Joint Submission 23);
- JS24 Pilgrims for Peace, Quezon City (Philippines) and ACT for Peace (Joint Submission 24);
- JS25 Philippine Alliance of Human Rights Advocates, Quezon City (Philippines), In Defense of Human Rights and Dignity Movement, Center for Popular Empowerment (Philippines) (Joint Submission 25);
- JS26 Privacy International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and The Foundation for Media Alternatives (Philippines) (Joint Submission 26);
- JS27 National Council of Churches in the Philippines, Iglesia Filipina Independiente Ramento Project for Rights Defenders, and United Church of Christ in the Philippines (Joint Submission 27);
- JS28 Katribu Kalipunan ng Katutubong Mamamayan ng Pilipinas (Joint Submission 28);

JS29	International Office of Catholic Education and Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines, Rome (Italy) (Joint Submission 29);
JS30	Pioneer Filipino Transgender Men Movement, Quezon City (Philippines) and TLF Sexuality, Health and Rights Educators Collective (Joint Submission 30);
JS31	Coalition against Trafficking in Women – Asia Pacific and World Organization Against Torture, Geneva (Switzerland) (Joint Submission 31);
JS32	The Advocates for Human Rights and The World Coalition Against the Death Penalty, Montreuil (France) (Joint Submission 32);
JS33	Jubilee Campaign, Surry (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and PREDA Foundation (Philippines) (Joint Submission 33).

National human rights institution:

CHRP	Commission on the Human Rights of the Philippines, Quezon City (Philippines).*
------	--

² See A/HRC/36/12, A/HRC/36/12/Add.1, and A/HRC/36/2.

³ CHRP, para. 27, referring to A/HRC/44/22, Situation of human rights in the Philippines, Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

⁴ *Ibid.*, para. 3, referring to A/HRC/36/12, para. 133.34 (Russian Federation), para. 133.35 (China), para. 133.36 (Nepal), para. 133.37 (Libya), para. 133.38 (Thailand), para. 133.39 (Uganda), para. 133.40 (Kenya), and para. 133.41 (Mexico), and A/HRC/36/12/Add.1.

⁵ *Ibid.*, paras. 4 and 5.

⁶ Red-tagging is “the practice of publicly and detractively labelling, branding, naming, and accusing individuals and/or organizations in order to classify them as government-critical individuals and/or organizations who are state enemies, left-leaning, subversives, communist terrorists, and/or members of communist front organizations, with the purpose of overthrowing the democratically legitimized state authority.” as defined in House Bill 9309 filed in Congress (See JS19, para. 7).

⁷ CHRP, paras. 8–10.

⁸ *Ibid.*, para. 14.

⁹ *Ibid.*, para. 12.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, paras. 16 and 17. See also JS8, p. 8.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, para. 15.

¹² CHRP, para. 20.

¹³ *Ibid.*, para. 24.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, paras. 25 and 26.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, para. 19.

¹⁶ The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;
OP-ICESCR	Optional Protocol to ICESCR;
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;
ICCPR-OP 1	Optional Protocol to ICCPR;
ICCPR-OP 2	Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty;
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women;
OP-CEDAW	Optional Protocol to CEDAW;
CAT	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT;
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child;
OP-CRC-AC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict;
OP-CRC-SC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography;
OP-CRC-IC	Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure;
ICRMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families;

CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities;
OP-CRPD	Optional Protocol to CRPD;
ICPPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

- ¹⁷ HRF, para. 1. HRF made a recommendation (para. 32). See also Salinlahi, para. 31.
- ¹⁸ JS13, para. 33 and fn. 19, referring to the Note verbal dated 18 April 2007 from the Permanent Mission of the Philippines to the United Nations addressed to the President of the General Assembly, A/61/882, (26 April 2007). See also AI, para. 4. AI made a recommendation (para. 26); and JS33, para. 3. JS33 made a recommendation (p. 1).
- ¹⁹ HRW, p. 3. HRW made recommendations (p. 3).
- ²⁰ JS6, paras. 3.2 and 4.4(b). JS6 made recommendations (p. 10).
- ²¹ JS7, para. 5.3.
- ²² JS32, para. 16. JS32 made recommendations (para. 43).
- ²³ JS15, p. 6. JS15 made recommendations (pp. 6–7). See also JS20, para. 23; JS25, para. 10; and BCU, paras. 26, 27, 31, 37. BCU made recommendations (p. 6).
- ²⁴ JS5, paras. 3.3–3.5. JS5 made a recommendation (para. 12.1). See also HRW, p. 6. HRW made a recommendation (p. 6).
- ²⁵ AI, para. 7. AI made a recommendation (para. 30). See also JS32, paras. 26 and 33.
- ²⁶ GABRIELA, paras. 5, 8 and 16.
- ²⁷ JS20, para. 3. See also ICHRP, para. 2. See also ICTUR, p. 3; IFI-RPRD, para. 6. IFI-RPRD made recommendations (para. 35); JS28, para. 29. JS28 referred to specific cases (paras. 30–37).
- ²⁸ JS3, para. 32. JS3 made recommendations (JS3, paras. 35–37. See also JS25, para. 19. JS25 made recommendations (paras. 59–67); RU, para. 2. RU made recommendations (para. 23).
- ²⁹ DPN, paras. 15–18. DPN made a recommendation (para. 40).
- ³⁰ JS1, paras. 1, 16 and 22. See AI, para. 9. AI made recommendations (paras. 32–41); HRF, para. 27; JS8, p. 2. JS8 made a recommendation (p. 3); JS12, paras. 38–44. JS12 made a recommendation (p. 14); JS15, p. 4. JS15 made recommendations (pp. 6–7); HRF, para. 21; and JS32, para. 24.
- ³¹ JS1, para. 4, para. 6, and para. 7, referring to A/HRC/36/12, para. 133.48 (United States of America), para. 133.55 (Timor-Leste), para. 133.58 (Guatemala), para. 133.59 (Estonia), para. 133.56 (Egypt), para. 133.54 (Zambia), para. 133.53 (Lebanon), para. 133.47 (Haiti), para. 133.44 (Peru), para. 133.46 (Myanmar), para. 133.50 (Romania), para. 133.52 (Thailand) and para. 133.42 (Ghana), and A/HRC/36/12/Add.1.
- ³² JS15, p. 5. JS15 made recommendations (pp. 6–7).
- ³³ L4L, paras. 10 and 11. L4L made recommendations (p. 5). See also NUPL1, para. 13.
- ³⁴ JS23, paras. 6, 10, 11, 19, 20, 22, 26 and 27. JS23 made recommendations (paras. 12–17 and paras. 31–37).
- ³⁵ JS13, para. 19. JS13 made a recommendation (p. 8). See also JS15, p. 5; JS23, paras. 38 and 41. JS23 made recommendations (paras. 47–49).
- ³⁶ JS10, paras. 37–41. JS10 made recommendations (p. 11).
- ³⁷ JS23, para. 63. JS23 made recommendations (paras. 73–80). See also BCU, para. 29; and JS32, para. 33. JS32 made recommendations (para. 43).
- ³⁸ DPN, paras. 19–29. DPN made a recommendation (para. 46).
- ³⁹ JS11, pp. 11–12, referring to A/HRC/36/12, para. 133.214 (Belgium), and A/HRC/36/12/Add.1. JS11 made recommendations (p. 12).
- ⁴⁰ JS1, para. 9–11. JS1 made a recommendation (para. 27). See also JS3, para. 55. JS3 made a recommendation (para. 57); See also JS8, p. 3.); JS15, para. 6; HRF, paras. 29–31; HRW, pp. 1–2; and RU, para. 5.
- ⁴¹ ECLJ, para. 4.
- ⁴² JS21, para. 21.
- ⁴³ DPN, para. 5. DPN made a recommendation (para. 41). See also GABRIELA, para. 13; and ICHRP, para. 13.
- ⁴⁴ JS24, paras. 8 and 15. JS24 made recommendations (pp. 6–7.); See also IFI-RPRD, para. 5. IFI-RPRD made recommendations (para. 35); JS28, para. 8. JS28 made recommendations (paras. 48 and 49); RU, para. 3. RU made recommendations (para. 23).
- ⁴⁵ Republic Act 11479.
- ⁴⁶ JS3, para. 18. JS3 made a recommendation (para. 25). See also JS7, paras. 2.5 and 2.6; JS9, paras. 14 and 15; JS12, para. 61. JS12 made a recommendation (p. 18); JS14, paras. 18 and 19; JS17, para. 25. JS17 made a recommendation (p. 8); JS18, pp. 7-8; JS19, para. 12. JS19 made recommendations (para. 15); JS23, paras. 51–55. JS23 made recommendations (paras. 57–61); JS24, para. 6; ECLJ paras. 6 and 7); GABRIELA, para. 12 and 17; HRW, p. 5. HRW made recommendations (p. 5); ICHRP, para. 21; ICTUR, p. 3; JS28, para. 9; L4L, para. 16. L4L made a recommendation (p. 5); NUPL1, para. 10; RU para. 4. RU made recommendations (para. 23); and DPN, para. 6.

- ⁴⁷ JS24, para. 8. JS24 made recommendations (pp. 6–7. See also JS25, para. 6. See also AI, para. 17; BAYAN, pp. 2–3; CRCN-P, paras. 10–12; ICHRP, para. 14; ICTUR, p. 3.
- ⁴⁸ JS20, paras. 11 and 12. JS20 made recommendations (pp. 12–13). See also JS22, para. 26; JS27, para. 5; BAYAN, pp. 2–3.
- ⁴⁹ JS1, paras. 12 and 13, referring to referring to A/HRC/36/12, para. 133.132 (United States of America) and para. 133.134 (Azerbaijan), and A/HRC/36/12/Add.1.
- ⁵⁰ DPN, para. 31. See also NUPL1, para. 41.
- ⁵¹ NUPL1, paras. 42 and 43.
- ⁵² Ibid, para. 33.
- ⁵³ JS1, paras. 14, 15 and 23. JS1 made a recommendation (para. 27).
- ⁵⁴ NUPL1, para. 8. See also ICHRP, para. 16.
- ⁵⁵ JS3, para. 20. JS3 made recommendations (paras. 27 and 28). See also JS20, para. 27. JS20 made recommendations (pp. 12–13); CRCN-P, para. 22.; IFI-RPRD, para. 5. IFI-RPRD made recommendations (para. 35); JS28, para. 38. JS28 referred to specific cases (paras. 39–41).
- ⁵⁶ ICHRP, para. 15.
- ⁵⁷ L4L, paras. 10 and 11. L4L made recommendations (p. 5). See also JS7, para. 3.6; NUPL1, para. 13.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid, paras. 13 and 14. L4L made recommendations (p. 5). See also DPN, para. 37.
- ⁵⁹ JS3, para. 38, referring to A/HRC/36/12, para. 133.137 (Croatia), para. 133.139 (Argentina), para. 133.141 (Luxembourg), para. 133.142 (Slovenia) and para.133.148 (Austria), and A/HRC/36/12/Add.1. JS3 made recommendations (para. 42). See also JS22, para. 33. JS22 made a recommendation (para. 37). See also JS20, para. 6; and RU, para. 21.
- ⁶⁰ ICHRP, para. 2. See also ICTUR, p. 3; IFI-RPRD, para. 6. IFI-RPRD made recommendations (para. 35); JS28, para. 29. JS28 referred to specific cases (paras. 30–37).
- ⁶¹ HRF, para. 14.
- ⁶² JS27, paras. 12–14. JS27 made recommendations (para. 48); See also IFI-RPRD, paras. 17, 18, 29 and 30. IFI-RPRD made recommendations (para. 35).
- ⁶³ JS33, paras. 6–16. JS33 made recommendations (paras. 17–19).
- ⁶⁴ JS14, paras. 12–14. JS14 made recommendations (para. 38).
- ⁶⁵ JS3, paras. 23 and 24. JS3 made a recommendation (para. 26). See also JS7, para. 4.2; JS20, para. 32. JS20 made recommendations (pp. 12–13); AI, para. 21.
- ⁶⁶ JS7, para. 2.12. JS7 made recommendations (para. 6.5). See also JS14, paras. 15–17.
- ⁶⁷ HRF, paras. 24 and 25; See also HRW, pp. 2 and 4. HRW made recommendations (p. 5).
- ⁶⁸ JS3, paras. 4–10. JS3 made recommendations (paras. 11–16). See also JS7, paras. 3.2–3.4. JS7 made recommendations (para. 6.4); See also JS9, paras. 10–13, JS12, para. 51; JS17, paras. 10, 11 and 13. JS17 made recommendations (p. 5); JS19, para. 6. JS19 made recommendations (para. 15); JS22, para. 11; AI, paras. 16, 23–25. AI made recommendations (paras. 42–45); CRCN-P, para. 21; PIMAHT, pp.1–2.
- ⁶⁹ NUPL1, para. 6. See also JS7, para. 2.4. JS7 made recommendations (para. 6.3); and JS12, para. 58. JS12 made a recommendation (p. 18).
- ⁷⁰ JS14, para. 34. JS14 made recommendations (para. 35).
- ⁷¹ Advance Passenger Information.
- ⁷² Passenger Name Record.
- ⁷³ JS26, paras. 7, 9, 10 and 17. JS26 made recommendations (para. 19).
- ⁷⁴ JS5, para. 7.1.
- ⁷⁵ JS31, paras. 3, 6, 8, 11 and 13. JS31 made recommendations (p. 5). See also BCN, para. 8.
- ⁷⁶ JS11, p. 3, referring to A/HRC/36/12, para. 133.187 (Belarus) and para. 133.196 (Netherlands), and A/HRC/36/12/Add.1. JS11 made recommendations (p. 4). See also JS16, para. 44. JS16 made recommendations (para. 55); JS25, para. 24; and JS33, paras. 21–23. JS33 made recommendations (paras. 47–50).
- ⁷⁷ PIMAHT, pp.1–2. PIMAHT made recommendations (p. 2).
- ⁷⁸ IBON, para. 4, JS21, paras. 9 and 10.
- ⁷⁹ JS2, para. 10. JS2 made a recommendation (para. 38). See also CWR-PH, para. 15.
- ⁸⁰ JS21, para. 8.
- ⁸¹ Ibid, paras. 13 and 15.
- ⁸² ICTUR, p. 2. ICTUR made recommendations (pp. 7–8).
- ⁸³ JS18, p. 3. See also ICTUR, p. 2; and JS2, paras. 23–28.
- ⁸⁴ IBON, para. 12 and 19 See also JS9, para. 3.
- ⁸⁵ Salinlahi, paras. 32 and 35.
- ⁸⁶ JS8, p. 9. See also Salinlani, paras. 5 and 9.
- ⁸⁷ Salinlani, paras. 12 and 13.
- ⁸⁸ CWR-PH, paras. 22 and 23. CWR-PH made a recommendation (para. 40).
- ⁸⁹ United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas.

- ⁹⁰ SEARICE, paras. 10, 11, 13, 21 and 23. SEARICE made recommendations (paras. 15 and 22).
- ⁹¹ JS4, p. 8. JS4 made recommendations (p. 10, paras. 2 and 3). See also JS9, para. 3; and Salinlahi, para. 18.
- ⁹² JS10, paras. 4, 17 and 31. JS10 made recommendations (p.10).
- ⁹³ Ibid, para. 32. JS10 made recommendations (p. 10). See also JS25, para. 26. JS25 made recommendations (paras. 68–81).
- ⁹⁴ CWR-PH, para. 25. CWR-PH made a recommendation (para. 41).
- ⁹⁵ FPOF, para. 9. FPOF made a recommendation (para. 15(a)).
- ⁹⁶ JS11, p. 11, referring A/HRC/36/12, para.133.213 (Brazil), para. 133.214 (Sweden) and para. 133.215 (New Zealand), and A/HRC/36/12/Add.1. JS11 made recommendations (p. 10).
- ⁹⁷ JS6, para. 45(b). JS6 made recommendations (p. 11).
- ⁹⁸ Ibid, paras. 4.6 (a) and (d). JS6 made recommendations (p. 14). See also HRW, p. 6. HRW made a recommendation (p. 6); and FPOF, paras. 3 and 13. FPOF made a recommendation (para. 15(b).)
- ⁹⁹ JS6, para. 4.3, referring A/HRC/36/12, para. 133.213 (Brazil), 133.214 (Sweden), 133.215 (New Zealand) and 133.216 (Denmark), and A/HRC/36/12/Add.1. JS6 made recommendations (p. 8). See also Salinlahi, para. 16.
- ¹⁰⁰ JS1, para. 26. JS1 made a recommendation (para. 27). See also JS15, p. 4. JS 15 made recommendations (pp. 6–7); and BCU, para. 30. BCU made recommendations (pp. 6–7)
- ¹⁰¹ JS5, paras. 6.1 and 6.2. JS5 made a recommendation (para. 12.11).
- ¹⁰² JS2, paras. 29 and 30.
- ¹⁰³ JS16, paras. 11–18, referring to A/HRC/36/12, para. 133.223 (Holy See) and para. 133.224 (Malaysia), and A/HRC/36/12/Add.1. JS16 made recommendations (para. 24).
- ¹⁰⁴ JS29, paras. 16 and 17. Referring to A/HRC/36/12, para. 133.219 (Viet Nam), para. 122.220 (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) and para. 133.221(Saudi Arabia), and A/HRC/36/12/Add.1. JS29 made a recommendation (para. 18).
- ¹⁰⁵ JS16, para. 19. JS16 made recommendations (para. 24). See also IBON, para. 25.
- ¹⁰⁶ JS8, p. 10. JS8 made a recommendation (p. 10); BCN para. 14.
- ¹⁰⁷ JS29, para. 6. JS19 made a recommendation (para. 7).
- ¹⁰⁸ BCN, para. 7.
- ¹⁰⁹ CRCN-P, para. 16. CRCN-P made recommendations (para. 28). See also JS28, para. 25.
- ¹¹⁰ JS17, para. 2.
- ¹¹¹ JS19, paras. 24 and 25.
- ¹¹² Ibid, para. 26. JS19 made recommendations (para. 28).
- ¹¹³ JS3, para.47, referring to A/HRC/36/12, para. 133.71 (Haiti), and A/HRC/36/12/Add.1. See also, JS19, para. 16. JS19 made recommendations (para. 22).
- ¹¹⁴ JS12, paras. 13 and 14. JS12 made recommendations (p. 9).
- ¹¹⁵ JS4, p. 5. JS4 made recommendations (p. 10, paras. 4).
- ¹¹⁶ Ibid, pp. 5–8. JS4 made recommendations (p. 9, para. 1). See also IBON, paras. 15 and 16.
- ¹¹⁷ JS9, para. 8.
- ¹¹⁸ GABRIELA, para. 8.
- ¹¹⁹ JS11, pp. 4–5 referring to A/HRC/36/12, para. 133.125 (Bosnia and Herzegovina), and A/HRC/36/12/Add.1. JS3 made recommendations (p. 5).
- ¹²⁰ CWR-PH, para. 29. CWR-PH made a recommendation (para. 42).
- ¹²¹ JS14, paras. 26–31. JS14 made recommendations (para. 38).
- ¹²² JS8, p. 2. JS8 made a recommendation (p. 3). See also HRF, para. 28.
- ¹²³ Ibid, p. 4, referring to a report by World Organisation Against Torture, “How could they do this to my child?”, June 2020. See also JS11, pp. 10-11. JS11 made recommendations (p. 11); CRCN-P, paras. 3, 4 and 8. CRCN-P made a recommendation (para. 28); HRW, p. 5. HRW made recommendations (p. 6).
- ¹²⁴ JS8, p. 9. See also JS22, para. 4. See also JS25, para. 29.
- ¹²⁵ JS11, pp. 4–5 referring to A/HRC/36/12, para. 133.125 (Bosnia and Herzegovina), and A/HRC/36/12/Add.1. JS3 made recommendations (p. 5).
- ¹²⁶ EV, paras. 2.1 and 2.2.
- ¹²⁷ JS16, para. 25, referring to A/HRC/36/12, para. 133.245 (Poland), and A/HRC/36/12/Add.1.
- ¹²⁸ Ibid, para. 25, referring to Republic Act 7610- Special Protection of Children Against Abuse, Exploitation, and Discrimination Act; Republic Act 7658- An Act Prohibiting the Employment of Children Below 15 Years of Age in Public and Private Undertakings, Amending for this Purpose Section 12, Article VIII of RA 7610; and Republic Act 9231- An Act Providing for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor and Affording Stronger Protection for the Working Child, Amending for this Purpose RA 7610, as amended.
- ¹²⁹ JS16, paras. 30–32. JS16 made recommendations (para. 39).
- ¹³⁰ JS11, p. 5. See also JS6, para. 3.3.

- ¹³¹ JS5, paras. 11.1 and 11.3.
- ¹³² JS11, p. 13. JS11 made recommendations (p. 13).
- ¹³³ JS9, para. 20.
- ¹³⁴ JS11, p. 6 referring to A/HRC/36/12, para. 133.247 (Ecuador), para. 133.248 (State of Palestine) and para. 133.249 (Tunisia), and A/HRC/36/12/Add.1. JS11 made recommendations (p. 7). See also JS9, para. 9.
- ¹³⁵ JS28, paras. 3–5, referring to A/HRC/36/12, para. 133.30 (Cuba) and para. 133.31 (Lao People’s Democratic Republic), and A/HRC/36/12/Add.1.
- ¹³⁶ JS17, paras. 3 and 32.
- ¹³⁷ JS3, para. 46 referring to A/HRC/36/12, para. 133.6 (Guatemala) and para. 133.250 (Peru), and A/HRC/36/12/Add.1. JS3 made recommendations (paras. 50–53); See also JS17, para. 2 and JS17, para. 2. JS17 made recommendations (pp. 3 and 7).
- ¹³⁸ JS22, paras. 12, 15 and 16. JS22 made recommendations (paras. 42 and 43). See also JS28, paras. 12–19. JS28 made recommendations (paras. 44 and 54).
- ¹³⁹ JS5, paras. 3.2 and 4.1.
- ¹⁴⁰ JS11, p. 7. JS11 made recommendations (p. 8).
- ¹⁴¹ JS30, paras. 6, 7, 8,10 and 16.
- ¹⁴² MI, paras. 3, 4, 12 and 16. MI made recommendations (pp. 4–5).
- ¹⁴³ JS28, paras. 20 and 21. JS28 made recommendations, paras. 44, 45, 47, 52 and 53).
- ¹⁴⁴ JS22, para. 22.
- ¹⁴⁵ JS24, para. 17.
-