



---

**Human Rights Council**  
**Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review**  
**Thirty-third session**  
6–17 May 2019

## **Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Equatorial Guinea\***

### **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 9 stakeholders' submissions<sup>1</sup> to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

#### **II. Information provided by stakeholders**

##### **A. Scope of international obligations<sup>2</sup> and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies<sup>3</sup>**

2. The Center for Global Nonkilling (CGNK) recommended that Equatorial Guinea ratify the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.<sup>4</sup>

3. CGNK and JS3 recommended the ratification of the Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.<sup>5</sup>

4. JS3 recommended the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.<sup>6</sup>

5. The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) recommended that Equatorial Guinea sign and ratify the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.<sup>7</sup>

6. JS4 stated that the government should extend a standing invitation to all Special Procedure mandate holders and prioritise official visits by the Special Rapporteurs on: the situation of human rights defenders; the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression; the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association; the

---

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



independence of judges and lawyers; extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions; the right to privacy; and the Working Group on arbitrary detention.<sup>8</sup>

## **B. National human rights framework<sup>9</sup>**

7. JS3 noted that the constitutional reform undertaken in Equatorial Guinea had established the institution of the Ombudsman. Under the Constitution, the Ombudsman was responsible for defending citizens' constitutional rights. The Office of the Ombudsman did not meet the criteria of independence and pluralism set out in the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (Paris Principles), as the Ombudsman was appointed by parliament, which was controlled entirely by the governing party and under the orders of the President of the Republic.<sup>10</sup>

8. Amnesty International (AI) recommended that Equatorial Guinea create an independent national human rights institution in line with the Paris Principles, fully independent from the government.<sup>11</sup>

9. JS1 indicated that the government had received recommendations to improve public access to information on policy measures, however, public and accessible information on HIV/AIDS remained scarce.<sup>12</sup>

## **C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law**

### **1. Cross-cutting issues**

#### *Equality and non-discrimination<sup>13</sup>*

10. JS2 noted that homosexuality, lesbianism and other forms of sexual diversity were considered a pathology in Equatorial Guinea, even by government institutions. The diagnosis and treatment of their "manifestations" were governed by a protocol involving distinct stages that clearly violated the dignity and rights of persons with a gender identity that did not fall within the socially established gender binary.<sup>14</sup> It added that, although homosexuality was not criminalized under the law of Equatorial Guinea, nor was homophobia; that legal vacuum made the country a haven for homophobic practices.<sup>15</sup>

11. According to JS2, although there was no anti-homosexuality law, the illegal fine imposed in police stations for being homosexual apparently ranged between 50,000 and 150,000 francs (90 to 270 dollars). JS2 also noted the testimony of 10 lesbian, gay, transgender, bisexual or intersex women who were allegedly the victims of physical, sexual and psychological abuse in prisons and, above all, in military and police training academies. JS2 took note of the allegations concerning 30 cases of forced pregnancy among lesbian, gay, transgender, bisexual or intersex women documented in the cities of Malabo and Bata. As a consequence, the young mothers had high rates of depression and alcohol and drug dependence. It also reported physical assaults and arbitrary imprisonment.<sup>16</sup>

12. JS1 indicated that persons living with HIV/AIDS resisted to access testing, counselling and antiretroviral treatment due to the high risk of stigmatization and marginalization.<sup>17</sup> JS1 recommended that Equatorial Guinea develop and implement a national legislation to ban processes, policies and statements that stigmatize, discriminate, or violate rights of HIV/AIDS patients.<sup>18</sup>

### **2. Civil and political rights**

#### *Right to life, liberty and security of person<sup>19</sup>*

13. JS3 noted that on 13 February 2014, the President had signed Decree No. 426/2014, which established a temporary moratorium on the application of the death penalty in Equatorial Guinea. However, there was reportedly evidence that four weeks before that announcement was made, the Government had clandestinely executed the prisoners sentenced to death in the country.<sup>20</sup>

14. JS3 recommended that the death penalty should be abolished by law and that investigations should be conducted into unlawful killings and extrajudicial executions committed by security personnel and that those responsible should be prosecuted.<sup>21</sup>

15. JS3 stated that the main perpetrators of torture in the police stations and prisons of Equatorial Guinea were well known, but none of them had been the subject of a judicial investigation. They all enjoyed immunity and in some instances had been promoted to positions in the Government or public administration.<sup>22</sup>

16. JS3 said that arbitrary detention was a weapon frequently used by the governing regime. Any individual in uniform, leader of the governing party or family member of an authority could decide arbitrarily to detain an ordinary citizen. Arbitrary detention was used in conjunction with threats, intimidation and harassment against dissidents, activists and politicians. Furthermore, such detention was usually accompanied by unlawful imprisonment of varying duration and could take place for any reason: interpersonal problems, common conflicts or political intolerance.<sup>23</sup> JS3 provided details of cases of detention.<sup>24</sup>

17. JS3 also stated that it was difficult to accurately assess conditions of detention in prisons in Equatorial Guinea. Visits were restricted and often even lawyers were not allowed to enter to meet with their clients. For ordinary prisoners, visits were only permitted on weekends and prisoners had no privacy with their family members. Family members did not dare make statements for fear of government reprisals. Political prisoners were not allowed any visits. Many prisoners died in detention as a result of torture or lack of medical care.<sup>25</sup>

18. JS3 recommended: ensuring that all those suspected of having committed a recognizable criminal offence should be promptly charged and tried within a reasonable time frame; putting an immediate end to the practice of incommunicado detention and secret detention and disclosing the whereabouts of all detainees; putting an immediate stop to the practice of holding the family members of political opponents as hostages; and fully applying Act No. 6/2006 which prohibited torture and bringing to justice those suspected of having participated in acts of torture, including political officials.<sup>26</sup>

19. JS2 noted that the situation of women in public prisons in Equatorial Guinea and the treatment they received in police stations were characterized by a complete disregard for their integrity. Female prisoners were extremely vulnerable to sexual assault and sexual violence by prison guards and fellow prisoners. It also noted that there was no segregation in prisons and that men and women shared common spaces.<sup>27</sup>

*Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law*<sup>28</sup>

20. JS4 indicated that the independence of the judiciary was seriously compromised as, according to Article 85 of the Constitution, judges must consult the President, who was Equatorial Guinea's First Magistrate, before they ruled on certain cases.<sup>29</sup>

21. JS3 stated that it was not possible to speak of judicial independence in Equatorial Guinea. The President of the Republic appointed and dismissed judges and prosecutors without any legal basis. Those judges handed down their judgments in accordance with the wishes of the President. The courts were not independent or impartial, as the executive branch exercised total control over the legislature and the judiciary, which made it impossible to oversee the executive branch. Procedural guarantees were not respected during trials and the right to the presumption of innocence was not recognized. The inability to guarantee the independence of the judiciary had resulted in the violation of the right to a fair trial.<sup>30</sup>

*Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life*<sup>31</sup>

22. JS4 reported that freedom of expression was severely restricted, in policy and practice.<sup>32</sup> JS4 noted that the publication of information or requests for information by journalists or media agencies, which the authorities deemed to violate the personal honour or reputation of a family or individual, was considered an act of defamation. In addition, defamation continued to be codified under Article 240 of the Criminal Code.<sup>33</sup>

23. JS4 added that very few private newspapers existed and those that did were strictly censored. Journalists who offered views that were critical of the government, security forces or the president and his family were dismissed or judicially persecuted. The authorities regularly blocked the websites of exiled groups, the political opposition and foreign news sources. The government also prevented information on protests and democratic uprisings in other countries from being broadcast in Equatorial Guinea.<sup>34</sup>

24. JS4 recommended that Equatorial Guinea: ensure the freedom of expression and media freedom by bringing national legislation into line with international standards; and reform defamation legislation in conformity with article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.<sup>35</sup>

25. AI noted that Equatorial Guinea accepted recommendations<sup>36</sup> concerning human rights defenders and journalists. However, harassment and intimidation continued to be used against human rights defenders, activists and political opponents. They also continued to be victims of arbitrary arrests and detentions. Since the last review no progress had been made in the implementation of any of these recommendations which affected the work of human rights defenders and activists.<sup>37</sup>

26. JS4 also indicated that the government viewed any independent Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) with suspicion and over recent decades had systematically cultivated an environment that made it impossible for organisations interested in addressing human rights, corruption, democracy and governance to be registered or function effectively.<sup>38</sup>

27. JS1 reported that currently non-governmental organizations involved in the fight against HIV/AIDS had actively contributed to raise awareness about the epidemic. However, they faced serious challenges due to governmental corruption and repression.<sup>39</sup>

28. Similarly, JS2 noted that Equatorial Guinea did not give the necessary space to NGOs to raise public awareness about the elimination of discrimination and violence against women.<sup>40</sup>

29. AI indicated that non-governmental organizations (NGOs) activities continued to be regulated by Law 1/1999, adopted on 24 February 1999. According to national NGOs, this law placed obstacles on their independence, functioning and development, including by imposing financial constraints which limit their capacity to receive donations from abroad which, in turn, prevent NGOs from carrying out their activities. The registration process for NGOs was also an obstacle because there is no set timeframe for the government response to a registration request from an NGO.<sup>41</sup>

30. AI noted that, according to information which had recently been released by official sources, a new NGO law has been sent to Parliament. However, NGOs had not been informed or consulted.<sup>42</sup>

31. AI recommended that Equatorial Guinea: repeal or amend legislation that may place obstacles in the way of legitimate activities to promote and defend human rights, including with regard to the rights to freedom of expression, peaceful assembly and association; and immediately reform Law 1/1999 regulating NGOs, including in line with recommendations made by NGOs, in order to facilitate their registration and enable their full and independent functioning.<sup>43</sup>

32. JS4 recommended that Equatorial Guinea: take measures to foster a safe, respectful and enabling environment for civil society, including by removing legal and policy measures that unwarrantedly limit the right to association; facilitate the registration of all CSOs that have submitted applications for registration; and remove all undue restrictions on the ability of CSOs to receive domestic and international funding.<sup>44</sup>

33. JS4 noted that most human rights defenders (HRDs) and independent journalists resorted to self-censorship or had been forced to flee the country.<sup>45</sup> JS4 reported that HRDs and civil society representatives were often subjected to arbitrary arrests, prolonged detentions and judicial persecution, and reported on cases of detention of such persons.<sup>46</sup>

34. AI recommended that Equatorial Guinea: investigate all threats and attacks against human rights defenders and activists and bring to justice those suspected to be responsible;

and refrain from using language that stigmatizes, abuses, disparages or discriminates against human rights defenders.<sup>47</sup>

35. JS4 recommended that Equatorial Guinea unconditionally and immediately release all HRDs, civil society representatives and political activists detained for exercising their fundamental rights to the freedoms of association, peaceful assembly and expression.<sup>48</sup>

36. JS4 stated that public assemblies in Equatorial Guinea were governed by Law 4/1992 on Freedom of Assembly and Demonstrations. According to Article 7 of the law, protest organisers must inform the Director General of National Security seven days before the start of a protest. In practice, however, notifications from civil society and the political opposition to hold peaceful protests to raise concerns about the actions of the government or on any issue related to the military, the president and his family were rejected.<sup>49</sup>

37. JS4 indicated that even though elections were held regularly, the authorities repressed the activities of opposition parties and arrested and prosecuted dissidents to enable the ruling Democratic Party of Equatorial Guinea to stay in power.<sup>50</sup>

38. JS3 noted that the Electoral Authority of Equatorial Guinea remained under the control of the governing party. The governing party had an absolute monopoly on the State media, which were subjected to relentless censorship and to which the opposition had no access. During the electoral campaign, the Government had denied the opposition the opportunity access to the national media to broadcast its message.<sup>51</sup>

39. JS3 recommended that Equatorial Guinea should ratify the African Charter on Democracy, Elections and Governance, adopted by the African Union in Addis Ababa on 30 January 2007, which included an institutional commitment to organize regular, free, fair and transparent elections conducted by competent, independent and impartial national electoral bodies.<sup>52</sup> It also recommended liberalizing the private media sector and opening up the public media to all political parties and civil society organizations in the country, in compliance with the provisions of the Constitution.<sup>53</sup>

40. JS2 noted that women's representation in politics and positions of responsibility in the three branches of government remained low, including in the diplomatic service. By way of illustration, of a total of 100 deputies in the Chamber of Deputies, 18 were women. In the Senate, 13 per cent of the 75 senators were women, while 13 per cent of the 76 members of the cabinet of senior officials were women. The Supreme Court of Justice, the country's highest court, did not have any female judges.<sup>54</sup> JS2 recommended adopting mechanisms to increase the participation of women in political and public life, particularly in decision-making positions, in accordance with article 13.2 of the Constitution.<sup>55</sup>

#### *Right to privacy and family life<sup>56</sup>*

41. JS2 reported that traditional marriage customs were still practised.<sup>57</sup> Women did not have the same rights as men in areas related to customary marriage. Equally, women had fewer rights as widows, when they were subjected to physical abuse, and in relation to issues such as dowries and polygamy. Despite the commitments made by Equatorial Guinea at the national level, the courts continued to give preference to customary traditions over women's rights.<sup>58</sup>

42. JS2 noted that, despite the commitment made by Equatorial Guinea to create mechanisms to achieve equality in marriage and in the event of separation or divorce, women's access to justice remained limited. Reasons included the high cost, a low level of education and lack of information among women, and the persistent discrimination against women when it came to the division of assets acquired during marriage and the custody of the children of the marriage. For example, according to the interpretation of customary law, in the event of separation or divorce, women in traditional marriages lost their rights, were obliged to return their dowries and in many cases were not allowed to keep their personal effects, and custody of children born into the marriage was given to the father.<sup>59</sup>

### 3. Economic, social and cultural rights

#### *Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work<sup>60</sup>*

43. JS4 indicated that the Law on Trade Unions (1992) imposed a number of restrictive provisions that made it difficult for trade unions to register and represent their members. While the law codified that the State will recognise the right of employees in the public administration to organise, it also stipulated that trade unions should have at least 50 members from the same workplace and geographic location before they can be registered. This requirement effectively prevented unions from registering because very few employers employed large numbers of people and there were many geographic divisions in Equatorial Guinea. Workers were also intimidated and put under pressure to join the ruling party. In effect, the government only recognised one union – the union of small farmers.<sup>61</sup>

44. JS4 recommended that Equatorial Guinea guarantee the existence and effective and independent functioning of autonomous trade unions, by removing proscriptions on the formulation of independent labour unions and undue limitations on the right to strike.<sup>62</sup>

45. JS2 stated that the discrimination faced by women in Equatorial Guinea in gaining access to education was one of the reasons for their limited access to employment, although there were no data on the issue. The Government had made little effort to eliminate discrimination against women in the field of employment.<sup>63</sup> Discrimination in the world of work was worse in rural areas, where there was widespread poverty and no strategy or existing or planned measures to alleviate poverty and improve the situation of women.<sup>64</sup>

#### *Right to an adequate standard of living<sup>65</sup>*

46. El Pueblo Indígena Bubi de la Isla de Bioko (the Indigenous People of the Island of Bioko) (EPIBIB) noted that the indigenous Bubi population of the island of Bioko had been subjected to the expropriation of its land, including agricultural land, without any compensation. Many people were dying of starvation. For a long time, the economy had been based on the production of cocoa, but the Government had allegedly destroyed almost all the cocoa farms to make way for the construction of military camps, football pitches and other facilities. It added that Bubi women had low life expectancy because of extreme poverty, and when they died left behind minor children who did not come under the protection of the State.<sup>66</sup>

#### *Right to health<sup>67</sup>*

47. JS1 indicated that HIV/AIDS was a widespread epidemic in Equatorial Guinea, and constituted one of the main causes of morbidity and mortality among the population. About 53,000 adults and children were counted as infected in 2017. Women and young individuals aged 15 to 19 years are currently the most afflicted.<sup>68</sup>

48. JS1 stated that the government claimed to have developed programs to control and eradicate sexually transmitted diseases and HIV/AIDS. However, the epidemic not only prevailed, but increased during the reporting period. The level of prevalence of HIV infection among women had tripled in the past 11 years and children, orphan minors, sex workers, immigrants, and military men remained as the groups most vulnerable among the population.<sup>69</sup>

49. JS1 also recommended that Equatorial Guinea: implement a comprehensive and country-wide sexual health education in the school system by the end of 2019 designed to reach all vulnerable populations, and that specially focused on HIV/AIDS infection and risk behaviours and preventative methods; and implement a comprehensive medical care distribution model which integrates HIV/AIDS care into primary health care, and prioritizes vulnerable communities.<sup>70</sup>

50. JS1 reported that the rate of prevalence of the HIV/AIDS epidemic was much higher among women. Prevalence remained remarkably high among pregnant women, with 7.8% and 8.8% in 2016. According to basic indicators released in 2014, the most vulnerable to the risk and HIV infection were women between 35 and 39 years (13%), pregnant women who worked as merchants (19.7%) and agricultural workers (15.4%). Women remain

unprotected.<sup>71</sup> JS1 recommended that Equatorial Guinea promote a healthcare framework that included outreach programs, testing for HIV-AIDS and protection guidelines for pregnant women at all health centers and hospitals.<sup>72</sup>

51. JS1 also reported that there was no mental health care legislation or protocols in Equatorial Guinea. It added that there were no departments of psychiatry established in public hospitals, and health care facilities dedicated to mental health were wholly insufficient. Individuals with mental health needs were at a present and constant risk of falling victim to violence and all forms of abuse.<sup>73</sup> JS1 recommended that Equatorial Guinea immediately implement effective legislation and policy regulations on mental health care and practice, that protect health care rights, and that specifically stipulate procedures on how to protect individual's rights against abuse, violence and discrimination.<sup>74</sup>

#### *Right to education*<sup>75</sup>

52. JS2 noted that the Government had taken measures that hindered girls' normal access to education, such as the issuance of Decree No. 1 of 18 July 2016 by the Ministry of Education on early pregnancy. That decree strictly prohibited access to classrooms for pregnant students.<sup>76</sup>

53. JS2 recommended drafting protocols for the annual compilation of data, disaggregated by gender, on basic indicators, including the school dropout and achievement rates and the reasons for dropout.<sup>77</sup>

54. EPIBIB indicated that many indigenous Bubi children could not go to school because of a lack of financial means, as education was not free and there was a shortage of schools on Bioko island.<sup>78</sup>

## **4. Rights of specific persons or groups**

### *Women*<sup>79</sup>

55. JS2 noted that, during the last universal periodic review, Equatorial Guinea had committed to promoting and protecting women's rights. However, inequality and discrimination against women had only worsened, especially in recent years.<sup>80</sup> There was apparently a total lack of awareness of the treaties and conventions ratified by the Government on the protection of the rights of women and combating gender-based violence.<sup>81</sup> It added that there were major inequalities throughout the country between men and women and that the Government had not taken measures to combat social stereotypes. It recommended accelerating the drafting and adoption of a law on gender equality that clearly prohibited discrimination against women.<sup>82</sup>

56. JS2 recommended that Equatorial Guinea should: accelerate the drafting and adoption of a law on gender equality that clearly prohibited discrimination against women; strengthen the capacity of the Ministry of Social Affairs and Gender Equality and provide it with sufficient human, technical and financial resources to properly carry out its mandate and increase its efficiency; and involve NGOs, especially women's organizations, in the design and implementation of policies, programmes and measures to promote gender equality and women's rights.<sup>83</sup>

57. JS2 indicated that perpetrators of physical abuse against women within marriage continued to go unpunished, as that practice was considered to be in accordance with traditional norms.<sup>84</sup> The few women who dared to report the violence committed against them by their husbands found that, as domestic violence was not classified as a specific crime, it was not treated with the necessary urgency and was dealt with as a common offence like bodily harm or assault.<sup>85</sup> JS2 considered that there were no effective legal complaint mechanisms in Equatorial Guinea to report such crimes. The local offices of the Ministry of Social Affairs and Gender Equality provided legal advice and mediation services to women who were the victims of discrimination and domestic violence. However, there were no legal mechanisms to bring complaints before the courts or ensure that perpetrators were punished.<sup>86</sup>

58. JS1 indicated that Equatorial Guinea had committed to accelerating the process of adopting specific legislation and a national action plan to combat all forms of violence against women, particularly those in vulnerable situations, including migrants, persons with disabilities and women in detention facilities.<sup>87</sup>

59. JS2 recommended: guaranteeing women's effective access to justice, including through the provision of legal assistance, and creating legal education and training mechanisms for members of the justice sector, including judges, lawyers and prosecutors; accelerating the adoption of a law providing for comprehensive protection of women to prevent, punish and eradicate the excessive violence against women prevalent in the country and guarantee strict compliance with the law; putting the national multisectoral programme to combat gender-based violence into operation; and reforming the relevant sections of the Criminal Code and other pertinent laws to address all forms of violence against women and unconditionally criminalize domestic violence.<sup>88</sup>

#### *Children*<sup>89</sup>

60. The Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) noted that the drafting of a law on children had long been under consideration. In 2011, the proposed new law, which included civil and penal measures for child protection as well as protection for children in conflict with the law, was reviewed by UNICEF. A draft Family Code and a draft Law on Gender Violence were under discussion.<sup>90</sup>

61. GIEACPC noted that though corporal punishment in Equatorial Guinea was prohibited as a sentence for a crime, it was still lawful in the home, in alternative and day care settings, in schools, and in penal institutions. It indicated that legislation should be enacted to explicitly prohibit all corporal punishment in all settings, including the home, and all legal defences for its use, including in the Civil Code 1889, should be repealed.<sup>91</sup>

62. GIEACPC noted, with relation to corporal punishment of children in the home, alternative care settings and day care, that articles 154 and 268 of the Civil Code 1889 provided for the right to administer "reasonable and moderate" correction.<sup>92</sup> With regard to schools, it noted that the Ministry of Education had launched a campaign to stop the use of corporal punishment in schools but that there was no explicit prohibition of corporal punishment in law.<sup>93</sup> Additionally, there was no explicit prohibition of corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure in penal institutions.<sup>94</sup>

63. GIEACPC stated that in the second cycle of the Universal Periodic Review the government had accepted recommendations<sup>95</sup> to "eradicate" corporal punishment.<sup>96</sup> However, since the review, there had been no change in the legality of corporal punishment. No progress had seemingly been made on the draft law on children and no bills had been introduced on the prohibition of corporal punishment of children.<sup>97</sup>

64. GIEACPC hoped that during the review in 2019 a specific recommendation would be made that Equatorial Guinea draft and enact legislation as a matter of priority to explicitly prohibit corporal punishment of children in all settings, including in the home, and repeal all legal defences for its use.<sup>98</sup>

#### *Minorities and indigenous peoples*

65. EPIBIB indicated that the Bubi indigenous people did not enjoy freedom of movement and could not easily move from one part of the island to another. Although the island covered an area of only 2,000 square kilometres, they needed government authorization to move from one town or village to another. EPIBIB reported that there were military checkpoints outside the villages, controlling people's comings and goings. This meant that contact with relatives and friends living in other villages was restricted. Furthermore, there were no Bubi representatives elected by the Bubi indigenous people, as the Government did not permit them to hold a congress at which they could elect their own representatives.<sup>99</sup>

66. EPIBIB added that the Government had converted the island into a petrochemical complex without the consent of the Bubi indigenous people. It noted that the pollution there



was apparently unbearable. The island's population density continued to grow. There was no limit on the number of foreign nationals coming to live on the island.<sup>100</sup>

67. EPIBIB reiterated its recommendations that Equatorial Guinea should: initiate a constructive dialogue in the United Nations with the Bubi people of the island of Bioko, on the basis of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; comply with article 37 of that Declaration, which required the Government to recognize the sovereignty of the Bubi people, which they had never legitimately lost, through previous agreements; and ensure that all the Bubi people from the island of Bioko who had had to flee the country could return freely, including those who had been expelled by the Government.<sup>101</sup>

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: [www.ohchr.org](http://www.ohchr.org).

### *Civil society*

#### *Individual submissions:*

AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom);
CGNK	Center for Global Nonkilling, Honolulu (United States of America);
EPIBIB	El Pueblo Indígena Bubi de la Isla de Bioko, Madrid (Spain);
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children London (United Kingdom);
ICAN	International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Geneva (Switzerland).

#### *Joint submissions:*

JS1	<b>Joint submission 1 submitted by:</b> EG Justice, Washington DC (United States of America); and the Center for Equatoguinean Studies (CESGE);
JS2	<b>Joint submission 2 submitted by:</b> Igualdad y Derechos Humanos de la Mujer em África (IDHMA), Malabo (Equatorial Guinea); la Asociación Pro Derechos Humanos de España (APDHE); EG Justice; SEJOF;
JS3	<b>Joint submission 3 submitted by:</b> ASODEGUE, Madrid (Spain); ADISI, AIDS-Free World; APDHE; CEID-GE; CESGE; EG Justice; and NEWSeta;
JS4	<b>Joint submission 4 submitted by:</b> CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Johannesburg (South Africa); Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ); Centro de Estudios e Iniciativas para el Desarrollo (CEID); ONG Cooperación y Desarrollo; EG Justice.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

- <sup>3</sup> For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/27/13, paras. 134.1-134.23, 134.48, 134.100, 134.102, 135.1-135.29, 135.54, 136.1-136.6.
- <sup>4</sup> CGNK, p. 5.
- <sup>5</sup> CGNK, p. 5 and JS3, p. 16.
- <sup>6</sup> JS3, p. 16.
- <sup>7</sup> ICAN, p. 1.
- <sup>8</sup> JS4, p. 16, para. 6.5. See also AI, p. 5.
- <sup>9</sup> For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/27/13, paras. 134.24-134.30, 134.32, 134.33 and 135.33-135.40.
- <sup>10</sup> JS3, paras. 4-5.
- <sup>11</sup> AI, pp. 4-5.
- <sup>12</sup> JS1, para. 11.
- <sup>13</sup> For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/27/13, paras. 134.34-134.42 and 135.51.
- <sup>14</sup> JS2, para. 26.
- <sup>15</sup> JS2, para. 29.
- <sup>16</sup> JS2, paras. 33-35.
- <sup>17</sup> JS1, paras. 18.
- <sup>18</sup> JS1, p. 17.
- <sup>19</sup> For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/13, paras. 134.44-134.48, 134.51-134.54, 134.59-134.60, 134.62-134.63, 135.10-135.15, 135.52-135.57, 135.60 and 135.62-135.63.
- <sup>20</sup> JS3, para. 42.
- <sup>21</sup> JS3, p. 16. See also CGNK, p. 5.
- <sup>22</sup> JS3, para. 45.
- <sup>23</sup> JS3, para. 8.
- <sup>24</sup> JS3, paras. 9-32.
- <sup>25</sup> JS3, paras. 33-34.
- <sup>26</sup> JS3, p. 16.
- <sup>27</sup> JS2, para. 24.
- <sup>28</sup> For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/13, paras. 134.51-134.54, 134.62-134.66, 135.23, 135.30, 135.41-135.43, 135.60 and 135.62-135.66.
- <sup>29</sup> JS4, para. 1.8.
- <sup>30</sup> JS3, paras. 46-47.
- <sup>31</sup> For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/13, paras. 134.39-134.40, 134.67-134.72, 135.45-135.46 and 135.68-135.76.
- <sup>32</sup> JS4, para. 4.2.
- <sup>33</sup> JS4, para. 4.3.
- <sup>34</sup> JS4, para. 4.2.
- <sup>35</sup> JS4, para. 6.3.
- <sup>36</sup> For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/13, paras. 134.26 (Spain), 134.67 (France), 134.72 (Spain), 135.68-135.71 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (Czech Republic) (Italy) (Czech Republic) and 135.75 (Canada).
- <sup>37</sup> AI, pp. 1-2.
- <sup>38</sup> JS4, para. 2.2.
- <sup>39</sup> JS1, para. 12.
- <sup>40</sup> JS2, para. 15.
- <sup>41</sup> AI, p. 2. See also JS4, para. 2.3.
- <sup>42</sup> AI, p. 2.
- <sup>43</sup> AI, p. 4.
- <sup>44</sup> JS4, para. 6.1.
- <sup>45</sup> JS4, para. 1.9.
- <sup>46</sup> JS4 paras. 3.2-3.7.
- <sup>47</sup> AI, p. 5.
- <sup>48</sup> JS4, para. 6.2.
- <sup>49</sup> JS4, para. 5.3.
- <sup>50</sup> JS4, para. 1.8.
- <sup>51</sup> JS3, paras. 57-58.

- 
- 52 JS3, p. 17.  
53 JS3, p. 17.  
54 JS2, para. 18.  
55 JS2, p. 12.  
56 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/13, paras.135.47, 135.50 and 135.67.  
57 JS2, para. 12.  
58 JS2, para. 17.  
59 JS2, para. 25.  
60 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/13, para.134.43.  
61 JS4, para. 2.6.  
62 JS4, p. 13.  
63 JS2, para. 21.  
64 JS2, para. 22.  
65 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/13, paras.134.74-134.79 and 135.78-135.79.  
66 EPIBIB, p. 1.  
67 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/13, paras.134.80-134.85, 134.101 and 135.78-135.80.  
68 JS1, p. 2, para.5.  
69 JS1, para. 6.  
70 JS1, pp. 16-17.  
71 JS1, para. 25.  
72 JS1, p. 16.  
73 JS1, paras. 29-31.  
74 JS1, p.18.  
75 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/13, paras.134.86-134.97, 135.81-135.82.  
76 JS2, para.20.  
77 JS2, p. 12.  
78 EPIBIB, p. 1.  
79 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/13, paras. 134.34-134.41, 134.54-134.58, 134.70, 134.97, 135.30-32, 135.44, 135.47-135.50, 135.67 and 135.81-135.82.  
80 JS2, para. 7.  
81 JS2, para. 9.  
82 JS2, para. 10 and p. 11.  
83 JS2, pp.11-12.  
84 JS2, para. 12.  
85 JS2, para. 13.  
86 JS2, para. 14.  
87 JS1, para. 26.  
88 JS2, pp.11-12.  
89 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/13, paras. 134.31, 134.55, 134.61 and 135.77.  
90 GIEACPC, para. 2.3.  
91 GIEACPC, p. 2.  
92 GIEACPC, paras. 2.1, 2.4 and 2.5.  
93 GIEACPC, para. 2.6.  
94 GIEACPC, para. 2.7.  
95 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/13, paras. 134.31 (Philippines) and 134.61(Djibouti).  
96 GIEACPC, para. 1.1.  
97 GIEACPC, para. 1.2.  
98 GIEACPC, para. 1.3.  
99 EPIBIB, p. 2.  
100 EPIBIB, p. 2.  
101 EPIBIB, pp. 2-3.
-