Summary of Stakeholders’ submissions on the United States of America


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 139 stakeholders’ submissions 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 and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies

2. Concerning recommendations from the previous universal periodic review (UPR) on the ratification of international instruments, HRW indicated that no new human rights treaty had been signed or ratified.


4. The USA was also called upon to ratify the Protocols I and II additional to the Geneva Conventions, the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, and the Arms Trade Treaty.

5. AI noted that the USA had not accepted requests for invitations for official visits from the Special Procedures since 2018 and that in June 2018, it had withdrawn from the Human
Rights Council.\textsuperscript{23} SBCC noted that the USA had withdrawn from the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration.\textsuperscript{24} HRW indicated that the USA had announced that it would no longer cooperate with the International Criminal Court and that in April 2019, had revoked the visa of the Prosecutor of the Court.\textsuperscript{25}

6. JS62 recommended that the USA pursue negotiations on nuclear arms control and the global elimination of nuclear weapons.\textsuperscript{26}

B. National human rights framework\textsuperscript{27}

7. JS16 recommended taking steps to create a national human rights institution.\textsuperscript{28}

8. JS5 recommended that the USA support the establishment of effective federal mechanisms to coordinate with state and local officials on international human rights monitoring and implementation regarding engagement with Treaty Bodies, Special Procedures, and the UPR.\textsuperscript{29}

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

1. Cross-cutting issues

\textit{Equality and non-discrimination}\textsuperscript{30}

9. JS5 stated that discrimination and inequality were longstanding challenges in the USA and that over the past two years there had been an increase in acts of harassment and discrimination.\textsuperscript{31}

10. Several submissions expressed concerns about certain statements and language of the Executive\textsuperscript{32} regarding, inter alia, race relations, indigenous peoples, people from African and Muslim countries, and immigrants and refugees.\textsuperscript{33}

11. CCR indicated that the USA had attempted to exclude transgender people from the military and had rescinded guidance or changed agency rules protecting LGBTQIA+ people’s access to healthcare and their rights in school.\textsuperscript{34} HRC indicated that LGBTQ people remained vulnerable to hate crimes particularly in those states that did not provide them with specific protection\textsuperscript{35} and AI reported that incidents of hate crimes based on sexual orientation or gender identity had increased each year from 2015 to 2017.\textsuperscript{36}

\textit{Development, the environment, and business and human rights}\textsuperscript{37}

12. JS54 stated that the energy policy was still mostly focused on the use of fossil fuels and that oil and gas industries benefited from favourable taxation.\textsuperscript{38} JAI noted that the USA had failed to implement effective controls over corporations contributing to greenhouse gas emissions, and was taking steps to remove regulations so that these corporations could increase their emissions.\textsuperscript{39} JS16 indicated that the USA had repealed water pollution regulations for fracking on federal and indigenous lands.\textsuperscript{40}

13. According to JS53, farmlands, and agriculture and food systems had been taken over by giant corporate monopolies who built their empires on mono-crops, genetically modified seeds, harmful pesticides, abusive livestock practices, and destructive soil technologies.\textsuperscript{41}

14. Guale-Nation invited the USA to fulfil its commitments under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.\textsuperscript{42} JS54 recommended reinstating the Paris Agreement.\textsuperscript{43}

15. Several submissions highlighted the negative impact of the imposition by the USA of unilateral coercive measures on third countries,\textsuperscript{44} in particular on the right to health,\textsuperscript{45} as well as the right to food.\textsuperscript{46}
Human rights and counter-terrorism

16. Concerning UPR recommendations regarding the closure of the Guantánamo Bay detention centre,48 several submissions noted that the prison remained open.49 IACHR-OAS condemned the Executive Order, announced in 2018, that called for the military prison facilities at Guantánamo Bay to remain open and opening the possibility that additional detainees may be transferred to the detention centre.50

17. CCR reported that forty men remained imprisoned at Guantánamo Bay and that these prisoners comprised an aging, increasingly sick population.51 AI indicated that seven of the detainees faced trials by military commission where they were eligible for the death penalty if convicted. The trial for those accused of crimes related to the 11 September 2001 attacks was scheduled to begin in 2021.52 JS40 noted concerns at the conditions of detention at the Guantánamo Bay detention centre;53 and JS59 stated that medical care was deficient and that the health condition of the detainees had worsened by their prolonged detention.54 CVT recommended that the USA allow the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment to visit Guantánamo to conduct a comprehensive assessment, including unmonitored interviews with detainees.55

18. AI stated that no perpetrators had been brought to justice for crimes, including torture and enforced disappearance, committed in the CIA-operated secret detention program authorised from 2001-2009 and that the limited investigations conducted had since been closed.56

2. Civil and political rights

Right to life, liberty and security of person

19. AI stated that under its “global war” doctrine, the USA had repeatedly resorted to lethal force in countries around the world, including using armed drones, and that despite calls for clarification, the USA was not transparent regarding the legal and policy standards and criteria applied for the use of lethal force outside the country.57

20. GICJ raised concerns about the invasion and occupation of a third country59 and lack of accountability.50 JS2 was concerned about the role of USA security assistance to a coalition engaged in an armed conflict in a third country.61 ADHRB was concerned about security assistance to a third country where there were allegations of widespread human rights abuses.62

21. ACLU reported that the use of the death penalty was in large part declining and limited to select jurisdictions, though substantial problems remained. Twenty-nine states formally retained the death penalty, as did the federal and the military systems. In these jurisdictions, it was applied in an arbitrary and discriminatory manner, based on race, geography, socioeconomic status, and the quality of representation.63 Several submissions noted that in July 2019, the Department of Justice had announced it would resume the federal death penalty,64 which had not been used since 2003.65

22. AI stated that in numerous cases, prisoners had gone to their deaths despite serious doubts about the proceedings that led to their convictions.66 Two submissions indicated that in 2002, the Supreme Court had ruled that persons with serious mental and intellectual disabilities were exempt from the death penalty.67 JS55 noted, however, that states had a wide latitude in determining what qualified as an intellectual disability resulting in inconsistencies and persons with such disabilities being sentenced to death.68

23. JS38 recommended the imposition of a moratorium on the death penalty at the federal and state level aiming at its complete abolition.69

24. Referring to recommendations on the excessive use of force by law enforcement,70 HRW stated that even when there was strong evidence of excessive, often lethal force, officers had usually not been criminally charged or otherwise held accountable.71 AI indicated that although the government did not effectively track how many such deaths occurred annually, the limited data available suggested that African Americans were disproportionately impacted by police use of lethal force.72 JS18 stated that racial profiling within policing remained pervasive.73
25. It was recommended that the USA: ensure that state legislatures introduce, or review and amend, statutes that authorize the use of lethal force to ensure they are in line with international law and standards;\(^{74}\) provide technical assistance to local governments on best practices for police use of lethal force, including de-escalation;\(^ {25}\) and commit to passing legislation that aims to reduce incidents of profiling by law enforcement.\(^ {76}\)

26. JS20 stated that the USA had taken no steps to implement UPR recommendations\(^ {77}\) on gun violence.\(^ {78}\) AmProg reported that tens of thousands of persons were killed with guns every year in suicides, homicides, and unintentional shootings.\(^ {79}\) JS20 indicated that roughly two-thirds of gun deaths were suicides.\(^ {80}\)

27. Several submissions stated that a large number of gun-related deaths and injuries disproportionately affected racial and ethnic minorities;\(^ {81}\) particularly impacting African American men.\(^ {82}\)

28. JS30 indicated that mass shootings took place with alarming frequency\(^ {83}\) and that school shootings had become a common occurrence.\(^ {84}\)

29. Several submissions noted reports that firearm related injuries was the second leading cause of death for children and adolescents.\(^ {85}\) JS30 noted that there were no federal laws mandating the use of safe storage of firearms in households with children.\(^ {86}\)

30. BRADY stated that more than half of all women murdered in the country were murdered by an intimate partner and half of these murders were caused by firearms.\(^ {87}\) AmProg noted that that though federal law prohibited persons convicted of domestic violence crimes or subject to a restraining order from owning a gun, gaps remained leaving victims of domestic violence vulnerable.\(^ {88}\)

31. BRADY indicated that certain laws contributed to the gun violence epidemic by providing special protections for gun dealers with inadequate business practices.\(^ {89}\) Several stakeholders indicated that certain laws protected the gun industry from liability in most tort actions; and had led to a near complete ban on federally-funded research related to firearms and gun violence, severely decreasing the Center for Disease Control and Prevention’s funding for such research.\(^ {90}\)

32. It was recommended that the USA: improve and expand the background check system to cover all firearms transactions;\(^ {91}\) adopt a ban on assault-style semi-automatic rifles and high-capacity magazines;\(^ {92}\) and support safe storage laws.\(^ {93}\)

33. CGJC stated that the USA had failed to implement UPR recommendations\(^ {94}\) on sexual violence in the military.\(^ {95}\) Servicewomen and men reporting violence were still frequently subjected to retaliation and barred from seeking civil or constitutional remedies in federal civilian courts.\(^ {96}\)

34. AFSC noted reports on the use of extreme solitary confinement, often for years, from people in prisons, jails and immigrant detention facilities.\(^ {97}\) JS55 stated that typically people under sentence of death were held in solitary confinement.\(^ {98}\)

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law\(^ {99}\)

35. HRW indicated that racial disparities persisted throughout the criminal justice system;\(^ {100}\) and AFSC noted reports that African Americans were nearly six times more likely and Hispanics were over three times more likely to be incarcerated.\(^ {101}\)

36. JS24 stated that over the past four decades the prison population had quadrupled, resulting in the phenomena of mass incarceration.\(^ {102}\) JAI indicated that many persons were detained in pre-trial detention due to an inability to post bail, contributing to the high levels of incarceration.\(^ {103}\)

37. ACLU indicated that one in nine people in prison were serving life sentences, more than a third of whom were sentenced to life without the possibility of parole.\(^ {104}\) Since the mid-1970s, there had been an explosive growth in the number of people serving life and life-without-parole sentences, largely because of “tough-on crime” policies that drove state and federal legislators to pass laws creating draconian sentencing and parole schemes.\(^ {105}\)
38. HRW stated that a significant proportion of non-violent offenders had convictions for drug offenses that would be better addressed through an approach focused on treatment and public health. JS46 stated that the privatization of prisons and detention centres incentivized mass incarceration.

39. JS24 reported that the number of women who were incarcerated continued to grow, noting, particularly, the dramatic increase of African American women who were incarcerated.

40. JS31 stated that incarceration contributed to poverty by creating employment barriers, making access to public benefits difficult and disrupting communities. Justice-Strategies referred to research indicating that mass incarceration involving generations of young Black men and women had devastating effects on their children.

41. ACLU stated that in 2018 federal legislation (the First Step Act) had been passed, including important sentencing reform provisions but that much more comprehensive reform was required. It was recommend that: congress and state legislatures enact comprehensive sentencing reform legislation, including federal legislation that eliminates mandatory minimums for drug crimes; and treating drug addiction as a public health issue.

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life

42. DRAD stated that in recent years the USA had used the Espionage Act against whistleblowers who acted as sources for journalists, and recently for publishing information from a whistleblower.

43. DRAD stated that a number of states and even the federal government had considered or passed laws aimed at chilling protest. JS36 reported that in June 2019, the federal government had announced that it would seek to expand criminal penalties for pipeline protests, which was followed by numerous anti-protest bills proposed by 35 state legislatures, 16 of which had passed into law. DRAD indicated that some 27 states had adopted laws aimed at proponents of the Boycotts, Divestment and Sanctions movement and noted challenges in the courts to such laws but indicated they remained on the books in many states.

44. FLD indicated that human rights defenders working with migrants and asylum seekers, particularly at the border, were being criminalised, intimidated and harassed by both state and non-state actors. IACHR-OAS called on the USA to adopt measures to ensure an environment in which immigrant human rights defenders can do their work freely, without threat of immigration detention and deportation.

45. JS11 stated that there were many obstacles and barriers to people voting including: the fact that people were required to vote on a weekday making it difficult for working people to vote; registration and identification requirements; and purges of a high number of persons from voter rolls. AFSC reported that mass incarceration, and the consequences of certain criminal convictions had disenfranchised many African Americans.

46. Several submissions highlighted that the citizens of Washington D.C. did not have voting representation in the federal Congress.

47. OSCE/ODIHR recommended, inter alia, that states refrain from introducing voter identification requirements that have or could have a discriminatory impact on voters; and consider establishing independent bodies to draw district boundaries, noting that districting should respect the equality of the vote, not discriminate against any group, and be free from political influence. It also recommended that citizens residing in the District of Columbia be provided with full representation rights in Congress.

Prohibition of all forms of slavery

48. JS51 stated that policy on trafficking remained heavily focused on domestic sex trafficking, leaving labour trafficking victims with fewer protections. JS18 stated that young girls coerced into sex trafficking were often treated as perpetrators rather than victims and faced unnecessary prison sentences. JS12 stated that employers must be held accountable for labour trafficking.
49. JS51 recommended requiring federal immigration enforcement officers to effectively screen to identify victims of human trafficking prior to detaining or removing a person from the country.\(^{135}\)

**Right to privacy and family life**\(^{136}\)

50. EPIC stated that the law did not prevent arbitrary or unlawful interference with the right to privacy in conducting foreign intelligence surveillance and that wide ranging surveillance continued.\(^{137}\) JS32 was concerned at the use of surveillance, particularly targeting the Muslim community.\(^{138}\)

51. EPIC indicated that the USA had failed to protect the right to privacy with respect to private sector data collection and use, and that the country still lacked both a data protection authority and comprehensive privacy legislation.\(^{139}\) AccessNow recommended the implementation of a comprehensive data privacy and protection framework that would guarantee fundamental privacy rights and control over one’s personal information for everyone whose data passes through the USA, whether it be through a government agency or private company.\(^{140}\)

52. JS45 stated that due to the complexity of international adoption procedures, a large number of adoptees, although legally adopted, never received U.S. citizenship.\(^{141}\)

3. **Economic, social and cultural rights**

**Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work**\(^{142}\)

53. JS51 stated that though both federal and state law guaranteed protections to workers, penalties for non-compliant employers were minimal; and that the agencies charged with enforcing those laws lacked resources and were complaint-driven.\(^{143}\) JS51 also indicated that problems faced by workers to secure their wages and other workplace rights were exacerbated in industries with high subcontracting rates;\(^{144}\) and that migrant workers, especially those with irregular status, were particularly vulnerable to labour exploitation.\(^{145}\)

54. JS49 highlighted that domestic workers and farmworkers had been exempted from the protections afforded to most workers by the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) and the National Labor Relations Act.\(^{146}\) JS23 stated that due to exemptions to the FLSA, child protection was minimal for agriculture, and indicated that a high number of predominately Hispanic children harvested produce, working very long hours, and that the high-school dropout rate for these children was high.\(^{147}\)

55. JS51 recommended that the USA remove exemptions from the FLSA so that all workers receive minimum wage and overtime protections, regardless of industry or type of worker, especially in high risk industries such as construction, domestic service, and agriculture.\(^{148}\)

56. JS54 stated that penal labour carried out by government or private operations, exacerbated poverty as prisoners were paid far less than the federal minimum wage.\(^{149}\) Two submissions indicated that individuals in the Voluntary Work Programs in immigration detention centres were paid about $1 per day.\(^{150}\)

**Right to an adequate standard of living**\(^{151}\)

57. JS47 stated that racial minority populations often experienced higher hunger rates linked to the poverty rates experienced by such groups, noting the higher poverty rates for African Americans and Hispanics.\(^{152}\) HRC indicated that LGBTQ families and older adults were at an increased risk of poverty.\(^{153}\) JS53 highlighted that the Native American population suffered from high poverty and unemployment rates.\(^{154}\)

58. JS58 indicated that the law provided no entitlement to housing assistance for low income people; and that recognition of a right to even basic shelter was extremely limited to a few communities.\(^{155}\) Two submissions reported that encampments had increased significantly since 2007.\(^{156}\) Several submissions referred to the criminalisation of homeless persons for engaging in life sustaining activities.\(^{157}\)
JS24 stated that institutional problems the Fair Housing Act was designed to solve, such as inequality in mortgage lending and landlords who avoided renting to minorities, endured. JS53 stressed that homelessness and the inability to access affordable housing was a reality for indigenous peoples, and that the 2018 cut of the US Department of Housing and Urban Development budget had severely impacted indigenous communities.

It was recommended that the USA affirm housing as a human right and commit to its implementation in a non-discriminatory way; and increase enforcement of existing fair housing and lending laws.

JS4 stated that many rural communities lacked access to basic sanitation and that there was a lack of political will to fully investigate the problem and its impacts and to provide adequate infrastructure funding.

Right to health

HRW stated that despite accepting UPR recommendations related to health-care, federal and state authorities continued to take actions to restrict access to health-care, targeting changes to the Medicaid program, private insurance subsidies, and other key elements of the 2010 Affordable Care Act (ACA).

JS1 stated that the wealth inequality increased inequality in health care because of the private insurance financing, with numerous coverage gaps. Higher levels of income inequality coincided with increased mortality for lower income individuals, and inequality in life expectancy was growing.

JS1 noted reports that from 2013-2016, medical problems and expenditures contributed to personal bankruptcies. JS37 stated that health issues increased the risk of homelessness and that individuals experiencing homelessness lacked access to quality health care.

JS1 stated that suicide was the 10th cause of mortality in 2017, rising every year from 2008 indicating that Native Americans and Alaska Natives had the highest rates and veterans took their lives at the rate of some 20 deaths per day.

JS42 stated that about one in every 5 deaths in the USA was due to tobacco.

HRW reported on the deaths of tens of thousands of Americans of drug overdose in 2017 and stated that the USA’s response to the crisis was increasingly punitive. In many states, criminal laws blocked expansion of proven public health interventions, such as syringe exchange programs and supervised consumption sites. Reduced access to Medicaid, threatened to put drug treatment out of reach for millions of Americans.

Several submissions noted the high and increasing rates of maternal mortality; particularly among black women; but also among indigenous women, low income women and women in poor rural areas. PPFA indicated that, according to reports, maternal mortality was the sixth most common cause of death among women aged 25-34. JS14 stated that the lack of systematically collected maternal mortality and morbidity data precluded comparisons across states and regions and undermined accountability for preventable maternal deaths.

AI was gravely concerned about the curtailment of sexual and reproductive rights, specifically, increasing efforts to criminalize pregnancy and abortion, and limiting access to reproductive health services.

Highlighting the Mexico City policy, several submissions were concerned about restrictions to foreign assistance related to abortion, while two submissions welcomed such restrictions.

HRW highlighted the adoption of a rule in 2019 to ban organizations providing abortion services from receiving federal family planning money, known as Title X, and to eliminate a requirement that doctors give neutral and factual information to pregnant women.

SRI stated that religious freedom had become an “opt out” strategy used to deny services related to health care, abortion and contraception, and that many such efforts
promoted discrimination against often already-marginalized groups. JS14 stated that an array of federal and state laws permitted individual and institutional health care providers to opt out of providing critical health services, including abortion (46 states) and contraception (12 states). Two submissions welcomed action taken by the USA to support persons voicing religious or moral objections to abortion.

73. JS14 stated that a number of state legislatures were enacting increasingly extreme abortion bans, noting that these state laws were the subject of ongoing litigation. Several stakeholders indicated that some of these bans made no exceptions for rape or for ectopic pregnancies, and that many women seeking an abortion must now travel as abortion services were not available.

74. UFI was concerned about third party reproduction including surrogacy.

75. interACT reported that children with intersex traits had been, and continued to be, subjected to unnecessary medical interventions without their consent.

Right to education

76. USHRN-SEWG stated that in the public education system, school funding was based primarily on local taxes, creating a system where wealthier neighbourhoods had wealthier schools. Low-income, often immigrant, primarily communities of colour did not have the same access to the same standard of education as wealthier communities.

77. JS50 recommended that the USA fully implement UPR recommendation in paragraph 176.319 by enhancing the quality of education in low income areas.

78. It was also recommended that the USA take steps to implement human rights education; and ensure that education in human rights and international humanitarian law is provided in public schools, colleges and universities.

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women

79. UNA-USA stated that the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) had lapsed in February 2019 and was yet to be renewed by Congress. Several organizations recommended that the Senate ratify the reauthorization of the VAWA.

80. JS12 stated that sexual violence against women and girls remained a prevalent issue, and that young girls were at the highest risk. JS24 indicated that women of African-descent faced higher instances of domestic violence; and JS12 stated that LGBTI people and women of colour had less access to support services. JS49 stated that low-paid migrant women workers risked deportation if they reported gender-based violence (GBV).

81. AI stated that indigenous women suffered disproportionately high levels of rape and sexual violence. CS noted that indigenous women were murdered at much higher rates; that many were reported missing, and that many serious crimes committed on Tribal lands fell under a mishmash of federal, state and Tribal jurisdictions, and were difficult to prosecute. TTIP alliance recommended fully funding the investigation of Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and setting up a special commission within the FBI to coordinate efforts with state, local, and tribal law enforcement.

82. JS49 indicated that workplace harassment remained a persistent and under-reported problem; and that women experienced various forms of sexual misconduct in hostile working environments.

83. JS12 stated that women still faced a significant gender wage gap. JS50 observed that progress to close the gender pay gap was extremely slow and that for women of colour the rate of change was slower.
Children

84. GIEACPC noted that the prohibition of corporal punishment of children had not been achieved in the home, and in some alternative care settings, day care, schools and penal institutions.

85. CFYJ stated that all 50 states allowed children to be transferred to adult courts in some manner resulting in tens of thousands children being tried as adults each year. HRW indicated that over one thousand people were serving sentences of life without parole for crimes they were found to have committed while under 18 and recommended that the USA commit to ending the trial of children as adults and ending life-without-parole sentences for crimes committed as children.

86. JS12 recommended passing a federal law banning child marriage.

Persons with disabilities

87. JS34 stated that women, girls, and non-binary persons with disabilities faced challenges in accessing quality health information and services, often created by discrimination and stereotypes. JS34 recommended enforcing the Americans with Disabilities Act’s requirement of non-discrimination and reasonable accommodation concerning health facilities and services.

Indigenous peoples

88. Guale-Nation invited the USA to implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), as pledged in the 2nd UPR cycle. Two organizations recommended incorporating UNDRIP into domestic policies and laws.

89. CS stated that the Non-recognized Tribes faced an expensive and daunting process to submit applications for acknowledgement, noting that federal services reserved for Native Americans and Alaska Natives were contingent on securing federal recognition.

90. JS21 stated that the USA had not taken concrete measures to protect sacred places for the Navajo people from business developments. HIHR made similar observations regarding the Kanaka Maoli of Hawai‘i.

91. CS referred to increasingly difficult battles for land and protection of natural resources, illustrating increasing federal disregard for indigenous sovereignty in favour of business and competitive interests. JS53 reported on the pollution and extermination of fragile eco-systems that indigenous peoples depended on for their livelihood, resulting in forced displacement of people. CS recommended that the USA ensure indigenous participation in decision-making in all matters affecting them.

92. Two submissions referred to the denial of the right to self-determination of the Hawaiian people. JS57 asserted the right of Alaska and Hawaii to claim self-determination and self-governance.

Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers

93. UNA-SNY stated that beginning in 2017, the USA had issued several executive orders or taken other actions designed to restrict immigration. JS28 indicated that the government had issued a series of executive orders and proclamations, including some which became known as “Muslim travel bans”, that undermined refugee protection. AI stated that resettlement of refugees to the USA had plummeted.

94. JS56 stated that as of May 2018, the USA had pursued a policy of “zero tolerance” toward migrants attempting to cross the border at places other than ports of entry. Under the policy, all adults entering without inspection at the border would face criminal prosecution. HBI indicated that since immigrant children could not be detained with their parents in adult prisons, they were detained separately. JS3 stated that this policy made no exceptions for asylum seekers.

95. JS28 indicated that on 20 June 2018, an Executive Order was issued ending the separation of immigrant children from their parents. However, the order failed to reunite all
children with their parents. JS56 indicated that on 26 June 2018, a District Court granted a preliminary injunction to end, at least temporarily, the practice of family separation.

JS3 highlighted the adoption of the “Migrant Protection Protocols” (MPP) forcibly sending asylum seekers to a neighbouring country pending their immigration hearings. JS56 stated that as a result of MPPs, vulnerable individuals were often forced to live in unstable camps or on the streets in a neighbouring country while awaiting the eventual adjudication of their asylum claims in the USA.

Several submissions highlighted a decision announced in June 2018 that curtailed claims of domestic and gang violence as relevant factors in asylum cases.

JS56 stated that as a result of MPPs, vulnerable individuals were often forced to live in unstable camps or on the streets in a neighbouring country while awaiting the eventual adjudication of their asylum claims in the USA.

Several submissions highlighted a decision announced in June 2018 that curtailed claims of domestic and gang violence as relevant factors in asylum cases.

MWAN was concerned with changes in the procedure of the medical “deferred action” policy which permitted immigrants with medical needs or their relatives to avoid deportation while they were undergoing treatment.

Several submissions noted reports of inhumane conditions of detention of migrants including severe overcrowding, exposure to extreme temperatures, and lack of adequate access to food, water, medical care, and hygiene products. JS28 stated that sexual assault and abuse of migrants in detention was a serious concern.

JS35 indicated that U.S. law offered no definition of statelessness, nor a procedure for identifying stateless persons. Certain loopholes increased the risk of statelessness regarding children born to surrogate parents outside of the USA.

5. Specific regions or territories

UNPO noted the disenfranchisement of the people of the five, permanently-inhabited, “unincorporated” U.S. territories (Puerto Rico, Guam, U.S. Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands). JS27 was concerned about the effect of the non-self-governing status of the U.S Virgin Islands on the exercise by the population of their right to self-determination.

AHRC highlighted that the support provided in response to Hurricane Maria in Puerto Rico, had been much less than that provided for another similar event.

OSCE/ODIHR recommended that citizens residing in U.S. overseas territories be provided with full representation rights in Congress and indicated additionally that the right to vote in presidential elections should be extended to them.
Notes

1 The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org.

Civil society

Individual submissions:

AccessNow, AccessNow, New York (United States of America);
ACLU, American Civil Liberties Union, New York (United States of America);
ADHRB, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
AFSC, American Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia (United States of America);
AHRC, Atlantic Human Rights Centre, Fredericton (Canada);
AI, Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
AISSA, Association of Iranian Short Statured Adults, Tehran (Islamic Republic of Iran);
AmPro, Center for American Progress, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
ASHNYM, At-sik:hata :Nation of :Yamasee-Moors, New York (United States of America);
BRADY, Brady Center to Prevent Gun Violence, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
CCR, Center for Constitutional Rights, New York (United States of America);
CEIN, Creative Educators International Network Inc., Washington D.C. (United States of America);
C-FAM, Center for Family and Human Rights, New York (United States of America);
CFYJ, Campaign for Youth Justice, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
CGJC, Cornell Gender Justice Clinic, Ithaca (United States of America);
CLSIIRC, Columbia Law School Immigrants' Rights Clinic, New York (United States of America);
CNWN, Network of Women's Non-governmental Organizations in the Islamic Republic of Iran, Tehran (Islamic Republic of Iran);
CS, Cultural Survival, Cambridge (United States of America);
CVT, The Center for Victims of Torture, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
DHF, The Dui Hua Foundation, San Francisco (United States of America);
DRAD, Defending Rights & Dissent, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
ECLJ, European Centre for Law and Justice, Strasbourg (France);
EPIC, Electronic Privacy Information Center, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
FFF, Four Freedoms Forum, Kaneohe (United States of America);
FHA Iran, Family Health Association of Iran, Tehran (Islamic Republic of Iran);
FLD, Front Line Defenders - The International Foundation for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders, Blackrock (Ireland);
GICJ, Geneva International Centre for Justice, Vernier (Switzerland);
GIEACPC, Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
GJC, Global Justice Center, New York (United States of America);
GLC, Giffords Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence, San Francisco (United States of America);
Guale-Nation, Guale Nation, Savannah (United States of America);
Haas Institute, Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society, Berkeley.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HBI</td>
<td>Hope Border Institute, El Paso (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGCRI</td>
<td>Harlan Group for Civil Rights Inc., Hato Rey (Puerto Rico);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIHR</td>
<td>Hawai‘i Institute for Human Rights, Honolulu (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HREUSA</td>
<td>Human Rights Educators USA, Ithaca (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRW</td>
<td>Human Rights Watch, Geneva (Switzerland);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC</td>
<td>Human Rights Campaign, Washington D.C. (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAPD</td>
<td>The International Alliance for Peace and Development, Geneva (Switzerland);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAN</td>
<td>International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Geneva (Switzerland);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLA</td>
<td>International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, Den Haag (The Netherlands);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILIA</td>
<td>Ertegha Keyfiat Zendegi Iranian Charitable Institute, Tehran (Islamic Republic of Iran);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interACT</td>
<td>interACT: Advocates for Intersex Youth, Sudbury (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAI</td>
<td>Just Atonement Inc., New York (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice-Strategies</td>
<td>Justice Strategies, Toronto (Canada);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSFA</td>
<td>Lovers of Successful Families Association, Theran (Islamic Republic of Iran);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCCR</td>
<td>Minneapolis Commission on Civil Rights, Minneapolis (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCLI</td>
<td>Meiklejohn Civil Liberties Institute, Berkeley (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGEC</td>
<td>Maryam Ghasemi Educational Charity Institute, Theran (Islamic Republic of Iran);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSAUIP</td>
<td>Medical Support Association for Underprivileged Iranian Patients, Theran (Islamic Republic of Iran);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWAN</td>
<td>Medical Whistleblower Advocacy Network, Washington D.C. (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRPTT</td>
<td>Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational Transparty, Rome (Italy);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODVV</td>
<td>Organization for Defending Victim of Violence, Tehran (Islamic Republic of Iran);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC(USA)</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (USA), New York (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHR</td>
<td>Physicians for Human Rights, New York (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPFA</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood Federation of America, New York (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests for Life</td>
<td>Priests for Life, Cocoa (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBCC</td>
<td>Southern Border Communities Coalition, San Diego (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCU-IHRC</td>
<td>Santa Clara University - International Human Rights Clinic, Santa Clara (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIPC</td>
<td>Southeast Indigenous Peoples’ Center, Eatonon (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRI</td>
<td>The Sexual Rights Initiative, Ottawa (Canada);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students for D.C. Statehood</td>
<td>Students for D.C. Statehood, Washington D.C. (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Harvest</td>
<td>The Harvest, Tempe (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKF</td>
<td>The Koani Foundation, Lihue (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP alliance</td>
<td>TIP alliance, Seattle (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCCHRE</td>
<td>University and College Consortium for Human Rights Education, New York (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNA UH-Manoa</td>
<td>United Nations Association, University of Hawaii - Manoa, Honolulu (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNA-SNY</td>
<td>United Nations Association - Southern New York State Division, Ossining (United States of America);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNA-USA</td>
<td>United Nations Association of the United States of America,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNPO  Washington D.C. (United States of America);
Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization, The Hague
(The Netherlands);

USHRN-SEWG  U.S. Human Rights Network Students & Education Working
Group, San Diego (United States of America);

UST Profile Center  University of St. Thomas Prolife Center, Saint Paul (United
States of America).

Joint submissions:

JS1  Joint submission 1 submitted by: National Lawyers Guild;
International Association of Democratic Lawyers; People’s
Action Institute; Rights and Democracy Institute; New York
(United States of America);

JS2  Joint submission 2 submitted by: Americans for Democracy
and Human Rights in Bahrain; European Centre for Democracy
and Human Rights; Washington D.C. (United States of
America);

JS3  Joint submission 3 submitted by: MADRE; Human Rights
and Gender Justice Clinic; Center for Gender & Refugee
Studies; Florence Immigrant and Refugee Rights Project; New
York (United States of America);

JS4  Joint submission 4 submitted by: The Center for Rural
Enterprise and Environmental Justice; The Columbia Law
School Human Rights Institute; The Program on Economic,
Social and Cultural Rights in the Institute for the Study of
Human Rights at Columbia University; New York (United
States of America);

JS5  Joint submission 5 submitted by: Columbia Law School
Human Rights Institute; The International Association of
Official Human Rights Agencies; New York (United States of
America);

JS6  Joint submission 6 submitted by: New York Campaign for
Alternatives to Isolated Confinement / #HALTsolitary
Campaign; Citizen Action of New York; NAMI NYS Criminal
Justice; NAMI Huntington; New Hour for Women and
Children; T’ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights;
VOCAL-NY; New York (United States of America);

JS7  Joint submission 7 submitted by: The United Nations
Association-New York; The United Nations Association-
Greater Detroit; The United Nations Association of the United
States of America; New York (United States of America);

JS8  Joint submission 8 submitted by: The United Nations
Association-Saint Louis Chapter; The United Nations
Association-Southern New York State Division; Saint Louis
(United States of America);

JS9  Joint submission 9 submitted by: Indigenous Alliance
Without Borders/ Alianza Indígena Sin Fronteras; International
Mayan League; Tucson (United States of America);

JS10  Joint submission 10 submitted by: International Human
Rights Clinic of Seattle University School of Law; Global
Rights Advocacy; Seattle (United States of America);

JS11  Joint submission 11 submitted by: National Lawyers Guild;
International Association of Democratic Lawyers; New York
(United States of America);

JS12  Joint submission 12 submitted by: The United Nations
Association-Southern California Division; The United Nations
Association-Greater Chicago Chapter; The United Nations
Association-Greater Detroit Chapter; The United Nations
Association-Kentucky Division; The United Nations
Association-Whittier Chapter; The United Nations Association
of the United States of America; Santa Monica (United States
of America);

JS13  Joint submission 13 submitted by: The United Nations
Association —Westchester Chapter; The United Nations
Association — Southern New York State Division; Hastings (United States of America);

**Joint submission 14 submitted by:** The Center for Reproductive Rights; Abortion Care Network; Amnesty International; Black Mamas Matter Alliance; The City University of New York Law School, Human Rights and Gender Justice Clinic; National Advocates for Pregnant Women; If/When/How: Lawyering for Reproductive Justice, National Asian Pacific American Women’s Forum, SisterSong, Women of Color Reproductive Justice Collective, Women Enabled International; Geneva (Switzerland);

**Joint submission 15 submitted by:** Birmingham City University, Pace University; Birmingham (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);

**Joint submission 16 submitted by:** Edmund Rice International, Augustinians International; Dominican Leadership Conference; Tri-State Coalition for responsible investment; Religious of the sacred heart of Mary; International Presentation Association; Congregation of Notre Dame; Vivat International; Loretto Community; Maryknoll; The Congregation of our lady charity of the good; Geneva (Switzerland).

**Joint submission 17 submitted by:** The United Nations Associations-University of Hawai‘i Manoa Chapter, The United Nations Associations Southern New York State Division; Honolulu (United States of America);

**Joint submission 18 submitted by:** Blacks in Law Enforcement of America; The United Nations Association — Southern New York State Division; White Plains (United States of America);

**Joint submission 19 submitted by:** University of Dayton Human Rights Center; Border Network for Human Rights; Dayton (United States of America);

**Joint submission 20 submitted by:** International Law Association, American Branch, Subcommittee on U.S. Compliance with International Human Rights Law; International Human Rights Law Institute, DePaul University College of Law; Just Planet; Human Rights Research League; Phoenix (United States of America);

**Joint submission 21 submitted by:** Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission; Diné Hataałii Association Inc.; Saint Michaels (United States of America);

**Joint submission 22 submitted by:** Lawyer Moms of America; Project Amplify; Woodinville (United States of America);

**Joint submission 23 submitted by:** US Human Rights Network with the contribution of 78 organisations and stakeholders; Atlanta (United States of America);

**Joint submission 24 submitted by:** World Council of Churches Commission of the Churches on International Affairs; National Council of Churches of the Christ USA; Geneva (Switzerland);

**Joint submission 25 submitted by:** Friends of the African Union; New Future Foundation; The African Diaspora Directorate; Friends of African Union EDecorp; Friends of Africans Union PBFS, Congress of Black Native Americans; Infinity Building Economics/Black Political Action Committee; Friends of African Union smartWISE; Black Methodist for Church Renewal Chapter of Keys of the Kingdom; United Methodist Church; Congress of Black Native Americans; Infinity Building Economics/Black Political Action Committee; Friends of Africans Union Mighty Forefront; Friends of Africans Union Ghana; Sons and Daughters of Africa; Friends of African Union Zimbabwe; Friends of African Union Ethiopia; The Universal Negro Improvement Association
and African Communities League; The Town of Forth Coffee; CASH Community Development; Cincinnati (United States of America);

JS26 **Joint submission 26** submitted by: Puente Human Rights Movement; Coalición de Derechos Humanos; Poder in Action; South Texas Human Rights Center; The Border Network for Human Rights; The Rio Grande Valley-Equal Voice Network; The University of Dayton Human Rights Center; Trans Queer Pueblo; Phoenix (United States of America);

JS27 **Joint submission 27** submitted by: Virgin Islands Youth Advocacy Coalition Inc.; Virgin Islands Rastafari Sacramental Cannabis Council Inc.; Christiansted (United States Virgin Islands);

JS28 **Joint submission 28** submitted by: The Advocates for Human Rights; Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Immigrant Law Center of Minnesota; ISAIAH; Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition; Northwest Immigrant Rights Project; Minneapolis (United States of America);

JS29 **Joint submission 29** submitted by: National Advocates for Pregnant Women; If/When/How: Lawyering for Reproductive Justice; Movement for Family Power; All-Options; Amnesty International; Birth Rights Bar Association; Black Mamas Matter Alliance; Center for Reproductive Rights; Human Rights and Gender Justice Clinic, City University of New York Law School; Human Rights Watch; National Network of Abortion Funds; Rise; SisterReach; Women and Harm Reduction International Network; Women’s Rights and Empowerment Network; The Yellowhammer Fund; New York (United States of America);

JS30 **Joint submission 30** submitted by: The Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute at Washington University School of Law; The Institute for Public Health of Washington University in St. Louis; Saint Louis (United States of America);

JS31 **Joint submission 31** submitted by: Pittsburgh Human Rights City Alliance; Casa san Jose; Hill District Consensus Group; Just Harvest; Pittsburgh for CEDAW; Pittsburghers for Public Transit; Pittsburgh (United States of America);

JS32 **Joint submission 32** submitted by: Justice for Muslims Collective; Muslim Justice League; Washington D.D. (United States of America)

JS33 **Joint submission 33** submitted by: The DC Human Rights City Alliance; The United Nations Association of the National Capital Area; George Washington University Law School International Human Rights Clinic; Washington D.C. (United States of America);

JS34 **Joint submission 34** submitted by: Women Enabled International; The Lurie Institute for Disability Policy at Brandeis University’s Heller School; Washington D.C. (United States of America);

JS35 **Joint submission 35** submitted by: Gender Justice Project at the University of the District of Columbia David A. Clarke School of Law; United Nations Association of the National Capital Area; Washington D.C. (United States of America);

JS36 **Joint submission 36** submitted by: University of Arizona Indigenous Peoples Law and Policy Program, Water Protector Legal Collective; Tucson (United States of America);

JS37 **Joint submission 37** submitted by: Human Rights Clinic; University of Miami School of Law; Environmental Justice Clinic, University of Miami School of Law; The Alliance for GLBTQ Youth; Struggle for Miami’s Affordable and Sustainable Housing; Miami Workers Center; National Economic & Social Rights Initiative; Coral Gables (United States of America);
Joint submission 38 submitted by: Fédération Internationale de l'Action des Chrétiens pour l'Abolition de la Torture; ACAT USA; Paris (France);

Joint submission 39 submitted by: International Transport Workers' Federation; International Association of Machinists and Aerospace workers; London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);

Joint submission 40 submitted by: The World Organisation against Torture; REDRESS; The International Commission of Jurists; Geneva (Switzerland);

Joint submission 41 submitted by: The Gwich’in Steering Committee; Cultural Survival; Land is Life; First Peoples Worldwide; American Indian Law Clinic at the University of Colorado; Fairbanks (United States of America);

Joint submission 42 submitted by: Action on Smoking & Health; The African American Tobacco Control Leadership Council; Corporate Accountability International; Austrian Council on Smoking and Health; Centro de Investigacion para la Epidemiologia del Tabaquismo; Cigarette Butt Pollution Project; Comité National Contre le Tabagisme; European Network for Smoking and Tobacco Prevention; International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease; Jeewaka Foundation; New Voi Association of the Phils Inc.; Public Health Advocacy Institute; Southeast Asia Tobacco Control Alliance; Tanzania Tobacco Control Forum; UBINIG- Policy Research for Development Alternatives; Washington D.C. (United States of America);

Joint submission 43 submitted by: Red Venezolana de Derechos Humanos; Sures; Genero con Clase; Embajada de Derechos Humanos; Red Ciega; Fundación por el Derecho a la Vivienda; Rompiendo la Norma; Base Lésbica Venezuela; Intersaber; Asociación Venezolana de Juristas; Fundación de Víctimas del Sicariato Campesino; Participación Activa y Social, por los Derechos de la Mujer y la Paz; La Araña Feminista; Caracas (Venezuela);

Joint submission 44 submitted by: Best Practices Policy Project; Outlaw Project; Black Sex Workers Collective; New Jersey Red Umbrella Alliance; Desiree Alliance; Morristown (United States of America);

Joint submission 45 submitted by: Institute on Statelessness and Inclusion; United Stateless; Americas Network on Nationality and Statelessness; Eindhoven (The Netherlands);

Joint submission 46 submitted by: U.S. Human Rights Cities Alliance; US Human Rights Network; All Aboard for Justice; Creative Educators International Network; DC Human Rights City Alliance; Malcolm X Grassroots Movement; Medical Whistleblower Advocacy Network; Pittsburgh Human Rights City Alliance; Protect the Protest Task Force; Ubuntu Institute for Community Development; Turn South; Westside Justice; Pittsburgh (United States of America);

Joint submission 47 submitted by: Human Rights Clinic, University of Miami School of Law; Why Hunger; IFAN International; Food Studies Program at Syracuse University; Center for Hunger-Free Communities; Coral Gables (United States of America);

Joint submission 48 submitted by: University of Miami School of Law Human Rights Clinic; Rural Women’s Health Project; Florida Legal Services; Florida Council Against Sexual Violence; Coral Gables (United States of America);

Joint submission 49 submitted by: University of Miami School of Law Human Rights Clinic; Miami Workers Center; WeCount!; Community Justice Project; National Domestic Workers Alliance; Coral Gables (United States of America);
Joint submission 50 submitted by: Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice; International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education, and Development; Veyrier (Switzerland);

Joint submission 51 submitted by: Centro de Trabajadores Unidos en la Lucha; The Advocates for Human Rights; Minneapolis (United States of America);

Joint submission 52 submitted by: Center for Global Nonkilling; Conscience and Peace Tax International; Geneva (Switzerland);

Joint submission 53 submitted by: Pocasset Pokanoket Land Trust; The Land and Water Sovereignty Campaign Project; Pocasset Wampanoag Tribe of the Pokanoket Nation; Indigenous People’s Network; Auburn (United States of America);

Joint submission 54 submitted by: Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom; Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom United States of America; Geneva (Switzerland);

Joint submission 55 submitted by: The Advocates for Human Rights; World Coalition Against the Death Penalty; Minneapolis (United States of America);

Joint submission 56 submitted by: International Law Association, American Branch, Task Force on Immigrant Human Rights and Women’s Rights; The International Refugee Assistance Project; The National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers Guild; The Interdisciplinary Human Rights Initiative of the College of Arts and Letters at San Diego State University; The Leitner Center for International Law and Justice at Fordham Law School; Iowa City (United States of America);

Joint submission 57 submitted by: Indigenous Peoples and Nations Coalition; The Koani Foundation; Geneva (Switzerland);

Joint submission 58 submitted by: National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty; Global Initiative for Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights; Human Rights Clinic, University of Miami School of Law; Washington D.C. (United States of America);

Joint submission 59 submitted by: The Center for Victims of Torture; Physicians for Human Rights; Washington D.C. (United States of America);

Joint submission 60 submitted by: International Human Rights Center of Loyola Law School, Los Angeles; Federazione Italiana Diritti Umani; Los Angeles (United States of America);

Joint submission 61 submitted by: United Nations Association of the United States of America; March for Our Lives; Washington D.C. (United States of America);

Joint submission 62 submitted by: Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy; Western States Legal Foundation; Swiss Lawyers for Nuclear Disarmament; New York (United States of America);

Joint submission 63 submitted by: Mama JuN - Mother’s Justice Network; Women LEAD Network; Canby (United States of America);

Joint submission 64 submitted by: Friends of the African Union; Vision Works Inc.; Cincinnati (United States of America);

Joint submission 65 submitted by: Angry Tias and Abuelas, Refugio Del Rio Grande; Proyecto Libertad; Greenstein and Kolker Law Firm; Law Office of Virginia Raymond; Law Office of Thelma Garcia; Weslaco (United States of America).

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):
IACHR-OAS Inter-American Commission on Human Rights—Organization of
The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

**OSCE/ODIHR**  
American States, Washington D.C. (United States of America);  
Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the  
Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Warsaw  
(Poland).

**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.

For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.1–176.72, 176.105–176.106, 176-109–  
176.112, and 176.342.
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