



General Assembly

Distr.: General
29 October 2012

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Fifteenth session
Geneva, 21 January – 1 February 2013

Summary prepared by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in accordance with paragraph 5 of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 16/21

Tonga*

The present report is a summary of 3 stakeholders' submissions¹ to the universal periodic review. It follows the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council in its decision 17/119. It does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), nor any judgement or determination in relation to specific claims. The information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes and, to the extent possible, the original texts have not been altered. As provided for in Resolution 16/21 of the Human Rights Council, where appropriate, a separate section is provided for contributions by the national human rights institution of the State under review that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles. The full texts of all submissions received are available on the OHCHR website. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the periodicity of the review and developments during that period.

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

I. Information provided by stakeholders

A. Background and framework

1. Scope of international obligations

1. The Civil Society Organisation - Human Rights Task Force, including the Civil Society Forum of Tonga, the Ma'a Fafine mo e Famili Inc, the Women and Children Crisis Centre, the Friendly Island Human Rights and Democracy Movement, the Friendly Island Teacher Association, the Tonga Women National Congress and the Tonga Leiti's Association (CSO HRTF) noted that Tonga had ratified only a few of the human rights core conventions: the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD) and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). Tonga had also become a signatory to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD).²

2. CSO HRTF underscored that Tonga had not ratified the following treaties: the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW); the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT); the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).³

3. Furthermore, it noted with concern that since the last UPR review in 2008, Tonga had failed to make positive steps towards the ratification of these Conventions and Covenants mentioned above.⁴ Therefore, CSO HRTF urged the Government to ratify CRPD, CEDAW and CAT and called on the Government to consider ratifying the Optional Protocol to CEDAW and the Optional Protocols to CRC.⁵

4. CSO HRTF stated that the Government's announcement in September 2009 at the United Nations General Assembly that Tonga would not become party to CEDAW, despite several commitments, was a setback. CSO HRTF reported that Tongan Legislative Assembly had voted 18 to 1 with 4 abstentions not to ratify CEDAW. In announcing this decision, the Tongan Prime Minister stated that ratification would cut across the cultural and social heritage of the Tongan way of life. He stated further that he did not wish to ratify with reservations or undertake a "ratification of convenience". According to CSO HRTF, it was reported that the Government had agreed to receive a re-submission for CEDAW ratification with reservations.⁶

5. CSO HRTF underscored that Tonga was committed to the following international and regional gender equality conventions and agreements: the Beijing Platform for Action of Women (1995); the Millennium Development Goals (2005); the Commonwealth Plan of Action for Gender Equality 2005-2015 and the Revised Pacific Platform of Action for Gender Equality 2005-2015.⁷

2. Constitutional and legislative framework

6. CSO HRTF declared that the most significant achievement had been the commencement of Tonga's Constitutional and Electoral Commission's public consultations on democratic reform in 2009. This process resulted in the first democratic elections held in November 2010.⁸ CSO HRTF explained that the Parliament comprised 17 members elected and nine Nobles elected amongst their peers. According to the civil society organisation, this allocation to the Nobles was not only undemocratic but also vulnerable to manipulation of power. CSO HRTF also noted that the Nobles received a yearly remuneration taken from

taxpayers' money but with no clear job description.⁹ Therefore, it called on the Government to consider reviewing the nine allocated seats for the Nobles and the law that allowed and included the Nobles' Representatives in electing the Prime Minister as they only represented a minority of the population. It also called on the authorities to consider abolishing the remuneration package assigned for the Nobles and to consider returning to the previous electoral districts.¹⁰

7. CSO HRTF listed positive legal reforms such as the Cabinet's approval to review the existing legislation on violence against women and children as well as the drafting of a subsequent amendment for enactment during the 2012 Parliamentary session. CSO HRTF reported that consultations had begun sharing ideas and recommendations for a Stand Alone Comprehensive Legislation dealing with all forms of domestic violence in order to better protect the rights of victims of violence. This covered a review of documentation on violence against women in Tonga and neighbouring countries. According to CSO HRTF, an extensive process for conducting wider community consultations would be held throughout the country once the draft bill was ready for public comment.¹¹

8. Despite the positive steps mentioned above, CSO HRTF highlighted that the Constitution of Tonga prohibited discrimination based on class, religion, and race, but it did not recognize discrimination based on gender.¹² Moreover, there were no laws relating to gender specifically, such as a prohibition of sexual discrimination. Therefore, CSO HRTF urged the Government to include gender as a ground to prohibit discrimination in the Constitution of Tonga.¹³

9. In terms of employment legislation, CSO HRTF reported that a bill had been discussed in the Legislative Assembly, but had not yet been approved. Thus there was no legal protection for any employees, male or female.¹⁴ The civil society organisation called on the Government to pass the Employment Act that addressed minimum wage, hours and protection of maternity rights and should also address paternity rights of employees and rights of migrant workers.¹⁵

3. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures

10. CSO HRTF underscored that, in Tonga, there was neither a human rights institution nor a national body to monitor and document human rights violations. It highlighted the importance of having such a national institution that could act as a coordination body overseeing all human rights issues within the country as well as helping to closely monitor UPR recommendations.¹⁶ CSO HRTF reported that the dialogue had progressed in the area of establishing a human rights mechanism in-country at a national level. However, it expressed concern that maintaining independence might prove challenging and therefore it was more in favour of the establishment of a regional mechanism to ensure non-interference by the Government.¹⁷ At the same time, CSO HRTF acknowledged the Government's lack of resources and technical skills to set up a national human rights institution, which would also take time to set up. Therefore, it supported the idea of establishing a regional human rights institution that operated independently and would allow sharing of expertise and resources. CSO HRTF recommended that the Government prioritize the establishment of a human rights institution.¹⁸

11. CSO HRTF stated that the Government was not well versed with its policy on gender. In fact, gender equality had not been a national priority and the result Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 3, Gender Equality & Empowerment of Women, had been off track as reported in the Tonga MDG Second Report.¹⁹ CSO HRTF noted that a review of the policy areas of the Three Year Implementation Plan for Gender and Development had been undertaken in 2011/2012. However, according to CSO HRTF, a very little budget had been allocated to the Plan, so it had not been well implemented.²⁰ CSO HRTF called on the

Government to prioritize gender equality within its National Strategic Planning Framework.²¹

12. With regard to human rights training, CSO HRTF commended the Ministry of Police who had since 2008, incorporated the International Human Rights Standards for Law Enforcement into its new police recruits training. It also noted that the Tonga Defence Services did not provide a complete human rights training package but gave training on the International Humanitarian Law. However, CSO HRTF mentioned with concern that the Government and its line ministries had not consolidated a commitment to provide human rights training for the public officials.²² Therefore, CSO HRTF called on the Government to provide human rights training to the Government officials and especially the senior police and those trained before 2008.²³

B. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

Cooperation with treaty bodies

13. The Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) noted that Tonga had acceded to the Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1995, but had not yet been examined by the Committee on the Rights of the Child.²⁴

14. CSO HRTF called on the Government to fulfil its commitment to reporting on CRC and CERD.²⁵

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations

1. Equality and non-discrimination

15. CSO HRTF highlighted that the legal age of majority for the citizens was 21 while for the Nobles it was 18. It stated that this situation was contrary to clause 4 of the Constitution which stipulated that all Tongans and non-Tongans were equal under the Laws of the Land.²⁶ Therefore, CSO HRTF called on the Government to consider reviewing the age of majority for the Nobles to be in line with the general age of majority for the people.²⁷

16. CSO HRTF reported that His Majesty King George Tupou V had appointed a Royal Land Commission on 10 October 2008, pursuant to the Royal Commissions Act (Cap 41) Laws of Tonga, which empowered such appointment to inquire into matters of importance to the public welfare. It added that the final report had been released in June 2012 with recommendations to increase women's rights to land, more specifically for women to be allowed to register a town allotment. However this recommendation did not allow women to register bush allotments with the reasoning being that only men attended to the bush for agricultural purposes.²⁸ CSO HRTF called on the Government to consider full rights of women to land registration.²⁹

2. Right to life, liberty and security of the person

17. The Child Rights International Network (CRIN) noted that child offenders might be sentenced to capital punishment. The Criminal Offences Act provided death penalty for treason and murder. It reported that in the case of murder, article 91(1) of the Act stated that "sentence of death shall not be pronounced on or recorded against any person under the age of 15 years", but it was unclear whether this referred to age at the time of the offence or at the time of conviction. No such restriction was specified in the case of treason.³⁰ It added that in prohibiting the death penalty for persons less than 15 years old convicted of murder, the Act stated that "in lieu of such punishment the Court shall sentence such person to be detained during His Majesty's pleasure".³¹ CRIN mentioned that the Criminal Offences Act

provided life imprisonment for offences relating to demolition of buildings, murder, and inciting or assisting suicide, but no limitations were specified in relation to the age of the offender.³²

18. CRIN noted that the death sentence might not be pronounced on a pregnant woman and that pregnant women convicted of a capital offence must be sentenced to life imprisonment in lieu of capital punishment.³³

19. CRIN underscored that no executions had been carried out since 1982 and sentencing for murder had been considered by the Supreme Court in 2005. The Court had concluded that the norm for sentencing should be life imprisonment, with capital punishment reserved for especially heinous crimes.³⁴

20. CRIN recommended that the Government explicitly prohibits sentences of capital punishment for persons under 18 at the time of the offence. Furthermore it recommended to explicitly prohibiting life imprisonment and indeterminate detention (“during His Majesty’s pleasure”) of child offenders, including when such imprisonment was in lieu of the death penalty, and legislating for the detention of children to be imposed only as a last resort and for the shortest possible duration. Finally, CRIN recommended that the Government raises the minimum age of criminal responsibility.³⁵

21. CSO HRTF noted that since the initial UPR review in 2008, there had been no documented use of torture by the Police of the Defence Force published by the Legal Literacy Project (LLP), now the Ma’a Fafine mo e Famili. Moreover, it underlined that the release of the report by the LLP detailing the police and defence force torture on detainees following the 16 November 2006 riots had resulted in prosecutions and even the dismissal of police and defence force staff.³⁶

22. CRIN highlighted that corporal punishment in the form of whipping was lawful as a sentence for males under the Criminal Offences Act. It reported that boys less than 16 years old might be whipped up to 20 strokes and older males might be whipped up to 26 strokes. CRIN added that the punishment must be administered in one or two instalments, as specified by the court, and that it was inflicted by the gaoler, in the presence of a magistrate, following certification that the offender was medically fit to undergo the punishment.³⁷ CRIN noted that the Magistrates’ Courts Act allowed a magistrate to impose whipping on a boy aged 7-14 in lieu of any other punishment.³⁸ CRIN reported that in 2010, the Appeal Court had overturned sentences of judicial whipping that had been imposed on two 17 year old males and this was the first time sentences of whipping had been handed down in 30 years. Furthermore, CRIN highlighted that the judgment also questioned the doctor’s role in certifying that an offender was fit for whipping.³⁹ CRIN recommended that the Government repeals all legal provisions authorising corporal punishment as a sentence of the courts for persons less than 18 years of age at the time of the offence.⁴⁰

23. GIEACPC noted that even though no specific recommendation on corporal punishment had been submitted during the initial UPR review, Tonga had made some progress towards prohibiting it. Since the review, corporal punishment had been prohibited as a disciplinary measure in prisons according to Article 66 of the 2010 Prisons Act. Nevertheless, the Global Initiative underscored that it had to be confirmed that the measure was effective in all institutions accommodating children in conflict with the law. Moreover, GIEACPD mentioned that, in 2010, the former Minister for Police had announced his intention to support a private members bill to abolish judicial whipping, but no further progress in this regard had appeared.⁴¹

24. GIEACPD noted that corporal punishment was lawful at home and in alternative care settings but was prohibited in schools according to article 40 of the Education (Schools and General Provisions) Regulation.⁴² GIEACPD recommended that the Government

enacts the legislation to explicitly prohibit corporal punishment of children in all settings, including the home and as a sentence for crime.⁴³

25. CSO HRTF highlighted that a review and drafting of a comprehensive bill on violence against women and girls was to be tabled in 2012. The recent National Study on Domestic Violence conducted by the Ma'a Fafine mo e Famili noted an increase of reports on domestic violence reported by the Ministry of Police and the Women and Children Crisis Centre.⁴⁴ CSO HRTF stated that the current laws were inadequate and that there was no specific offence for stalking. It added that the legislation did not allow for a restraining order for women for sexual or domestic violence regardless of their marital status. Nevertheless a few provisions that might be applied for the protection of women in vulnerable or threatening situations existed. CSO HRTF noted that domestic violence had been historically treated by the police as a private and minor matter. It stated that having a pro-prosecution provision would ensure that if reported, such offences against women in vulnerable situation were taken seriously by law enforcement agencies.⁴⁵

26. CSO HRTF highlighted that the police had established a domestic violence “no drop policy” but noted that it had not been yet fully implemented across all front line police. In fact, patriarchal attitudes and behaviours had a negative impact on the response services to female victims of violence. CSO HRTF mentioned that a Domestic Violence Response Policy (DVRP) was drafted in 2010 and had been circulated amongst Civil Society Organisations for their feedback and input. This was a positive step forward between the police and CSOs working on the elimination of violence against women and girls. CSO HRTF added that the no drop policy and the vast improvements to police response to domestic violence should be formalized within the new policy, which was still in draft form.⁴⁶ CSO HRTF called on the Ministry of Police to take immediate steps in formalizing the Domestic Violence Response Policy for Tonga Police.⁴⁷

27. CSO HRTF acknowledged the Ministry of Police’s efforts to publicly broadcast over the National Radio and Television the different types and forms of violence (physical, psychological and emotional) especially violence against women and children.⁴⁸

28. In the matter of human trafficking, CSO HRTF pointed out the modest progress made in the law enforcement efforts to address the problem. Tonga prohibited all forms of human trafficking through its Revised Transnational Crimes Act of 2007, which defined human trafficking as including forced labour and forced prostitution. CSO HRTF mentioned that this law prescribed up to 25 years' imprisonment for these offences, which was sufficiently stringent and commensurate with penalties for other serious crimes, such as rape. It reported that in April 2011, Tonga, for the first time, had sentenced a trafficking offender to prison.⁴⁹ However, CSO HRTF stated that the Government had not taken action to reduce the demand for commercial sex acts or forced labour during the reporting period. It highlighted that Tonga was not a party to the 2000 Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children (UN TIP Protocol).⁵⁰ CSO HRTF called on the Government to accede immediately to the UN TIP Protocol and consider drafting legislation or establishing policies around protecting the rights of victims of trafficking.⁵¹

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

29. Regarding the Judiciary, CSO HRTF stated that the Government's decision in 2010, to abolish the Judicial Services Commission and to repeal the Judicial Services Commission Act was an example of the interference of the Executive with judicial independence. The civil society organization viewed this as an unconstitutional step undertaken by the Government to compromise the integrity and the independence of the Judiciary. The Government also made the first direct appointment of a judge by the executive Government without the recommendation of the Attorney General or the Judicial

Services Commission. According to CSO HRTF, this did not comply with acceptable constitutional principles and compromised the integrity of the Judiciary.⁵²

30. Regarding the tragedy of the MV *Princess Ashika*, CSO HRTF called on the Government to implement and execute the recommendations highlighted in the Royal Commission's report as well as to ensure that all victims had access to effective legal remedy.⁵³ CSO HRTF explained that the MV *Princess Ashika* was an inter-island ferry operating in Tonga that had sank on 5 August 2009. Official figures confirmed that 54 men had been rescued, 74 persons had disappeared and all women and children had died. CSO HRTF noted that the report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the sinking had condemned senior Government officials and ministers for purchasing the ferry and allowing it to sail. After the release of the report, the Government ensured that no ministers would be held accountable. The Attorney-General resigned after the Government had refused to support the appointment of foreign prosecutors to investigate criminal matters arising from the Commission's inquiry. He stated that the authorities had been attempting to control the prosecution to ensure that members of the Cabinet and other people, who might be regarded as close friends or cronies, were not prosecuted. According to him, the Government wanted to control members of the Judiciary to dispose of them or to hire them as they see fit.⁵⁴

31. CSO HRTF underlined that a legal aid policy had been endorsed by the Ministry of Justice following the 2006 riots to assist those who needed legal advice and support, however the project had since ceased and there had been no attempts to revive legal aid support in the last two years.⁵⁵ Therefore, CSO HRTF called on the Government to revive this support particularly for the most vulnerable members of the community who lacked access to financial resources and technical legal advice because of their low income and economic status.⁵⁶

32. CSO HRTF pointed out that Tonga had passed the Anti-Corruption Act in 2007 which authorized the establishment of an Anti-Corruption Commission to deal with corruption in Government; however the Government had declared that the Act could not be implemented due to financial constraints. CSO HRTF noted that this had raised public concern that it was not a priority to Government since the current focus was on economic development. It added that, according to a report of Ministry of Communication and Information, Tonga was considering accession to the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC).⁵⁷ CSO HRTF called on the Government to set up the Anti-Corruption Commission and to ensure that it was independent of the Government.⁵⁸

4. Freedom of expression and right to participate in public and political life

33. CSO HRTF noted that as part of its democratic political reforms, the Government had commissioned the Ministry of Information and Communications to commence the development of a draft a Freedom of Information Policy in January 2011. After extensive consultation with internal and external stakeholders, the Government had launched the this policy on 28 June 2012 and this was a major step forward in addressing the long-acknowledged gaps in public reporting and disclosure of information. CSO HRTF added that the Government ultimately intended to use the process as the basis for developing Freedom of Information legislation in the future.⁵⁹ It called on the Government to ensure that the Freedom of Information Policy was developed into a Freedom of Information Act.⁶⁰

34. CSO HRTF stated that there were no affirmative action policies to increase women's participation in Parliament despite their low level of representation over the last 60 years. Since 1951 when women had been first given the right to vote and stand as candidates there had only ever been 4 elected women into Parliament and three appointed.⁶¹ CSO HRTF noted that there was no provision in the Constitution or in any legislation that allowed for temporary special measures (TSM) for women's equal representation in Parliament.⁶²

Therefore, it recommended that the Government considers setting up TSM or quotas for the women participation in the Parliament.⁶³

35. Furthermore, regarding the participation of women to elections, CSO HRTF stated that the current electoral system did not favour female candidates who were most often resident in their husbands' constituency and therefore regarded as 'outsiders' rather than part of the original inhabitants of that particular constituency. It added that it was also difficult for a female candidate to compete with a male candidate for one vote per constituency and in the last general elections there had been a lack of support for female candidates by political parties.⁶⁴

36. CSO HRTF underscored that although women occupied almost 30 per cent of the employment in the public sector, few were at the decision-making level and that there were no female magistrates.⁶⁵ It called on the Government to establish policies to increase women's participation at all formal decision making levels.⁶⁶

5. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

37. CSO HRTF noted that there was no official system for supporting female workers with the exception of maternity leave for public servants. It explained that public servants were entitled to maternity leave through a policy not a law. In the private sector, the majority of the companies did not give maternity leave, with some exceptional cases in which around ten days leave was provided.⁶⁷ CSO HRTF underlined that over the last 30 years, the number of females in formal employment had increased almost fourfold. However, according to CSO HRTF, there had been little progress in the type of occupations that women were engaged in. Most women had been and still were employed in unskilled menial work or subordinate positions and therefore were paid at the lower end of the scale.⁶⁸

6. Right to health

38. CSO HRTF stated that reproductive health rights were still limited, thus the wives needed the permission of their husbands or the unmarried women required the signature of a guardian before the abortion's procedure was undertaken by the national hospital.⁶⁹ CSO HRTF called on the Ministry of Health to abolish this policy and to give the women the right to choose their method of contraception.⁷⁰

7. Right to education

39. CSO HRTF noted that human rights had not been incorporated into the new syllabus for primary education released by the Ministry of Education in January 2012. However, there had been consultation on the inclusion of human rights into a new syllabus for high schools which was being drafted. Furthermore, CSO HRTF underlined that there was no human rights training offered either at higher level or in the Tonga Institute of Education for Teachers⁷¹ CSO HRTF called on the Government to incorporate human rights into the school syllabus.⁷²

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

CRIN Child Rights International Network;
 CSO HRTF Tonga Civil Society Organisation - Human Rights Task Force Joint Submission: Civil Society of Tonga (CSFT); Ma'a Fafine mo e Famili Inc (MFF); Women and Children Crisis Centre (WCCC); Friendly Island Human Rights and Democracy Movement (FIHRDM); Friendly Island Teachers Association (TFITA); Tonga Women National Congress (TWNC); Tonga Leiti's Association (TLA);

GIEACPC Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment for Children.

- ² CSO HRTF, p. 11, para. 35.
³ CSO HRTF, p. 11, para. 36.
⁴ CSO HRTF, p. 11, para. 37.
⁵ CSO HRTF, p. 11, para. 38.
⁶ CSO HRTF, p. 2.
⁷ CSO HRTF, p. 7, para. 9.
⁸ CSO HRTF, p. 2.
⁹ CSO HRTF, p. 4, paras 5 and 6.
¹⁰ CSO HRTF, p. 5, para. 13.
¹¹ CSO HRTF, p. 3.
¹² CSO HRTF, p. 7, para. 10.
¹³ CSO HRTF, p. 9, para. 26.
¹⁴ CSO HRTF, p. 8, para 18.
¹⁵ CSO HRTF, p. 9, para. 26.
¹⁶ CSO HRTF, p. 7, para. 7.
¹⁷ CSO HRTF, p. 3.
¹⁸ CSO HRTF, p. 7, paras. 7 and 8.
¹⁹ CSO HRTF, p. 8, para. 12.
²⁰ CSO HRTF, p.8, para. 11.
²¹ CSO HRTF, p. 9, para. 26.
²² CSO HRTF, p. 11, para. 34.
²³ CSO HRTF, p. 10, paras. 30 and 31.
²⁴ GIEACPC, p. 3, para. 3.1.
²⁵ CSO HRTF, p. 11, para. 38.
²⁶ CSO HRTF, p.5, para. 8.
²⁷ CSO HRTF, p. 5, para. 13.
²⁸ CSO HRTF, p. 9, para. 25.
²⁹ CSO HRTF, p. 10, para. 26.
³⁰ CRIN, p. 1.
³¹ CRIN, p. 2.
³² CRIN, p. 2.
³³ CRIN, p. 2.
³⁴ CRIN, p. 3.
³⁵ CRIN, p. 4.
³⁶ CSO HRTF, p. 5, para. 1.
³⁷ CRIN, pp. 1 and 2. See also GIEACPC, p. 2, para. 2.3.
³⁸ CRIN, p. 2.
³⁹ CRIN, p. 2. See also GIEACPC, p. 2, para. 2.4.
⁴⁰ CRIN, p. 4.
⁴¹ GIEACPC, pp. 2 and 3, paras 1.2, 2.4 and 2.5.
⁴² GIEACPC, pp. 2 and 3, paras 2.1, 2.2 and 2.6.
⁴³ GIEACPC, p. 1.

- 44 CSO HRTF, p. 9, para. 21.
 - 45 CSO HRTF, p. 8, para. 19.
 - 46 CSO HRTF, p. 10, para. 29.
 - 47 CSO HRTF, p. 11, para. 34.
 - 48 CSO HRTF, p. 10, para. 28.
 - 49 CSO HRTF, p. 9, para. 22.
 - 50 CSO HRTF, p. 9, para. 23.
 - 51 CSO HRTF, p. 10, para. 26.
 - 52 CSO HRTF, p. 3.
 - 53 CSO HRTF, p. 7, para. 6.
 - 54 CSO HRTF, p. 6, para. 4.
 - 55 CSO HRTF, p. 6, para. 5.
 - 56 CSO HRTF, p. 7, para. 6.
 - 57 CSO HRTF, p. 5, para. 3.
 - 58 CSO HRTF, p. 7, para. 6.
 - 59 CSO HRTF, p. 5, para. 2.
 - 60 CSO HRTF, p. 7, para. 6.
 - 61 CSO HRTF, p. 8, para. 14.
 - 62 CSO HRTF, p. 4, para. 10.
 - 63 CSO HRTF, p. 5, para. 13.
 - 64 CSO HRTF, p. 4, para. 12.
 - 65 CSO HRTF, p. 8, para. 15.
 - 66 CSO HRTF, p. 9, para. 26.
 - 67 CSO HRTF, p. 8, para. 16.
 - 68 CSO HRTF, p. 8, para. 17.
 - 69 CSO HRTF, p. 9, para. 24.
 - 70 CSO HRTF, p. 10, para. 26.
 - 71 CSO HRTF, p. 11, para. 34.
 - 72 CSO HRTF, p. 10, para. 32.
-