



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
10 August 2015

Original: English

---

**Human Rights Council**  
**Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review**  
**Twenty third session**  
2-13 November 2015

**Summary prepared by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21**

**Nauru\***

The present report is a summary of 11 stakeholders' submissions<sup>1</sup> 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 Human Rights Council resolution 16/21, 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.



## Information provided by stakeholders

### A. Background and framework

#### 1. Scope of international obligations<sup>2</sup>

1. Kaleidoscope Australia stated that during the 2011 UPR, Nauru accepted recommendations that it ratify the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and its two Optional Protocols<sup>3</sup>, and during the 2012-2013 year, Nauru's inter-ministerial Working Group on Treaties prepared a Cabinet Submission on recommended treaty actions, including on the ICCPR. Nonetheless, Nauru has not yet ratified the ICCPR.<sup>4</sup> Kaleidoscope Australia recommended that Nauru ratify all significant human rights treaties, including, but not limited to, the ICCPR and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) (and their Optional Protocols) to reinforce the implementation of, and compliance with, international human rights law in Nauru.<sup>5</sup> Amnesty International made a similar recommendation.<sup>6</sup> ICJ recommended that Nauru become a state party to all core human rights treaties.<sup>7</sup>

#### 2. Constitutional and legislative framework

2. Amnesty International recommended that Nauru incorporate the provisions of core human rights instruments, including the Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and the Convention on the Rights of the Child, into domestic law and implement them in policy and practice.<sup>8</sup> NNWC called upon the government of Nauru to domesticate CEDAW as soon as possible and ensure that it consults women's groups in Nauru on the process of domestication of CEDAW.<sup>9</sup>

3. Amnesty International recommended amending the Constitution and the Criminal Code to include provisions which specifically protect against sexual and gender based violence, including against threatened, apprehended or actual violence, as a matter of urgency.<sup>10</sup>

4. NPDO recommended that Nauru domesticate the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) by the creation of legislation within a time-frame of about 2-3 years, conduct a legislative analysis to determine the current legislations, and identify the gaps and challenges to the realisation of CRPD.<sup>11</sup> NPDO also recommended conducting a legislative scan to determine the impact of Nauru's current laws on the full realisation of women's rights, in compliance with CEDAW and CRPD.<sup>12</sup>

5. NPDO recommended that Nauru amend the 1968 Constitution to include disability as a prohibited ground for discrimination.<sup>13</sup>

6. Emedena Eimwi stated that the constitutional review process in Nauru began in 2006 and still ongoing. Under the current Government there has been no progress made in areas identified as critical by the public, including the establishment of a Leadership Code and Ombudsman.<sup>14</sup>

7. Emedena Eimwi stated that there are no corruption laws in Nauru: nobody had been charged for bribery in the history of Nauru. There are regulations in the House of Parliament by which members of Parliament are required to surrender or register their assets, but this measure has never been implemented.<sup>15</sup>

8. ICAAD noted that the Crimes Act is currently being revised to include a domestic violence chapter.<sup>16</sup>

9. Kaleidoscope Australia recommended that Nauru complete the review of the 1899 Criminal Code, decriminalises sexual activity between consenting adults of the same sex, and introduces a bill for a modernised Code in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.<sup>17</sup> Kaleidoscope Australia urged the Human Rights Council to recommend Nauru formulate a strategy for successfully amending its Constitution to include a positive and substantive right to equality for all people, and to include sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression as prohibited grounds for discrimination.<sup>18</sup>

### **3. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures**

10. Amnesty International recommended establishing without delay a national preventive mechanism in accordance with the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.<sup>19</sup>

11. JS2 recommended that Nauru develop, enact and implement a specific national law on the protection of human rights defenders in accordance with the international Declaration on Human Rights Defenders.<sup>20</sup>

12. ICAAD noted that the Nauru Police Force established a Domestic Violence Unit (DVU) in 2008, with the aim to collect and maintain statistics and case information that provide a realistic picture of violence against women. Additionally, the DVU coordinated with Women's Affairs of Nauru and established in 2008 a temporary Safe House, which served as a refuge center for victims of domestic violence. This Safe House has sheltered over thirty-five women and children since its establishment. In 2013, the Government built a new Safe House, which now offers counselling services and a special program for survivors of domestic violence.<sup>21</sup>

13. ICAAD also noted that the Domestic Violence Committee (DVC), consisting of both Nauruan government agencies and non-government organizations, was established to discuss issues relating to domestic violence and to determine strategies to address the issue and reduce such violence. The Pacific Prevention of Domestic Violence Programme and the Nauruan Police, annually organise the "White Ribbon Day" (November 25), which is aimed at ending violence against women and increasing awareness of domestic violence in communities.<sup>22</sup>

14. JS3 commended the Government for establishing a national focal point for children.<sup>23</sup>

15. JS1 stated that in the beginning of 2015, the Government of Nauru adopted the Framework for Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction as an official policy to respond to the risks to sustainable development posed by climate change and disasters.<sup>24</sup>

## **B. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms**

### **1. Cooperation with treaty bodies**

16. Noting that Nauru's reports to the Committee on the Rights of the Child, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, the Committee against Torture and the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities are overdue, ICJ recommended that Nauru fulfil its reporting obligations.<sup>25</sup>

17. NPDO recommended that the Government submit its initial report to the Committee on CRPD.<sup>26</sup>

## **2. Cooperation with special procedures**

18. JS2 recommended extending an invitation for a visit of the Special Rapporteur on human rights defenders.<sup>27</sup>

19. Amnesty International and JS1 recommended that Nauru facilitate promptly the visit requested by the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention.<sup>28</sup>

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

### **1. Equality and non-discrimination**

20. ICAAD noted that women's participation in higher public office has been minimal: while there is no direct barrier to women's participation, there have only ever been two women elected to Parliament. The majority of women in Government hold low level positions. The Women's Affairs Department (WAD) seeks to increase women's political participation and representation in decision making and women's economic empowerment.<sup>29</sup>

21. Kaleidoscope Australia stated that during the first UPR in 2011, Nauru accepted recommendations that it decriminalise sexual activity between consenting adults of the same sex<sup>30</sup>, and signed a joint statement, together with other 84 countries, made in the framework of the Human Rights Council works in 2011, entitled "Ending Acts of Violence and Related Human Rights Violations Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity".<sup>31</sup> Noting that Nauru does not currently have any laws or policies which prohibit discrimination of a person based on sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression,<sup>32</sup> Kaleidoscope Australia recommended that Nauru explicitly legalises same-sex marriage and adoption by same-sex couples.<sup>33</sup>

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

22. NNWC noted with concern that violence against women is not adequately protected in Nauru's domestic laws. These include laws around domestic violence, rape laws and related provisions that are often discriminatory towards women. NNWC recommended that the Nauru government enact domestic violence legislation to ensure that women survivors of violence have legal protection from domestic violence.<sup>34</sup>

23. ICAAD stated that in light of international pressure, Nauru has made addressing domestic violence a national priority. The general community perception, however, is that domestic violence against women is increasing as the economic situation deteriorates. Unfortunately, most domestic violence cases reported to the police are withdrawn and only a few cases actually make it to court.<sup>35</sup> Domestic violence is often treated as a domestic or familial issue, rather than an act that invokes state responsibility.<sup>36</sup>

24. ICAAD noted that Nauru has no specific laws against sexual harassment, so instances of sexual harassment must involve physical assault to be punishable by law. Sexual harassment is not believed to be widespread; nonetheless, non-physical forms of sexual harassment should be criminalized and recognized as a form of discrimination. The crime of rape is punishable by up to life imprisonment, but marital rape is not specifically identified as a crime.<sup>37</sup>

25. Amnesty International recommended that Nauru end mandatory indefinite detention, amounting to arbitrary detention, of children in the Immigration Detention Centre. Amnesty International was also alarmed at reports of sexual abuse at the Immigration Detention Centre and apparent failure of the government to investigate these complaints and prosecute the alleged perpetrators. Amnesty International recommended that Nauru strengthen

national laws to include provisions which specifically protect against physical and sexual abuse against children; to establish a process to ensure the prompt and independent investigation of allegations of sexual abuse at the centre and ensure that alleged perpetrators are charged in accordance with the law; to develop and implement a national child protection framework; and to implement the CRC in consistency with law, policy and practice.<sup>38</sup>

26. Noting that since the UPR in 2011 Nauru has enacted the 2011 Education Act, which prohibits corporal punishment in schools, GIEACPC stated that in Nauru, corporal punishment of children is lawful, despite the State's accession to the Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1994 and the Government's acceptance of recommendations made during the UPR in 2011 to protect the rights of children including through the enactment of legislation.<sup>39</sup>

27. ICAAD indicated that the lawful age to get married in Nauru is 16 years old and even earlier with consent. Early marriage has a profound impact on limiting opportunities for education and increasing the likelihood for violence. The minimum age for marriage should be set at 18 in line with the Convention on the Rights of the Child.<sup>40</sup>

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

28. ICJ was concerned about the summary dismissal and deportation of the Resident Magistrate in January 2014, and the subsequent removal of the Chief Justice, who had issued an injunction to stop the Government from deporting the Resident Magistrate. ICJ considered that these actions by the executive branch of the Government are inconsistent with the government's obligation to respect the independence of the judiciary and have undermined judicial independence.<sup>41</sup> JS2 stated that it took nine months for the Nauruan Government to appoint replacements, and that the removal of the Chief Magistrate and Chief Justice in rapid succession was reported to be a politically motivated response to a particular case before the courts. The circumstances of their removal undermined the rule of law and jeopardised both the actual and perceived independence of the Nauruan Judiciary.<sup>42</sup> ICJ recommended that the Government of Nauru immediately reverse and remedy the actions taken against the Chief Justice and Resident Magistrate and ensure that public officials throughout the Nauru Government respect the independence of the judiciary and the rule of law, and implement orders of the judiciary.<sup>43</sup> JS2 made a similar recommendation.<sup>44</sup> Amnesty International recommended strengthening the independence of the judiciary by ensuring that judicial officers cannot be arbitrarily removed from office without due process.<sup>45</sup>

29. ICAAD indicated that sentences handed down in rape and other sexual assault cases tended to be far lower than the maximum sentences in the legislation. However, the Supreme Court emphasized that sexual assault is a serious offense and that a custodial sentence must be given especially where the age of the accused is much greater than that of the victim or a position of trust had been breached. ICCAD recommended that the Nauruan Government work to make gender based violence cases more accessible, which will ultimately have the benefit of improving transparency, accountability, and consistency in ascertaining how these cases are decided.<sup>46</sup>

30. Amnesty International recommended that Nauru seek assistance from the international community to expand and strengthen the legal and judicial sectors, including by improving access to affordable legal advice on civil and criminal matters and ensuring that court cases are not subject to lengthy delays.<sup>47</sup>

31. NNWC observed that the lack of qualified legal professionals in Nauru causes challenges to access to justice and in particular those pleaders whose understanding of law

is limited. NNWC recommended that the Government open the legal market to allow for more qualified legal firms, including from overseas, to operate in Nauru.<sup>48</sup>

#### **4. Freedom of movement**

32. JS1 was concerned at the freedom of movement and freedom of assembly of asylum seekers. The Government of Nauru issued a decree to limit the places that refugees can visit. They were forbidden from visiting schools, the hospital, the harbour and the airport. Media has reported attack by local Nauru population against refugees. JS1 recommended ensuring the personal security of asylum seekers and refugees in Nauru, and guaranteeing their rights to freedom of assembly, movement and expression.<sup>49</sup>

#### **5. Freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly, and right to participate in public and political life**

33. JS1 and JS2 noted that in January 2014 Nauru increased the visa fee for journalists and that the fee is non-refundable even if the visa application is rejected. This measure has discouraged foreign journalists from travelling to Nauru to report on the treatment of asylum seekers.<sup>50</sup> Emedena Eimwi stated that the Nauru Government basically denied any media visiting the island so it can prevent anyone voicing the real issues affecting the island.<sup>51</sup> JS1 and JS2 recommended abolishing the visa application fee and guaranteeing foreign journalists access to Nauru.<sup>52</sup>

34. Noting that Nauru has not implemented UPR WG recommendations on establishing mechanisms to increase the population's access to government information and on continuing efforts for the introduction of freedom of information through ordinary legislation,<sup>53</sup> NPDO recommended that the Government create freedom of information legislation that allows the public, and especially people with disabilities, for accessing to public information and realise their right to information.<sup>54</sup> JS2 recommended that Nauru enact legislation which enshrines the right to access and disclose information held by both State and non-State actors relating to human rights.<sup>55</sup>

35. JS3 was concerned that all media and information outlets are government operated, and that there was no protection for freedom of information in law. JS3 recommended that the Government of Nauru legislate a right to information law; and establish information centres for the rehabilitation of mined-out phosphate lands; asylum seekers and refugees; and land related records.<sup>56</sup>

36. Amnesty International noted that, in June 2014, five opposition Members of Parliament were suspended for criticising the government in international media. Amnesty International recommended that Nauru fully reinstate the five suspended Members of Parliament immediately and ensure that they are able to fully participate in parliamentary discussions.<sup>57</sup> Amnesty International also recommended that Nauru guarantee that individuals who publically disclose information about human rights abuses or criticize the government are not subject to reprisals, through enacting legislation to expressly protect persons who expose such information, including journalists, politicians, and human rights advocates.<sup>58</sup> JS2 made a similar recommendation.<sup>59</sup>

37. JS3 stated that, since the suspension in 2014 of five members of Parliament, Parliament has been operating on 68% of total parliamentarians to make national decisions, allocate resources to constituencies, and enact laws. This means that the voice of 32% of the Nauruan voters is not being heard in Parliament. This is unfair representation and it also implies lost economic opportunities in national processes for the constituents who are not being represented. Their right to representation is neither respected nor fulfilled.<sup>60</sup>

## **6. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work**

38. ICAAD stated that the Government continues to encourage women to seek higher positions in the private sector. Recently, the Government has supported and provided training workshops, such as business skills training for underprivileged women and youth.<sup>61</sup>

39. NNWC recommended that the Government provide a review of Nauru's employment conditions within the civil services in order to retain suitably qualified Nauruans to civil service positions.<sup>62</sup>

40. NPDO recommended that the Government create opportunities for basic skills such as weaving, handicraft, typing and other skills set to enable persons with disabilities to access their right to equality and non-discrimination on employment opportunities. NPDO also recommended creating a quota for persons with disabilities to be gainfully employed within the civil service if they are suitably qualified or able to perform the functions required of the position.<sup>63</sup>

## **7. Right to social security and to an adequate standard of living**

41. JS1 stated that the right to food of the people in Nauru was at stake: with only 21 square kilometres and the land damage caused by years of phosphate mining operation in the island, there is very little area that can be cultivated for agriculture. JS1 recommended that Nauru ensure the provision of clean drinking water and access to water services and sanitation for all, as well as to ensure the access to food for all population, including in times of natural disaster.<sup>64</sup>

42. JS3 noted that with 80% of Nauruan lands in disfigured and unusable state, Nauruan families depend on exorbitantly priced imported goods and foods. Rehabilitation of the mined-out phosphate lands will fulfil economic, social and cultural rights to an adequate standard of living including food security, housing and opportunities to continued improvement of living conditions.<sup>65</sup>

43. NNWC recommended that the Government properly regulate the housing market and ensure that an adequate standard of living is achieved.<sup>66</sup>

44. NPDO recommended that the Government ensure that public facilities and properties are suitable for persons with disabilities, guaranteeing them proper access to basic human rights.<sup>67</sup>

## **8. Right to health**

45. Emedena Eimwi stated that Native Nauruan and refugees were denied to access adequate health services since the hospital was partially destroyed in a fire on the 15 August 2013.<sup>68</sup>

46. NNWC congratulated the Nauruan Government for ratifying CEDAW; however Nauruan women still face enormous challenges, particularly access to health services, and it recommended providing accessible medical services for women, especially the provision of facilities such as mammogram machines, equipment for early detection and appropriate intervention. NNWC also recommended that the Nauru Government ensure that more scholarship opportunities are available to train or up skill local Nauruans in areas with medical shortages.<sup>69</sup>

47. NPDO recommended employing and/or seeking international assistance to recruit specialist health care providers who are skilled in a range of disabilities treatment.<sup>70</sup>

## **9. Right to education**

48. NPDO recommended that the Government ensure that the 2011 Education Act is implemented fully through ensuring that children with disabilities are accepted into the formal education system, and qualified teachers are able to incorporate learning techniques to cater for disabled students.<sup>71</sup>

## **10. Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers**

49. JS1 noted that the conditions of the migration detention for asylum seekers in Nauru facility have been consistently criticised as unacceptable by national and international observers. On the 19th of July 2013 a riot caused substantial damage to the centre buildings and detainees were resettled in tent accommodation.<sup>72</sup> JS1 also noted that, as at 31 January 2015, 119 of children were held in immigration detention and that there have been extensive complaints about abuse and aggression towards children by facility staff.<sup>73</sup> JS1 recommended the immediate closure of the asylum seekers Regional Processing Centre in Nauru,<sup>74</sup> and taking appropriate measures ensuring the rights to life, physical and mental integrity, and freedom from arbitrary deprivation of liberty of persons currently detained, especially children.<sup>75</sup>

50. Amnesty International visited the Immigration Detention Centre and found that asylum seekers were detained arbitrarily and in harsh conditions for a lengthy period, which violates international laws. Amnesty International recommended that Nauru immediately review the regional resettlement arrangement with a view to ending offshore processing and offshore detention of asylum seekers; and to release asylum seekers from detention while their claims are being processed and ensure that rights to freedom of expression and freedom of movement are respected, with priority given to releasing children and families as soon as possible. In the interim, provide adequate safeguards for the detainees in detention, including reasonable standards of security and hygiene.<sup>76</sup>

51. Amnesty International recommended working with the UN and other governments in the region, including inter-governmental organizations such as the Pacific Islands Forum, to ensure a regional approach to the processing and settlement of asylum seekers in the Pacific which meets international human rights laws and standards.<sup>77</sup>

52. JS2 noted that since the UNHCR visit to the immigration detention centre in October 2013, UN and NGO access has been restricted.<sup>78</sup>

53. NNWC noted that there have been almost no community discussions around the issue of asylum seekers and refugees. Many Nauruans are not aware of the progress on this matter because very little information is made available to the people. Recent events in the past, including refugees protesting on the island, is causing alarm and concern for Nauru citizens who are confronted with this situation of dissent. NNWC recommended that the Government of Nauru provide community and national consultations on the issue of refugee resettlement to ensure that people are consulted and aware of refugee issues.<sup>79</sup> Amnesty International believed that there is a need for a major shift in policy towards asylum seekers in Nauru, and recommended that the Government consult with the public and inform them of any new refugee laws, integration policies and plans for their implementation.<sup>80</sup>

## **11. Environmental issues**

54. JS1 noted that in the first UPR cycle, Nauru accepted recommendations on developing a human rights-based climate change adaptation strategy; increasing cooperation with the United Nations bodies and other regional and international organizations to mitigate the harms from environmental degradation and adapt to the effects of climate change on its citizens; developing a rights-based national action plan, including



disaster management and mitigation; continuing its efforts, through the United National Framework Convention on Climate Change and other forums, to remind the international community, especially developed countries and other major emitting states, of their obligations to protect and promote human rights by reducing greenhouse gas emissions to safe levels.<sup>81</sup> JS1 recommended that Nauru continue dialogue and pro-active multilateral and bilateral negotiations with other States on the protection of the human rights of the citizen of Nauru by ensuring safe havens for them as their islands become uninhabitable, and by bringing a human rights based approach to the climate negotiations in UNFCCC to ensure legally binding agreements. JS1 also recommended that Nauru continue to negotiate for compensation for the damage caused to their islands from those responsible for climate change, according to the principle of common but differentiated responsibility as stipulated in the UNFCCC.<sup>82</sup>

55. JS3 recommended that the Government of Nauru seek assistance from the international community in relation to financial and technical support to augment nationally available resources and implementation capacity, to progress activities necessary for the implementation of the physical rehabilitation of mined-out phosphate lands and the active implementation of the proposed Master Land Use Plan.<sup>83</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). (One asterisk denotes a national human rights institution with “A” status).

*Civil society*

## Individual submissions:

AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
EE	Emedena Eimwi , Meneng (Nauru);
GIACPC	Global Initiative to end All Corporal Punishment of Children, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
ICAAD	International Center for Advocates Against Discrimination, New York (United States of America);
ICJ	International Commission of Jurists, Geneva (Switzerland);
Kaleidoscope Australia	Clayton (Australia);
NNWC	Nauru National Women’s Council, Yaren (Nauru);
NPDO	Nauru Persons Disability Organisation, Meneng (Nauru);

## Joint submissions:

JS1	Joint submission 1 submitted by: Edmund Rice International, Geneva (Switzerland); Franciscans International, Geneva (Switzerland);
JS2	Joint submission 2 submitted by: International Service for Human Rights, Geneva (Switzerland); Human Rights Law Centre (Australia);
JS3	Joint submission 3 submitted by: Nauru Island Association of Non-Governmental Organisations, Yaren (Nauru).

<sup>2</sup> The following abbreviations have been used in the present document:

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> A/HRC/17/3/Add.1, paragraph 2. Recommendations 79.2 (Algeria); 79.3 (United States of America); 79.4 (United Kingdom); 79.5 (Sweden); 79.6 (Brazil); 79.13 (Spain); 79.14 (Argentina); 79.17

- (France); 79.20 (Chile); 79.21 (France); 79.23 (Italy); 79.24 (Slovenia); 74.25 (Poland) in A/HRC/17/3, pages 13 and 14.
- 4 Kaleidoscope Australia, Submission to the UPR, page 4.
  - 5 Kaleidoscope Australia, Submission to the UPR, page 1.
  - 6 Amnesty International, Submission to the UPR, page 5.
  - 7 ICJ, Submission to the UPR, page 3.
  - 8 Amnesty International, Submission to the UPR, page 5.
  - 9 NNWC, Submission to the UPR, page 1.
  - 10 Amnesty International, Submission to the UPR, page 5.
  - 11 NPDO, Submission to the UPR, page 1.
  - 12 NPDO, Submission to the UPR, page 4.
  - 13 NPDO, Submission to the UPR, page 4.
  - 14 Emedena Eimwi, Submission to the UPR, page 1.
  - 15 Emedena Eimwi, Submission to the UPR, page 1.
  - 16 ICAAD, Submission to the UPR, page 2.
  - 17 Kaleidoscope Australia, Submission to the UPR, page 1.
  - 18 Kaleidoscope Australia, Submission to the UPR, page 7.
  - 19 Amnesty International, Submission to the UPR, page 5.
  - 20 JS2, Submission to the UPR, page 3.
  - 21 ICAAD, Submission to the UPR, page 3.
  - 22 ICAAD, Submission to the UPR, page 3.
  - 23 JS3, Submission to the UPR, page 4.
  - 24 JS1, Submission to the UPR, page 5.
  - 25 ICJ, Submission to the UPR, page 3.
  - 26 NPDO, Submission to the UPR, page 1.
  - 27 JS2, Submission to the UPR, page 3.
  - 28 Amnesty International, Submission to the UPR, page 5. JS1, Submission to the UPR, page 4.
  - 29 ICAAD, Submission to the UPR, page 4.
  - 30 A/HRC/17/3/Add.1, paragraph 31. Recommendations 79.74 (United Kingdom) and 79.75 (Sweden) in A/HRC/17/3, page 17.
  - 31 Kaleidoscope Australia, Submission to the UPR, page 2 and 3. A/HRC/17/3/Add.1, paragraph 31. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2011/03/158847.htm>
  - 32 Kaleidoscope Australia, Submission to the UPR, page 7.
  - 33 Kaleidoscope Australia, Submission to the UPR, page 1. A/HRC/17/3/Add.1, paragraphs 31 and 32.
  - 34 NNWC, Submission to the UPR, page 1.
  - 35 ICAAD, Submission to the UPR, page 2.
  - 36 ICAAD, Submission to the UPR, page 4 and 5.
  - 37 ICAAD, Submission to the UPR, page 2.
  - 38 Amnesty International, Submission to the UPR, page.
  - 39 GIEACPC, Submission to the UPR, page 1. A/HRC/17/3/Add.1, paragraph 29.
  - 40 ICAAD, Submission to the UPR, page 3.
  - 41 ICJ, Submission to the UPR, page 2.
  - 42 JS2, Submission to the UPR, page 2.
  - 43 ICJ, Submission to the UPR, page 3.
  - 44 JS2, Submission to the UPR, page 3.
  - 45 Amnesty International, Submission to the UPR, page 5.
  - 46 ICAAD, Submission to the UPR, page 5 and 6.
  - 47 Amnesty International, Submission to the UPR, page 5.
  - 48 NNWC, Submission to the UPR, page 4 and 5.
  - 49 JS1, Submission to the UPR, page 3.
  - 50 JS2, Submission to the UPR, page 1.
  - 51 Emedena Eimwi, Submission to the UPR, page 2.
  - 52 JS1, Submission to the UPR, page 4. JS2, Submission to the UPR, page 3.
  - 53 Recommendations 79.76 (Canada) and 79.77 (Germany) in A/HRC/17/3, page 17 and A/HRC/17/3/Add.1, paragraph 33.
  - 54 NPDO, Submission to the UPR, page 2.

- <sup>55</sup> JS2, Submission to the UPR, page 3.  
<sup>56</sup> JS3, Submission to the UPR, page 3.  
<sup>57</sup> Amnesty International, Submission to the UPR, page 3 and 6.  
<sup>58</sup> Amnesty International, Submission to the UPR, page 6.  
<sup>59</sup> JS2, Submission to the UPR, page 3.  
<sup>60</sup> JS3, Submission to the UPR, page 4.  
<sup>61</sup> ICAAD, Submission to the UPR, page 4.  
<sup>62</sup> NNWC, Submission to the UPR, page 3.  
<sup>63</sup> NPDO, Submission to the UPR, page 3.  
<sup>64</sup> JS1, Submission to the UPR, page 6.  
<sup>65</sup> JS3, Submission to the UPR, page 2.  
<sup>66</sup> NNWC, Submission to the UPR, page 4.  
<sup>67</sup> NPDO, Submission to the UPR, page 2.  
<sup>68</sup> Emedena Eimwi, Submission to the UPR, page 2.  
<sup>69</sup> NNWC, Submission to the UPR, page 2.  
<sup>70</sup> NPDO, Submission to the UPR, page 3.  
<sup>71</sup> NPDO, Submission to the UPR, page 1.  
<sup>72</sup> JS1, Submission to the UPR, page 2 and 3.  
<sup>73</sup> JS1, Submission to the UPR, page 4.  
<sup>74</sup> JS1, Submission to the UPR, page 3.  
<sup>75</sup> JS1, Submission to the UPR, page 4.  
<sup>76</sup> Amnesty International, Submission to the UPR, page 3 and 5.  
<sup>77</sup> Amnesty International, Submission to the UPR, page 6.  
<sup>78</sup> JS2, Submission to the UPR, page 1.  
<sup>79</sup> NNWC, Submission to the UPR, page 3 and 4.  
<sup>80</sup> Amnesty International, Submission to the UPR, page 6.  
<sup>81</sup> JS1, Submission to the UPR, page 5. See A/HRC/17/3, page 17 and A/HRC/17/3/Add.1, para.38: recommendations 79.84 (Canada), 79.85 (Malaysia), 79.86 (United Kingdom) and 79.87 (Maldives)  
<sup>82</sup> JS1, Submission to the UPR, page 7.  
<sup>83</sup> JS3, Submission to the UPR, page 2 and 3.
-