



16 March 2016
Check against delivery

**UN Human Rights Council
Thirty-first session, 29 February – 25 March 2016**

**Item 6:
Consideration of UPR reports**

NAURU

Mr. President,

At its review in November, Nauru acknowledged the value of the UPR in addressing human rights challenges and accepted the majority of the recommendations made to it by other states.

Amnesty International is concerned, however, that despite its commitments during the review to welcome the media to Nauru,¹ the government has since 2014 refused to grant access to international monitors, including Amnesty International and independent journalists. We are therefore very disappointed that Nauru has rejected recommendations to allow access for international media organizations and independent observers to Nauru, and to reduce the prohibitively expensive visa fees.²

Amnesty International has made two requests for permission to visit Nauru since the review last November; however, our requests have been met with silence.

On 19 February 2016 Nauru suspended all Australian and New Zealand visitor visas until further notice, reportedly in response to a journalist attempting to enter Nauru without the appropriate visa.

¹ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review – Nauru*, A/HRC/31/7, 5 November 2015, paragraph 43.

² A/HRC/31/7, recommendations 87.14 (Germany), 87.15 (New Zealand), 87.16 (Timor Leste), 87.20 (Spain) and 87.21 (France); Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review – Nepal (Addendum)*, A/HRC/31/7/Add.1, 14 March 2016, paras. 21, 22 and 25.

We call on Nauru to deliver on its commitment to allow access to the country for the media and other international monitors.

Mr President,

Amnesty International remains seriously concerned about the safety and wellbeing of refugees and asylum-seekers on Nauru in light of credible reports of sexual violence and harassment against them while in detention on Nauru. Amnesty International has repeatedly called on both Australia and Nauru to do more to protect the rights of refugees and asylum-seekers.³

We are therefore very disappointed to note that Nauru rejected recommendations to respect the rights of asylum-seekers and refugees by ending its arrangement to provide offshore detention and processing of asylum-seekers and refugees,⁴ and to provide the necessary protection and support to asylum seekers, refugees and migrants, in particular unaccompanied children.⁵

Finally, Amnesty International regrets Nauru's rejection of recommendations to strengthen the independence of the judiciary,⁶ and to guarantee access to the internet, including social media.⁷

Thank you, Mr. President.

³ <https://www.amnesty.org/en/countries/asia-and-the-pacific/nauru/report-nauru/>

⁴ A/HRC/31/7, recommendation 87.27 (Kenya); A/HRC/31/7/Add.1, para. 25.

⁵ A/HRC/31/7, recommendations 87.19 (New Zealand) and 87.26 (Fiji); A/HRC/31/7/Add.1, para. 25.

⁶ A/HRC/31/7, recommendation 87.18 (Costa Rica); A/HRC/31/7/Add.1, para. 24.

⁷ A/HRC/31/7, recommendation 87.14 (Germany) and 87.18 (Costa Rica); A/HRC/31/7/Add.1, para. 21 and 24.