



---

**Human Rights Council**  
**Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review**  
**Thirty-sixth session**  
4–15 May 2020

## **Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Jamaica\***

### **Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights**

#### **I. Background**

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 10 stakeholders' submissions<sup>1</sup> to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

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

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

2. Amnesty International (AI) recommended Jamaica to promptly accede to the International Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and its Optional Protocol, without making any reservation, and implement them into its national law<sup>3</sup> as well as to ratify the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.<sup>4</sup> It also recommended that Jamaica promptly ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, and implement it fully into the national law.<sup>5</sup>

3. International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) noted with appreciation that Jamaica signed the UN Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons on 8 December 2017 and recommended that it ratifies the treaty as a matter of international urgency.<sup>6</sup>

##### **B. National human rights framework<sup>7</sup>**

4. AI, JS3 and JS4 noted that while accepting multiple recommendations to expedite the establishment of a national human rights institution, no such mechanism had been

---

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



established.<sup>8</sup> The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights-Organization of American States (IACHR-OAS) stated that Jamaica had an Office of the Public Defender of Jamaica, whose fundamental role was to investigate complaints filed by people who believed they had been harmed by the State or a State entity, however the State's commitment to establish a national human rights institute was not fulfilled.<sup>9</sup> It was recommended to Jamaica that it establish a national human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles.<sup>10</sup>

5. JS4 noted that Jamaica could benefit from a permanent institutionalized mechanism or body to coordinate government's engagement with the international and regional human rights mechanisms.<sup>11</sup> It recommended that Jamaica establish such a permanent mechanism in consultation with the civil society.<sup>12</sup>

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

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

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

6. JS4 and TransWave Jamaica reported that discrimination was not comprehensively defined within Jamaica's existing legal framework. The 2011 Charter of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms did not adequately protect against discrimination on the basis of gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, health status, disability or marital status.<sup>14</sup> The rights guaranteed by the Charter were constricted by the savings law clauses and there was no other comprehensive anti-discrimination law or correspondent complaint mechanism.<sup>15</sup> It was recommended to Jamaica that it adequately protect and promote the human rights of all persons, through amendments to the Charter of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms, to protect against all forms of discrimination by both state and non-state actors and to repeal clauses which unduly limit the rights of its citizens, including the savings law clauses.<sup>16</sup>

7. According to JS4, AI, JS3 and TransWave Jamaica, discriminatory attitudes and practices towards members of the LGBTI+ community were widespread<sup>17</sup> and sexual relations between consenting adults of the same sex had not been decriminalized.<sup>18</sup> IACHR-OAS made similar observations.<sup>19</sup> It was recommended that Jamaica remove all legal and policy barriers which prevent LGBT Jamaicans from fully participating on an equal footing with cisgender heterosexual Jamaicans<sup>20</sup> and amend the Offences Against the Person Act to decriminalize same-sex sexual relations between consenting adults.<sup>21</sup> JS4 and JS3 recommended enacting a comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation to prohibit all forms of discrimination, to define indirect and direct forms of discrimination, in public and private settings, by public and private agents, inclusive of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.<sup>22</sup> AI recommended that Jamaica fully and thoroughly investigate all incidents and acts of violence suspected of being motivated by homophobia or transphobia and bring to justice those suspected of criminal responsibility. It also recommended Jamaica to implement comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation to protect against institutionalized and societal discrimination of socially marginalized groups.<sup>23</sup> TransWave Jamaica made similar recommendations.<sup>24</sup>

8. TransWave Jamaica also reported that there was no legislative or policy framework that allows trans people to have their gender identities formally recognized through changes on their birth certificates and other forms of identification<sup>25</sup> and recommended developing a relevant legislation.<sup>26</sup> JS3 and TransWave referred to the Sexual Offences Act of 2009, under which only women could be victims of rape, and the Domestic Violence Act of 2009, defining "spouse" and "visiting relationship" to be exclusively heterosexual and cisgender as discriminatory against LGBTI+ persons.<sup>27</sup> JS3 recommended to amend the Sexual Offences Act to afford equal protection to all persons from different forms of sexual violence as well as review current family law arrangements and reconsider the provisions in light of their exclusion of LGBT persons from their rubric of protection.<sup>28</sup> TransWave and JS3 also recommended to enact anti-bullying legislation and policies in all schools that includes protection from violence and discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.<sup>29</sup>

*Development, the environment, and business and human rights*<sup>30</sup>

9. AI reported that Jamaica had been vocal in the international community in calling for measures to address the climate crisis. While noting that in September 2019, Jamaica signed the Regional Agreement on Access to Information, Public Participation and Justice in Environmental Matters in Latin America and the Caribbean (Escazú Agreement),<sup>31</sup> AI recommended Jamaica to continue advocacy to address the climate change crisis, including by ratifying the Escazú Agreement.<sup>32</sup>

**2. Civil and political rights***Right to life, liberty and security of person*<sup>33</sup>

10. AI recommended that Jamaica establish an official moratorium on executions with a view to abolishing the death penalty.<sup>34</sup>

11. AI noted that killings by the police continued to be an alarming human rights issue during the period under review with large numbers of people fatally shot by the police or injured.<sup>35</sup> In 2018, IACHR-OAS reported that Jamaica had the third highest homicide rate in Latin America and the Caribbean. Although a large portion of the violence was attributable to criminal gang activity, a percentage of the annual deaths was attributable to the police. There was evidence of the disproportionate use of force—including lethal force—by the police, as well as extrajudicial executions as an “alternative to detention and long criminal processes”.<sup>36</sup> AI made similar observations<sup>37</sup> and noted that relatives of victims, in particular women relatives, were left to face a long struggle for justice, truth and reparation, as well as frequent intimidation and harassment by the police.<sup>38</sup> AI recommended that Jamaica publicly condemn extrajudicial executions, unlawful killings, ill-treatment of families by the police, and any other crime.<sup>39</sup> It also recommended to strengthen police training to focus on communication and de-escalation and prevention of situations in which there may be a need to use force.<sup>40</sup>

12. IACHR-OAS noted that the 2017 legal reform that allowed certain areas to be declared Zones of Special Operations and the deployment of joint operations by the Jamaica Constabulary Force and the Jamaica Defense Force had led to numerous arrests. The legal reform established an emergency powers review tribunal and protected security forces from any legal action brought against them for actions taken “in good faith” in the exercise of their duties during the period of emergency.<sup>41</sup> JS4 made similar observations and noted that civil society actors had raised concerns about the constitutionality of these measures, focusing on the over-reliance on extraordinary security powers as a regular policing strategy.<sup>42</sup>

*Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law*<sup>43</sup>

13. AI reported that severe delays in the criminal justice system were a major structural barrier to reducing crime in Jamaica and to holding those suspected of criminal responsibility for unlawful police killings to account.<sup>44</sup> AI and JS4 noted that the Special Coroner’s Court had limited resources to deal with the number of cases it received.<sup>45</sup> It was recommended to Jamaica that it channel adequate resources to the Coroner’s Court<sup>46</sup> and continue to urgently reform the criminal justice system to ensure that victims have access within a reasonable time to a competent, independent and impartial tribunal and establish safe spaces or safe rooms in courthouses for witnesses and family members of victims allegedly killed by law enforcement officials to reduce intimidation and harassment in the court.<sup>47</sup> IACHR-OAS was concerned at the information on the lack of trust in the institutional administration of justice, particularly by women, with fewer than 12% of women using it.<sup>48</sup>

14. AI also noted that the impunity for killings by the police remained widespread.<sup>49</sup> While improved investigations and prosecutions by the Independent Commission of Investigations made way for arrests and charges on an unprecedented number of cases, Jamaica had failed to strengthen internal accountability in the police through policy changes, leaving advocating for police reform largely to the efforts of local NGOs.<sup>50</sup> JS4 stated that the functioning of the Independent Commission of Investigations continued to be

impeded by its insufficient authority and a lack of adequate resources. It lacked powers to lay charges, arrest suspects, prosecute, and compel information.<sup>51</sup> It was recommended to Jamaica that it should explicitly grant Independent Commission of Investigations the power to issue arrest warrants, charge and, if there is sufficient admissible evidence, prosecute in alleged cases of unlawful killings by law enforcement officials.<sup>52</sup>

15. IACHR-OAS noted delays in the work on reparations for the violent Tivoli Gardens incidents in 2010 due to a lack of collaboration by justice officials, including an alleged bias in favor of the police by the Director of Public Prosecutions. It emphasized that in December 2017, the Prime Minister of Jamaica had issued a public apology and announced approval of 200 million Jamaican dollars in reparations for the victims. The apologies were criticized for being vague and bland, especially as regarding the attribution of responsibility to State agents.<sup>53</sup>

16. JS1 noted that Jamaica enacted the Child Diversion Act in 2018, with the intention that children be diverted from the formal justice system.<sup>54</sup>

17. JS4 noted however that with the State of Emergency, there had been concerns raised about the arrest and detention of children within this framework. There were concerns that children were being held in inhumane conditions and children housed in juvenile correctional facilities had reported verbal and physical abuse and that they were not allowed to speak in court and felt excluded from the judicial process.<sup>55</sup> JS4 highlighted the need to treat children entering the justice system in a manner which promotes their dignity and prioritizes the child ultimately being reintegrated into society through clear and robust legislative and regulatory framework, strengthened capacity of all persons who deal with children in conflict with the law and the implementation of monitoring mechanisms to ensure adherence to and a respect for the child's rights and dignity at all levels. JS4 recommended that the State should repeal all provisions that authorize the deprivation of liberty of these children who were deemed 'beyond control' or who otherwise displayed behavioural problems, unless they were lawfully deemed to be in need of care and protection.<sup>56</sup>

18. JS4 also noted that children continued to be detained at Police lock-ups, in some instances for periods of more than 24 hours. It reported that education in juvenile facilities were found to be unsatisfactory, while there was a limited mental health support for children who were detained. JS4 recommended to remove minors from all police lock-ups and provide alternative holding facilities that are conducive to their safety, comfort and rehabilitations. It further recommended that the educational provisions for wards of the state to be aligned to those that are in place for students in the general education setting and that consistent, periodic and frequent psychological support services are provided to minors in detention.<sup>57</sup>

#### *Fundamental freedoms*<sup>58</sup>

19. JS2 and JS4 referred to the case of an activist, who was arrested after publicly naming the alleged perpetrators of sexual violence on social media. She was subsequently charged under Section 9(1) of Jamaica's Cybercrime Act for "use of a computer for malicious communication", which it was alleged had been menacing in nature and subsequently caused annoyance, distress and harm.<sup>59</sup> Though all charges were dropped, the case represented the threats to freedom of expression arising from the Cybercrime law. It was also noted that despite the criminal charges being dropped, the Supreme Court of Jamaica had awarded \$16 million to one of the men accused of sexual violence who filed a defamation suit against the activist. An appeal process was currently underway.<sup>60</sup> JS2 recommended that Jamaica should clarify definitions in its Cybercrime Act, particularly section 9(1), regarding "malicious" and "unlawful" communication because the legislation, as it stands, was susceptible to broad interpretation and application resulting in human rights violations.<sup>61</sup>

20. JS4 recommended that Jamaica enact and implement laws and policies that recognize and protect all human rights defenders, and ensure prompt, thorough and impartial investigations of all violations against them.<sup>62</sup>

21. The increase in internet penetration in Jamaica was noted by JS2, but it reported that, as of 2018, only 9.7 out of every 100 Jamaicans had fixed-line broadband subscriptions.<sup>63</sup> It recommended Jamaica to ensure that affordable internet access is made available across the island so that rural citizens would be able to readily access information and services through various public and private entities.<sup>64</sup>

22. JS2 also highlighted that under the Access to Information Act (2004), there was a legal right to access government information.<sup>65</sup> However, it was concerned that in October 2019, the Jamaican Government attempted to pass a resolution which would extend the period for which Cabinet documents were exempt from being requested under the Act, from twenty years to seventy years. JS2 claimed that this had raised significant questions about the accessibility of information and the credibility of the Act, which was enacted to promote transparency and to encourage governmental accountability.<sup>66</sup> JS2 recommended that Jamaica review the Access to Information Act and ensure that any amendments to the Act do not frustrate its object and purpose.<sup>67</sup>

#### *Right to privacy*

23. JS2 reported that in April 2019, the Jamaican Constitutional Court ruled that the mandatory requirement of biometric identification under the 2017 National Identification and Registrations Act was in violation of the Jamaican Constitution and infringed upon the right to privacy. Thus it rendered the Act void and dissolved the National Identification System in its entirety. The 2019 ruling against Jamaica's Digital ID system was noted as setting a precedent of respecting the human rights – the privacy and liberty – of all Jamaicans.<sup>68</sup> JS2 recommended that the National Identification and Registration Act and accompanying regulations should be compliant with the Constitution and should include safeguards for the collection and storage of sensitive data.<sup>69</sup>

24. JS2 also noted that the Government was working to complete the Data Protection Bill that supported the right of every Jamaican to have their privacy protected, and which sought to set clear guidelines for how the Government, businesses and organizations should correctly collect, store and dispose of persons' personal and sensitive data.<sup>70</sup> It recommended that Jamaica should work in cooperation with the civil society to ensure that the Data Protection Bill provides robust protection to its citizens and is in alignment with human rights principles.<sup>71</sup> In its 2018 report IACHR-OAS referred to the concerns raised by the civil society in relation to the Bill.<sup>72</sup>

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

#### *Right to an adequate standard of living<sup>73</sup>*

25. JS3 noted that the Government of Jamaica had adopted both the National Policy on Poverty and the National Poverty Reduction Programme since the 2015 UPR Process, but it had not since adopted a revised national policy on housing.<sup>74</sup> JS3 also noted that there was no constitutional protection of the rights to social security, housing or work. Social protection was secured through piecemeal legislation, policies and programmes such as the Poor Relief Act 1886 and the Programme for Advancement through Health, and Education and other services offered through the Ministry of Labour & Social Security.<sup>75</sup> JS3 also referred to a review of the National Policy on Poverty and the National Poverty Reduction Programme, which had found that the “culture of poverty” approach within the policy was problematic because it maintained bias against the poor and there was a failure to address discriminatory attitudes as a cause of poverty.<sup>76</sup>

26. TransWave Jamaica regretted that the Government of Jamaica was not implementing any type of comprehensive plan that addresses its approximately 2000 homeless residents. The actual number of homeless people in Jamaica was not seen as reliable since the count relied on direct interaction between the government agencies and the homeless population.<sup>77</sup> Under the Rent Restriction Act, landlords might evict a tenant for causing a nuisance or annoyance or when a tenant engages in “immoral behavior”, some of which were subjective standards used to discriminate.<sup>78</sup> TransWave Jamaica recommended that the Government prioritize combating homelessness generally, by utilizing the legislative process and instituting safe houses and programs geared towards the

homeless which included members of the vulnerable populations, including LGBTQ persons.<sup>79</sup> JS3 made similar recommendations.<sup>80</sup> TransWave Jamaica also recommended that the country amend the Towns and Community Act to decriminalize sleeping in public places and loitering as well as remove from the Rent Restriction Act the provisions on “annoyance to adjoining occupiers” and “immoral behavior”.<sup>81</sup>

27. JS3 also noted the absence of a government-run shelter for homeless population. The existing support for the LGBT homeless population largely came from civil society organizations.<sup>82</sup>

*Right to health*<sup>83</sup>

28. According to JS4, since the last UPR session, Jamaica had not made any notable progress in relation to sexual and reproductive rights, maternal mortality or abortion. The State had made minimal effort towards the development of laws or policies which addressed sexual and reproductive health and rights and had continued to exercise the savings clause in its Constitution to preserve anti-abortion legislation. In 2019, a Joint Select Committee was formed to review the Abortion Act. The Committee’s report of that review was pending.<sup>84</sup> JS4 recommended that a sexual and reproductive health law must be in place to ensure adequate protection, guidance and opportunities for redress for sexual and reproductive health issues faced by all persons, including women and girls. It also recommended that the State take steps to decriminalise abortion and to ensure that women who are faced with unwanted pregnancies do not resort to illegal abortions that could put their lives at risk.<sup>85</sup> IACHR-OAS was concerned over information indicating that 15% of pregnancies were among girls and adolescents, with 10 times as many among the poor.<sup>86</sup> International Planned Parenthood Federation (BFLA) reported that currently, there were legal barriers to contraceptive access for young people<sup>87</sup> and recommended Jamaica to remove all barriers to contraceptive access for young people 16 years of age and older.<sup>88</sup>

29. JS3 noted that public healthcare presented several systemic issues that prevented the average Jamaicans from utilizing the full extent of the services due to socioeconomic barriers, under-resourced facilities and lack of staff.<sup>89</sup> IACHR-OAS noted that access to health remained difficult for children who lived in rural areas or disadvantaged neighborhoods.<sup>90</sup>

30. JS4 noted that discrimination against people living with HIV/AIDS persisted in Jamaica, largely due to the absence of any meaningful legal protection. It recommended that Jamaica establish, in legislation, protection from discrimination based on health status, including HIV status, accompanied by a robust enforcement and redress mechanism, and that the National HIV/AIDS Workplace Policy and the National HIV Reporting and Redress System are strengthened. In particular, JS4 recommended that the Parliament must reject recommendations made by its Joint Select Committee which recommend the creation of a law that criminalises wilful and reckless transmission, and refrain from enacting legislation that would fuel the stigmatisation of and discrimination against persons living with HIV.<sup>91</sup>

31. AI noted that while Jamaica continued to take steps to address the HIV epidemic, it remained concentrated in groups who experienced human rights violations resulting from intense stigma and discrimination.<sup>92</sup> TransWave noted that trans persons faced significant obstacles in receiving equal and adequate health care<sup>93</sup> and recommended to enact codified protections against gender and sexuality based discrimination when seeking health care services.<sup>94</sup>

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

*Women*<sup>95</sup>

32. JS4 noted that the Government was slowly taking steps in the right direction towards dealing with gender inequality. However, it had failed to implement, in a meaningful way, strategies to remove different structural barriers to women’s participation in decision-making and to gender equality. Despite expressed commitments, there had been little progress made on a societal level to address fundamental inequalities between men and

women, which was further exacerbated by a weak, ineffective national machinery commencing with the Bureau of women's/gender affairs. The Government had amended the Constitution to prohibit discrimination on the basis of being male or female in section 13(3)(i), however, the impact of this amendment was yet to be felt. It was unclear to what degree private companies and other non-State actors could be held accountable to this provision.<sup>96</sup> JS4 recommended that Jamaica must move expeditiously to address gender inequality in its various forms, by enacting comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex and gender.<sup>97</sup>

33. According to JS4, the current percentage of women in Parliament was at its historic highest. It recommended that the State must work to increase the representation of women in Parliament, the Cabinet and public boards. Legislation should be enacted to uphold women's economic equality.<sup>98</sup>

34. BFLA and JS4 regretted that gender based and sexual violence remained widespread.<sup>99</sup> According to JS4, the legislation which addressed violence against women remained inadequate and there was a clear need for policies and infrastructure to respond to violence against women and girls.<sup>100</sup> While noting that the Domestic Violence Act provided some protection against physical and mental injury caused by intimate partners and family members,<sup>101</sup> JS4 recommended that the State must provide a legislative and regulatory framework to protect women from gender based violence.<sup>102</sup>

35. According to BFLA, there was only one official shelter for victims which could only accommodate 12 women and their children.<sup>103</sup> In 2018, the Government launched a 10-year strategic plan to eliminate gender-based violence.<sup>104</sup> BFLA recommended that Jamaica guarantee financial and institutional support for implementing the action plan and ensure its implementation nationwide.<sup>105</sup> JS4 highlighted the need to strengthen efforts to combat gender-based violence and to ensure that cases are dealt with in an appropriate and systematic manner by, inter alia, investigating, prosecuting and punishing the perpetrators.<sup>106</sup>

36. Both IACHR-OAS and JS4 noted that the 2009 Sexual Offenses Act had a limited definition of rape and limited protection to women who experienced sexual violence.<sup>107</sup> The law also penalized conjugal rape only in certain circumstances, which was discriminatory.<sup>108</sup> Currently, there was no legislation on sexual harassment or legal remedies available to victims<sup>109</sup> and the Sexual Harassment Bill sought to protect women (and men) from unwanted sexual advances, request for sexual favours and crude sexual behaviour.<sup>110</sup>

#### *Children*<sup>111</sup>

37. Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) highlighted that Jamaica became a Pathfinder country with the Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children in 2016. It reported, however, that provisions against violence and abuse in the Offences Against the Person Act 1864, the Domestic Violence Act 1996, and the Constitution 1962 and its Charter of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms 2011 were not interpreted as prohibiting corporal punishment in childrearing.<sup>112</sup>

38. GIEACPC and JS4 noted that corporal punishment was lawful in the home under the common law right to inflict "reasonable and moderate" punishment. While the Child Care and Protection Act 2004 punished "cruelty to children", it did not prohibit all corporal punishment and allowed by inference the infliction of "necessary" suffering.<sup>113</sup> JS1 recommended that all corporal punishment of children, including in the home, must be prohibited. Parents and guardians should be provided with educational programmes and materials on positive parenting and be held accountable for failing to protect children and prevent violence against them.<sup>114</sup>

39. According to GIEACPC, corporal punishment appeared to be prohibited in some but not all day care institutions,<sup>115</sup> while it remained lawful in schools, with the exception of "basic schools" for students under the age of six years.<sup>116</sup> JS1 recommended stronger sanctions against violence in government institutions, such as children's homes, juvenile centres, churches and other places of safety.<sup>117</sup>

40. IACHR-OAS noted that impunity persisted for those responsible of sexual crimes against children, which enabled them to continue committing them, mostly affecting girls. The Sexual Offences Act did not protect adolescents between the ages of 16 and 18.<sup>118</sup> JS1 noted that girls accounted for the vast majority of child abuse reports and recommended appropriate penalties to be put in place for perpetrators of sexual abuse. It also recommended that children be provided with information about agencies providing support, and where to ask for help if they experience or witness sexual violence.<sup>119</sup>

*Persons with disabilities*<sup>120</sup>

41. IACHR-OAS and JS4 were concerned that the Disabilities Act, promulgated in 2014, still had not taken effect.<sup>121</sup> JS4 noted that basic rights of access and equal protection were routinely violated and many persons with disabilities remained unaware of how the Act would protect them.<sup>122</sup> JS4 recommended that the State legislate special protective measures and secure their meaningful implementation in order to comply with the international standards and better protect the rights of persons with disabilities. It highlighted the need for improved infrastructure through the adoption and implementation of building codes as well as policies and practices to be more inclusive of the realities of persons with disabilities. It highlighted the need for the immediate enforcement of the Disabilities Act, and awareness around the Disabilities Act and sensitization of the general public about the rights of persons with disabilities. JS4 also emphasized that data collection mechanisms should be employed to measure progress on the treatment of persons with disabilities in various settings, including schools, prisons and remand centres.<sup>123</sup>

42. IACHR-OAS highlighted that aside from its alleged non-applicability, Article 6(c) of the Aliens Act of 1946 remained in effect, banning people with disabilities from entering the country.<sup>124</sup>

*Notes*

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

*Civil society*

*Individual submissions:*

AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom);
ICAN	International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Geneva (Switzerland);
BFLA	International Planned Parenthood Federation/Western Hemisphere Region, New York (USA);
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London (UK);
TransWave Jamaica	TransWave Jamaica, Kingston (Jamaica).

*Joint submissions:*

JS1	<b>Joint submission 1 submitted by:</b> World Council of Churches, Geneva (Switzerland), Jamaica Council of Churches, Kingston (Jamaica) and the Caribbean and North America Council for Mission, Kingston (Jamaica);
JS2	<b>Joint submission 2 submitted by:</b> Access Now, New York (USA) and Jamaicans for Justice, Kingston (Jamaica);
JS3	<b>Joint submission 3 submitted by:</b> J-FLAG, Kingston (Jamaica) and Women's Empowerment for Change (WE-Change), Kingston (Jamaica);
JS4	<b>Joint submission 4 submitted by:</b> Jamaicans for Justice, Kingston (Jamaica), The Caribbean Vulnerable Communities Coalition, Kingston (Jamaica), The Jamaica Youth Advocacy Network, Kingston (Jamaica), Jamaica Network of Seropositives, Kingston (Jamaica).

*Regional intergovernmental organization:*

IACHR-OAS	Inter-American Commission on Human Rights-Organization of American States, Washington D.C. (USA).
-----------	---

<sup>2</sup> For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/15, paras. 119.1–119.3, 120.1–120.19, 121.1–121.19, and 121.21–121.23.

- <sup>3</sup> AI, p. 5.
- <sup>4</sup> AI, p. 6. See also JS4, pp. 8-9.
- <sup>5</sup> AI, p. 5.
- <sup>6</sup> ICAN, p. 1.
- <sup>7</sup> For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/15, paras. 118.2–118.8, and 119.4–119.16.
- <sup>8</sup> AI, p. 2, JS3, para. 20 and JS4, pp.2-3.
- <sup>9</sup> IACHR-OAS, p. 2.
- <sup>10</sup> AI, p. 5 and JS4 p. 3.
- <sup>11</sup> JS4, p. 3.
- <sup>12</sup> JS4, p. 3.
- <sup>13</sup> For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/15, paras.119.17–119.18, 121.24, 121.27–121.41, 121.56, and 120.20.
- <sup>14</sup> JS4, p. 3 and TransWave Jamaica, p. 2.
- <sup>15</sup> JS4, pp. 3-4.
- <sup>16</sup> JS4, p. 4 and JS3, paras. 7 and 21.
- <sup>17</sup> JS4, p. 5, AI, p. 1, JS3, para. 9 and TransWave Jamaica, p. 5.
- <sup>18</sup> JS4, p. 5, AI, p. 2, JS3, para. 3 and TransWave Jamaica, p. 5.
- <sup>19</sup> IACHR-OAS, p. 3.
- <sup>20</sup> JS4, p. 5.
- <sup>21</sup> JS3, para. 21 and TransWave Jamaica, pp. 5-6.
- <sup>22</sup> JS4, p. 5 and JS3, para. 21. See also TransWave Jamaica, p. 4.
- <sup>23</sup> AI, p.6.
- <sup>24</sup> TransWave Jamaica, p.1.
- <sup>25</sup> TransWave Jamaica, pp. 2-3.
- <sup>26</sup> TransWave Jamaica, pp. 7-8.
- <sup>27</sup> JS3, paras. 5-6 and 9, and TransWave Jamaica, pp. 2-3.
- <sup>28</sup> JS3, para. 21.
- <sup>29</sup> TransWave Jamaica, pp. 5-6 and JS3, para. 21.
- <sup>30</sup> For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/15, paras. 118.22–118.23.
- <sup>31</sup> AI, p. 1.
- <sup>32</sup> AI, p. 5.
- <sup>33</sup> For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/15, paras. 121.3, 121.42–121.51, 119.20, 119.22–119.26, and 119.28–119.29.
- <sup>34</sup> AI, p. 6.
- <sup>35</sup> AI pp. 3-4. See also JS1, p. 5.
- <sup>36</sup> IACHR-OAS, pp. 1-2.
- <sup>37</sup> AI, p. 3.
- <sup>38</sup> AI pp. 3-4.
- <sup>39</sup> AI, p. 6.
- <sup>40</sup> AI, p. 6.
- <sup>41</sup> IACHR-OAS, p. 2.
- <sup>42</sup> JS4, pp. 8-9
- <sup>43</sup> For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/15, paras. 119.45–119.47, 119.20, and 120.26.
- <sup>44</sup> AI, p. 4.
- <sup>45</sup> AI, p. 4 and JS4, p. 1.0.
- <sup>46</sup> JS4, p. 11.
- <sup>47</sup> AI, p. 6.
- <sup>48</sup> IACHR-OAS, p. 3.
- <sup>49</sup> AI, p. 3.
- <sup>50</sup> AI, p. 5.
- <sup>51</sup> JS4, p. 9.
- <sup>52</sup> AI, p. 6. See also JS4, p. 11.
- <sup>53</sup> IACHR-OAS, pp. 3-4.
- <sup>54</sup> JS1, p. 7.
- <sup>55</sup> JS4, p. 11.
- <sup>56</sup> JS4, p. 12.
- <sup>57</sup> JS4, p. 12.
- <sup>58</sup> For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/15, paras. 121.20 and 121.47.
- <sup>59</sup> JS2, para. 18 and JS4, p. 13.
- <sup>60</sup> JS2, para. 19 and JS4, p. 13.
- <sup>61</sup> JS2, para. 21.
- <sup>62</sup> JS4, p. 13.
- <sup>63</sup> JS2, para. 14.
- <sup>64</sup> JS2, para. 20.

- <sup>65</sup> JS2, para. 16.  
<sup>66</sup> JS2, para. 17.  
<sup>67</sup> JS2, para. 24.  
<sup>68</sup> JS2, para. 11.  
<sup>69</sup> JS2, para. 23.  
<sup>70</sup> JS2, para. 12.  
<sup>71</sup> JS2, para. 22.  
<sup>72</sup> IACHR-OAS, pp. 4-5.  
<sup>73</sup> For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/15, paras. 119.49–119.53, and 118.18–118.19.  
<sup>74</sup> JS3, para. 11.  
<sup>75</sup> JS3, para. 12.  
<sup>76</sup> JS3, para. 13.  
<sup>77</sup> TransWave Jamaica, p. 3.  
<sup>78</sup> TransWave Jamaica, p. 4.  
<sup>79</sup> TransWave Jamaica, p. 4.  
<sup>80</sup> JS3, para. 21.  
<sup>81</sup> TransWave Jamaica, p. 4.  
<sup>82</sup> JS3, para. 14.  
<sup>83</sup> For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/15, paras. 118.1, 118.21, and 119.54–118.57.  
<sup>84</sup> JS4, p. 8.  
<sup>85</sup> JS4, p. 8.  
<sup>86</sup> IACHR-OAS, p. 4.  
<sup>87</sup> BFLA, para. 14.  
<sup>88</sup> BFLA, para. 16.  
<sup>89</sup> JS3, para. 21.  
<sup>90</sup> IACHR-OAS, p. 4.  
<sup>91</sup> JS4, p. 6.  
<sup>92</sup> AI, pp. 1-2.  
<sup>93</sup> TransWave Jamaica, p. 6.  
<sup>94</sup> TransWave Jamaica, p. 7.  
<sup>95</sup> For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/15, paras. 118.9–118.15, 119.19, 119.31–119.33, 120.21–120.22, 121.25–121.26, and 121.52.  
<sup>96</sup> JS4, p. 6. See also BFLA, para. 20.  
<sup>97</sup> JS4, pp. 7-8.  
<sup>98</sup> JS4, pp. 7-8.  
<sup>99</sup> BFLA, paras. 18 and 21, and JS4, pp. 7-8.  
<sup>100</sup> JS4, p. 7.  
<sup>101</sup> JS4, p. 7.  
<sup>102</sup> JS4, pp. 7-8.  
<sup>103</sup> BFLA, para. 25.  
<sup>104</sup> BFLA, para. 23.  
<sup>105</sup> BFLA, paras. 28-30.  
<sup>106</sup> JS4, p.7.  
<sup>107</sup> ACHR-OAS, p. 3 and JS4, p. 7.  
<sup>108</sup> IACHR-OAS, p. 3.  
<sup>109</sup> IACHR-OAS, p. 3.  
<sup>110</sup> JS4, p. 7.  
<sup>111</sup> For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/15, paras. 118.20, 119.27, 119. 30, 119.34–119.37, 119.44, 120.24, and 121.53–121.55.  
<sup>112</sup> GIEACPC, p. 3.  
<sup>113</sup> GIEACPC, pp. 2-3 and JS4, p. 12. See also IACHR-OAS, p. 4.  
<sup>114</sup> JS1, p. 3.  
<sup>115</sup> GIEACPC, pp. 3-4.  
<sup>116</sup> GIEACPC, p. 4. See also JS1, p. 3.  
<sup>117</sup> JS1, p. 6.  
<sup>118</sup> IACHR-OAS, p. 4.  
<sup>119</sup> JS1, pp. 4-5.  
<sup>120</sup> For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/15, paras. 119.60–119.62.  
<sup>121</sup> IACHR-OAS, p. 4 and JS4, p. 4.  
<sup>122</sup> JS4, p. 4.  
<sup>123</sup> JS4, p. 4.  
<sup>124</sup> IACHR-OAS, p. 4.