



General Assembly

Distr.: General
9 November 2012

Original: English

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

**Compilation 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**

Luxembourg

The present report is a compilation of the information contained in the reports of treaty bodies and special procedures, including observations and comments by the State concerned, and of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), and in other relevant official United Nations documents. It is presented in a summarized manner due to word-limit constraints. For the full text, please refer to the document referenced. This report does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of OHCHR other than those contained in public reports and statements issued by the Office. It follows the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council in its decision 17/119. Information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the periodicity of the review and developments during that period.

I. Background and framework

A. Scope of international obligations¹

International human rights treaties²

	<i>Status during previous cycle</i>	<i>Action after review</i>	<i>Not ratified/not accepted</i>
<i>Ratification, accession or succession</i>	ICERD (1978)	OP-CAT (2010)	ICRMW
	ICESCR (1983)	OP-CRC-SC (2011)	
	ICCPR (1983)	CRPD (2011)	
	ICCPR-OP 2 (1992)		
	CEDAW (1989)		
	CAT (1987)		
	CRC (1994)		
	OP-CRC-AC (2004)		
	CPED (signature only, 2007)		
	<i>Reservations, declarations and/or understandings</i>	ICCPR (Declaration, arts. 10.3, 14.5, 19.2, 20.1 and 20, 1983 / Declaration, art. 14.5, 2004)	
ICCPR-OP 1 (Declaration, art. 5.2, 1983)			
CEDAW (Withdrawal of reservations, arts. 7 and 16.1 (g), 2008)			
CAT (Declaration, art. 1.1, 1987)			
CRC (Declaration, arts. 3, 6, 7 and 15, 1994)			
<i>Complaint procedures, inquiry and urgent action³</i>	ICERD, art. 14 (1996)	OP-ICESCR (signature only, 2009)	ICRMW
	ICCPR, art. 41 (1983)		
	ICCPR-OP 1 (1983)	OP-CRC-IC (signature only, 2012)	
	OP-CEDAW, art. 8 (2003)	OP-CRPD, art. 6 (2011)	
	CAT, arts. 20, 21 and 22 (1987)		
	CPED (signature only, 2007)		

Other main relevant international instruments

	<i>Status during previous cycle</i>	<i>Action after review</i>	<i>Not ratified</i>
<i>Ratification, accession or succession</i>	Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide	Palermo Protocol ⁷	Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court
	Conventions on refugees and stateless persons ⁴	ILO Convention No. 169 ⁸	ILO Convention No. 189 ⁹
	Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 and Additional Protocols thereto ⁵		
	ILO fundamental conventions ⁶		
	UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education		

1. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) welcomed the pledge made by Luxembourg at the UNHCR ministerial meeting in 2011, to accede to the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.¹⁰ UNHCR noted that Luxembourg planned to do so after an amendment to its Nationality Law expected in 2013.¹¹

B. Constitutional and legislative framework

2. UNHCR noted that there was no specific legislation on statelessness. It recommended that Luxembourg ensure that the planned reform of the Nationality Law complied with the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness, and with other international standards.¹² UNHCR also recommended that the reform of the Nationality Law provided facilitated access to nationality for stateless persons, in line with obligations of Luxembourg under the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons.¹³

3. UNHCR noted that legislation governing the return of non-European Union nationals in irregular situation, entered into force on 28 July 2011. The law transposed the European Union Returns Directive 2008/115/EC, which established common standards and procedures in member States for returning third-country nationals staying in an irregular situation. UNHCR stated that it and the Council of State had provided comments on the draft bill. However, the legislature had only taken a few of those comments into account.¹⁴

C. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures**Status of national human rights institutions¹⁵**

<i>National human rights institution</i>	<i>Status during previous cycle</i>	<i>Status during present cycle¹⁶</i>
Commission consultative des droits de l'homme du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg	A (2002)	A (2010)

4. The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) noted that Luxembourg was undertaking several initiatives at the national level to promote human rights education in schools,¹⁷ including teacher training. Activities related to the annual International Day of Commemoration to honour the victims of the Holocaust had also been

organized. OHCHR also noted that several activities had been undertaken to celebrate the sixtieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.¹⁸

5. OHCHR also noted that a special issue of the *Courrier de l'Éducation Nationale* had been dedicated to peace education. It contained several examples of good practices for primary schools of education for peace, human rights and non-violent conflict resolution. A book for primary school students, entitled "Mission: Stopp die Armut!", had been jointly elaborated by the Ministry of National Education and the Ministry of Cooperation. The book aimed to sensitize children to the different aspects of poverty. Training sessions were also organized for teachers and students on dialogue, participation and conflict-resolution to favour the development of democratic schools and to prevent violence. OHCHR also noted that, in primary schools, children were sensitized to issues such as rights, duties, participation, respect and values for living together.¹⁹

6. With respect to secondary schools, OHCHR noted that a multidisciplinary programme had been developed in Luxembourg for education on democratic citizenship aimed to promote a democratic culture, peace and the development of a reflective, critical, cooperative and responsible citizenship.²⁰

7. OHCHR also noted that the University of Luxembourg organized pre-service training on education for democratic citizenship and human rights, for post-primary teachers.²¹

II. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

A. Cooperation with treaty bodies²²

1. Reporting status

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Concluding observations included in previous review</i>	<i>Latest report submitted since previous review</i>	<i>Latest concluding observations</i>	<i>Reporting status</i>
CERD	March 2005	–	–	Fourteenth to seventeenth reports overdue since 2007, 2009 and 2011 respectively
CESCR	May 2003	–	–	Fourth report overdue since 2008
HR Committee	March 2003	–	–	Fourth report overdue since 2008
CEDAW	January 2008	–	–	Combined sixth and seventh reports due in 2014
CAT	May 2007	–	–	Combined sixth and seventh reports overdue since 2011
CRC	January 2005	2010	–	Third and fourth reports pending consideration Initial OP-CRC-SC report due in 2013
CRPD	–	–	–	Initial report due in 2013

2. Responses to specific follow-up requests by treaty bodies

Concluding observations

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Due in</i>	<i>Subject matter</i>	<i>Submitted in</i>
CAT	2008	Detention and treatment of arrested persons; treatment of minors in conflict with the law and minors at risk; and impartial investigation. ²³	_ ²⁴

B. Cooperation with special procedures

	<i>Status during previous cycle</i>	<i>Current status</i>
<i>Standing invitation</i>	Yes	Yes
<i>Visits undertaken</i>	None	None
<i>Visits agreed to in principle</i>	None	None
<i>Visits requested</i>	None	None
<i>Responses to letters of allegations and urgent appeals</i>	During the period under review, no communications were sent.	

C. Cooperation with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

8. Luxembourg annually makes voluntary contributions to support the work of OHCHR, including to the Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture in 2008, 2009 and 2011, and to the Voluntary Fund on Contemporary Forms of Slavery in 2008.

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

A. Equality and non-discrimination

9. UNHCR noted that, the recent rise in the number of asylum seekers was mainly due to an influx of Roma, many of whom had serious medical conditions. Their arrival had put great pressure on the existing reception facilities and on the asylum procedure. As a result, there was a risk of deteriorating public perception, which had traditionally been rather positive vis-à-vis asylum seekers and migrants. UNHCR recommended that Luxembourg make all necessary efforts to preserve the overall positive public perception of refugees and asylum seekers.²⁵

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

10. According to UNHCR, in 2011, 20 forced returns reportedly took place (58 in 2009) in Luxembourg. The country had an agreement with the Red Cross regarding the monitoring of forced returns on charter flights. The Red Cross did not monitor the phase between the detention centre and the plane and did not monitor forced returns on regular flights. With the support of the Government of Luxembourg, the International Organization for Migration was implementing a programme of assisted voluntary return. The programme targeted different categories of migrants, including rejected asylum seekers and persons who had withdrawn their asylum application. Since 2011, the programme had not covered persons who came from the Balkan countries and thus benefited from visa liberalization vis-à-vis the European Union. UNHCR noted that the programme aimed to prevent an influx of persons who might come to Luxembourg with the main goal of receiving reintegration assistance upon return.²⁶

11. UNHCR also noted that, until the recent increase in the number of asylum applications, the overall reception situation in Luxembourg had improved significantly, partly due to agreements between the authorities and some NGOs regarding the management of some centres, the decrease of asylum applications and the closure of centres where conditions had deteriorated. UNHCR nevertheless continued to advocate for improvement in the supervision of centres where there was no permanent presence of dedicated expert staff.²⁷

12. According to UNHCR, the increase in the number of asylum seekers from the Balkans had put a serious strain on Luxembourg's reception facilities. As a result, existing centres became overcrowded and, until they increased their capacities, those centres could not accommodate some asylum seekers in regular structures. The profile of those seeking asylum had also changed and there were more people with serious medical conditions and/or disabilities, who needed increase specialized staff/support.²⁸

13. UNHCR recommended making available to all asylum seekers the level and quality of the valuable specialized support available in some reception centres where there is a permanent presence of dedicated expert staff.²⁹

14. According to UNHCR, Luxembourg did not detain persons who applied for asylum at the border. Those detained mainly belong to two categories: asylum seekers undergoing "Dublin" procedures and, more rarely, persons who applied for asylum in immigration detention centres. However, the 28 May 2009 Act on the *centre de rétention* (the detention centre for migrants residing in an irregular situation on the territory) and the 1 July 2011 Act, implementing the European Union Returns Directive explicitly allowed detention of unaccompanied children. The regulation stipulating the conditions and operating rules of the detention centre did not contain any provisions adapting the system to the needs of unaccompanied children. UNHCR recommended that the Luxembourg embed in legislation the current good practice of not detaining unaccompanied children; and consider alternatives to detention for vulnerable persons.³⁰

15. The establishment of a new detention centre for aliens awaiting deportation (including rejected asylum seekers), opened in summer 2011 in Findel, was noted by UNHCR. The new centre could accommodate 88 people. Men and women lived on different corridors. Families with children could only be held for a maximum of 72 hours. According to UNHCR, overall, the conditions in Findel were good and were a significant improvement on those in the Schrassig prison, where such persons had previously been held.³¹

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

16. In the view of UNHCR, there was still room for improvement regarding the asylum system in Luxembourg. UNHCR expressed concerns regarding status determination in first instance and on appeal related to remaining gaps in the system. For example, the Administrative Tribunal lacked investigative powers. UNHCR also noted that the asylum seeker bore the burden of proof and had no opportunity for a hearing on appeal. In some decisions, there was inadequate reasoning and misinterpretation of the refugee definition. UNHCR referred to the 2009 activity report of the Administrative Tribunal, which had shared some of these concerns and mentioned the possibility of creating a specialized section on immigration and asylum matters in the Administrative Tribunal. The section would receive support from staff in charge of assisting the magistrates in their investigations, notably with country-of-origin research. The report had also mentioned the possibility of establishing hearings for asylum seekers in the specialized section. According to UNHCR, there had been no further development on the issue, and discussions had focused more on wider reform of the judiciary rather than on the establishment of a specialized tribunal.³²

17. UNHCR noted that the recent increase in asylum requests had placed serious strains on all stages of the asylum procedure. Luxembourg prioritized asylum claims of persons from countries considered as safe countries of origin and treated those cases in an accelerated manner. As a result, asylum seekers from other countries ended up at the back of the line, with waiting periods that could exceed one year before the first interview. In order to cope with the increase, the Immigration Directorate had hired new staff who had benefited in 2012 from training provided by the European Asylum Support Office and UNHCR. However, despite the significant increase in the number of cases processed through accelerated procedures, at the appeal level, Luxembourg had not hired new staff in the Administrative Tribunal or Court to respond to the increased numbers of appeals.³³

18. UNHCR recommended that Luxembourg ensure, including through the provision of adequate means, that both the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Administrative Tribunal and Court were able to issue quality decisions on asylum requests within a reasonable time, despite the recent increase in the number of asylum seekers; and consider providing for a procedure which was better adapted to the determination of international protection needs at the Administrative Tribunal level, possibly including a shared burden of proof, judicial investigation powers and hearings.³⁴

19. UNHCR noted that, under a grand-ducal decree, the Minister of Labour, Employment and Immigration was competent to determine whether a person is stateless. Nevertheless, there was no dedicated procedure for the determination of statelessness status in Luxembourg. UNHCR referred to Government sources, according to which, in 2009, the Government issued 47 passports to stateless persons, the majority of whom were in the process of acquiring the Luxembourg nationality. Out of the 47 applicants, 23 were first-instance requests and 24 were renewals. However, little was known about how these individuals were found to be stateless, the number of people seeking recognition as stateless, or the characteristics of the stateless population and the official status of such persons. UNHCR recommended that Luxembourg introduce a formal statelessness determination procedure to improve its compliance with protection obligations owed to stateless persons pursuant to the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons.³⁵

D. Right to family life

20. UNHCR expressed concerns regarding the family reunification procedure in Luxembourg. It referred to reported problems that included the duration of the procedure, difficulties in obtaining travel documents or visas for family members who could not obtain those documents in their country of origin and difficulties in proving a family relationship. In addition, beneficiaries of international protection only had three months to submit their application for family reunification in order to receive exemption from more demanding conditions (i.e. a stable income, adequate housing and health insurance). UNHCR recommended that Luxembourg ensure that family reunification of beneficiaries of international protection take place without undue delay in a positive and humanitarian spirit and consider facilitating, when needed, the issuance of travel documents for family reunification.³⁶

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

21. According to UNHCR, asylum seekers had authorization to seek employment if they had been in the asylum procedure for nine months and had not yet received a first decision. However, in April 2009, UNHCR led a participatory assessment exercise focusing on access to the labour market for asylum seekers and holders of *attestations de tolérance*, and the results showed that only four per cent of asylum seekers received work permits, compared to sixteen per cent of holders of *attestations de tolérance*. Both groups testified that finding employment was difficult due to legal and administrative obstacles and to the precariousness of their status.³⁷

22. According to the ILO *Work World Report 2012*, in some of the countries where spending on social benefits as a percentage of the gross domestic product decreased, such as Luxembourg, the number of unemployed individuals continued to rise.³⁸

F. Right to social security and to an adequate standard of living

23. According to UNHCR, asylum seekers in Luxembourg were entitled to social assistance, which included accommodation, a monthly allowance, public transport, urgent medical care, psychological assistance, social counselling, guidance for unaccompanied minors and sexual and reproductive advice. The amount of the monthly allowance depended on the age of the person, his or her family situation and whether or not meals were provided with his or her accommodation.³⁹ UNHCR noted however, that, on 20 June 2012, the Government had issued a grand-ducal regulation on reception conditions, and that the new regulation reduced the monthly allowance amount and created additional grounds for withdrawal or reduction of social assistance, including in cases of subsequent applications.⁴⁰ UNHCR recommended continuing to provide asylum seekers with sufficient support to meet their basic needs, bearing in mind their profile and specific needs and making sure the support lasted for the entire asylum procedure until they received a final decision on their asylum claim.⁴¹

24. UNHCR noted that Luxembourg did not have a structural resettlement programme and recommended that Luxembourg consider adopting a structural resettlement programme.⁴²

G. Right to health

25. In 2011, the ILO Committee of Experts on the Applications of Conventions and Recommendations noted that entitlement to health care was suspended and cash sickness benefits were not paid while the insured person is under detention in Luxembourg.⁴³

H. Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers

26. UNHCR stated that, at the end of 2011, a total of 2,855 refugees, 1,694 asylum seekers and 177 stateless persons were living in Luxembourg. The number of asylum seekers had risen considerably during 2011, with 2,165 individuals lodging asylum applications, which represented an increase of 175 per cent compared to 2010, while the number of asylum requests had already risen from 426 in 2007 to 786 in 2010. More than 70 per cent of all asylum seekers in 2011 originated from just two countries. In the first five months of 2012, the number of asylum requests remained at the same elevated level as in 2011, with 1,018 people seeking asylum between January and May 2012. The asylum authorities had recognized only a few asylum claims among the newly arrived asylum seekers.⁴⁴

27. UNHCR noted that, in 2011, the recognition rate of first requests for asylum was 4.34 per cent (3.95 per cent refugee recognition rate). The Administrative Tribunal recognition rate was 3.6 per cent and the Administrative Court recognition rate was 2 per cent.⁴⁵

I. Right to development and environmental issues

28. The ILO *Work World Report 2012* indicated that the global crisis had also led to a slowdown in foreign aid for health programmes in many countries. For example, development assistance for health stagnated or decreased in Luxembourg, among others.⁴⁶

Notes

¹ Unless indicated otherwise, the status of ratifications of instruments listed in the table may be found on the official website of the United Nations Treaty Collection database, Office of Legal Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat, <http://treaties.un.org/>. Please also refer to the United Nations compilation on Luxembourg from the previous cycle (A/HRC/WG.6/3/LUX/2).

² The following abbreviations have been used for this 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
CPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance

³ Individual complaints: ICCPR-OP 1, art 1; OP-CEDAW, art. 1; OP-CRPD, art. 1; OP-ICESCR, art. 1; OP-CRC-IC, art. 5; ICERD, art. 14; CAT, art. 22; ICRMW, art. 77; and CPED, art. 31. Inquiry procedure: OP-CEDAW, art. 8; CAT, art. 20; CPED, art. 33; OP-CRPD, art. 6; OP-ICESCR, art. 11; and OP-CRC-IC, art. 13. Inter-State complaints: ICCPR, art. 41; ICRMW, art. 76; CPED, art. 32; CAT, art. 21; OP-ICESCR, art. 10; and OP-CRC-IC, art. 12. Urgent action: CPED, art. 30.

⁴ 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol, 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons and 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.

⁵ Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field (First Convention); Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea (Second Convention); Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (Third Convention); Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (Fourth Convention); Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I); Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II); Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Adoption of an Additional Distinctive Emblem (Protocol III). For the official status of ratifications, see Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, at www.eda.admin.ch/eda/fr/home/topics/intla/intrea/chdep/warvic.html.

⁶ International Labour Organization Convention No. 29 concerning Forced or Compulsory Labour; Convention No. 105 concerning the Abolition of Forced Labour; Convention No. 87 concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise; Convention No. 98 concerning the Application of the Principles of the Right to Organise and to Bargain Collectively; Convention No. 100 concerning Equal Remuneration for Men and Women Workers for Work of Equal Value; Convention No. 111 concerning Discrimination in Respect of Employment and Occupation; Convention No. 138 concerning Minimum Age for Admission to Employment; Convention No. 182 concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour.

⁷ Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

⁸ International Labour Organization Convention No. 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries.

⁹ International Labour Organization Convention No. 189 concerning Decent Work for Domestic Workers.

¹⁰ UNHCR submission for UPR, p. 1.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

¹⁵ According to article 5 of the rules of procedure for the International Coordination Committee (ICC) Sub-Committee on Accreditation, the different classifications for accreditation used by the Sub-Committee are: A: Voting Member (fully in compliance with each of the Paris Principles), B: Non-Voting Member (not fully in compliance with each of the Paris Principles or insufficient information provided to make a determination); C: No Status (not in compliance with the Paris Principles).

¹⁶ For the status of national institutions accredited by the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (ICC), see A/HRC/20/10,

annex.

¹⁷ OHCHR, summary of national initiatives undertaken within first phase (2005–2009). Available from www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/education/training/Summary-national-initiatives2005-2009.htm.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid..

²² The following abbreviations have been used for this document:

CERD	Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination
CESCR	Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
HR Committee	Human Rights Committee
CEDAW	Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women
CAT	Committee against Torture
CRC	Committee on the Rights of the Child
CRPD	Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

²³ Concluding observations of CAT, CAT/C/LUX/CO/5, para. 17.

²⁴ See letter dated 17 November 2008 from CAT to the Permanent Mission of Luxembourg in Geneva. Available from http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cat/docs/Luxembourg_reminder.pdf (accessed on 24 September 2012).

²⁵ UNHCR submission, pp. 1 and 3.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 2.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 3.

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 3 and 4.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 4.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 4.

³¹ Ibid., p. 4.

³² Ibid., pp. 2 and 3.

³³ Ibid., p. 3.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 3.

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 5 and 6.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 5.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 2.

³⁸ ILO, *Word of Work Report 2012: Better jobs for a better economy* (Geneva, 2012), p. 65.

³⁹ UNHCR submission, p. 3.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 4.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 4.

⁴² Ibid., pp. 4 and 5.

⁴³ ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, Observation concerning the ILO Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102), adopted 2011, published 101st ILC session (2012), available from www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100_COMMENT_ID:2699210, first paragraph.

⁴⁴ UNHCR submission, p. 1.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 1.

⁴⁶ ILO, *Word of Work Report 2012*, p. 16.