



General Assembly

Distr.: General
24 October 2014

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twenty first session
19–30 January 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

Guyana*

The present report is a summary of 10 stakeholders' submissions¹ to the universal periodic review. It follows the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council in its decision 17/119. It does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), nor any judgement or determination in relation to specific claims. The information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes and, to the extent possible, the original texts have not been altered. As provided for in 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

1. Amnesty International (AI) welcomed that Guyana acceded to the two optional protocols of the Convention on the Rights of the Child on 30 July 2010 and 11 August 2010 and also ratified the ICRMW on 7 July 2010.²

2. The International Human Rights Clinic – University of Oklahoma College of Law – (IHRC-UOCL) stated that in the last UPR, Guyana examined the recommendation regarding ILO Convention No. 169, and in 2011 voluntarily committed itself to consult and report about its ratification within one year's time. IHRC-UOCL affirmed that however, to date Guyana has not ratified the aforementioned Convention.³

3. AI recommended to ratify without reservations the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights⁴; the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women; the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment; and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.⁵ AI also recommended Guyana to remove reservations to the First Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.⁶

B. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

1. Cooperation with treaty bodies

4. Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative (CHRI) stated that Guyana had a poor record of treaty reporting.⁷ CHRI recommended the Government of Guyana to demonstrate its commitment to the UN human rights mechanisms by complying with its treaty reporting obligations.⁸

2. Cooperation with special procedures

5. AI stated that although Guyana supported a recommendation to invite the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment to conduct an assessment of torture in the country and other similar recommendations calling for an open invitation to United Nations human rights special procedures mandate holders, to its knowledge no invitations were issued.⁹ CHRI recommended the government to extend an open invitation to all special procedures of the UN Human Rights Council and facilitate, without further delay, the visit of the Special Rapporteur on Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment.¹⁰

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

1. Equality and non-discrimination

6. JS1-SASOD-SRI (JS1) stated that much of the violence against LGBT persons was fuelled by socio-cultural norms, and that discriminatory laws reinforced these homophobic and transphobic prejudices.¹¹

7. AI reported that at least three individuals were murdered in 2013 in what appears to have been killings motivated by their perceived sexual orientation and/or gender identity and expressed concern at reports of the police refusing to take complaints from the LGBTI community and often verbally abusing them.¹² CHRI recommended *inter alia*, ensuring that all allegations of hate crimes based on sexual orientation and gender identity were properly investigated and perpetrators held accountable.¹³ AI recommended fully and thoroughly investigating all incidents and acts of violence suspected of being motivated by homophobic or transphobic reasons.¹⁴

8. JS1 affirmed that discriminatory responses from the police, manifested in lack of or inadequate investigations and mostly unsolved cases often lead to injustice and fostered impunity for anti-LGBT hate crimes.¹⁵ JS1 recommended the Government of Guyana *inter alia*, to investigate, and punish where necessary, discriminatory and abusive behaviour by the uniformed forces.¹⁶

9. Equal Rights Trust (ERT) asserted it found evidence of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity in employment, education and healthcare, all legitimised by continued criminalisation.¹⁷ JS1 affirmed that LGBT persons suffered discrimination in many sectors. JS1 also affirmed that discriminatory laws contributed to a repressive socio-cultural environment and to a limitation in LGBT people's access to public, semi-public and private spaces.¹⁸ CHRI stated there is no explicit legislation against discrimination on sexual orientation and gender identity grounds¹⁹ and JS1 recommended the Government of Guyana to amend Article 149 of the Constitution in order to include sexual orientation and gender identity as grounds for discrimination.²⁰ Justice Institute-Guyana (JIG) also recommended amending section 4 of the Prevention of Discrimination Act to include sexual orientation and gender identity as prohibited grounds for discrimination.²¹

10. JS1 stated that LGBT persons oftentimes chose not to express their orientations and identities because they were threatened, discriminated against and victimised, and that transgender persons were expressly forbidden from expressing their gender identity because of Section 153 (1) (xlvii) of the Summary Jurisdiction (Offences) Act which made cross-gender dressing an offence.²² JS1 stated this norm facilitated arbitrary arrests, police harassment and abuse.²³ CHRI reported that, in September 2013, the Supreme Court partially repealed the controversial section 153 of the 1893 Guyanese Summary Jurisdiction Act on cross-dressing.²⁴ CHRI reported that the Court ruled that cross-dressing can only be considered a criminal offence if it is done for an "improper purpose".²⁵ CHRI also expressed that the failure to define what exactly is meant by "improper purpose", may be sufficient for arbitrary police arrests of cross-dressers and transgender citizens.²⁶

11. JIG recommended Guyana to repeal the norm which criminalises cross-dressing,²⁷ and ERT urged states involved in Guyana's UPR to make recommendations to repeal legislative provisions criminalising cross-dressing and other forms of expressing gender identity and to amend the Prevention of Discrimination Act 1997 to include sexual orientation and gender identity as protected characteristics.²⁸

12. CHRI recommended inter alia, that the government promote and facilitate a constructive dialogue on sexual orientation and gender identity with stakeholders and introduce policies and educational programmes aimed at ending discrimination and harassment based on sexual orientation and gender identity.²⁹ AI recommended, inter alia, to establish and implement policies to address discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity.³⁰

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

13. AI stated that the Guyana Police Force reported 255 people had been fatally shot by the police between 1 January 1997 and 18 October 2012, with 10 officers charged for murder and 3 for manslaughter on these crimes, and that no figure was provided for convictions.³¹

14. CHRI asserted Guyana retained a mandatory death penalty for a number of criminal offences, and that it had taken an ambiguous position regarding abolition of death penalty during its last UPR, while it did not respond specifically to 18 recommendations on the subject.³² AI welcomed that since its last UPR, the National Assembly amended the Criminal Law (Offences) Act on 14 October 2010 to remove the mandatory death penalty for anyone convicted of murder.³³ It regretted that, since its last Universal Periodic Review, Guyana had continued to vote against the UN General Assembly resolutions on a moratorium on the use of the death penalty in December 2010 and December 2012, and reported that death sentences continued to be imposed.³⁴ CHRI said Guyana pledged voluntarily to continue its consideration of this issue over the next two years and to report its findings to the Human Rights Council.³⁵

15. CHRI stated that in 2012, the Parliament established a Special Select Committee to examine the possibility of abolishing the death penalty and facilitate a wide national consultation on the subject.³⁶ AI stated that no such meetings had been held³⁷ and CHRI expressed that at the time of writing, no Committee report on the results of deliberations was available.³⁸ JIG noted that the Committee appeared to be unwilling to advocate abolition without greater public support.³⁹ AI recommended Guyana to establish an official moratorium on executions, to commute without delay all death sentences to terms of imprisonment, and to ensure in all cases rigorous compliance with international standards for a fair trial, pending full abolition of death penalty.⁴⁰ JIG recommended, inter alia, amending Article 138 of the Constitution to remove the power of the Court to order executions.⁴¹

16. CHRI reported that since its last UPR, there have been several reports of alleged police torture and ill-treatment, as well as persistent discrimination against Indo-Guyanese persons by the predominantly Afro-Guyanese police.⁴² It also reported that although according to the law the national Guyana Police Force is under civilian control, there have been many accusations that the police was manipulated by the Government, and that public confidence in the police was low, among other reasons due to allegations of corruption, brutality and discrimination.⁴³

17. AI expressed concern about very high levels of physical and sexual violence against women and girls in Guyana.⁴⁴ JS2-Help & Shelter-Read Thread (JS2) stated that in 2013 there were 22 murders of women by intimate partners and that so far in 2014 there had been at least 16.⁴⁵

18. AI welcomed the passing of the Sexual Offences Act on 24 May 2010 and stated that it improved significantly previous gender-discriminatory legislation, widening the definition of rape and criminalizing marital rape.⁴⁶ AI asserted that more than a year after its enactment, the implementation of the Sexual Offences Act remained slow, as the National Task Force on Prevention of Sexual Violence envisaged in this Act had apparently

met only once, the National Plan for the Prevention of Sexual Violence had yet to be drafted and the Sexual Offences Unit had yet to be created.⁴⁷ JS2 expressed that the lack of full implementation of the Sexual Offences Act 2010 was due to the State's failure to put in place the necessary human, financial and material resources.⁴⁸ It underscored that while policy implementation oversight was vested in the National Domestic Violence Oversight Committee, in order to carry out its functions it should be provided with the necessary resources.⁴⁹ AI recommended, *inter alia*, to ensure that the Sexual Offences Act was fully implemented without delay and to ensure a coordinated implementation of the National Domestic Violence Policy.⁵⁰

19. Child Link, Inc. (CL) highlighted the situation of family violence and child abuse, physical as well as emotional/mental, including reports of sexual abuse against girls.⁵¹ CL recommended, *inter alia*, that the National Task Force set up for the implementation of the Sexual Offences Act should be made functional and should have the duty to develop and implement a national plan for the prevention of sexual violence.⁵² CL stated that this plan should include, *inter alia*, initiatives for prevention of sexual violence, and making functional the family court to improve legal services to children and the rate of successful prosecution in child abuse cases.⁵³

20. JS2 referred to the UPR recommendation accepted by Guyana on efforts to address violence against children, stating that there were over 2925 cases of child abuse in 2013, and that the Childcare and Protection Agency (CPA) established in 2010 lacked the human, financial, technical and material support services needed, while in some remote regions there were no CPA officers.⁵⁴

21. JS2 asserted that corporal punishment of children was currently lawful in the home, in some alternative care and day care settings, in schools and in the penal system for children over the age of 16.⁵⁵ It stated that severe cases of corporal punishment continued to be reported.⁵⁶

22. CL stated that in order to prohibit all corporal punishment, it was necessary to repeal the provisions allowing guardians and teachers "to administer reasonable and proper punishment" and to enact explicit prohibition in relation to all settings where adults have authority over children, including the home, all alternative care centres, and in schools.⁵⁷ IHRC-UOCL recommended to pass and implement a comprehensive law banning all corporal punishment.⁵⁸ ERT urged states involved in the UPR of Guyana to repeat recommendations that Guyana, as a matter of urgency, should prohibit all forms of corporal punishment against children.⁵⁹

23. CL stated that despite the amendments to the Juvenile Offenders (Amendment) Act and the Training Schools (Amendment) Act 2010 to outlaw whipping for any offences committed by students there were still complaints of whipping at the juvenile detention centre New Opportunity Corps (NOC).⁶⁰ CL recommended measures to abolish the use of corporal punishment at the NOC centre and that it be placed under an independent management committee with the necessary expertise, experience, interest and knowledge of human rights law and practice.⁶¹

24. GIEACPC stated that persons aged 17 may be sent to prison where flogging is lawful as a disciplinary measure under article 37 of the Prison Act 1957. CRIN stated that the Whipping and Flogging Act 1922 permitted flogging up to 24 strokes, requiring presence of a medical official.⁶² Child Rights International Network (CRIN) expressed hope that members of the Human Rights Council will urge the Government of Guyana, *inter alia*, to explicitly prohibit sentences of corporal punishment under all systems of justice and without exception.⁶³

25. ERT stated that at the UPR in 2010 five states made recommendations that Guyana prohibit all forms of corporal punishment against children.⁶⁴ In this regard, ERT reported

that a Special Select Committee to consult inter alia on this subject was established and evidence from stakeholders and oral presentations were made to this Committee in 2013.⁶⁵ ERT said that, however, as of June 2014, the Special Select Committee has yet to report on the issue.⁶⁶

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

26. AI asserted that impunity for police abuses, including unlawful killings, remained the norm.⁶⁷ AI affirmed that among the UPR recommendations which Guyana accepted and considered “already implemented or in the process of implementation” was one related to increasing the capacity of the Police Complaints Authority to investigate allegations of extrajudicial killings and the use of excessive force by police, using prompt and impartial proceedings. It expressed concern that however, the capacity of the Police Complaints Authority remained very limited, with all investigations still being carried out by the Guyana Police Force itself.⁶⁸ CHRI added that the Police Complaints Authority did not have an independent investigation unit.⁶⁹ AI recommended ensuring all complaints of excessive use of force by the security forces were subject to immediate, thorough and independent investigations and to establish a fully independent oversight body to receive and investigate complaints of police misconduct and reports of human rights violations.⁷⁰

27. Regarding UPR accepted recommendations about the rights of victims of sexual offences and the implementation of the national domestic violence policy (recommendations 17 and 15), JS2 reported that none of the 22 sexual offences prosecutions brought between 2011 and 2013 resulted in a conviction.⁷¹ JS2 stated that poor and unprofessional police investigation relying heavily on confession statements was a reason for dismissal of SOA cases.⁷² AI recommended addressing prevention, investigation and punishment of acts of sexual violence. (AI, p.6) JS1 reported that the lack of sufficient high court judges to hear on sexual offences cases contributed to delays and in complainants not proceeding with cases.⁷³ JS2 recommended establishing special courts or special judges to deal with the backlog.⁷⁴

28. CRIN pointed out that children in Guyana could be held criminally responsible from the age of 10 and persons aged 17 are tried as adults.⁷⁵ CL stated that a person under the age of 17 may be brought to Court for offences such as begging or receiving alms, or wandering and not having any home or settled place of abode or visible means of subsistence.⁷⁶ CL explained that these offences penalized the child for circumstances beyond his/her control and indicated that he/she was a victim of child abuse or neglect.⁷⁷ CL recommended that the very young age (10 years and older) at which children could be held criminally responsible needed to be changed to 16 years.⁷⁸

29. CRIN said that there appears to be no explicit prohibition on life imprisonment in the case of an adult convicted of a murder committed as a child or young person⁷⁹ and that although persons under 17 must be sentenced under the Juvenile Offenders Act and may not be sentenced to imprisonment, these restrictions did not appear to apply when the conviction relates to attempted murder, manslaughter, or wounding with intent to cause grievous bodily harm.⁸⁰ CRIN expressed hope that members of the Human Rights Council will urge the Government of Guyana to explicitly prohibit life imprisonment under all systems of justice and without exception.⁸¹

30. CL recommended that the Welfare division in the Ministry of Education be reorganized to avoid the criminalization of youth because of truancy and absenteeism and that a more human and welfare oriented policy be put in place.⁸² JS2 demanded the Government, among other measures, to ensure that students detained and/or charged be granted independent legal representation, and also demanded the National Assembly to repeal the offence of “wandering” (a status offence) as children charged with this ‘offence’

who make up a large section of NOC students were not offenders but victims of child abuse and neglect.⁸³

31. JS2 stated, following up on the UPR recommendation accepted by Guyana on conditions of detention, that press reports indicated poor administration and inappropriate handling of the juveniles, unqualified staff members and claims of abuse of teenage inmates.⁸⁴

4. Right to privacy and family life

32. ERT stated that, at Guyana's first UPR in May 2010, six States made recommendations that Guyana repeal legislative provisions which criminalise consensual same-sex sexual activity.⁸⁵ JS1 affirmed that Guyana maintained invasive laws which criminalise consensual private sexual activity between adult men and that by retaining these laws, the rights of same-sex/gender practising persons to privacy were being violated.⁸⁶ ERT stated that these provisions were the basis for widespread extortion and police harassment of openly gay men.⁸⁷ ERT asserted that, as such, the continued criminalisation of same-sex sexual activity put Guyana in clear violation of its commitments under international human rights law.⁸⁸ ERT urged States involved in Guyana's Review to repeat recommendations to repeal, as a matter of urgency, legal provisions criminalising consensual same-sex sexual activity.⁸⁹

33. ERT said that, at its first UPR, Guyana said it would hold consultations on the issue of decriminalisation of these actions "over the next 2 years".⁹⁰ CHRI reported that, in 2012, the Parliament established a Committee to examine the possibility of decriminalising consensual adult same sex relations and promised to hold a public consultation on the subject.⁹¹ ERT stated no date has yet been set for the consultation⁹² and CHRI reported that at the time of writing, no Committee report on the results of any such deliberations had been made available.⁹³

5. Freedom of religion or belief, expression, association and peaceful assembly, and right to participate in public and political life

34. CHRI reported that defamation and libel were punishable by up to three years imprisonment, and that a number of civil lawsuits by government officials against journalists had taken place.⁹⁴

35. CHRI asserted that state-owned media was known to give extended air-time to government spokespeople and limit the coverage of opposition figures, and that the government had allegedly interfered with the work of the independent media sector on several occasions.⁹⁵ CHRI asserted that in 2011, the government adopted the Broadcast Act, which provided for the creation of a Guyana National Broadcasting Authority (GNBA), with powers to grant or revoke licenses for private television and radio operators, in order to diversify the print and broadcasting sector, currently dominated by state-owned media.⁹⁶ CHRI expressed that, nevertheless, the law allowed the President to appoint six of the seven members of the GNBA and had in practice increased governmental control over the media. By the end of 2013, none of the licensed radio stations had commenced operation.⁹⁷

36. CHRI asserted that in 2011, the Parliament of Guyana adopted an Access to Information Act, setting out a formal path to access information held by public authorities and establishing the post of Commissioner of Information, appointed by the President and responsible for ensuring access.⁹⁸ CHRI reported that the law had received criticism as a result of a less than transparent appointment process of the Commissioner and the effect this could have on the independence of this office⁹⁹ and recommended to enact a Right to Information Act compatible with international best practices.¹⁰⁰

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

37. JS1 affirmed that LGBT people faced higher levels of unemployment, underemployment, and if employed they were paid lower wages, denied promotions and forced to perform tasks outside of their job descriptions or were not adequately paid if they worked over time.¹⁰¹ JS1 recommended amending the Prevention of Discrimination Act, to include sexual orientation and gender identity as grounds for discrimination in employment, training and recruitment.¹⁰²

7. Right to health

38. IHRC-UOCL asserted that in the 2010 UPR Working Group Report, Guyana supported recommendations inter alia, on increasing health services in rural areas.¹⁰³ IHRC-UOCL stated that although efforts were being made to provide adequate and equal healthcare to Amerindian Communities, major challenges persisted, including lack of resources and skilled professionals. It also stated that efforts to increase medical services had been hindered by the lack of resources.¹⁰⁴

39. JS1 stated that LGBT persons continued to face high levels of stigma and discrimination from healthcare workers and auxiliary staff which deterred them from visiting hospitals and other health facilities, and that the incidence of HIV still remained vexingly high for vulnerable groups. It recommended the Government, inter alia, to ensure all healthcare facilities adopt policies which unequivocally prohibit discrimination in accessing healthcare.¹⁰⁵

40. IHRC-UOCL affirmed that the HIV/AIDS prevalence rate declined significantly in recent years.¹⁰⁶ IHRC-UOCL stated that malaria was endemic in Guyana and that the majority of malaria infections occurred in the hinterland among the Amerindian population. It added that the lack of contraception and awareness lead the Amerindian population to have the highest rate of cervical cancer among any ethnic group in Guyana.¹⁰⁷ IHRC-UOCL recommended, inter alia, to focus Guyana's efforts to combat HIV/AIDS and preventive efforts against malaria on populations residing in the Amerindian Communities. It also recommended to increase under-one vaccination rates among Amerindian Communities.¹⁰⁸

8. Right to education

41. CL asserted that the illiteracy rate in Guyana was an alarming 21%¹⁰⁹ and that despite the fact that education at the primary levels should be free, several children were hindered from engaging in school due to the added cost of transportation and meals,¹¹⁰ while sufficient funds had not been allocated to maintain the standards of education.¹¹¹ However, CL also said that the 2014 National budget had increased allocations to improve the education section.¹¹² CL recommended the Government, inter alia, to provide adequate resources to retain the more trained teachers in the education system.¹¹³

42. IHRC-UOCL stated that a major reason for the deficiency of qualified educators was the lack of secondary schools in the Amerindian region and recommended, inter alia, to invest in increasing accessibility to secondary schools for students in the Amerindian Communities.¹¹⁴

9. Persons with disabilities

43. CL recognized important progress on rehabilitation and education projects for children with disabilities and also highlighted remaining challenges, stating that they continued to be the most disadvantaged of all groups in society and many did not have access to education and employment which lead to social and economic exclusion.¹¹⁵ CL stated that children with disabilities had inadequate access to health and education due to a lack of pertinent policies and due to the attitudes of service providers and of family

members.¹¹⁶ CL recommended, inter alia, to identify and eliminate obstacles and barriers to ensure children with disabilities can access transportation, public facilities and services, and to make access to social assistance available on a long-term basis for them.¹¹⁷

10. Minorities and indigenous peoples

44. JI stated that, under the laws of Guyana, Amerindian peoples were protected against discrimination, juridical personality was recognized to their community and collective land ownership was provided.¹¹⁸ Regarding the Amerindian Act 2006 which established a process to claim lands based on its occupation and use, JI reported on delays in these claim processes and expressed that in recent years the Government had changed its practice of settling Amerindian land claims and had failed to comply with its legal obligations.¹¹⁹

45. IHRC-UOCL reported that Guyana had failed to meet international standards dictating certain protections of Amerindian land rights¹²⁰, and that titled Amerindian villages were rarely able to enjoy all their land rights.¹²¹ It also stated that oftentimes Amerindian villages received a title only to a fraction of their traditional land and that Guyana refused to extend Amerindian villages land rights for untitled land, even if this land was traditionally used and occupied by Amerindian people.¹²² IHRC-UOCL recommended Guyana to ensure all Amerindian communities in the country have a legal title to their traditional lands.¹²³

46. In relation to mining, IHRC-UOCL reported that the High Court of Guyana was giving effect to concessions granted prior to titles awarded through the Amerindian Act, irrespective of the fact that the Amerindian presence on those traditional lands predated the granted concessions.¹²⁴ IHRC-UOCL recommended the Government to rescind any concessions on Amerindian titled lands that were granted prior to the Amerindian Act of 2006 in order to ensure the Amerindian villages were able to fully exercise their right to control the use of their titled land and its natural resources.¹²⁵ IHRC-UOCL also recommended the Government to abstain from granting any future concessions on titled Amerindian lands or on any land that was identified in an existing Amerindian title or extension application without the free, informed, and prior consent of the Amerindian communities.¹²⁶

47. IHRC-UOCL reported that the Amerindian populations had no subsurface mineral rights and no rights to waterways or to the land that immediately surrounded them.¹²⁷ IHRC-UOCL recommended, inter alia, to implement a policy for recognizing Amerindian titled land rights over mining concessions regardless of whether the mining concession was granted prior to a title awarded under the Amerindian Act, and to consider removing the override power of the Minister of Mines to authorize large-scale mining deemed to be in the nation's interest without consent of the local Amerindian population.¹²⁸

48. IHRC-UOCL reported that the lack of infrastructure in the interior regions, made it difficult for the Forestry Commission to monitor violations including illegal timber harvesting, trespassing, and hunting on Amerindian land.¹²⁹ It also reported that the Forestry Training Centre, which sought to educate village leaders in laws and management or forestry, lacked funding.¹³⁰ IHRC-UOCL recommended the Government to increase the capacity building for the Tashoes and Village Councils through increased funding of the Forestry Training Centre. It also recommended the Government to increase protection for lands adjacent to titled lands that may have concession availability, through legislation in the Forests Act and through increasing the monitoring component of the Forestry Commission.¹³¹

Notes

¹ The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org.

Civil society

Individual submissions:

AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
CHRI	Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, New Delhi (India);
CL	Child LinK, Inc.;
CRIN	Child Rights International Network, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
ERT	Equal Rights Trust, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End all Corporal Punishment of Children;
IHRC-UOCL	International Human Rights Clinic – University of Oklahoma College of Law, City (United States of America);
JIG	Justice Institute Guyana, Georgetown (Guyana).

Joint submissions:

JS1	Joint submission 1 submitted by: SASOD: Society Against Sexual Orientation Discrimination ; and SRI (Sexual Rights Initiative);
JS2	Joint submission 2 submitted by: H&S: Help and Shelter, Georgetown (Guyana); and RT: Read Thread, Georgetown (Guyana).

² AI, p.1.

³ IHCRC, p.1.

⁴ AI, p.6. See also: JIG, para.2.

⁵ AI, p.6.

⁶ AI, p.7.

⁷ CHRI, p.2.

⁸ CHRI, p.2.

⁹ AI, p.1 See also. CHRI, p.2.

¹⁰ CHRI, p.2.

¹¹ JS1-SASOD-SRI para. 8.

¹² AI, p.5.

¹³ CHRI, p.6.

¹⁴ AI, p.6.

¹⁵ JS1-SASOD-SRI para.8.

¹⁶ JS1-SASOD-SRI para.10. See also JS1-SASOD-SRI para.9.

¹⁷ ERT, para.16.

¹⁸ JS1-SASOD-SRI, para.11. See also JS1-SASOD-SRI, paras.30-34.

¹⁹ CHRI, p.5.

²⁰ JS1-SASOD-SRI, para.12. See also: JIG, para.5.

²¹ JIG, para.5.

²² JS1-SASOD-SRI paras.18 and 19.

²³ JS1-SASOD-SRI, para.21.

²⁴ CHRI p.5.

²⁵ CHRI p.5.

²⁶ CHRI p.5.

²⁷ JIG, para.5. See also: JS1-SASOD-SRI, para.21.

²⁸ ERT, para.17. See also AI, p.6.

²⁹ CHRI, p.6.

³⁰ AI, p.6.

³¹ AI, p.4.

³² CHRI, p.2.

³³ AI, p.2.

³⁴ AI, p.2.

- 35 CHRI, p.2.
36 CHRI, p.2. See also: JIG, para.2.
37 AI, p.1.
38 CHRI, p.2.
39 JIG, para.2.
40 AI, p.6. See also, CHRI p.3.
41 JIG, para.2.
42 CHRI, p.3.
43 CHRI, p.3.
44 AI, p.2.
45 JS2-HS-RT, p.3.
46 AI, p.2.
47 AI, p.2. See also: HS-RT, p.2.
48 JS2-HS-RT, p.1.
49 JS2-HS-RT, p.2.
50 AI, p.6.
51 CL pp. 7 and 8.
52 CL, p.8.
53 CL, p.8.
54 JS2-HS-RT, p.2.
55 JS2-HS-RT, p.1. See also: GIEACPC, para. 1.3 and ERT, para.20.
56 JS2-HS-RT, p.1.
57 CL, p.5. See also: GIEACPC, paras.2.2 and 2.5.
58 IHRC-UOCL, p.5.
59 ERT, para.27. See also: GIEACPC, para. 1.3.
60 CL, p.6. See also: GIEACPC, para. 1.3.
61 CL, p.6. See also: HR-ST, p.4.
62 CRIN, para.7.
63 CRIN, para.12.
64 ERT, para.19.
65 ERT, para.19.
66 ERT, para.19. See also: IHRC, p.5 and HS-RT p.1.
67 AI, p.4.
68 AI, p.1.
69 CHRI, pp. 3 and 4.
70 AI, p.6. See also: CHRI, pp. 3 and 4.
71 JS2-HS-RT, p.1. See also: AI, p.3.
72 JS2-HS-RT, p.1.
73 JS2-HS-RT, p.1.
74 JS2-HS-RT, p.2.
75 CRIN, para.1 See also: CRIN, para.12.
76 CL, p.5.
77 CL, p.6.
78 CL, p.6.
79 CRIN, para.4.
80 CRIN, para.5.
81 CRIN, para.12.
82 CL, p.5.
83 JS2-HR-ST pp.3 and 4.
84 JS2-HR-ST, p.3.
85 ERT, para.4. See also CHRI, p.5.
86 JS1-SASOD-SRI, para.13. See also: AI, p.4, CHRI, p.4, ERT, paras.6 and 8.
87 ERT, para.9.
88 ERT, para.8.
89 ERT, para.17. See also: JIG, para.5, JS1-SASOD-SRI, para.15, and CHRI, p.6.
90 ERT, para.4. See also: AI, p.4.

- 91 CHRI, p.5.
 - 92 ERT para.5.
 - 93 CHRI, p.5. See also: AI, pp. 1 and 4.
 - 94 CHRI, p.4.
 - 95 CHRI, p.4.
 - 96 CHRI, p.4.
 - 97 CHRI, p.4.
 - 98 CHIRI, p.4.
 - 99 CHRI, p. 4.
 - 100 CHRI, p. 4.
 - 101 JS1-SASOD-SRI, para.25.
 - 102 JS1-SASOD-SRI, para.26.
 - 103 IHRC-UOCL, p.3.
 - 104 IHRC-UOCL, p.3.
 - 105 JS1-SASOD-SRI, para. 29.
 - 106 IHRC-UOCL, p.4.
 - 107 IHRC-UOCL, p.4.
 - 108 IHRC-UOCL, p.4.
 - 109 CL, p.4.
 - 110 CL, p.2.
 - 111 CL, p.4.
 - 112 CL, p.4.
 - 113 CL, p.4.
 - 114 IHRC-UOCL, p.5.
 - 115 CL, p.9.
 - 116 CL, p.2.
 - 117 CL, p.9.
 - 118 JIG, paras. 10 and 11.
 - 119 JIG, paras. 14-16.
 - 120 IHRC-UOCL, p.3.
 - 121 IHRC-UOCL, p.3.
 - 122 IHRC-UOCL, p.3.
 - 123 IHRC-UOCL, p.3.
 - 124 IHRC-UOCL, p.2.
 - 125 IHRC-UOCL, p.3.
 - 126 IHRC-UOCL, p.3.
 - 127 IHRC-UOCL, p.2.
 - 128 IHRC-UOCL, p.2.
 - 129 IHRC-UOCL, p.1.
 - 130 IHRC-UOCL, p.1.
 - 131 IHRC-UOCL, p. 1.
-