



General Assembly

Distr.: General
7 August 2015

Original: English

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

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

Saint Lucia*

The present report is a summary of 5 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 obligations²

1. Amnesty International (AI) recalled that during its first Universal Periodic Review (UPR), Saint Lucia accepted a number of recommendations on the ratification of core international human rights treaties, including the ICCPR, the ICESCR, and CRPD.³ AI acknowledged that Saint Lucia signed the ICCPR and CRPD in 2011 but noted that there had been no further progress since then.⁴ AI recommended the Government to fully implement the recommendations accepted during its first UPR to ratify ICCPR, ICESCR and CRPD.⁵ Joint Submission 2 (JS2)⁶ and Joint Submission 3 (JS3)⁷ made similar recommendations. Additionally, JS3 recommended the ratification of the optional protocols to ICCPR and CEDAW as well as the third OP-CRC. AI also noted that Saint Lucia failed to express a clear position on recommendations calling for the ratification of CAT and it had taken no steps towards becoming a party to it.⁸ AI recommended that Saint Lucia ratifies CAT and seeks the assistance of OHCHR in overcoming any obstacles in ratifying international human rights treaties and ensuring their full compliance.⁹

2. Constitutional and legislative framework

2. JS3 reported that after its first UPR review, Saint Lucia had not implemented or revised any domestic laws covering the international instruments to which it is a party, despite accepting recommendations to do so.¹⁰ This action was necessary as Saint Lucia was a dualist state and citizens do not have direct access and redress to several of the protections afforded under these instruments unless implemented domestically. JS3 recommended that the Government implement domestic legislation for all of the international instruments to which Saint Lucia is party, so citizens can have direct access to provisions under these instruments.¹¹

3. AI stated that, in 2005, Saint Lucia initiated a process of constitutional reform and that, in May 2013, the report of the Constitutional Reform Commission had been tabled in Parliament with a series of recommendations. The reform process had not been pursued despite important recommendations to strengthen gender equality and the protection of children.¹²

4. JS3 welcomed that, in 2012, Saint Lucia implemented the Labour Code Act of 2006 which captured some concerns under ILO Conventions in areas of unfair dismissal, child labor, sexual orientation, and workers' rights but regretted that there had been no revision of the Civil Code to eliminate gender based discriminatory provisions as accepted by the State during its previous review.¹³ JS3 recommended the Government to review the Civil Code and eliminate gender based discriminatory provisions.¹⁴

5. Regarding children's rights, JS3 considered that existing legislation did not fully encompass the principles and provisions of the CRC and that national legislation must be implemented to deal with discrimination against children born out of wedlock, juvenile justice, and corporal punishment.¹⁵ JS3 recommended the Government to establish domestic legislation to incorporate fully all the principles of the CRC.¹⁶

3. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures

6. JS2 commended the Government for its dedication with respect to the general advancement of human rights despite its lack of financial and technical resources. JS2 cited

as examples of such commitment that the Constitution contained provisions which protect all persons from torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment; the country maintained the office of the Parliamentary Commissioner and Ombudsman; and the Criminal Code of Saint Lucia condemned violence against all persons. Nonetheless, JS2 considered that there remained a great number of opportunities for Saint Lucia to better protect the human rights of its people, including, by abolishing the death penalty.¹⁷

7. JS2 indicated that it appeared that little had been done since the first UPR review, when the Government gave assurances that it would promote and build public awareness of human rights.

8. JS2 also noted that, although Saint Lucia accepted the recommendation to consider establishing a National Preventive Mechanism, nothing had been done.¹⁸

9. JS3 recalled that in 2011 Saint Lucia did not accept many of the recommendations it received regarding the establishment of a National Human Rights Institution.¹⁹ The Government explained its position by stating that the existing office of the Ombudsman protected the fundamental rights of the citizens. The Government also pledged to strengthen the office of the Ombudsman, which operated in a very limited capacity, but it had taken no steps to carry out such commitment.²⁰ JS3 recommended the Government to establish an independent National Human Rights Institution in accordance with the Paris Principles.²¹

10. JS3 informed that, in September 2012, the Cabinet of Ministers approved the National Action Child Protection Committee (NACPC) whose mandate is to act as an advisory body in child protection matters as well as to coordinate and report on the implementation of the CRC. JS3 added that the NACPC, which was established following a recommendation made to Saint Lucia by the CRC in 2011, had not yet activated its mandate or taken specific steps in its pursuit.²²

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

1. Equality and non-discrimination

11. JS3 informed that the Constitutional Reform Committee had recommended, with regards to discrimination against women, that the provisions of CEDAW be implemented in domestic legislation and, where complementary, included in the Constitution.²³ JS3 recommended the Government to implement the recommendation of the Constitutional Reform Committee regarding implementation of CEDAW into domestic law and within the Constitution, where complimentary.²⁴

12. JS3 reported that the Division of Gender Relations, which was the national machinery for the advancement of Gender issues, was severely understaffed. The staff comprised the director, two technical officers, one research officer and a driver. JS3 recommended Saint Lucia to increase the staff within the Division of Gender Affairs to improve its levels of productivity.²⁵

13. JS3 recalled that during its first review, the Government rejected recommendations to decriminalize consensual relations between consenting same sex adults and deferred the matter to the then pending report of the Constitutional Reform Committee.²⁶ This report had considered decriminalizing sexual acts between consenting adults of the same sex, without making specific recommendations. Additionally, the report had not taken into account recommendations that sexual orientation be afforded any constitutional protection but had recommended that discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation be addressed under separate legislation.²⁷

14. JS3 further indicated that sexual orientation, as a basis for protection, had for the first time entered law books through the Labour Code Act (2006), implemented in 2012. The code provides that it is unlawful for an employer to dismiss or institute disciplinary action against an employee based on sexual orientation. JS3 considered that this was a significant but limited achievement since other protections available under the Act, such as protection from sexual harassment, excluded persons of different sexual orientation.²⁸

15. JS3 regretted that, despite the acceptance of UPR recommendation 89.97,²⁹ there continued to be acts of violence committed against persons because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. Also, persons who defended the rights of LGBT persons were often subjected to verbal attacks.³⁰

16. JS3 recommended the Government to raise public awareness regarding non-discrimination of LGBT persons and include sexual orientation as part of the curriculum in the Health and Family Life Education for schools; swiftly implement the recommendations of the Constitutional Reform Committee and establish well defined separate legislation to address discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation; decriminalize same-sex consensual relations; and promptly investigate all complaints of violence against LGBT persons.³¹ AI recommended Saint Lucia to repeal all legal provisions prohibiting and punishing same-sex sexual relations between consenting adults;³² and engage with civil society organizations working on behalf of LGBTI persons to implement human rights education and anti-discrimination awareness-raising programs.³³

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

17. JS2 welcomed that Saint Lucia was de facto abolitionist and that there had not been a reported execution since 1995.³⁴ However, AI reported that the last death sentence known to have been imposed was handed down in 2011, which was later commuted to life imprisonment. As to the end of 2014, there was no one on death row in Saint Lucia.³⁵

18. JS2 expressed concern at statements by politicians that had begun calling for an end to the de facto abolition of the death penalty in response to rising crime rates.³⁶ AI indicated that statements by high-profile politicians could encourage popular belief that the death penalty acted as a deterrent and recalled that there was no convincing evidence to support this idea. Instead, there was a wide range of measures that the Government could take to protect the population from crime and violence, such as strengthening the capacities and resources of the police and judiciary. AI considered that, since the last UPR review of Saint Lucia, the authorities had failed to show political leadership in terms of drawing attention to the human rights issues inherent in the death penalty, as well as to promote its abolition.³⁷

19. JS2 noted that it was impossible to predict how the death penalty would be applied if the moratorium would be lifted. For JS2 it was unclear whether the criminal justice system would provide those accused of crimes punishable by the death penalty a process in accordance with all minimum international safeguards intended to prevent the arbitrary deprivation of life, torture, and coercion of the accused and witnesses to obtain convictions.³⁸

20. JS2 recalled that the Government had noted all UPR recommendations to declare a formal moratorium or abolish the death penalty.³⁹ The justification of the Government's position was that the views of the Saint Lucian population were not supportive of abolition of the death penalty.⁴⁰

21. JS2 pointed out that, as a representation of the country's position regarding capital punishment, Saint Lucia had voted against every U.N. General Assembly Moratorium Resolution prohibiting capital punishment, including the one adopted in 2014. Saint Lucia had also signed a Note Verbale of Dissociation submitted with respect to each resolution.⁴¹

22. JS2 considered that as public support for the death penalty was the primary obstacle to Saint Lucia instituting a formal moratorium, the Government should undertake a public education campaign about human rights and alternatives to the death penalty, in order to move the country closer to full abolition.⁴² JS2 encouraged delegations participating in the UPR of Saint Lucia to ask what steps had the Government taken to change public opinion about the death penalty, with a view towards facilitating full abolition.⁴³ JS2 recommended the Government to impose a country-wide moratorium on the death penalty that immediately halts all sentences and executions, with a view toward its complete abolition.⁴⁴ AI made similar recommendations. It also recommended Saint Lucia to support calls to abolish the death penalty nationally and internationally, including by voting in favour of future UN General Assembly resolutions on a moratorium on the use of the death penalty.⁴⁵

23. JS2 mentioned that various reports and news outlets had indicated that crime was a significant problem in Saint Lucia. In 2012 Saint Lucia had a homicide rate of 21.6 per 100,000 people.⁴⁶

24. Joint Submission 1 (JS1) noted that, since 2010, law enforcement had increasingly become a priority in Saint Lucia, in light of an increase in the number of homicides committed on the island.⁴⁷ As a response, the Government had formed that same year a Special Task Force of Police Officers.⁴⁸ JS1 added that, in the midst of rumours of a police hit list and that people who were in that list were shot dead, the police killed 12 individuals by November 2011.⁴⁹ It was further rumoured that these individuals were killed even though they posed no immediate threat to approaching officers.⁵⁰ As a result, in August 2013, a Government from the Hemisphere suspended all forms of assistance to Saint Lucia's Police, citing allegations of serious human rights violations.⁵¹ Subsequently, in August 2014, the Government requested the Caribbean Community Implementation Agency for Crime and Security (CARICOM IMPACS) to investigate the killings.⁵² The report was completed and presented to the Prime Minister but not released for several months and, as of the moment of JS1's submission, was not yet available to the public.⁵³

25. JS1 further indicated that, in March 2015, Prime Minister Anthony revealed that the report confirmed the hit lists and that all the shootings reviewed were 'fake encounters' staged by the Police to legitimise its actions. Prime Minister Anthony went on to say that the report suggested that the crime problem in Saint Lucia was facilitated by corrupt politicians and government officials, businesspersons and police officers. He also stated that the investigators had reported that some senior officers did not co-operate with them during the course of the investigation.⁵⁴ The Government decided not to release the report to the public but to send it to the Director of the Public Prosecution for action. JS1 considered that the challenge was that many of these cases had already had their day in court finding that there was no judicial culpability.⁵⁵

26. JS3 considered that there was a need for an independent body to exercise oversight and investigate citizen complaints against police officers. It regretted that the Police Complaints Bill, passed in November 2013, had retained police officers as part of the unit that would hear and determine citizen complaints.⁵⁶ JS3 recommended the Government to ensure that the body that hears and determines police complaints is independent and does not comprise police officers.⁵⁷

27. JS3 noted that Saint Lucia had not taken any action to address the accepted recommendation⁵⁸ relating to reforms to better combat gender and domestic violence that would allow prosecution of perpetrators without the necessity for the victim to lodge a complaint. JS3 considered vital that Saint Lucia incorporates legislation that allows the State to independently prosecute perpetrators as the cycle of domestic violence was such that the victim was often too afraid of the perpetrator or too dependent on him/her to lodge such complaint. JS3 recalled that, reacting to a February 2015 incident of extreme violence by a male against his female partner, the Director of Public Prosecution had made strong

statements calling for the laws to be changed to facilitate state intervention and independent prosecution in matters of domestic and sexual violence.⁵⁹ JS3 recommended Saint Lucia to implement the recommendation of the Director of Public Prosecution and adopt laws that allow for prosecution of perpetrators of domestic violence, without requiring the victim to lodge a complaint.⁶⁰

28. JS3 reported that The Vulnerable Persons Team within the Police assisted with the investigation and management of all domestic violence as well as child abuse and neglect cases. However there were various impediments that mitigated against the work of this team, including a high turnover in team members; the physical structure where victims were received that lacked the necessary privacy; and the lack of targeted and specialized training of members within the vulnerable person's team.⁶¹ JS3 recommended the Government to strengthen the Vulnerable Persons Team of the Police by providing specialized training to officers and maintaining well trained staff within the unit; and improve privacy settings in areas where domestic and sexual violence victims are received by staff.⁶²

29. For JS3 there was a need for a well-established centralized data register with compiled information relating to domestic and sexual violence complaints and prosecutions. The register was fundamental so that the Government could deliberately pursue appropriate and targeted policy development to effect necessary change.⁶³ JS3 recommended the Government to seek technical support to establish a centralized data register which captures information relating to domestic and sexual violence complaints and prosecutions within the Department of Gender Affairs.⁶⁴

30. JS3 recalled that during its first UPR review, when asked to address the link between prostitution and the tourism industry, the Government stated that prostitution was unlawful and that it did not condone this activity. JS3 informed that persons were not actively prohibited by the authorities from working as prostitutes or sex workers but that they were afraid to seek the protection of the law or even medical attention when exploited, abused or at risk, due to the fact that prostitution was illegal. JS3 considered that sex workers were exposed to various types of abuse and neglect and that the Government had turned a blind eye to this issue.⁶⁵ JS3 recommended the Government to address the link between prostitution and the tourism industry, ensuring that those who exploit prostitutes are punished.⁶⁶

31. JS3 reported that, since 1980, the Upton Gardens Girls Centre, an NGO, had provided a day care rehabilitation service to abused, disadvantaged and neglected girls aged 12 to 17 years. The centre facilitated training in several key areas including technical and vocational skills, remedial learning for slower girls and behaviour modification programs. The Centre experienced challenges as girls returned daily to vulnerable home communities and some dropped out of the program before they could be successfully rehabilitated. JS3 stated that the Director of the Centre was convinced that partial residential accommodation was absolutely necessary to ensure that the more vulnerable girls could reside at the Centre for the duration of the program. This required financial assistance and staffing support from Government.⁶⁷ JS3 recommended the Government to allocate funding and support staff for the Upton Gardens Girls Centre to establish partial residential quarters for girls, and implement all necessary legal and policy measures to facilitate this service.⁶⁸

32. JS3 regretted that Saint Lucia had experienced a sudden surge in child suicides with an unprecedented number of four cases recorded for the period 2013-2014. JS3 urged the Government to investigate the root causes and patterns of these suicides and immediately institute preventative measures to intercept this behaviour.⁶⁹

33. The Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) reminded that during the first review of Saint Lucia there were a number of

recommendations to prohibit corporal punishment that the Government did not support. The Government noted these recommendations, stating that Saint Lucia recognised the need to pursue alternative forms of discipline to corporal punishment but that amending the legislation which allowed the use of corporal punishment remained a formidable challenge as corporal punishment was rooted in the country's tradition and culture.⁷⁰ GIEACPC added that, from the review of Saint Lucia by CRC in 2014, it appeared that a national consultation on abolition of corporal punishment had been carried out but that there were no moves towards prohibiting it in law.⁷¹

34. GIEACPC further recalled that, in Saint Lucia, corporal punishment of children was unlawful as a sentence for crime but it was not prohibited in the home, alternative care settings, day care, schools and penal institutions.⁷² GIEACPC indicated that, as part of an initiative to reform child laws in the region, the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) had circulated a number of draft laws for consideration by member states, including Saint Lucia. As originally drafted, the laws did not explicitly prohibit corporal punishment but they nevertheless provided the impetus to review national legislation and to enact new laws which do prohibit corporal punishment.⁷³

35. GIEACPC hoped that during the second UPR of Saint Lucia delegations would raise the issue and note with concern the legality of corporal punishment of children. GIEACPC requested delegations to make a specific recommendation that the Government prohibit all corporal punishment of children in all settings including the home and repeal the right to administer reasonable punishment in the Children and Young Persons Act of 1972.⁷⁴

36. JS1 noted that PAHO/WHO studies done in the Caribbean had repeatedly reported high levels of "trauma" among Caribbean young people associated with physical, mental, and sexual abuse. One study recorded that 60% of Caribbean young people reported their first sexual experience was non-consensual. Physical abuse was common and corporal punishment enshrined in legislation. Bullying was also common and homophobia directed toward males particularly extreme.⁷⁵

37. JS3 considered that there was a need for a well-established centralized data register, with compiled information relating to child and juvenile concerns and complaints within the Division of Human Services of the Government. This register was fundamental, noted JS3, so that the Government could deliberately pursue appropriate and targeted policy development to effect necessary change.⁷⁶ JS3 recommended Saint Lucia to seek technical support to establish a centralized data register, which contains child and juvenile violations, complaints and issues within the Division of Human Services.⁷⁷

3. Administration of justice and the rule of law

38. JS2 stated that the judicial system suffered from various issues, including heavy caseloads, insufficient protection for witnesses, problems with the jury, high levels of crime, weak forensic capacities, crime lab delays in processing evidence, lack of mental health assessments for the accused, and inadequate legal representation. It added that one or more of these factors could easily contribute to the miscarriage of justice.⁷⁸

39. JS1 stated that the continuation of a drugs policy based on the strict application of imprisonment contributed significantly to the growth of the prison population.⁷⁹ Since 1999 there had been a steady rise in pre-trial detention as a percentage of the prison population, rising from 28.4% in that year to 45.2% in 2010.⁸⁰ As of 31st July 2014, out of the 634 persons incarcerated in the Bordelais Correctional Institution –opened in 2003 to accommodate 500 inmates-, approximately 369 persons (58.2%) were on remand.⁸¹

40. JS1 recommended the Government the immediate activation of a second criminal court to review existing remand population and penal population with the view of reducing

the population at Bordelais Correctional Institution (BCF); and to increase the Judiciary budget to offset the increased costs for additional judicial services.⁸²

4. Right to participate in public and political life

41. In order to increase the participation of women in public life -i.e. the judiciary, legislature and administration- JS3 recommended the Government to implement temporary special measures in line with the first paragraph of article 4 of CEDAW.⁸³

5. Right to health

42. JS3 considered that the criminalization of sexual acts between consenting same sex adults served as an impediment in accessing necessary healthcare and that LGBT persons continued to confront unacceptable levels of discrimination and stigma when visiting health clinics.⁸⁴ JS3 recommended the Government to implement non-discriminatory policies at health facilities and reporting processes, with sanctions for health workers who discriminate generally and against LGBT persons.⁸⁵

43. JS1 informed that the Drugs Act made no mention of treatment, education, aftercare or social reintegration as an alternative to imprisonment⁸⁶ and that drug demand reduction efforts rested primarily with “Just say No” campaigns for school children and one abstinence based drug treatment programme operated by the Ministry of Health.⁸⁷ It added that the main goal of the current drug control model was to deter and limit drug use. However, the criminal law did not deter use but it did undermine health, increased the power and reach of organised criminal gangs, increased risk of corruption and fuelled violence.⁸⁸

44. JS1 further stated that the use of the criminal law to address drug use had significant and negative impacts on individuals.⁸⁹ JS1 considered that there was a need for comprehensive interventions in the combat against drugs, including reforming legislation, providing support to the establishment of drug demand reduction programmes and drug treatment centres in the community and prisons, training for staff responsible for working in such centres and the development of effective mechanisms of cooperation between criminal justice institutions and treatment centres.⁹⁰

45. JS1 also noted that the right to health and access to cannabis for medical purposes was limited.⁹¹

6. Right to education

46. JS3 stated that there was a need for a targeted reintroduction of vocational schools and training programs within secondary schools to facilitate young persons with different learning abilities, by affording them an alternative to mainstream academia. This could likely reduce the number of children, especially boys, who dropped out of school. JS3 added that school drop out by boys in particular remained a challenge for the State.⁹² JS3 recommended Saint Lucia to fully re-introduce vocational and technical training in secondary schools to provide alternative learning to students of different abilities and talents.⁹³

7. Persons with disabilities

47. JS3 reported the existence of three NGO day care centres for children with disabilities. Two were located in the South (Soufriere and Vieux Fort) and one in the East (Denery) of the island. The Centre in Denery especially provided care to children with severe multi-disability. The Childhood Development and Guidance Centre was another NGO that provided early intervention services to children with special needs. The Centre received a Government subvention and was also supported by international and local grants.⁹⁴

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 (UK); |
| GIEACPC | Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London(UK); |
- Joint submissions:
- | | |
|-----|--|
| JS1 | Joint submission 1 submitted by: Caribbean Drug & Alcohol Research Institute (CDARI), Castries (Saint Lucia), Caribbean Harm Reduction Coalition (CHRC), Castries (Saint Lucia), and Transform Drug Policy Foundation, Bristol (UK); |
| JS2 | Joint submission 2 submitted by: The Advocates for Human Rights Minneapolis, (USA), The Greater Caribbean for Life and The World Coalition against the Death Penalty, Port of Spain (Trinidad and Tobago); |
| JS3 | Joint submission 3 submitted by: United and Strong Inc. Castries (Saint Lucia), CariFLAGS Castries (Saint Lucia and Sexual Rights Initiative. |
- ² The following abbreviations have been used in the present document:
- | | |
|-----------|--|
| ICESCR | International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights |
| ICCPR | International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights |
| CEDAW | Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women |
| CAT | Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment |
| 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 |
| CRPD | Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities |
- ³ For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/17/6, recommendations 89.1 (Brazil), 89.3 (Algeria), 89.4 (United Kingdom), 89.5 (Mauritius), 89.6 (Argentina), 89.8 (Costa Rica), 89.9 (Spain), 89.10 (Maldives), 89.11 (Italy), 89.12 (Sweden), 89.13 (Portugal), 89.14 (Trinidad and Tobago), 89.15 (Poland), 89.16 (Portugal), 89.17 (France), 89.18 (Slovakia), 89.19 (Morocco), 89.22 (Morocco), and 89.23 (Australia).
- ⁴ AI, page 1. See also JS2, para. 11 and JS3 paras. 5-7.
- ⁵ AI, page 3.
- ⁶ JS2, page 8.
- ⁷ JS3, paras. 12-15.
- ⁸ AI, page 1. For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/17/6, recommendations 89.6 (Argentina), 89.8 (Costa Rica), 89.9 (Spain), 89.10 (Maldives), 89.11 (Italy), 89.12 (Sweden), 89.15 (Poland), 89.17 (France) and 89.18 (Slovakia).
- ⁹ AI, page 3.
- ¹⁰ For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/17/6, recommendations 89.8 (Costa Rica) and 89.17 (France).
- ¹¹ JS3, para. 17.
- ¹² AI, page 2.
- ¹³ For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/17/6, recommendations 89.31 (Turkey) and 89.32 (Italy).
- ¹⁴ JS3, paras. 16-18.
- ¹⁵ JS3, para. 32.
- ¹⁶ JS3, para. 43.
- ¹⁷ JS2, para. 13.
- ¹⁸ JS2, para. 10. For the full text of the recommendation see A/HRC/17/6, para. 89.20 (Maldives).

- ¹⁹ For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/17/6, recommendations 89.38 (South Africa) and 89.39 (Poland).
- ²⁰ JS3, para. 63. See also JS2, para. 10.
- ²¹ JS3, para. 64.
- ²² JS3, para. 33.
- ²³ JS3, para. 53.
- ²⁴ JS3, para. 60.
- ²⁵ JS3, para. 61.
- ²⁶ For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/17/6, recommendations 89.92 (Spain), 89.93 (France), 89.94 (Canada), 89.95 (Slovenia), and 89.96 (United States).
- ²⁷ JS3, para. 22. See also AI, page 2.
- ²⁸ JS3, para. 21.
- ²⁹ For the full text of the recommendation see A/HRC/17/6, para.89.97 (United States).
- ³⁰ JS3, para. 19. See also AI, page 2.
- ³¹ JS3, paras. 24-31.
- ³² AI, page 4.
- ³³ AI, page 4.
- ³⁴ JS2, para. 1.
- ³⁵ AI, page 3.
- ³⁶ JS2, para. 1.
- ³⁷ AI, page 3.
- ³⁸ JS2, para. 6.
- ³⁹ JS2, para. 1. For the full text of the recommendation see A/HRC/17/6, recommendations 89.64 (Spain), 89.65 (Slovakia), 89.66 (Italy), 89.67 (Portugal), 89.68 (Australia), 89.69 (Sweden), 89.70 (Germany) and 89.71 (France).
- ⁴⁰ JS2, para. 8. See also AI, pages 2-3.
- ⁴¹ JS2, para. 15. See also AI, pages 1-3.
- ⁴² JS2, page 8.
- ⁴³ JS2, page 8.
- ⁴⁴ JS2, page 8.
- ⁴⁵ AI, page 4.
- ⁴⁶ JS2, para. 14.
- ⁴⁷ JS1, para. 8.
- ⁴⁸ JS1, para. 42.
- ⁴⁹ JS1, para. 46.
- ⁵⁰ JS1, para. 48.
- ⁵¹ JS1, para. 46.
- ⁵² JS1, para. 52.
- ⁵³ JS1, para. 53. See also JS3, para. 65.
- ⁵⁴ JS1, para. 55.
- ⁵⁵ JS1, para. 56.
- ⁵⁶ JS3, para. 65.
- ⁵⁷ JS3, para. 66.
- ⁵⁸ For the full text of the recommendation see A/HRC/17/6, para. 89.76 (Spain).
- ⁵⁹ JS3, para. 50.
- ⁶⁰ JS3, para. 56.
- ⁶¹ JS3, para. 51.
- ⁶² JS3, para. 58.
- ⁶³ JS3, para. 52.
- ⁶⁴ JS3, para. 59.
- ⁶⁵ JS3, para. 49.
- ⁶⁶ JS3, para. 57.
- ⁶⁷ JS3, para. 36.
- ⁶⁸ JS3, para. 47.
- ⁶⁹ JS3, para. 39.
- ⁷⁰ GIEACPC, para. 1.2.

- ⁷¹ GIEACPC, para. 2.6. See also JS3, para. 34.
⁷² GIEACPC, para. 2.1.
⁷³ GIEACPC, para. 2.2.
⁷⁴ GIEACPC, page 1. See also JS3, paras.44-45.
⁷⁵ JS1, para. 24.
⁷⁶ JS3, para. 40.
⁷⁷ JS3, para. 48.
⁷⁸ JS2, para. 5.
⁷⁹ JS1, para. 40.
⁸⁰ JS1, para. 64.
⁸¹ JS1, para. 73.
⁸² JS1, para. 75.
⁸³ JS3, paras. 55 and 62.
⁸⁴ JS3, para. 23.
⁸⁵ JS3, para. 30.
⁸⁶ JS1, para. 7.
⁸⁷ JS1, para. 29.
⁸⁸ JS1, para. 37.
⁸⁹ JS1, para. 21.
⁹⁰ JS1, para. 74.
⁹¹ JS1, para. 17.
⁹² JS3, para. 35.
⁹³ JS3, para. 46.
⁹⁴ JS3, para. 37.
-