



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
6 November 2015

Original: English

---

## Human Rights Council

Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review

Twenty-fourth session

18-29 January 2016

### **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**

#### **Palau\***

The present report is a summary of 5 stakeholders' submissions<sup>1</sup> 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. Kaleidoscope Human Rights Foundation (KHRF) stated that during its 2011 UPR, Palau had accepted recommendations that it ratify the core human rights treaties, while stating that it was undergoing consultations and working towards public awareness about these instruments and determining its capacity and resources to fulfil the international obligations that would result from the ratification of treaties to which Palau was not yet a party.<sup>2</sup> It noted that Palau had ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities on 11 June 2013 and that on the 20 September 2011, Palau had become a signatory to the ICCPR, ICESCR and CEDAW.<sup>3</sup>

2. KHRF stated that the ICCPR and ICESCR formed the cornerstone of the international legal framework for the protection of human rights and that the ratification of these covenants would assist in strengthening Palau's obligations under international law.<sup>4</sup> It recommended that Palau ratify all significant international human rights treaties (and their Optional Protocols) to reinforce its implementation of, and compliance with, international human rights law.<sup>5</sup>

3. KHRF asserted that Palau had signalled its support for the protection and maintenance of the human rights of LGBTI persons by becoming a signatory to the joint statement on "Ending Acts of Violence and Related Human Rights Violations Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity", delivered during the general debate of the Human Rights Council in September 2011. KHRF stated that by signing the Joint Statement on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Palau acknowledged its responsibility to end human rights violations against all those who were vilified and to prevent discrimination in all forms.<sup>6</sup>

#### **2. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures**

4. ARC International (ARCI) recommended that the Human Rights Council, in its upcoming UPR review, urge Palau to bring its legislation into conformity with its international human rights obligations.<sup>7</sup>

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

#### **1. Equality and non-discrimination**

5. Palau Think Tank (PTT) recommended that the Government of Palau continue to establish laws that reflected the values of CEDAW such as the one to protect women from abuse, to ensure economic equal opportunities and protection and to establish access to resources on the empowerment of women and their roles in society.<sup>8</sup> PTT reported that this had led to the creation of the "Family Protection Act" and the new reformed Penal Code as well as other new laws to be undertaken to ensure the protection of women's rights and antidiscrimination. PTT asserted that the national government still needed to work on better cohesive resources, capacities and coordination to enforce laws and provide necessities for women, the elderly and vulnerable groups. It also highlighted the need of access to resources for assistance and support in their social and economic needs.<sup>9</sup>

6. PTT stated that more girls than boys were graduating from high school. With available scholarships and grants, many girls were pursuing their college education and women increasingly play leading roles in both the public and private sectors, including as elected officials. In the Judiciary system, there were more women judges than men.<sup>10</sup>

7. KHRF stated that there was no reliable data on patterns of discrimination of LGBTI persons within the Palauan society but that the fact that 83.55% of Palauan voters had specifically voted to define marriage as being only between a man and a woman in a 2008 constitutional referendum suggested that attitudes towards LGBTI equality were not particularly favourable.<sup>11</sup>

8. KHRF stated that Palau did not provide any legal rights to same-sex couples, even though the constitutional definition of marriage in Section 13 of Article IV did not hinder the ability of the National Congress to legislate for other forms of relationship recognition.<sup>12</sup> Palau recognised marriage only between two people of the opposite sex, and in February 2014, a bill was introduced in the Senate stipulating that marriage could only be between a man and a woman in order to give statutory effect to the new constitutional definition of marriage.<sup>13</sup> The bill had passed its first reading in May 2014. KHRF considered that if enacted, this bill would further entrench discrimination against same-sex couples in Palauan law.<sup>14</sup>

9. ARCI stated that recommendations were made to the government of Palau concerning discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity in 2011 during the country's first UPR, some of which were accepted.<sup>15</sup> Among these recommendations, ARCI highlighted the recommendation to repeal all provisions in domestic legislation criminalizing consensual sexual activity between same sex adults and to combat discrimination against LGBT persons through political, legislative and administrative measures.<sup>16</sup>

10. KHRF reported that in 2014, Palau had acted on this recommendation by repealing its legislative provisions which criminalised consensual sexual activity between persons of the same sex. Palau had done this through the introduction of a new Penal Code that did not contain any prohibitions on consensual same-sex sexual activity.<sup>17</sup> ARCI stated that this new legislation represented both a monumental affirmation that Palau was committed to upholding its obligations under international human rights law, and that it was committed to implementing "accepted" recommendations coming from international mechanisms, such as the UPR process. ARCI commended Palau for this achievement.<sup>18</sup>

11. KHRF stated that since its previous Universal Periodic Review in 2011, Palau had considered legislation punishing hate crimes on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity, and supported the efforts of the international community to address discrimination against LGBTI persons.<sup>19</sup>

12. KHRF stated that nevertheless, in addition to lacking any constitutional protections for LGBTI persons, Palau did not have any explicit laws or policies that prohibited discrimination of a person based on sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression.<sup>20</sup> In this sense, KHRF considered Palau had not implemented measures to give effect to the UPR recommendation that it combat discrimination against LGBTI people through political, legislative and administrative measures, despite having accepted it.<sup>21</sup>

13. ARCI observed very limited development in the last four years, regarding the same recommendation. It recommended that the Human Rights Council urge Palau to bring its legislation into conformity with its commitment to equality and non-discrimination, and its international human rights obligations, by developing anti-discrimination laws that prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity and inter sex status.<sup>22</sup> KHRF recommended that Palau take steps to amend Section 5 of Article IV of the

Constitution to include sexual orientation and gender identity as non-discrimination grounds.<sup>23</sup>

14. KHRF also recommended that Palau ensure that proposed legislation punishing hate crimes on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity were enacted as soon as possible.<sup>24</sup> While this bill was going through the legislative process, broader measures were needed to prohibit discrimination against LGBTI persons in all areas of public life, including employment, provision of goods and services, education and health care.<sup>25</sup> KHRF recommended that Palau implement a framework of legislative reform that actively prevented and prohibited discrimination of LGBTI persons in all facets of life and society, including but not limited to employment, the provision of goods and services, education and health care.<sup>26</sup>

15. KHRF considered that the gender-specific reference to “husband and wife” on section 402 of Title 21 (Domestic Relations) of the Palau National Code (Code) represented a barrier against same-sex couples adopting children jointly. KHRF stated that this law was not in compliance with Palau's obligations under international law, including under the CRC (which Palau had ratified), as it distinguished a person's eligibility to adopt a child based on their sexual orientation or gender identity and a State Party could not discriminate against a child on the basis of their parent's or legal guardian's sexual orientation or gender identity.<sup>27</sup>

16. KHRF recommended that Palau extend the same legal rights to same-sex couples as to opposite-sex married couples.<sup>28</sup>

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

17. GIEACPC reported that the issue of corporal punishment of children was raised in the compilation of UN information and in the summary of stakeholders' information, and that the Government had accepted a number of recommendations to prohibit corporal punishment in the home and other settings, with reference to Recommendations 61.43, 61.44 and 61.45 made to Palau in its first UPR.<sup>29</sup>

18. Since the initial UPR of Palau in 2011, the Family Protection Act 2012 and the Penal Code 2013 had been adopted. GIEACPC stated that despite the Government's acceptance of the 2011 UPR recommendations to prohibit corporal punishment, these new laws did not achieve this<sup>30</sup>.

19. Regarding the situation at schools, GIEACPC reported that the Master Plan for Education (2000) aimed to discourage and prevent the use of corporal punishment at primary and secondary levels and that according to the 2014 UNICEF baseline research, all schools had child protection policies that included a ban on corporal punishment.<sup>31</sup>

20. GIEACPC stated nevertheless that regarding the situation at home, schools, care settings, and penal institutions, it was particularly concerned about the inclusion in the new Penal Code of a provision specifically authorising the use of force in the “discipline” of children (Article 309), thus providing a legal basis for corporal punishment in the home, schools and other settings.<sup>32</sup>

21. Regarding alternative care settings and day care, GIEACPC stated that corporal punishment was lawful by guardians and others with parental authority under the provisions confirming “the power to exercise parental control and authority” in the Palau National Code.<sup>33</sup>

22. GIEACPC asserted there was no provision for judicial corporal punishment in criminal law. However, according to the baseline research published by UNICEF in 2014, in 7% of cases where children had committed a crime the response of police officers was to impose physical punishment.<sup>34</sup>

23. GIEACPC expressed hope that the UPR Working Group would note with concern the legality of corporal punishment of children in Palau and that states would raise the issue during the review in 2016 and make a specific recommendation that Palau clearly prohibit all corporal punishment of children in all settings including the home, and explicitly repeal the provisions in the Penal Code authorising the use of force for purposes of “discipline”.<sup>35</sup>

24. Regarding recommendation 61.38 on human trafficking<sup>36</sup>, MLSC (Micronesian Legal Services corporation) reported that Palau’s recently updated Penal Code now contained detailed provisions regarding human and labour trafficking, inter alia: that labour trafficking included the acts of providing or obtaining labour or services through the use of force, extortion, fraud, deception, etc.; the inclusion of the offense of international non-payment of wages; the codification of the offence of people smuggling; and the codification of the offence of people trafficking, which broadly included recruiting, transporting, transferring, harbouring or receiving a person for the purposes of exploitation (sexual servitude, prostitution, forced labour or services, or slavery) by threat, use of force, abduction, fraud, deception, etc. (17 PNC §3906), including a separate offence for child trafficking (17 PNC §3907).<sup>37</sup>

25. MLSC recommended that Palau establish a national strategy to combat human and labour trafficking as defined by the relevant Penal Code provisions, including: Better coordination between the Division of Labour and the Attorney General’s office to identify, investigate and properly prosecute trafficking cases; Providing training to Bureau of Public Safety (including police and Criminal Investigation Department) regarding the new Penal Code provisions addressing human and labour trafficking; An active and meaningful effort by the government (such as a dedicated assistant attorney general) to prioritize bringing charges against employers under applicable provisions of the Penal Code and to utilize statutory penalties against employers to deter noncompliance; and the creation or coordination of emergency support services for victims of trafficking.<sup>38</sup>

26. PTT stated that regarding human trafficking, further consultations and resources were needed to improve Palau’s efforts to understand and combat this illegal activity as it was led by Organized International Crime Syndicates.<sup>39</sup> The Ministry of Justice, with the Office of Immigration and the Labour office, needed to establish protocols and cooperative relations with its ally nation states and establish strict laws and procedures against illegal recruiters, including warnings to workers who willingly take part in this illegal process.<sup>40</sup>

27. Regarding Recommendation 61.37 on measures to protect victims of trafficking including the provision of shelters and the facilitation of the process for victims to be witnesses against traffickers in court, MLSC stated that victims of trafficking who chose to file claims were typically removed from their jobs by their employer (the alleged trafficker) and therefore no longer had a source of livelihood or a place to stay.<sup>41</sup> It reported that currently in Palau, there were no shelters for these victims or any coordinated emergency support services.<sup>42</sup>

28. MLSC explained that one of the main obstacles faced by victims and witnesses in trafficking cases is that they were subjected to the same stringent employment transfer exception as all other migrant workers. If the allegations of trafficking were against their employer, as they often were, removal from their jobs and attempted repatriation were nearly certain. In order to stay in Palau, these individuals needed to be able to support themselves, and thus required an expedited and streamlined path for their jobs to be transferred. Foreign workers were also not entitled to transfer if they reported claims of trafficking to the government or filed a civil lawsuit for trafficking.<sup>43</sup>

29. MLSC recommended that Palau review the employment transfer rules and that it include a new exception to streamline transfers for those who have active labour

complaints, civil lawsuits for trafficking offenses, or bona fide reports of trafficking to the Bureau of Public Safety.<sup>44</sup>

30. ARCI stated that the LGBTI community in Palau faced security threats.<sup>45</sup> ARC required the government to ensure that initiatives such as the Bill proposed in 2014 regarding "hate crimes" be supported, as part of its commitments to combat discrimination and ensure the safety of all its citizens.<sup>46</sup>

### **3. Freedom of expression and right to participate in public and political life**

31. MLSC recommended that Palau provide ongoing meaningful consultation and coordination with civil society organizations, including more streamlined information sharing and dissemination to civil society organizations to enable participation in subsequent UPR and other human rights reporting processes.<sup>47</sup>

### **4. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work**

32. PTT indicated that the increase of unemployment among Palauan citizens needed to be addressed between the government and civil societies. PTT recommend that Palau carry out an upgrade study and database of household incomes and local unemployment so as to improve household income and needs as well as to establish resources for addressing the rise of unemployment.<sup>48</sup>

33. MLSC indicated that isolated workers such as farm workers and domestic workers needed increased protection against human rights abuses. Those workers were not covered by the new minimum wage laws, and therefore could face higher levels of abuse and exploitation.<sup>49</sup> Some domestic workers experienced economically abusive relationships, where they received a minimum pay and worked long hours and some employers confiscated workers' passports or used threats of deportation to maintain control over their employees.<sup>50</sup> Although the Constitution of Palau prohibited indentured servitude, many of these workers still suffered these conditions.<sup>51</sup>

34. MLSC stated that due to uncertainties regarding the application of the minimum wage law and inconsistent or inadequate enforcement of labour laws generally, it had noticed a high incidence of noncompliance with labour laws in the private sector.<sup>52</sup> PTT asserted that no system was in place for the Palauans working in the private sector to appeal their grievances and cases. There were no clear labour laws protecting the Palauan citizen workforce and the national government needed to establish a comprehensive law to protect them.<sup>53</sup>

### **5. Right to social security and to an adequate standard of living**

35. ARCI reported that issues such as job security, access to services, housing, etc. had been highlighted as a key concern for LGBT persons in Palau, and required immediate attention by the State.<sup>54</sup> KHRF affirmed that in the absence of any legal recognition, same-sex couples were unable to access a number of rights, including hospital visitation, inheritance and social security benefits (e.g. survivor pensions).<sup>55</sup>

### **6. Right to health**

36. PTT stated that Palau had been rated second in the world with non-communicable diseases, and that as a population of only over 20,000 people, this was a national crisis. PTT affirmed that it was essential that Palau establish coordination and cooperation of professional expertise and resources from the international community to help provide methods and models to help Palau in addressing and combating this crisis.<sup>56</sup>

## 7. Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers

37. PTT reported a great influx of over 6,000 migrant workers who lived and worked in Palau.<sup>57</sup>

38. MLSC stated that most cases of noncompliance with labour laws in the private sector that reported to it involved migrant workers. Because of the inability of migrant workers to change employers, many workers faced contract termination and subsequent repatriation to their country of origin if they complained about their work conditions. Some private sector employers who employed migrant workers were able to disregard or manipulate applicable labour laws, and simply fired and repatriated workers who complained and replaced them with others.<sup>58</sup>

39. Regarding UPR recommendations 61.15 and 61.36 on human trafficking and the situation of migrant workers, and recommendations 61.54-61.56 on foreign workers and regulations to protect them<sup>59</sup>, MLSC stated that the provisions of the Labour Code were re-codified and that the most significant inclusion was the minimum wage law, which became effective on 1 October 2013.<sup>60</sup> This was a significant achievement to improve the situation of migrant workers because it removed the previous exemption which permitted employers to pay migrant workers a lower minimum wage than Resident (Palauan) Workers.<sup>61</sup>

40. MLSC highlighted that despite the broad scope of the new law and strong enforcement mechanisms, many employers in the private sector were not in compliance with the minimum wage law, as some were paying a monthly salary with no limit to the hours required to work, and others had found loopholes to the minimum wage law.<sup>62</sup> The lack of overtime laws and maximum work hour laws meant that employers could require their employees to work excessive hours without additional compensation.<sup>63</sup>

41. MLSC explained that employers paying the minimum wage were authorized to take into account and deduct from the employee's wages the reasonable and actual cost of providing food and housing. There was no statutory guidance as to what was "reasonable" and some employers utilized this, along with other unauthorized deductions and/or penalties, in order to unilaterally and freely reduce their employees' wages.<sup>64</sup>

42. MLSC stated that there were five exceptions to the minimum wage law, including the cases of: (1) Up to two individuals employed as farmers by a single employer; and (2) Up to two individuals employed as domestic helpers, caretakers, babysitters, or house boys. Most of these workers worked more than 48 hours a week because they were under the direct and continuous control of their employers.<sup>65</sup>

43. MLSC underscored that these employees did not have any viable recourse, and employees who complained were most often faced with either threats or actual contract termination and subsequent repatriation. MLSC recommended that Palau pass a comprehensive labour law reform which should include across the board minimum entitlements, including statutorily set hours of work and entitlements to overtime compensation, annual leave, sick leave, and entitlement to public holidays.<sup>66</sup>

44. MLSC reported that upon arrival, some migrants were housed in isolated conditions and had their passports confiscated by their employers. Some were required to work in brothel-bars where they were forced to perform sexual acts to earn a livelihood. Migrant workers and victims of trafficking were often not aware of their rights in Palau or how they could seek help upon arrival, and so many remained in abusive and exploitative employment relationships for long periods of time. To its knowledge, no relevant government agency distributed any 'Know your rights' information or conducts community outreach regarding labour rights or human trafficking. MLSC recommended that Palau assume a meaningful commitment to raising awareness and education around employment rights of both migrant workers and Palauan workers.<sup>67</sup>

45. MLSC recommended, inter alia, that Palau: carry out the promulgation of updated rules and regulations for the Division of Labour, in consultation with relevant civil society actors, with a specific focus on improving the rights and conditions of migrant workers; provide information to foreign workers upon arrival (while being processed by immigration officials) regarding trafficking and specifically how to seek help and safety if they found themselves subjected to trafficking conditions;<sup>68</sup>

46. Based on the correlation between domestic work and forced labour and exploitation, MLSC recommended that these workers be provided with extra protection and that their minimum salary be increased.<sup>69</sup>

47. PTT expressed its support for the fundamental principles of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families (ICRMW). Palau was a small island state with extremely limited funding, capacity and resources to effectively make any tangible and effective enforcement of migrant international laws. Palau was not ready to ratify this Convention, but similar or related laws applicable to Palau could be applied and thus, further consultation and technical expertise was needed in order for Palau to move forward on this issue.<sup>70</sup>

## **8. Right to development, and environmental issues**

48. PTT reported that there were various non-profit organizations established in Palau working closely with government and public sectors to address and combat climate change. It also stated that capacity building and resources were needed to protect water borders from numerous illegal fishing, which still persisted in Palau. PTT stated that the Government needed to work on coordination with the international community to enforce international law on water protections and security, including the impacts of global sea level rising.<sup>71</sup>



## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: [www.ohchr.org](http://www.ohchr.org).
- Civil society*
- Individual submissions:
- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| ARCI    | ARC International;  |
| GIEACPC | Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children;                 |
| KHRF    | Kaleidoscope Human Rights Foundation (Australia);                             |
| MLSC    | Micronesia Legal Services Corporation, Washington (United States of America); |
| PTT     | Palau Think Tank (Palau).   |
- <sup>2</sup> KHRF, para. 2.7.
- <sup>3</sup> KHRF, paras. 2.7 and 6.3.
- <sup>4</sup> KHRF, paras. 6.1 and 6.2.
- <sup>5</sup> KHRF, para. 6.3.
- <sup>6</sup> KHRF, para. 2.10.
- <sup>7</sup> ARC International, p.2.
- <sup>8</sup> PTT, p. 2.
- <sup>9</sup> PTT, p. 2.
- <sup>10</sup> PTT, p. 3.
- <sup>11</sup> KHRF, para. 4.3.
- <sup>12</sup> KHRF para. 5.4.
- <sup>13</sup> KHRF, paras. 5.2 and 5.3.
- <sup>14</sup> KHRF, para. 5.3.
- <sup>15</sup> Recommendation 62.38 (France), Recommendation 62.39 (Norway), Recommendation 62.40 (Spain). For the full text of the recommendations see: UN Doc. A/HRC/18/5. See also: A/HRC/18/5/Add.1
- <sup>16</sup> ARCInternational, p.1. Recommendation 62.40 (Spain). For the full text of the recommendations see: UN Doc. A/HRC/18/5.
- <sup>17</sup> KHRF, para. 2.3.
- <sup>18</sup> ARC International, p.1.
- <sup>19</sup> KHRF, para.2.1.
- <sup>20</sup> KHRF, para. 4.2. See also: ARC International, p. 2.
- <sup>21</sup> KHRF, paras. 4.1 and 5.1. Recommendation 62.40 (Spain). For the full text of the recommendations see: UN Doc. A/HRC/18/5.
- <sup>22</sup> ARC International, p.2.
- <sup>23</sup> KHRF, para. 4.6.
- <sup>24</sup> KHRF, para. 2.6.
- <sup>25</sup> KHRF, para. 4.4.
- <sup>26</sup> KHRF, para. 4.4.
- <sup>27</sup> KHRF, paras. 3.1, 3.2 and 7.
- <sup>28</sup> KHRF, para. 5.7.
- <sup>29</sup> GIEACPC, para. 1.1. Recommendation 61.43 (Poland), Recommendation 61.44 (Norway) and Recommendation 61.45 (Brazil). For the full text of the recommendations see: UN Doc. A/HRC/18/5.
- <sup>30</sup> Recommendation 61.43 (Poland), Recommendation 61.44 (Norway) and Recommendation 61.45 (Brazil). For the full text of the recommendations see: UN Doc. A/HRC/18/5.
- <sup>31</sup> GIEACPC, para. 2.7.
- <sup>32</sup> GIEACPC, paras. 1.2, 2.3.
- <sup>33</sup> GIEACPC, para. 2.4.
- <sup>34</sup> GIEACPC, para. 2.9.
- <sup>35</sup> GIEACPC, p. 1.
- <sup>36</sup> Recommendation 61.38 (Slovakia). For the full text of the recommendation see: UN Doc. A/HRC/18/5.
- <sup>37</sup> MLSC, pp. 3 and 4.
- <sup>38</sup> MLSC, p. 6.
- <sup>39</sup> PTT, p. 4.

- <sup>40</sup> PTT, p.5.  
<sup>41</sup> MLSC, p. 5. Recommendation 61.37 (Norway). For the full text of the recommendations see: UN Doc. A/HRC/18/5.  
<sup>42</sup> MLSC, p. 5.  
<sup>43</sup> MLSC, p.5.  
<sup>44</sup> MLSC, p. 6.  
<sup>45</sup> ARC International, p. 2.  
<sup>46</sup> ARC International, p. 2.  
<sup>47</sup> MLSC, p. 6.  
<sup>48</sup> PTT, p. 4.  
<sup>49</sup> MLSC, p.2.  
<sup>50</sup> MLSC, p. 2.  
<sup>51</sup> MLSC, p. 2.  
<sup>52</sup> MLSC, p. 1.  
<sup>53</sup> PTT, p. 4.  
<sup>54</sup> ARC International, p. 2.  
<sup>55</sup> KHRF, para. 5.5.  
<sup>56</sup> PTT, p.3.  
<sup>57</sup> PTT, p.4.  
<sup>58</sup> MLSC, p.1.  
<sup>59</sup> Recommendation 61.15 (Algeria), Recommendation 61.36 (United States of America), Recommendation 61.54 (Hungary), Recommendation 61.55 (China), and Recommendation 61.56 (New Zealand). For the full text of the recommendations see: UN Doc. A/HRC/18/5.  
<sup>60</sup> MLSC, p. 2.  
<sup>61</sup> MLSC, p.2.  
<sup>62</sup> MLSC, p.2.  
<sup>63</sup> MLSC, p. 3.  
<sup>64</sup> MLSC, p. 2.  
<sup>65</sup> MLSC, p.6.  
<sup>66</sup> MLSC, p.6.  
<sup>67</sup> MLSC, pp. 2 and 5.  
<sup>68</sup> MLSC, p. 6.  
<sup>69</sup> MLSC, p. 3.  
<sup>70</sup> PTT, p. 4.  
<sup>71</sup> PTT, p.3.
-