United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/48/AGO/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
8 November 2024

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Forty-eighth session
Geneva, 20–31 January 2025

Summary of stakeholders' submissions on Angola*

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

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review and the outcome of the previous review.[1] It is a summary of 18 stakeholders' submissions[2] for the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Information provided by stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations[3] and cooperation with human rights mechanisms

2. Joint submission 9 (JS9) stated that Angola must ratify the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169) of the International Labour Organisation.[4]

3. The Center for Global Nonkilling (CGNK) recommended that Angola ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.[5]

4. The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) urged Angola to ratify the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.[6]

5. Joint submission 2 (JS2) recommended that Angola extend a standing invitation to all of the United Nations Special Procedure mandate holders.[7] Human Rights Watch (HRW) recommended that the Government facilitate the visit requested by the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions.[8]

6. JS2 recommended that Angola consult with civil society on the implementation of the recommendations issued during the universal periodic review (UPR), incorporate the results of the UPR into action plans for the promotion and protection of human rights and present a midterm evaluation report to the Human Rights Council on the implementation of the recommendations.[9]

* The present document is being issued without formal editing.

B. National human rights framework

1. Constitutional and legislative framework

7. The African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights (AU-ACHPR) highlighted the entry into force of the Code of Criminal Procedure and of the new Penal Code in 2021.[10]

2. Institutional infrastructure and policy measures

8. JS9 reported that despite the commitment made by Angola, an Independent National Human Rights Institution in accordance with the Paris Principles had not yet been established.[11]

9. Joint submission 4 (JS4) stated that the dwindling functionality of the Local Human Rights Committees continued to threaten human rights. Despite the fundamental role Committees played, the mechanism was becoming defunct as meetings were irregular, and increasingly some civil society organisations had not been invited to meetings.[12]

10. Amnesty International (AI) took positive note of the approval by the Government of its human rights strategy, and the adoption of plans to advance the human rights of vulnerable groups, particularly persons with albinism, persons with disabilities, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or intersex (LGBTI) people.[13] JS9 stated that the National Human Rights Strategy had been partially implemented, noting that the provisions relating the creation of a National Human Rights Observatory and the preparation of periodic reports at the local level by the Provincial Human Rights Committees had not been complied with.[14]

C. Promotion and protection of human rights

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

Equality and non-discrimination

11. Joint submission (JS10) applauded the government for prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation in the Penal Code and for repealing the criminalization of same-sex sexual conduct. It noted however that legal framework on equality and non-discrimination had not yet been adapted to reflect those changes.[15]

Right to life, liberty and security of person, and freedom from torture

12. AU-ACHPR was concerned at the persistence of police brutality and excessive use of force and the resulting culture of impunity within the police force.[16] JS2 indicated that the security forces frequently used excessive and lethal force, including live ammunition, batons and dogs, against peaceful protesters.[17] AI and HRW reported on cases of excessive use of force by the police resulting in the deaths of protestors.[18]

13. JS9 stated that, in practice, there was no institution or body with a clear mandate to respond to complaints of extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions allegedly perpetrated by police agents or security forces.[19]

14. AI stated that law enforcement officers and the criminal justice system failed to take steps to investigate allegations of torture, injuries and use of lethal weapons against protesters and human rights defenders and other violations committed by the police.[20]

15. JS2 stated that journalists were frequently intimidated, threatened and physically attacked.[21] Joint submission 7 (JS7) highlighted a number of reports of alleged instances of journalists being physically attacked either in retaliation for their journalistic work or in an attempt to silence journalists from reporting on unfolding events.[22] JS7 also noted reports of incidents of Angolan police beating reporters covering government protests and confiscating reporting equipment.[23]

16. AI recommended that Angola conduct prompt, thorough, impartial and independent investigations into allegations of killing, torture, and other ill-treatment committed by police

forces, particularly in the context of protests and bring suspected perpetrators to justice and provide effective remedies to victims and their families.[24] JS2 and HRW made related recommendations.[25] Joint submission 5 (JS5) recommended the adoption of robust measures to combat impunity for violence against journalists.[26]

17. JS9 stated that though the new Penal Code contained a criminal definition of the crime of torture, an effective national torture prevention mechanism to carry out regular unannounced visits to all places of detention had not yet been put in place.[27] JS9 stated that Angola must adopt legislation establishing an independent body with the power to carry out prompt, impartial and independent investigations into all allegations of torture, and approve the necessary regulations to allow parliamentarians or civil society organizations to carry out visits to prisons or police stations.[28]

18. JS2 was alarmed by the arbitrary arrest and prosecution of Human Right Defenders (HRDs), journalists and protesters.[29] HRW stated that arbitrary arrests and detentions continued to be a significant issue in Angola, particularly in the oil-rich enclave of Cabinda.[30] JS2 indicated that protesters were frequently arrested, charged and, in some cases, sentenced in summary trials.[31]

19. AI recommended that Angola end all criminal proceedings against individuals exercising their right to peaceful assembly, quash any resulting convictions, and drop associated fines.[32]

20. Joint submission (JS1) indicated that security in communities must be enhanced to protect citizens from criminality, and measures put in place to restrict access to firearms. The root causes of gang creation and activity should be better understood and addressed.[33]

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

21. JS10 reported that steps had been taken to implement a supported recommendation from the previous UPR, [34] on intensifying efforts to help vulnerable groups access justice, but that several challenges remained, including procedural delays, deficient infrastructure, lack of properly trained and qualified personnel and low levels of information and education. It also indicated that it was not clear whether LGBTQI people were included as a vulnerable group.[35]

22. JS10 recommended strengthening the training of police and judicial agents on sexual orientation and gender identity, as well as creating awareness programs and taking measures to promote access to justice for LGBTQI people.[36]

23. Joint submission 6 (JS6) indicated that in September 2019, the Government had announced the creation of a commission to prepare a plan to honour the victims of political conflicts in Angola, including those of May 27, 1977, [37] when the then Government, which was led by the People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) had detained, tortured and summarily executed numerous civilians without a trial. Some of the victims had been buried in mass graves and others had possibly been thrown into the ocean.[38] These acts were the result of political divisions within the ruling MPLA party.[39]

24. JS6 acknowledged that the Government had publicly addressed the events of 27 May 1977 and that, after four decades of silence, in 2021 the President had recognised in a historical speech that numerous people had been unlawfully executed and tortured in the aftermath.[40] JS6 stated, however, that declarations made by the heads of the Commission indicated that there would not be any attempt to carry out real investigations and address the existing difficulties in identifying the victims and recover their bodies.[41]

25. JS6 recommended that Angola investigate these human rights violations effectively, expeditiously and impartially, in particular by ensuring that a truly independent commission was set up to investigate the events surrounding 27 May 1977, and ensure that the families and their representatives were involved in this process.[42]

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life

26. The European Centre for Law and Justice (ECLJ) reported that Christians belonging to non-traditional denominations had great difficulty registering and that stringent

requirements resulted in very low numbers of recognitions of religious groups.[43] ECLJ stated that Angola must uphold protections for religious liberty, ensuring that all its citizens were free to peacefully practice their faith and should amend its laws to make it easier for religious organizations to register and ensure that requirements for registering were not used to restrict religious freedom.[44]

27. JS5 stated that the change in political leadership in 2017, which ended four decades of a family rule, had not significantly improved freedom of expression as censorship and control of information still characterized media freedom.[45]

28. JS5 indicated that journalists, particularly those affiliated with independent, privately-owned media outlets, often faced threats and attacks. Additionally, both online and traditional media suffered from some degree of government interference.[46] Joint submission 3 (JS3) stated that media freedom and independence continued to be elusive concepts, with the state owning and controlling most of the media outlets.[47] JS5 recommended that Angola promote media plurality and independence by allowing private media to freely operate and take measures to enhance the autonomy of regulatory bodies.[48]

29. JS3 indicated that Law No. 3/17, of 23 January on the Exercise of Television Activity and the Law No. 4/17, of 23 January on Broadcasting Activity, needed to be revised because they established too high costs for initiatives to establish television and radio channels.[49] JS4 stated that Angola was the only country in Southern Africa that did not have community radio stations, partly due to the high costs of setting them up and the bureaucratic processes involved.[50]

30. JS5 indicated that access to the internet remained very limited but was steadily improving.[51] JS3 recommended that Angola increase access to electricity in rural areas to effectively implement digital inclusion programs and close the digital divide and provide affordable access to the internet for all.[52]

31. JS2 noted that articles 214, 215 and 217 of the 2019 Penal Code, defined defamation and slander as criminal offences, to be punished with prison sentences or a fine.[53] Additionally, article 333 of the Penal Code established the offence of insulting the president or any other sovereign body punishable by a prison sentence or a fine.[54]

32. JS2 stated that Law 23/10 of 3 December 2010 on Crimes against the Security of the State contained several restrictive provisions, which were frequently used by the authorities against HRDs and journalists.[55]

33. JS7 reported that criminal defamation suits against journalists were frequent and were often brought by members of the government.[56] Criminal charges such as "incitement to rebellion" and "outrage against the president" had also been used as a means of putting pressure on journalistic operations.[57] JS3 reported that online expression had been under attack, especially through the insult laws.[58]

34. JS7 recommended that Angola stop using criminal defamation charges to prosecute journalists and media outlets;[59] and undertake reforms to Angola's penal code to exclude the criminalization of defamation and repeal insult laws.[60] JS2, JS3, JS5 and made related recommendations.[61] JS2 recommended that Angola refrain from censoring social and conventional media and ensure freedom of expression was safeguarded in all arenas.[62] JS9 stated that the National Security Law must respect the rights legally protected by the Constitution and national and international norms on fundamental rights.[63]

35. Several submissions expressed concerns regarding the draft National Security Law and the draft law on the Statute of Non-Governmental Organisations.[64]

36. JS3 indicated that in January 2024, a National Security Bill had passed its first vote in the country's National Assembly. Human rights organizations had condemned the Bill stating that in its current form, it would allow excessive government control over private institutions, including the media, and undermine press freedom, freedom of expression, and association.[65] JS7 stated that it would give the Angolan government the power to censor broadcasting and disrupt telecommunication services, authorize police surveillance, close public premises and prohibit movement.[66]

37. HRW recommended that Angola revise or withdraw the proposed new national security law and ensure national security laws were drafted in line with international law.[67]

38. AU-ACHPR was concerned about the adoption of bills which, in their current form, would reduce civic space, in particular the bill on the status of non-governmental organisations.[68] JS2 indicated that under pretext of combating money laundering and terrorist financing, the Government had introduced a draft law on the Statute of Non-Governmental Organisations, which had passed the first stage of approval by the National Assembly in May 2023, containing many restrictions to freedom of association. The draft law would give the power of 'supervision and monitoring' of non-governmental organisations (NGOs), including the power to suspend NGO activities without judicial recourse, to a state body, appointed by the President of the Republic.[69]

39. JS9 stated that civil society encouraged the Government and the National Assembly to conduct an inclusive dialogue of consultation with Angolan civil society organizations and other stakeholders, to better understand the role of NGOs, the nature of their work, and their needs and concerns. This would allow the development of new legislation, which would be less restrictive, more inclusive and favourable, and would promote the critical work of NGOs in accordance with Angola's constitutional and international obligations.[70]

40. JS2 noted that the registration process for NGOs was in practice a lengthy process and that some organisations waited 15 years for registration certificates to be granted.[71] JS10 noted that LGBTQI organizations still struggled to register owing to administrative barriers due in part to stigma.[72]

41. AI reported that Angolan judicial authorities continued to restrict the rights to peaceful assembly and association, particularly by using the Law on the Right to Assembly and Protest and recommended repealing article 4 (2) of that law.[73] HRW recommended that Angola fully respect the rights to freedom of expression and peaceful assembly including by undertaking necessary legal reforms.[74]

42. AU-ACHPR noted that peaceful general elections had been held in 2022.[75] JS3 stated that in August 2022, Angola held its general elections, and that several human rights violations and undue restrictions to fundamental rights had been noted including crackdowns on the political opposition and civic activists, as well as restrictions on expression and access to independent, alternative sources of information than state-run media.[76] JS4 indicated that, threats to civic space and fundamental freedoms had been on the rise since the 2022 election.[77]

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

43. JS1 noted reports of the existence of high levels of unemployment, and that job opportunities were limited and people got paid very little. Youth unemployment was very high, and women had less opportunity for employment and were more often engaged in lower quality jobs than men.[78]

Right to an adequate standard of living

44. JS1 noted that despite the country being one of the largest economies in sub-Saharan Africa due to its oil production, high levels of poverty were reported.[79] Broken-Chalk stated that the number of people facing extreme poverty in Angola had been following an upward trend and that it was expected that the number of Angolans living in extreme poverty would increase in 2026.[80] Droughts, which were frequent in the country, aggravated poverty by generating agricultural losses and food insecurity, forcing families to choose immediate survival above long-term expenditures.[81] AI reported that food insecurity in the southern provinces of Huíla, Cunene and Namibe persisted, in part due to diversion of communal grazing land for commercial farming and to prolonged drought.[82]

45. AI recommended that Angola take effective measures to ensure food security for everyone, without discrimination on any ground; and immediately provide sustained and regular emergency food assistance and access to clean and safe water in rural areas.[83]

46. JS1 indicated that there were large disparities in the levels of access to services between urban and rural areas noting, for example, that in 2020, the percentage of basic

drinking water services within urban households was 72 percent, whereas within rural areas this was only 28 percent.[84] JS1 stated that measures must be taken to improve infrastructure and access to electricity, and sanitation, especially in the countryside, through the provision of sufficient financial resources.[85]

47. JS9 noted that despite measures taken, the right to adequate housing continued to be a problem, as many could not afford to buy a house from public programmes, which were often riddled with corruption and clientelism.[86] AI noted that Angolan authorities continued to illegally evict residents without providing adequate and reasonable notice, as well as alternative housing to those affected.[87] It recommended that Angola end forced evictions and establish a comprehensive human rights-based housing policy and a legal framework that prohibits forced evictions and provides effective remedies.[88]

Right to health

48. JS9 congratulated the Government for building new hospitals and health care centres across the country but noted that challenges remained in accessing healthcare, especially in peri-urban and rural areas.[89] JS10 highlighted challenges in the healthcare system including the lack of funding for the health sector and insufficient investment at the national level.[90]

49. JS1 noted concerns related to access to health services including the lack of specialized doctors, and access to medicine. Patients often needed to wait for long periods before they could be treated, resulting in high rates of death and diseases.[91]

50. JS1 reported that there were just 0.2 doctors per 1,000 of the population and that many were not skilled in obstetrics. JS1 noted estimates that there were some 20,000 women in Angola living with obstetric fistula, a childbirth injury usually caused by prolonged, obstructed labour without timely medical intervention leading to severe health consequences.[92]

51. Joint submission 8 (JS8) reported that Angola had a maternal mortality rate (MMR) of 222 per 100 000 live births. Noting that Sustainable Development Goal target 3.1 called for reduction of maternal mortality ratio to less than 70 per 100,000 live births by 2030, JS8 stated that it was crucial that there be political engagement and collective efforts to implement strategies aimed at reducing maternal mortality effectively.[93] JS9 made similar observations and also noted high infant mortality rates.[94]

52. JS9 stated that Angola should invest more in primary health care services, creating a network of medical centres, with doctors and support technicians to ensure access to health for citizens, and especially care for pregnant women and children from zero to five years old, thus reducing the high number of deaths of women during childbirth and of children before completing five years of age.[95] JS1 recommended that Angola increase access to medical services including pre-natal consultations, and to adequate care during the delivery, for women in all regions.[96]

53. JS1 reported that public hospitals did not have the means to diagnose and treat people with disabilities, resulting in a situation where health care was only available for those who had funds to go to private clinics.[97]

54. JS10 noted that despite efforts made, barriers to accessing health services for LGBTQI people continued to exist including because they faced high levels of discrimination.[98] JS10 noted that there were no sexual and reproductive health services that specifically responded to the needs of intersex people.[99]

55. JS10 urged Angola to improve access to sexual and reproductive health services, including access to modern methods of contraception, and include the needs of LGBTQI people.[100]

56. JS10 noted that the Law 08/04 on HIV/AIDS, of 1 November 2004, protecting the rights of people living with HIV, was being revised with a view to aligning it with scientific progress and international human rights standards. JS10 also reported that the Penal Code still criminalized non-disclosure of HIV status, which made access to sexual health services difficult.[101]

57. JS10 reported that a recommendation[102] from the previous UPR to decriminalize abortion in all cases, had been partially implemented as the Penal Code had been amended to allow abortion in certain circumstances. However, voluntary termination of pregnancy had not been fully decriminalized.[103] AI noted that article 154(4) of the Penal Code continued to criminalize those who received abortions or delivered abortion materials.[104]

Right to education

58. Broken-Chalk noted that numerous families in Angola faced challenges in providing education due to household poverty and struggled to afford school expenses, such as basic school supplies, school uniforms, or transportation costs, limiting children's access to education, especially in rural areas.[105] Furthermore, Angola faced a lack of qualified teachers, which directly impacted the quality of education, especially in rural areas.[106]

59. JS1 reported that high levels of inequality between the rich and poor in Angola were illustrated through the education system as children received different levels of education depending on what their parents could pay for. Furthermore, the percentage of school completion was low.[107] JS1 stated that the right to education should be ensured through the removal of fees for primary and secondary education and a reduction of universities fees and building schools closer to areas in which people are living.[108]

60. Broken-Chalk recommended that Angola: address challenges to education, including through educational reforms and economic help for families,[109] invest in upgrading rural schools to provide safe and conducive learning environments and make sure that schools have essential utilities,[110] and expand access to education so that everyone is able to access it.[111]

61. JS1 noted reports indicating that some 35 percent of girls aged 15 to 19 were either pregnant or had already given birth, which caused girls to drop out of school.[112] Broken-Chalk noted that the lack of comprehensive sexual education also contributed to the high rates of child marriages and teenage pregnancies.[113]

62. Broken-Chalk recommended that Angola increase funding for educational programmes aimed at girls.[114] JS1 recommended promoting the equal importance of education for girls as well as boys at secondary as well as primary levels.[115] JS10 recommended providing greater access to comprehensive sexuality education in schools, including issues of sexual orientation and gender identity.[116]

Development, the environment, and business and human rights

63. JS1 noted reports that Angola depended heavily on imported products, even though Angola had natural resources which could be developed. JS1 indicated that more produce should be grown in Angola, by Angolans, for the consumption of Angolans, including crops such as sugar.[117]

64. AI noted that Angola had joined the Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative (EITI) in June 2022, as recommended during the previous UPR.[118]

65. AI stated that corporate business operations continued to divert community land, which contributed to poverty. The occupation of more fertile land by commercial farmers had undermined the economic and social resilience of pastoralist communities, particularly their ability to survive the drought in southern Angola. As a result, more than 10,000 people had crossed the border into a third country, in search of food, water and essential services.[119] HRW also referred to the migration of Angolan nationals to a third country noting that many of the migrants were from Angola’s southern Cunene, Huila, and Namibe provinces, where the worst drought in four decades had caused severe food shortages and livestock deaths.[120]

66. JS8 reported that while the law recognized communitarian lands, land demarcation conflicts remained common between the communities living on the land, and companies.[121] Though the Government had organised public consultations to actively involve communities to protect their rights as provided for in the Land Law, the rights of communities were often violated, and they were exposed to various forms of exploitation.[122] Similarly, JS9 indicated that the Land Law No. 09/04 of 9 November 2004, protected the rights to land of rural communities. However, the majority of such communities did not have Recognition Titles

for their lands leading to central government bodies assigning community lands to entrepreneurs.[123]

67. JS9 stated that the expropriation of land was carried out under the guidance of the central government and with the complicity of local administrators, ignoring the populations.[124] JS9 noted that a private project had resulted in the coercive occupation of 85 thousand hectares of land, and jeopardised the survival of some 39 communities and various ethnic groups in the province of Cunene, many of which were on the verge of extinction.[125]

68. JS9 stated that Angola must approve a legal norm for the attribution of land recognition titles to communities in an impartial manner, thus avoiding the arbitrary occupation of community lands by businessmen, and, in the event of expropriation of community lands for public utility and beyond, it must always hear the affected populations, including the local traditional authorities.[126] AI recommended that Angola work with civil society to demarcate all rural communal lands and issue communal title deeds for occupation, possession and rights of use in accordance with applicable legislation.[127]

69. JS9 stated that in accordance with the Mining Code the mining industry should be taxed 25 percent of which 5 percent must revert to the municipality of the jurisdiction where the mine is located. It noted that companies paid taxes, but the Government did not invest in municipalities as established by the Mining Code. Moreover, companies in the extractive industry did not observe environmental preservation measures and corporate social responsibility towards local communities.[128]

70. JS9 reported that the Government intended to open 35 new oil wells in nature reserve areas in the next five years, which would impact marine life, flora and animal life. JS9 noted that environmental impact studies were not public, as established by Angolan legislation.[129]

2. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women

71. JS8 indicated that violence remained a big challenge for women and girls despite the enactment of the law against domestic violence in 2011 and a slew of legislative and policy instruments to ensure its implementation.[130] JS8 highlighted that the legal notion of violence had expanded with the criminalization of sexual harassment and the criminalization of discrimination based on sexual orientation.[131]

72. JS8 reported, however, that the lack of data regarding gender-based violence (GBV) affected the capacity to respond to the problem of violence against women.[132] Additionally, there was widespread underreporting of cases due to, among others, cultural pressure to address the issue internally, the lack of training of police officers, and lengthy court proceedings which allowed perpetrators to pressure victims.[133] JS9 also highlighted the negative impacts of extremely lengthy procedures before the Family Court for wives seeking pensions and widows seeking the recognition of *de facto* unions.[134]

73. JS8 reported that the difficulties in getting a medical examination from the Central Criminalistics Laboratory of Luanda undercut the ability of victims of sexual violence to effectively report such violence.[135]

74. JS10 expressed concern that the General State Budget had reduced financial support for victims of domestic violence and sexual abuse.[136] JS8 noted existing difficulties for victims in accessing legal assistance, health support, and income or support allowance within the scope of social protection.[137] JS9 noted the lack of shelters in the country's provinces and municipalities.[138]

75. JS9 urged Angola to build shelters in all provinces of the country to guarantee protection for victims of domestic violence;[139] and ensure that perpetrators of violence against women and girls, including sexual and domestic violence, were brought to justice, and in particular ensure access to justice in rural areas.[140]

76. JS8 recommended that Angola: allocate adequate funds for the implementation of programs dedicated to end violence against women; and create the material conditions for the full application of the administrative measures contained in the Domestic Violence Law,

namely, the protection mechanism for victims, including the creation of special police stations to assist women victims of violence.[141]

77. Noting that the law against domestic violence (25/11, 14 July 2011) was in the process of being revised, JS10 expressed the hope that the law would be expanded to include all situations of GBV.[142]

Children

78. End Corporal Punishment (ECP) stated that Article 10 of the Child Law 2012 provided for the concept of "justifiable correction". ECP indicated that the near universal acceptance of corporal punishment in "disciplining" children meant that the absence of an explicit prohibition could be construed as a defence for the use of corporal punishment. Therefore, this provision should be repealed or amended to clarify that no corporal punishment was justifiable.[143] ECP expressed the hope that a recommendation would be made that Angola intensify efforts to enact a law that clearly prohibits all corporal punishment of children, however light, in every setting of their lives.[144]

79. JS1 noted concerns related to the exploitation and trafficking of children, particularly through labour and noted that, in some cases, children were forced to do hard work to sustain the family. It noted information estimating that some 19 percent of children were involved in exploitative labour.[145] JS1 stated that the Government must take measures to reinforce the protection of children from violence, exploitation and abuse.[146]

80. Broken-Chalk stated that in Angola, some 30 percent of girls married before the age of 18, while some 6 percent of Angolan boys married before the age of 18.[147] It noted that traditional beliefs had great impact and that many Angolan communities placed a higher value on marriage and motherhood for girls than on education and personal development.[148] Additionally, poverty contributed to the high rates of child marriages and teenage pregnancies.[149]

81. JS9 urged Angola to amend the provisions of the Family Code which allow boys or girls under the age of 18 to marry, in order to eradicate child marriage, and bring the Code into line with the provisions of instruments for the protection of children's rights.[150] Broken-Chalk recommended that Angola enforce current laws against child marriage more strictly, to ensure that the legal marriage age was respected.[151] It indicated that community awareness campaigns, and comprehensive sexual and reproductive health care were critical to ending the cycle of early marriage and teenage pregnancies.[152]

Persons with disabilities

82. JS9 recommended that Angola: ensure the right to quality education for all, without exception, with particular emphasis on students with disabilities, in common schools, as established in Presidential Decree No. 187/17, of 16 August, on the National Policy on Special Education Oriented to School Inclusion;[153] and monitor compliance with the Law on Quotas for Persons with Disabilities.[154]

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons

83. JS10 reported that the violence suffered by lesbian, bisexual, intersex and trans women continued to be greatly underestimated and little addressed,[155] with an increase in verbal and physical attacks, including deaths,[156] and hate speech on social networks and in the media against LGBTQI people.[157]

84. JS10 noted that little effort was made to investigate allegations of attacks against LGBTQI people[158] and regretted that no institutional mechanisms had been created to deal with such cases.[159] It recommended that Angola establish institutional mechanisms and reinforce the training of police and judicial agents on sexual orientation and gender identity, as well as create awareness programs, and take measures to promote access to justice for LGBTQI people.[160]

Migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers

85. HRW stated that Angolan security forces had been implicated in serious abuses against migrants. It reported that mass expulsions of migrants workers had taken place in April of 2023, during which security forces had allegedly raped and otherwise abused migrant women and their children.[161] HRW recommended that Angola investigate all reports of human rights abuses by police, military and other security forces against migrants, and hold those responsible to account and increase efforts to prevent such abuses.[162]

Notes

[1] A/HRC/43/11, A/HRC/43/11/Add.1, and A/HRC/43/2.

[2] 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);
Broken-Chalk	The Stichting Broken Chalk, Amsterdam (Netherlands);
CGNK	Center for Global Nonkilling, Grand-Saconnex (Switzerland);
ECLJ	European Centre for Law and Justice, The, Strasbourg (France);
ECP	End Corporal Punishment, Geneva (Switzerland);
HRW	Human Rights Watch, Geneva (Switzerland);
ICAN	International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Geneva (Switzerland);

Joint submissions*:*

JS1	**Joint submission 1 submitted by:** World Council of Churches Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, Geneva (Switzerland), the Council of Christian Churches in Angola/Conselho de Igrejas Cristãs em Angola, (CICA), and Geneva for Human Rights;
JS2	**Joint submission 2 submitted by:** CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Johannesburg (South Africa); Plataforma Lusófona dos Direitos Humanos (PLUDH);
JS3	**Joint submission 3 submitted by**: Africa Freedom of Information Centre, (AFIC), Kampala (Uganda), Paradigm Initiative (PIN), International Press Institute (IPI);
JS4	**Joint submission 4 submitted by:** International Service for Human Rights, Geneva (Switzerland), MOSAIKO, MWANA PWO, KUTAKESA, SJA;
JS5	**Joint submission 5 submitted by:** Small Media, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Epito Repórter, International Press Institute (IPI);
JS6	**Joint submission 6 submitted by:** PLATAFORMA 27 DE MAIO, Lisboa (Portugal) composed by: Associação M27, Associação 27 de Maio, Grupo de Sobreviventes do 27 de Maio de 1977;
JS7	**Joint submission 7 submitted by:** Committee to Protect Journalists, New York (United States of America); Committee to Protect Journalists, Media Institute of Southern Africa – Angola ("MISA Angola"): Angolan Journalists' Syndicate ("SJA");
JS8	**Joint submission 8 submitted by:** The Sexual Rights Initiative, Ottawa (Canada); Ondjango Feminista Sexual Rights Initiative;
JS9	**Joint submission 9 submitted by:** Grupo de Trabalho de Monitoria dos Direitos Humanos em Angola (GTMDH) - Working Group for Monitoring Human Rights in Angola composed by: ACC - Associação Construindo Comunidades, ACDA - Acção Comunitária para o Desenvolvimento de Angola, AJPD - Associação Justiça, Paz e Democracia,

	ADRA – Acção pelo Desenvolvimento Rural de Angola, AJUDECA- Associação Juvenil para o Desenvolvimento Comunitário de Angola, ALDA- Associação Luterana para o Desenvolvimento de Angola, ANO- Ame Name Omunu, Angola 2000, Associação OMUNGA, FORDU - Fórum Regional para o Desenvolvimento Universitário, FoA - Friends Of Angola, MBAKITA-Missão de Beneficência Agropecuária do Kubango, Inclusão, Tecnologias e Ambiente, AML - Associação Mãos Livres, NCC - Centro Nacional de Aconselhamento, PMA-Plataforma Mulheres em Acção, REDE TERRAS,SCARJOV-Associação de Reintegração de Jovens e Crianças á Vida Social, SOS-Habitat Acção Solidaria, MWANA-PWO, Plataforma Sul;
JS10	**Joint submission 10 submitted by:** Angolan Identity Archive - AIA, Luanda (Angola), IRIS Angola Association, I Am Trans Movement; Movimento T; Queer People.

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):

AU-ACHPR	African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, Banjul (Gambia).

[3] The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
OP-ICESCR	Optional Protocol to ICESCR
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICCPR-OP 1	Optional Protocol to ICCPR
ICCPR-OP 2	Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
OP-CEDAW	Optional Protocol to CEDAW
CAT	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
OP-CRC-AC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict
OP-CRC-SC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography
OP-CRC-IC	Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure
ICRMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
OP-CRPD	Optional Protocol to CRPD
ICPPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance

[4] JS9, para. 15.
[5] CGNK, pp. 4–5.
[6] ICAN, p. 1.
[7] JS2, para. 6.5.
[8] HRW, p. 3. See also JS2, para. 6.5.
[9] JS2, para. 6.6.
[10] AU-ACHPR, p. 4. See also AI, para. 2.
[11] JS9, para. 5.
[12] JS4, para. 10.
[13] AI, para. 2. See also JS10, p. 12.
[14] JS9, para. 4.
[15] JS10, p.5.
[16] AU-ACHPR, p. 5.
[17] JS2, para. 5.4.
[18] AI, para. 17 and HRW, p. 3.

[19] JS9, para. 16.
[20] AI, para. 17. See also JS7, para. 13, JS9, paras. 31–32.
[21] JS2, para. 3.10.
[22] JS7, para. 13.
[23] JS7, para. 16.
[24] AI, para. 30.
[25] JS2, para. 6.4. and HRW, p. 3. See also JS4, p. 3 and JS7, para. 26.
[26] JS5, p. 12, para. 3. See also JS7, para. 28.
[27] JS9, para. 20.
[28] JS9, para. 21–22.
[29] JS2, para. 1.6. See also JS7, paras. 19–21.
[30] HRW, p. 2.
[31] JS2, para. 5.5.
[32] AI, para. 21. See also HRW, p. 2, JS2, para. 6.2.
[33] JS1, p.8.
[34] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/43/11 para. 146.103 (United Republic of Tanzania).
[35] JS10, p.7.
[36] JS10, p.10.
[37] JS6, para. 5.
[38] JS6, para. 7.
[39] JS6, para. 8.
[40] JS6, para. 16.
[41] JS6, para. 17.
[42] JS6, para. 26(a).
[43] ECLJ, paras. 14–15.
[44] ECLJ, para. 21.
[45] JS5, para. 2.
[46] JS5, para. 3.
[47] JS3, p. 3, para. 8.
[48] JS5, p.12, para. 5. See also JS9, para. 29.
[49] JS3, p. 4, para. 9. See also JS9, para. 28–29.
[50] JS4, para. 9.
[51] JS5, para. 4.
[52] JS3, p. 8.
[53] JS2, para. 4.5
[54] JS2, para. 3.4 See also JS5, para. 32.
[55] JS2, para. 3.3.
[56] JS7, para. 22.
[57] JS7, para. 23.
[58] JS3, p. 5, para. 13.
[59] JS7, para 36.
[60] JS7, para. 37.
[61] JS2, para. 6.3, JS3, p. 8, JS5, p. 12, para.1.
[62] JS2, para. 6.3.
[63] JS9, para. 35.
[64] AU-ACHPR, p. 5, HRW, pp. 3–4, JS2, para. 1.5 and 2.3, JS3, p. 2, paras. 6–7, JS4, para.12, JS7, para. 23–24, 43, JS9, paras. 34–39.
[65] JS3, p. 3, para. 7. See also HRW, p.3, JS9, para. 34.
[66] JS7, para. 43.
[67] HRW, p. 4.
[68] AU-ACHPR, p. 5.
[69] JS2, para. 2.3. See also JS9, para. 36.
[70] JS9, para. 39.
[71] JS2, para. 2.8.
[72] JS10, p. 7.
[73] AI, paras. 12 and 18.
[74] HRW, p. 2.
[75] AU-ACHPR, p. 5.
[76] JS3, p. 1, para. 4. See also JS2, para. 3.10.
[77] JS4, para. 1.
[78] JS1, p.8.
[79] JS1, p. 7.

[80] Broken Chalk, para. 16.
[81] Broken Chalk, para. 22.
[82] AI, para. 15.
[83] AI, paras. 23–24. See also JS1, p. 8.
[84] JS1, p. 7.
[85] JS1, p. 8.
[86] JS9, para. 23.
[87] AI, para. 16.
[88] AI, para. 27. See also JS9, para. 25–26.
[89] JS9, para. 40.
[90] JS10, p. 8.
[91] JS1, p. 4.
[92] JS1, p. 5.
[93] JS8, para. 24. See also JS9, para. 40.
[94] JS9, para. 40.
[95] JS9, para. 42. See also JS1, p. 6.
[96] JS1, p. 6.
[97] JS1, p. 9.
[98] JS10, p. 8.
[99] JS10, p. 9.
[100] JS10, p. 9.
[101] JS10, p. 9.
[102] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/43/11 para. 146.178 (Iceland).
[103] JS10, p. 8.
[104] AI, para. 8.
[105] Broken Chalk, paras. 16–20.
[106] Broken Chalk, paras. 23–26.
[107] JS1, pp.6–7.
[108] JS1, p.7.
[109] Broken Chalk, para. 36.
[110] Broken Chalk, para. 40.
[111] Broken Chalk, para. 38.
[112] JS1, p. 3. See also Broken Chalk, para. 32.
[113] Broken Chalk, para. 35.
[114] Broken Chalk, para. 39.
[115] JS1, p.7.
[116] JS10, p. 9.
[117] JS1, p. 8.
[118] AI, para. 2.
[119] AI, para. 15.
[120] HRW, p. 4.
[121] JS8, para. 42.
[122] JS8, para. 43.
[123] JS9, para. 12. See also JS8, para. 45.
[124] JS9, para. 10.
[125] JS9, para. 11.
[126] JS9, paras. 13–14. See also AI, para. 25.
[127] AI, para. 26.
[128] JS9, para. 8.
[129] JS9, para. 7.
[130] JS1, para. 9
[131] JS8, para 10.
[132] JS8, para 12.
[133] JS8, paras. 13–15. See also JS1, p. 2.
[134] JS9, para. 43.
[135] JS8, para 16.
[136] JS10, p. 11.
[137] JS8, para 17.
[138] JS9, para. 43.
[139] JS9, para. 46. See also JS1, p. 3.
[140] JS9, para. 45.
[141] JS8, p. 9.

142 JS10, p. 11.
143 ECP, para. 2.
144 ECP, para. 1.3.
145 JS1, p. 3.
146 JS1, p.4.
147 Broken Chalk, para. 31. See also JS1, p. 3.
148 Broken Chalk, para. 33.
149 Broken Chalk, para. 34.
150 JS9, para. 47.
151 Broken Chalk, para. 37.
152 Broken Chalk, para. 36.
153 JS9, para. 49.
154 JS9, paras. 50.
155 JS10, p. 10.
156 JS10, p. 6.
157 JS10, p. 5.
158 JS10, p. 5.
159 JS10, p. 6.
160 JS10, pp. 6 and 10.
161 HRW, p. 4.
162 HRW, p. 4.