Flygtningenævnets baggrundsmateriale

Bilagsnr.:	**723**
Land:	Nigeria
Kilde:	UN General Assembly
Titel:	Summary of Stakeholders' submission on Nigeria
Udgivet:	10. november 2023
Optaget på baggrundsmaterialet:	10. juni 2024

United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/45/NGA/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
10 November 2023

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Forty-fifth session
22 January–2 February 2024

Summary of stakeholders' submissions on Nigeria*

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 41stakeholders' submissions[2] for the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints. A separate section is provided for the contribution by the national human rights institution that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles.

II. Information provided by the national human rights institution accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles

2. NHRC stated, inter alia, that:

(a) the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999 (Fifth Alteration, No. 5) Act, 2023 (Constitution) should be amended to address the justiciability of economic, social, and cultural rights;[3]

(b) the prevalence of torture and extra judicial and arbitrary killings were attributed to poor human rights attitudes of law enforcement personnel and unconventional methods to investigate drug and substance abuse, amongst others;[4]

(c) Nigeria faced challenges in combatting terrorism and noted the adoption of the "whole of government, whole of society approach" in the implementation of the National Policy Framework and Action Plan for Preventing & Countering Violent Extremism, and the Reversed Terrorism (Prevention and Prohibition) Act 2022, amongst others. However, the Federal Government was yet to approve the National Policy on Protection of Civilians and Civilian Harm Migration in Armed Conflict;[5]

(d) lengthy pre-trial detention and frequent court adjournments were some of the challenges faced in the criminal justice system, which stemmed from heavy work loads and an inadequate number of judges;[6]

* The present document is being issued without formal editing.

(e) Implementation of policies for sustainable development was affected by weak accountability in governance, which hindered effective improvement of people's social and economic well-being;[7]

(f) there were concerns of trust and confidence in the Independent National Election Commission and in the election process, and noted in that regard the late arrival of officials and voting materials in polling stations, insecurity, and voter intimidation during the elections in 2019 and 2023;[8]

(g) women's needs and interests were provided for in legislation, policies, and programmes, but that the realization of women's rights was hindered by the ineffective implementation of policies, the lack of gender sensitive budgeting, and the prevalence of domestic violence and harmful cultural practices, among other things;[9]

(h) the rights of the child were undermined by inadequate child protection policies and the lack of implementation of Universal Basic Education Act, among other things;[10]

(i) internally displaced persons were exposed to overcrowded camps; older persons faced social, health, economic and financial constraints due to their age; persons with disabilities had limited access to public facilities and employment.[11]

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations[12] and cooperation with human rights mechanisms

3. BC noted that OP-ICESCR was yet to be ratified.[13]

4. WILPF stated that there was an urgent need for Nigeria to translate the commitment made through the ratification of the Arms Trade Treaty into concrete actions.[14]

B. National human rights framework

1. Constitutional and legislative framework

5. JS18 stated that the main pillars of the Constitution were undermined by the parallel legal systems.[15] UPR-BCU stated that as a former British colony, Nigeria had a complex and mixed legal system consisting of English common law, Islamic law, and customary law, which was operational in a federal system, comprised of the Federal Government and 36 States.[16]

6. Noting that Nigeria had ratified CEDAW in 1985, JS13 stated that the provisions of this Convention was yet to be integrated into national legislation.[17]

7. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, JS3 noted that in 2021, the Senate rejected the Gender and Equal Opportunities (GEO) Bill for the second time. The rejection of this Bill and other pro-women bills hindered the promotion of inclusion for women, girls, children, and children with disabilities.[18]

8. JS4 state that if the proposed legislation to regulate freedom of expression, including the Hate Speech (Prohibition) Bill, 2019, the National Commission for the Prohibition of Hate Speeches (Est. etc.) Bill, 2019, and the Digital Rights and Freedom Bill, 2019, were enacted, they would pose serious restrictions on civic space.[19]

9. CGNK called for the decriminalization of suicides.[20]

2. Institutional infrastructure and policy measures

10. JS18 stated that since the end of military rule and the restoration of civilian governance in 1999, the desire to achieve genuine democratic governance was problematic.[21] Nigeria fell short of ensuring the independence and credibility of all institutions of governance and fully functional accountability systems to effectively protect democracy and

human rights.[22] Religious legitimacy shaped political power in the north of the country in a way that challenged national cohesion and a common citizenship.[23]

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. JS21 stated that the impact of discrimination was significant and harmful, as it perpetuated inequality, denied individuals equal opportunities and treatment, fostered social exclusion and stigma, undermined well-being, and hindered the full realisation of human rights for those who experienced it, including LGBTIQ+ persons.[24]

12. WILPF stated that the existence of discriminatory gender norms and patriarchy fuelled those narratives promoting harmful and militarised masculinities. The strategy of engaging men as allies to achieving gender equality had been identified globally as key to confronting harmful masculinities, by changing social norms and promoting positive masculinity.[25]

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

13. JS2 noted that the Constitution and several federal and state laws made provision for the death penalty. Recalling that at the previous review, Nigeria had not supported all but one of the recommendations relating to the abolition of the death penalty and the establishment of a moratorium on executions, JS2 stated that no formal moratorium had been established and considered the supported recommendation to have not been implemented.[26]

14. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, JS2 stated that despite the enactment of Anti-Torture Act, torture and ill-treatment remained pervasive in the criminal justice system.[27] JS8 noted the perpetration of torture and ill treatment by security agencies in places of detention, and during arrests and interrogation of suspects; the gaps in the legislation in relation to investigations of alleged cases of torture and victims' rights to reparation and rehabilitation; and the lack of independence of the National Committee on Prevention of Torture which was comprised of law enforcement and security agency personnel.[28]

15. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, AL stated that Nigeria was yet to establish an official database of missing persons, and there was still no justice for victims of enforced disappearance and their families.[29]

16. UPR-BCU stated that the fight against female genital mutilation was hindered by the dysfunctional workings of multiple government institutions.[30]

17. HRW stated that despite Nigeria supporting recommendations in the previous review to ensure the protection of civilians, several armed groups, and criminal gangs continued to jeopardise the safety of millions of Nigerians.[31] JS1 stated that the lack of effective law enforcement responses, including the failure to make arrests and carry out prosecutions against attackers, contributed to increased violence and a sense of abandonment among victims.[32]

18. JS20 stated that at the previous review, Nigeria supported recommendations to address intercommunal violence which it failed to implement.[33] JS18 stated that the Numan Federation and the Middle Belt Sub-regions of Nigeria were characterized by protracted and persistent violent conflicts between herders and farmers. Due to the lack of constructive engagement with affected communities by the federal government, there was no resettlement, rehabilitation, restitutions, or any form of peace building.[34]

19. JS22 stated that several villages were subjected to frequent attacks leading to heavy civilian casualties, with the violence increasingly taking on ethnic and religious dimensions. Assailants almost systematically set houses and infrastructure on fire and destroyed food reserves. Measures taken by the Federal Government to curb the violence, including the launch of military operations in affected areas have remained ineffective.[35]

20. TP-MPF stated that since the previous review, women and girls continued to be targeted for abduction by Islamist groups, bandits, and armed Fulani herdsmen. Mass abductions from certain locations such as schools were predictable with people of certain gender and faith particularly targeted. Yet, no pro-active measures to prevent these abductions were taken by the authorities. The authorities also failed to communicate with victims' families and to offer support to distressed relatives. Victims who escaped from their captives or were released from captivity did not receive any meaningful support.[36]

21. TP-MPF stated that forceful private abductions, conversions, and subsequent marriage of under-aged Christian girls to Muslim men had become rampant in the Northern region of the country, which was not the same thing as the wave of kidnap-for-ransom criminality that had infected Nigeria.[37] JS5 stated that local Islamic institutions and traditional rulers were often complicit in these violations.[38] JS19 expressed concern about the increase in mass abductions, often for ransom, and stated that abductions had become a lucrative industry.[39]

22. JS12 stated that the LGBTIQ+ community were subject to violence, aggression, blackmail, extortion, and kidnapping. There has been a significant spike in cases of illegal stop-and-search operations, unlawful detentions, extortion, and targeted abuse and arrests based on perceived sexual orientation and gender identity and expression by law enforcement officers.[40]

23. JS21 stated that arbitrary arrest and detention of LGBTIQ+ persons had a devastating impact, perpetuating fear, trauma, and a climate of discrimination while denying them their fundamental rights and access to justice. It was typical that following arrests and detention by the police, LGBTIQ+ persons faced torture and cruel, unhuman, or degrading treatment to coerce them to confess to being homosexual.[41] LGBTIQ+ persons were also impacted by the prevalence of hate crimes.[42]

24. JS12 stated that female sex workers faced arbitrary arrest, rape as a bail condition, extortion, theft, and false accusations from law enforcement agents who invaded their privacy, destroyed personal properties, and wrongfully stopped and searched them.[43]

25. DHRAN stated that people who use drugs continued to routinely experience arbitrary arrests and abuse by law enforcement agencies; and that there was a lack of access to medical support when they experienced drug-related withdrawals during detention.[44]

26. JS2 stated that a supported recommendation from the previous review relating to the implementation of the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules) had not been implemented.[45] Referring to another relevant supported recommendation, JS2 noted that the Nigerian Correctional Services Bill was signed into law. However, despite this development, there has been continuous complaints about prison congestion. Also, the prisons suffered from poor infrastructure with prisoners on death row facing especially poor custodial conditions, and the specific sexual and reproductive needs of women on death row were not considered.[46]

Human rights and counter-terrorism

27. AI stated that the Terrorism (Prevention and Prohibition) Act, 2022, contained provisions which violated international human rights obligations, as well as the Constitution.[47]

28. Referring to supported recommendations from the previous review, AI stated that since 2019, security forces had consistently violated human rights, including in the context of military operations against Boko Haram.[48] The reports of the army-led Special Board of Inquiry and the Presidential Investigative Panel set up in 2017 to review human rights compliance by the armed forces was yet to be made public, despite the commitment to do so made by Nigeria in the previous review.[49]

29. HRW stated that security forces continued to be implicated in gross human rights abuses including arbitrary detention, extrajudicial killings, and apparently indiscriminate airstrikes. Despite supporting several relevant recommendations at the previous review, Nigeria failed to hold those responsible for such abuses.[50]

30. JS5 stated that farming communities in the central states increasingly experienced lethal attacks by irregular armed groups of Fulani extraction. In 2020, the Boko Haram terrorist faction secured alliances with armed groups in northwestern and central states, and in 2021 some of its fighters and bomb makers relocated to forests in predominantly Christian southern Kaduna. Islamic State West Africa Province (ISWAP) and al Qaeda affiliate Ansaru secured similar alliances.[51] FPST stated that Christians were disproportionately affected by violence perpetrated by groups such as Boko Haram, ISWAP and armed Fulani herders.[52]

31. ECLJ noted that Nigeria was a dangerous country for Christians and highlighted the killing of Christians at the hands of Islamic militants, as well as the destruction of churches and schools. Nigeria should take immediate steps to protect Christians.[53]

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

32. JS18 stated that the judicial system was weak and compromised, and thus unable to enforce civil liberties.[54] There were also mounting concerns about the independence of the judiciary, which lacked the confidence of citizens.[55]

33. JS5 stated that the legal challenges to the outcome of the 2023 elections subjected the Supreme Court to scrutiny, amid heightened concerns regarding the capture of the Judiciary by the Executive. Fears of progressive judicial capture initially emerged in 2016, when the homes of senior judges were raided by the State Security. Confidence in the Supreme Court was further dented by its judgments in political cases.[56]

34. JS11 state that lawyers faced intimidation and harassment for their work on politically sensitive cases. There were also reports of criminal prosecution of lawyers in relation to their legitimate professional activities. The Nigeria Bar Association did not have any mechanism in place to ensure accountability for attacks on lawyers.[57]

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

35. JS10 stated that incidents of religious violence, discrimination, and intolerance highlighted the need to address the challenges faced in protecting the right to freedom of religion or belief. Although the Constitution gave all Nigerians the right to choose or change their religion, changing one's religion resulted in severe repercussions.[58]

36. JS21 stated that religious institutions continued to preach homophobic and transphobic rhetoric and continued to exclude LGBTIQ+ persons from religious communities. In 2021, the Anglican Church in Nigeria issued a statement condemning the LGBTIQ+ community and comparing them to murders.[59]

37. JS1 stated that in addition to the secular criminal law, the Muslim-majority States in the north of Nigeria also applied Sharia criminal law to Muslims. Both systems of law shared similarities. However, the Sharia penal codes include one significant additional crime – "insult" against the "Holy Quran or any Prophet," for which the death penalty was the punishment. Blasphemy laws curtailed religious and other expression beyond the limits permitted under international human rights law and the Constitution.[60] JS5 stated that there was a strong correlation between blasphemy laws, extremism, and mob violence, with perpetrators enjoying impunity.[61]

38. JS5 stated that Christian communities in States were Sharia law was practiced continued to experience marginalization, discrimination, and socioeconomic deprivations.[62] JS18 stated that there was a lack of deliberate effort by Nigeria to protect minority religious groups from discrimination.[63]

39. JS15 noted that some radio and television stations were shut down by the authorities for covering a political event organized by the opposition Peoples Democratic Party.[64] Journalists were reportedly detained, harassed, or assaulted while covering the 2023 elections.[65]

40. JS4 stated that the Nigeria Broadcasting Code, 2016, which prescribed minimum standards for broadcasting, was used to curtail media freedoms, causing media houses to self-censor for fear of reprisals.[66] The Cybercrimes (Prohibition, Prevention etc) Act, 2015, was

being used to harass bloggers and journalists for publishing content critical of the government.[67]

41. JS14 stated that defamation was criminalized by the Nigerian Criminal Code in the southern States and by Penal Code in the northern States. These laws were applied to artistic expression and used to arbitrarily arrest, detain, and prosecute artists as part of a broader clampdown on activists who expresses critical views against the government.[68] JS14 noted the censorship mechanisms in place and highlighted their impact on artists on creative practitioners.[69]

42. JS4 stated that human rights defenders, civil society activists and journalists were subject to intimidation and harassment. Journalists, in particular, were vulnerable to psychological harm, physical abuse, indiscriminate arrests, detention and seizures of publications and work equipment, such as cameras and computers.[70]

43. JS9 stated that the situation for human rights defenders remained challenging, with many facing harassment, violent online attacks, arbitrary detention, imprisonment, and other threats due to their work. Human Rights Defenders who voiced their opinions about the government remained highly vulnerable to reprisals.[71] Noting that technology has increased the level of investigation and documentation of human rights violations by human rights defenders, JS13 stated that there was an urgent need for Nigeria to commit to protecting the digital rights of human rights defenders.[72]

44. JS4 stated Section 4 of the Same-Sex Marriage (Prohibition) Act, 2013 prohibited the registration of LGBTQI+ organisations.[73]

45. JS10 noted the exclusion of individuals from social and political participation on the basis of them being Christians, Muslims, women or youth, and the use of religion and religious identity to garner political support and fulfil political ambitions.[74] JS13 stated that persons with disabilities had limited access to and participation in the electoral process.[75]

46. JS18 stated that since 1999, election have been marred by irregularities, with violence being a constant feature. It noted persistent flaws in the electoral process and lack of transparency. There was overwhelming interference by centrifugal political forces among the power elite due to low political education and awareness.[76] JS8 stated that during the 2023 elections, instances of organized violence to intimidate the public, oppress political opponents and hinder the exercise of voting rights had been documented. This included disruptions of political rallies, politically motivated killings, and property destruction.[77]

47. JS13 stated that following the 2023 elections, there was a decline in the number of women in elected positions.[78] WILPF stated that women remained largely underrepresented at all levels of governance. The situation was exacerbated by the lack of political will to decisively address the issue of women's political participation.[79]

48. JS8 stated that during the 2023 elections, instances of organized violence to intimidate the public, oppress political opponents and hinder the exercise of voting rights had been documented. This included disruptions of political rallies, politically motivated killings, and property destruction.[80]

Right to privacy

49. JS15 noted that the release of information by telecommunication companies and mobile network providers to the police in breach of privacy standards resulted in arrest, detention, and prosecution of journalists. It noted that in June 2023 the Nigeria Data Protection Bill was signed into law.[81]

Prohibition of all forms of slavery, including trafficking in persons

50. JS13 noted an increase in the prevalence of harmful customary or traditional practices in the northern part of Nigeria, which included the trafficking of young girls.[82]

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

51. JS3 stated that Nigeria should strengthen policies to ensure equal opportunities for women and girls with disabilities. This should include training for them, as well as targets

and affirmative action programmes.[83] JS7 stated that investment in inclusive employment and livelihood interventions were critical to addressing unemployed-related challenges facing persons with disabilities.[84]

Right to social security

52. SOS-CV stated that despite the initiatives taken towards the development and implementation of social protection programmes, there were persistent challenges of poverty, inequality, and vulnerability that threatened the unity of families and the growth and development of children.[85]

53. HRW stated that Nigeria lacked a universal and well-functioning social security system to protect people against economic shocks and income insecurity, including during common life events such as old age, unemployment, sickness, or childbirth, and caring for dependents.[86]

Right to an adequate standard of living

54. HRW stated that Nigeria was failing to take steps to ensure economic and social rights for its people, including the right to an adequate standard of living.[87]

55. JS10 stated that the youth were disproportionately affected by "working poverty", which was linked to sub-minimal youth wages, in violation of the principle of equal pay for equal work.[88]

56. AI stated that since the previous review, forced eviction continued unbated without adequate notice or consultation.[89]

57. JS19 stated that although Nigeria had abundant water resources, the country was facing a serious challenge in ensuring adequate access to clean water due to poor infrastructure in the water sector and the abandonment of dams and reservoirs in recent years. If the bill to transfer control of water resources from the States to the Federal Government passes, water would become a privatization resource and commercial commodity.[90]

Right to health

58. JS16 stated that the demand of the youth population for sexual and reproductive services was inadequately met and that there was a gap in the health policy space in relation to planning and providing for the needs of adolescents.[91]

59. JS13 stated that Postpartum haemorrhage was a major health problem for women and pregnancy complications were also high.[92] JS19 noted high levels of obstetric fistula which was a severe long-term complication of prolonged obstructed labour during childbirth.[93]

60. JS3 stated that although health policies were designed to ensure universal health coverage, accessibility remained a challenge for women and girls with disabilities.[94] Noting the negative attitude of health workers towards persons with disabilities, JS3 state that training should be carried out for all health workers on the human rights-based approach to disability and the right to health.[95] HRW stated that thousands of people with mental health conditions or psychological disabilities continued to be chained or locked in confined spaces in various facilities across the country.[96]

61. JS12 stated that the criminalisation of LGBTQI+ people, people who use drugs and sex workers, negatively impacted their right to health care as it led to them experiencing stigma and discrimination in health care facilities and the lack of healthcare services tailored to their specific needs.[97]

62. DHRAN highlighted the lack of a human rights-based treatment for drug use and dependence. Although the National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDELA) established drug rehabilitation centres, a significant number of rehabilitation centres were privately owned, many of which were operated by religious organizations and charged a substantial fee, often beyond the means of people who use drugs. They also gained a reputation for inhumane treatment and did not human rights-based approach to drug treatment. The centres established by NDELA have also faced criticism for failure to adopt a human rights-based approach to treatment. DHRAN noted the lack of implementation of the National HIV

Strategic Plan (NSP 2022–2026) which supported the provision of harm reduction services, including needle and syringe programmes and Opioid Agonist Therapy. Also, the stigma and discrimination people who use drugs experienced from health care workers deterred them from seeking help at health care centres.[98]

63. JS16 stated that disregard for human rights had adverse implications for HIV prevention and treatment. Although strides had been made in increasing access to HIV prevention, treatment, and care services, more needed to be done to meet the needs of children and adolescents. It also noted a shortage of gender-sensitive HIV services and sexual and reproductive health services.[99]

Right to education

64. JS7 stated that the education system faced a perennial shortage of resources that ranged from qualified teachers, schools, classrooms, and books and other learning materials. Teachers were overworked and were unable to attend to the individual needs of pupils.[100]

65. BC stated that in areas affected by the Boko Haram insurgency, at least 496 classrooms had been destroyed, with almost 2.8 million children in the north-eastern part of Nigeria in dire need of educational support.[101]

66. JS7 stated that access to education remained particularly challenging for vulnerable children, such as children with disabilities, children in street situations, and girls. Ensuring that girls have equal access to education as compared to boys remained one of the main challenges.[102] Noting the adoption of the inclusive education policy by the Ministry of Education in 2017, JS3 stated that the inclusive education programme faced numerous challenges, including inadequate infrastructure, personnel shortage, and lack of instructional materials.[103]

67. SOS-CV stated that the Almajiri educational system, which aimed to provide Islamic education, fell short in providing a comprehensive education that included literacy, numeracy, and vocational skills. As a result, many Almajiri children had limited access to formal education and lacked the necessary skills to succeed in life. In addition, the Almajiri educational system had faced challenges related to inadequate governance, limited regulation, and insufficient resources.[104]

Development, the environment, and business and human rights

68. JS13 noted that the extension of The National Anti-Corruption Policy to 2026.[105] JS6 stated that massive and widespread corruption affected all levels of government but that the bulk of anticorruption efforts by the Independent Corrupt Practices Commission and the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission remained focused on low and mid-level government officials.[106] ASFF stated that corruption remained endemic in the petroleum industry.[107]

69. Noting that at the previous review, Nigeria supported a recommendation to assist the communities suffering from environmental damage due to oil spills, AI stated that the Niger Delta region continued to suffer from an epidemic of oil spills which had a devasting impact on the human rights and livelihoods of the communities.[108]

2. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women

70. AI stated that despite the Federal Capital Territory and 35 States domesticating the Violence Against Persons (Prohibition) Act, violence against women and girls remained pervasive.[109] JS10 noted high rates of gender-based violence, domestic abuse, sexual abuse, rape, and gender discrimination.[110] JS19 noted the lack of accountability for gender-based violence.[111] JS13 stated that stigma and silence around sexual violence prevented many survivors from reporting such violence to the authorities.[112] JS6 stated that police had often refused to intervene in domestic violence cases, and in some cases blamed the victims for provoking the abuse.[113]

Children

71. JS18 referred to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review and considered them to have been partly implemented. The Child Rights Act of 2003 had not been domesticated in all the States and in those States in which the Act had been domesticated, there was a need for improvement in its implementation.[114]

72. JS20 stated one of the reasons for the failure to fully domesticate the Child Rights Act in all States related to the issue of child marriage. Section 23 of the Act states that any person under the age of 18 years was incapable of contracting a valid marriage and that if such a marriage did take place, it should be declared null and void. However, the Constitution presented a contradicting position on the issue, with Section 29(4b) providing that any woman who is married shall be deemed to be of full age.[115] HRW noted that customary and Islamic law in several northern States permitted child marriage. Child marriage was also prevalent in some States in the majority Christian southern part of Nigeria.[116] JS10 stated that the culture of underage marriage was influenced by poverty, harmful religious practices, and the lack of formal education.[117]

73. JS7 stated that the National Strategy on Ending Child Marriage in Nigeria, 2016 – 2021, which aimed at accelerating national efforts to end child marriage by 2030 had limited progress due to the lack of an actionable work-plan with concrete steps and implementation processes.[118]

74. JS18 stated that human rights abuses against children should be addressed through comprehensive action, including strengthening the capacity of law enforcement agencies, and providing support and rehabilitation services for affected children.[119]

75. JS18 stated that homeless children were exposed to risks such as exploitation, abuse, and a lack of access to basic necessities.[120]

76. ECP stated that corporal punishment of children was lawful. In June 2021, the Federal Government issued a statement committing to end violence against children and to enforce a ban on corporal punishment in both Federal and State school systems and in all other settings. However, legislation prohibiting corporal punishment was yet to be adopted.[121]

77. SOS-CV noted the existence of children's parliaments in the Federal Capital Territory and in most States. However, support was needed to ensure that the participation of children in these parliaments went beyond ceremonial functions and was directed towards dialogue on national issues and law-making.[122]

Persons with disabilities

78. JS3 noted that while the passage of the National Disability Act represented a significant legislative achievement, its impact on improving the lives of persons with disabilities remained limited. The implementation of this Act had been ineffective, due to the lack of political will and insufficient budget. There was also the failure of many States to domesticate the Act.[123]

79. JS7 stated that persons with disabilities experienced rejection, neglect, loss of respect, and denial of identity and self-worth at the family and community levels.[124]

80. JS23 stated that leprosy was a mildly infectious, preventable, and curable disease. However, many Nigerians diagnosed with leprosy would live with the consequences of that diagnosis throughout their lives because of leprosy-related stigma and discrimination. Persons with leprosy faced significant challenges in assessing an adequate standard of living, the right to development, and the right to health, all of which was avoidable if the public had a greater understanding of leprosy.[125]

Indigenous peoples and minorities

81. ICO noted concerns over the lack of representation of minorities in decision-making and that ethnic communities such as the Tiv, Ijaw, Itsekiri, Gbagyi and Efik faced issues over resources and socioeconomic opportunities. It also noted the preferential treatment given to Hausa-Fulani, Yoruba, and Igbo.[126]

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons

82. Referring to relevant recommendations from the previous review which did not enjoy the support of Nigeria, JS21 stated that these recommendations were important for the protection of human rights, particularly for LGBTIQ+ persons, and therefore definitive steps should be taken to implement them.[127]

83. JS21 stated that the legislative framework presented a hostile environment for LGBTIQ+ persons. A combination of Federal and State laws criminalised same-sex relations. These laws, while existing within a constitutional framework that guaranteed rights to privacy, assembly and association, expression, and freedom of conscience, conflicted with the rights guaranteed in the Constitution.[128] IN noted the absence of legal recognition of intersex persons, which made them vulnerable to stigmatization, discrimination, and social exclusion. Noting difficulties for intersex persons whose physical attributes no longer conform to their assigned sex or gender at birth, NI stated that the law did not provide for self-identification.[129]

84. Noting that conversion practices aimed to change a person's sexual orientation or gender identity through harmful and pseudoscientific methods, JS21 stated that the lack of protection from such practices posed a grave threat to the rights and well-being of LGBTIQ+ persons.[130] IN noted that "corrective" surgeries lead to untold agonies for intersex persons and the lack of adequate information from medical practitioners performing these surgeries.[131]

Internally displaced persons

85. JS17 stated that the armed conflict has resulted in the displacement of about 2.2 million people, most of whom were settled in camps for internally displaced persons (IDP camps) and about half of whom were women and girls. Sexual and reproductive health services in the IDP camps were poor. Family planning services, basic health care and treatment for sexually transmitted infections were not readily available in the camps. Sexual exploitation and violence against women and girls in exchange for basic necessities such as food, were common. Camp staff members who were supposed to protect these women and girls were also sexually abusing and exploiting them.[132]

86. HRW stated that the closure of IDP camps in Maiduguri, Borno State, the epi centre of the Boko Haram crisis, without consultation, adequate information, or sustainable alternatives, violated the rights of internally displaced people.[133]

87. JS6 noted that the safe, voluntary, and dignified return, resettlement, or integration of internally displaced persons were not always promoted by Nigeria. Also, access to internally displaced persons by humanitarian non-governmental organizations and international organizations were restricted at times.[134]

Notes

1 A/HRC/40/7, A/HRC/40/7/Add.1, and A/HRC/40/2.

2 The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org (one asterisk denotes a national human rights institution with A status).

Civil society

Individual submissions:

AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
ASFF	Advocats Sans Frontiers France, Toulouse (France);
BC	The Stichting Broken Chalk, Amsterdam (Netherlands);
CGNK	Center for Global Nonkilling, Geneva (Switzerland);
DHRAN	Drug Harm Reduction Advocacy Network Nigeria, Abuja (Nigeria);
ECLJ	European Centre for Law and Justice, Strasbourg, (France);
ECP	Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children, Geneva (Switzerland);

FPST	Foundation Platform for Social Transformation, Voorburg, (Netherlands);
HRW	Human Rights Watch, Geneva, (Switzerland);
ICO	International Communities Organisation, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
IN	Intersex Nigeria, Lagos (Nigeria);
IHRC	Islamic Human Rights Commission, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
JC	Jubilee campaign, Fairfax (United States of America);
SOS-CV	SOS Children's Villages, Abuja (Nigeria);
TP-MPF	Gideon and Funmi Para–Mallam Peace Foundation, Jos (Nigeria);
UPR-BCU	The UPR Project at BCU, Centre for Human Rights, School of law, Birmingham City University, Birmingham (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
WILPF	Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Geneva (Switzerland).

Joint submissions:

JS1	Accountability Lab Nigeria, ADF International, Anglican Communion, Baptist World Alliance, Christian Council International, Coordination des Associations et des Particuliers (CAP) pour la Liberté de Conscience, Global Christian Relief, International Committee on Nigeria, and Jubilee Campaign, Geneva (Switzerland) (Joint Submission 1);
JS2	The Advocates for Human Rights, Minneapolis (United States of America), The World Coalition Against the Death Penalty, and Avocats Sans Frontières/Lawyers without Borders France (France) (Joint Submission 2);
JS3	Centre for Citizens with Disabilities, Ikeja (Nigeria) Hope Alive for Possibilities Initiatives and Spinal Cord Injury Association of Nigeria (Joint Submission 3);
JS4	CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Johannesburg (South Africa) and The Nigeria Network of NGOs (Joint Submission 4);
JS5	Christian Solidarity Worldwide, New Malden (United Kingdom) and Christian Solidarity Worldwide-Nigeria (Joint Submission 5);
JS6	VIVAT international, The Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, and Edmund Rice International Geneva (Switzerland) (Joint Submission 6);
JS7	IIMA – Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, VIDES International – International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, Marist Foundation for International Solidarity (FMSI), Company of the Daughters of Charity of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Salesian Sisters of Nigeria, and Marist Brothers of Nigeria (Switzerland) (Joint Submission 7);
JS8	IIMA – Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, VIDES International – International International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims, Copenhagen (Denmark) and Prisoners' Rehabilitation and Welfare Action (Joint Submission 8);
JS9	Development Dynamics, Partnership for Justice, Protection International and International Service for Human Rights, Geneva (Switzerland) (Joint Submission 9);
JS10	JISRA Consortium in Nigeria comprising of: Development Initiative of West Africa, Federation of Muslim Women Associations in Nigeria, Dialogue, Reconciliation and Peace, Tearfund, Search for Common Ground, Mensen met een Missie, Catholic Agency for Overseas Development, Justice Peace and Reconciliation Movement, RURCON, Scripture Union West Africa, and Women Interfaith Council (Joint

	Submission 10);
JS11	Lawyers for Lawyers and The International Bar Association's Human Rights Institute (Joint Submission 11);
JS12	Love Alliance composed of GALZ, SANPUD, Sisonke, UHAI EASHRI, ISDAO, Global Network of People Living With HIV (GNP+) and Aidsfonds, Cape Town (South Africa) (Joint Submission 12);
JS13	Women's Rights and Health Project, GoVote – A Project of Co-Creation Hub, Human and Environmental Development Agenda (HEDA) Resource Centre, Centre for Women's Health and Information, Centre for Citizens with disabilities, Rule of Law and Accountability Advocacy Centre, The Inclusion Project Nigeria, Intersex Nigeria, VisionSpring Initiative, Prisoners Rehabilitation and Welfare Action, Avocat Sans Frontières France, Network on Police Reform in Nigeria Foundation, and Partnership For Justice, Lagos (Nigeria) (Joint Submission 13);
JS14	Freemuse, PEN International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Nhimbe Trust and Unchained Vibes Africa (Joint Submission 14);
JS15	Small Media Foundation and Nigeria Network of NGOs (Joint Submission 15);
JS16	Creme de la Creme House of Fame Foundation, Abuja (Nigeria), McClifford Initiative for Equal Access to HealthCare and Human, Abuja (Nigeria), Olive Right to Health Initiative (Nigeria), International Centre for Total Health and Rights Advocacy Empowerment, Abuja (Nigeria), Community Health Initiative For youths in Nigeria (Nigeria), Dynamic Initiative for Healthcare and Human Rights (Nigeria), The PACT, and the Sexual Rights Initiative, Geneva (Switzerland) (Joint Submission 16);
JS17	Stand with a Girl Initiative and International Youth Alliance for Family Planning (Joint Submission 17);
JS18	The Lutheran Church of Christ in Nigeria, Numan (Nigeria), Adamawa United Forum (Nigeria) and Fresh Air Profile Empowerment Foundation (Joint Submission 18);
JS19	World Council of Churches, the Ecumenical Water Network Nigeria, the Christian Council of Nigeria, the Widows Development Organisation, the Community Hope Development Foundation, Geneva for Human Rights, and Rights Proof – Prevention of Obstetric Fistula (Joint Submission 19);
JS20	World Evangelical Alliance and Open Doors International (Joint Submission 20);
JS21	Centre for Health, Education, and Vulnerable Support Access to Good Health Initiative, Adequate Healthcare Community Initiative, Creme de la Creme House of Fame Foundation, Hope Alive Health Awareness Initiative, The Initiative for Equal Rights, Think Positive Live Positive Support Initiative, Wavemakers Initiative for Health and Youth Empowerment, Women Initiative for Sustainable Empowerment and Equality, and Women's Health and Equal Rights Initiative (Joint Submission 21);
JS22	eyewitness to Atrocities, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), International Committee on Nigeria (United States of America) and Bwatiye Community Development Association (Joint Submission 22);
JS23	The Leprosy Mission Nigeria, Abuja (Nigeria) and International Federation of Anti-Leprosy Associations, Genava (Switzerland) (Joint Submission 23).
National human rights institution:	
NHRC	National Human Rights Commission of Nigeria,* Abuja

(Nigeria).

[3] NHRC, para. 30.
[4] Ibid., paras. 14 and 15. NHRC made a recommendation (para. 16).
[5] Ibid., paras. 17–19. NHRC made a recommendation (para. 20).
[6] Ibid., para. 12. NHRC made a recommendation (para. 13).
[7] Ibid., para. 5 NHRC made a recommendation (para. 6).
[8] Ibid., para. 9. NHRC made a recommendation (para. 10(c)).
[9] Ibid., paras. 22 and 23. NHRC made a recommendation (para. 24).
[10] Ibid., para. 25 and 26. NHRC made a recommendation (para. 27).
[11] Ibid., para. 32. NHRC made a recommendation (para. 33).
[12] *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

[13] BC, para. 24.
[14] WILPF, pp. 7–8. WILPF made recommendations (p. 9).
[15] JS18, p. 6.
[16] UPR-BCU, para. 7.
[17] JS13, para. 1. JS13 made a recommendation (para. 1).
[18] JS3, p. 5.
[19] JS4, para. 4.6. JS4 made recommendations (para. 6.3).
[20] CGNK, p. 3.
[21] JS18, p. 7.
[22] JS18, p. 8.
[23] JS18, p. 6.
[24] JS21, p. 28.
[25] WILPF, pp. 9–10. WILPF made recommendations (p. 10).
[26] JS2, paras. 5–7. JS2 made recommendations (para. 29). See also JS13, para. 10. JS13 made recommendations (para. 10); AI, para. 33. AI made recommendations (paras. 54–58); and ASFF, p. 5. ASFF made recommendations (p. 6).
[27] JS2, paras. 21–23, referring to A/HRC/40/7, para. 148.25 (Spain), para. 148.153 (Hungary); para. 148.155 (Czechia), para. 148.156 (Ukraine) and para. 148.154 (Chile), and A/HRC/40/7/Add.1. JS2 made recommendations (para. 29). See also ASFF, p. 4. ASFF made recommendations (p. 5); and AI, para. 6.
[28] JS8, pp. 3–4. JS8 made recommendations (para. 10). See also JS13, para. 7. JS13 made recommendations (para. 7); and ASFF, p. 4. ASFF made recommendations (p. 5).
[29] AI, para. 3 referring to A/HRC/40/7, para. 148.150 (Germany), para. 148.151 (Azerbaijan) and para. 148.152 (Guyana), and A/HRC/40/7/Add.1.
[30] UPR-BCU, paras. 3, 6, 8 and 21. UPR-BCU made recommendations (D(i)–(vii)). See also JS6, para.

19. JS6 made recommendations (para. 22).

[31] HRW, paras. 1 and 5, referring to A/HRC/40/7, para 148.172 (Argentina), para. 148.178 (Germany) and para. 148.102 (Afghanistan), and A/HRC/40/7/Add.1. HRW made recommendations (p.2). See also IHRC, p. 6.

[32] JS1, para. 29, 33 and 36. JS1 made recommendations (para. 47).

[33] JS20, p. 3, referring to A/HRC/40/4, para. 148.168 (Netherlands) and para. 148.180 (New Zealand), A/HRC/40/4/Add.1.

[34] JS18, p. 10. JS18 made recommendations (p. 13). See also JS20, pp.3–4. JS20 made recommendations (p. 11); JS22, para.8.); and AI, para. 26. AI made recommendations. (paras. 46 and 47).

[35] JS22, paras. 12, 15, 17, 19 and 23. JS22, made recommendations (pp. 8–9).

[36] TP-MPF, paras. 5, 8, 14, 21. TP-MPF made recommendations (paras. 24–27).

[37] TP-MPF, para. 4. See also JS17, para. 1.

[38] JS5, para. 76. JS5 made recommendations (paras. 87–89).

[39] JS19, p. 7. JS19 made recommendations (p. 8). See also BC, para. 26; and JC para. 15.

[40] JS12, para. 8. JS12 made recommendations (paras. 28 and 29); AI, paras. 27 and 28. AI made a recommendation (para. 50); JS16, paras. 29 and 31; and JS21, para. 12.

[41] JS21, paras. 18, 19 and 21.

[42] JS21, para. 23.

[43] JS12, para. 10. JS12 made recommendations (paras. 28 and 29).

[44] DHRAN, paras. 4, 5 and 7.

[45] JS2, para. 26, referring to A/HRC/40/7, para. 148.158 (Switzerland), and A/HRC/40/7/Add.1. JS2 made recommendations (para. 29).

[46] JS2, paras. 27–32, referring to A/HRC/40/7, para. 148.157 (Georgia), and A/HRC/40/7/Add.1. JS2 made recommendations (para. 29). See also JS8, pp. 5–6. JS8 made recommendations (para. 13); and JS19, p. 6. JS19 made recommendations (p. 6).

[47] AI, para. 11, referring to Section 66, subsection (1) and (2) of the Terrorism (Prevention and Prohibition) Act, 2022. AI made a recommendation (para. 35).

[48] AI, para. 4, referring to A/HRC/40/7, para. 148.102 (Afghanistan), para. 148.104 (Portugal), para. 148.105, (Cyprus), para. 148.106 (Ethiopia), para. 148.107 (Lebanon), para. 148.108 (France); para. 148.116 (China), para. 48.120 (Brazil), para. 148.121 (Bulgaria), para. 148.123 (Portugal), para. 148.165 (Slovakia), para. 148.168 (Netherlands), para. 148.172 (Argentina), para. 148.173 (Canada), para. 148.174 (Republic of Korea), para. 148.175 (Switzerland), para. 148.176 (Australia), para. 148.177 (United States of America), para. 148.178 (Germany), and para. 148.179 (New Zealand), and A/HRC/40/7/Add.1.

[49] AI, para. 4, referring to A/HRC/40/7, para. 148.176 (Australia), para. 148.177 (United States of America), and para. 148.178 (Germany), and A/HRC/40/7/Add.1.

[50] HRW para. 6 referring to A/HRC/40/7, para. 148.103 (Australia), para. 148.168 (Netherlands), para. 148.178 (Germany), para. 148.104 (Portugal), para. 148.146 (Ireland), para. 148.145 (Belgium), para. 148.173 (Canada), para. 148.174 (Republic of Korea), para. 148.175 (Switzerland), and A/HRC/40/7/Add.1. HRW made recommendations (p. 4).

[51] JS5, para. 19. JS5 made recommendations (paras. 36–37). See also JS6, para. 2. JS6 made recommendations (paras. 6 and 7); AI, paras. 24 and 24. AI made recommendations (paras. 46 and 47); JS20, pp.3–4. JS20 made recommendations (p. 11); and JC, para. 14. JC made a recommendation (para. 22).

[52] FPST, paras. 8 and 23. FPST made recommendations (paras. 28 and 29). See also ICO, para. 21. See also JC, paras. 12 and 13. JC made recommendations (paras. 21 and 22).

[53] ECLJ, paras. 2, 7–36.

[54] JS18, p. 6.

[55] JS18, p. 8.

[56] JS5, paras. 70, 71 and 73. JS5 made a recommendation (para. 75).

[57] JS11, paras. 11, 19 and 22. JS11 made a recommendation (p. 5).

[58] JS10, pp. 5–6. JS10 made recommendations (pp. 2–4).

[59] JS21, para. 27.

[60] JS1, paras. 10–14 and 39. JS1 made recommendations (para. 47). See also JC, paras. 2–11. JC made a recommendation (para. 18).

[61] JS5, para. 44. JS5 made recommendations (paras. 53–54).

[62] JS5, para. 3. JS5 made recommendations (paras. 15–17). See also JS18, p. 4. JS18 made recommendations (p. 6).

[63] JS18, p. 5. JS18 made recommendations (p. 6).

[64] JS15, para. 26.

[65] JS15, paras. 30 and 32. JS15 made recommendations (p. 15).

[66] JS4, para. 4.4. JS4 made recommendations (para. 6.3).
[67] JS4, para. 4.5. JS4 made recommendations (para. 6.3). See also JS5, paras. 62 and 64; JS13, para. 5; JS14, para. 7. JS14 made recommendations (para. 33); JS15, para. 27. JS15 made a recommendation (p. 5); ASFF, p. 6; and HRW, para. 19. HRW made recommendations (para. 20).
[68] JS14, paras. 13–15. JS14 made recommendations (para. 33).
[69] JS14, paras. 22–30. JS14 made recommendations (para. 33).
[70] JS4, para. 3.2. JS4 made recommendations (para. 6.1). See also AI, paras. 14 and 15. AI made a recommendation (para. 42); and JS16 para. 27.
[71] JS9, p. 2. JS9 made recommendations (p. 5). See also JS13, para. 4. JS13 made recommendations (para. 4).
[72] JS13, para. 3. JS139 made recommendations (para. 3).
[73] JS4, para. 2.4. JS4 made recommendations (para. 6.2).
[74] JS10, pp. 5–6. JS10 made recommendations (pp. 2–4).
[75] JS13, para. 8. JS13 made a recommendation (para. 8).
[76] JS18, p. 7. JS18 made recommendations (p. 9).
[77] JS8, pp. 6–7. JS8 made recommendations (para. 17).
[78] JS13, para. 1. JS13 made a recommendation (para. 1).
[79] WILPF, pp. 1–3. WILPF made recommendations (pp. 3–4).
[80] JS8, pp. 6–7. JS8 made recommendations (para. 17).
[81] JS15, para. 55. See also JS13, para. 6.
[82] JS13, para. 2. JS13 made recommendations (para. 2).
[83] JS3, p. 7.
[84] JS7, para. 47.
[85] SOS-CV, para. 13. SOS-CV made recommendations (para. 14).
[86] HRW, para. 25. HRW made recommendations (p. 7).
[87] HRW, para. 24. HRW made recommendations (p. 7).
[88] JS10, p. 9.
[89] AI, para. 22. AI made recommendations (paras. 44 and 45).
[90] JS19, p. 4. JS19 made recommendations (pp. 4–5).
[91] JS16, paras. 15 and 16.
[92] JS13, para. 14. JS13 made recommendations (para. 14).
[93] JS19, p. 3. JS19 made recommendations (p. 3).
[94] JS3, p. 5.
[95] JS3, p. 6. JS3 made a recommendation (p. 10).
[96] HRW, para, 34. HRW made recommendations (pp. 9–10).
[97] JS12, para. 16. JS12 made a recommendation (para. 30).
[98] DHRAN, paras. 16–19, 20 and 22. DHRAN made recommendations (para. 37).
[99] JS16, paras. 3 and 5. See also JS21, para. 25.
[100] JS7, para. 23.
[101] BC, para. 10.
[102] JS7, paras. 19–21.
[103] JS3, pp. 9–10. See also p. 6. JS3 made a recommendation (p. 11). See also JS7, para. 41. JS7 made a recommendation (para. 48(c)).
[104] SOS-CV, para. 9. CV made recommendations (para. 10).
[105] JS13, para. 11. JS13 made a recommendation (para. 11).
[106] JS6, para. 16. JS6 made recommendations (para. 17).
[107] ASFF, p. 2.
[108] AI, para. 29, referring to A/HRC/40/7, para. 148. 94 (Republic of Korea), and A/HRC/40/7/Add.1. AI made a recommendation (para. 51). See also JS19, pp. 8–9. JS19 made recommendations (pp. 9–10).
[109] AI, para. 23, AI made a recommendation (para. 38).
[110] JS10, p. 7. JS10 made recommendations (p. 3). See also JS13, para. 2. JS13 made recommendations (para. 2).
[111] JS19, p. 2.
[112] JS13, para. 2. JS13 made recommendations (para. 2).
[113] JS6, para. 16. JS6 made recommendations (para. 17).
[114] JS18, pp. 14–15, referring to A/HRC/40/7, para. 148.38 (Côte d'Ivoire), para. 148.39 (Portugal), para. 148.54 (Germany), para. 148.240 (Plurinational State of Bolivia), para. 148.271 (Belgium), para. 148.273 (Burundi), and para. 148.277 (Spain), and A/HRC/40/7/Add.1. See also JS19, p. 2; BC, para. 8; BC, paras. 18 and 21. BC made a recommendation (para. 22); and HRW, para. 28. HRW made recommendations (p. 8)
[115] JS20, p. 2, JS20 made a recommendation (p. 2). See also JS6, para. 26.
[116] HRW, paras. 29 and 30, HRW made recommendations (p. 8).

[117] JS10, p. 8. See also BC, paras. 14–16.
[118] JS7, para. 15. JS7 made recommendations (para. 17). BC made a recommendation (para. 23).
[119] JS18, p. 14.
[120] JS18, p. 15.
[121] ECP. paras. 1.1–1.3.
[122] SOS-CV, para. 21. SOS-CV made recommendations (para. 22).
[123] JS3, pp. 7–8. JS3 made a recommendation (p. 10). See also JS6, para. 32. JS6 made a recommendation (para. 33).
[124] JS7, para. 42. JS7 made recommendations (para. 48(a)).
[125] JS23, pp. 1 and 6. JS23 made recommendations (pp. 6–8).
[126] ICO, para. 8. ICO made recommendations (para. 12).
[127] JS12, paras. 5–9, referring to A/HRC/40/7, para. 148.67 Italy), para. 148.71 (France), para. 148.72 (Uruguay), para. 148.74 (Iceland), para. 148.75 (New Zealand), para148.76 (Belgium), para. 148.77 (Mexico), and para. 148.79 (Chile), and A/HRC/40/7/Add.1.
[128] JS21, paras. 10 and 11. JS21 made recommendations (paras. 35 and 36). See also JS12, para. 4. JS12 made recommendations (para. 27; See also JS16, para. 33; and JS4, para. 2.4. JS4 made recommendations (para. 6.1).
[129] IN, paras. X, xviii and xix. IN made recommendations (p. 4).
[130] JS21, para. 33. See also JS12, para. 15.
[131] IN, paras. xiii–xv. IN made recommendations (p. 4).
[132] JS17, paras. 2, 11. 19, and 26. JS17 made recommendations (pp. 18–19).
[133] HRW, paras. 32 and 33. HRW made recommendations (p. 9).
[134] JS6, para. 9. JS6 made recommendations (paras. 11–14).