

Flygtningenævnets baggrundsmateriale

Bilagsnr.:	407
Land:	Eritrea
Kilde:	UN. General Assembly
Titel:	Summary of stakeholders' submissions on Eritrea
Udgivet:	16. februar 2024
Optaget på baggrundsmaterialet:	28. maj 2024



General Assembly

Distr.: General
16 February 2024

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Forty-sixth session
29 April–10 May 2024

Summary of stakeholders' submissions on Eritrea*

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' submissions² 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 stakeholders

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

2. CGNK called for the ratification of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and congratulated Eritrea for supporting recommendations from the previous review in this regard.³

3. JC called for the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty, the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. JC also called for the ratification of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and for Eritrea to make the required declaration recognizing the competence of the Committee under articles 31 and 32.⁴

4. ICAN noted that Eritrea had shown support for the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons by consistently voting in favour of an annual United Nations General

* The present document is being issued without formal editing.

** Agreement was reached to publish the present report after the standard publication date owing to circumstances beyond the submitter's control.



Assembly resolution since 2018 that called upon states to sign, ratify, or accede to it. However, Eritrea had yet to sign this Treaty and was urged to do so.⁵

5. JS8 stated that since the previous review, very little had changed with respect to the human rights situation in Eritrea.⁶ (JS8, para. 1) JS6 stated that Eritrea had systematically failed to undertake any meaningful steps to engage and cooperate with regional and international human rights mechanisms and to uphold its human rights obligations. It noted the failure of Eritrea to implement recommendations from the previous review and in this regard, its failure to meaningfully cooperate on offers of technical support from OHCHR to assist with the implementation of those recommendations.⁷

6. HRCE noted that it was highly significant that at the previous review relevant recommendations including those relating to the granting of unimpeded access to Human Rights Council special procedure mandate holders had not enjoyed the support of Eritrea.⁸ The refusal of Eritrea to cooperate with the mandate holders made it difficult to comprehend how an elected member of the Human Rights Council could fundamentally refuse to cooperate with and participate in the procedures of the very body it claimed to respect and represent.⁹ JS8 stated that as member of the Human Rights Council, Eritrea ought to have been a model for the highest level of human rights protection.¹⁰

7. JS4 noted the lack of cooperation by Eritrea with the Special Rapporteur for the situation of human rights in Eritrea and its rejection of the findings and recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in Eritrea.¹¹

8. JS2 expressed alarm by the deliberate and continued refusal of Eritrea to cooperate with the Human Rights Council special procedures mechanism and other international mechanisms. It stated that Eritrea should extend a standing invitation to all special procedure mandate holders of the Human Rights Council and should prioritise official visits by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, Special Rapporteur on freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, and the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention.¹²

9. JS8 noted that Eritrea had ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and stated that Eritrea had violated its obligations under these Convention.¹³

10. JS6 considered the submission of the 2nd Periodic Report to the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR) covering the period 2017–2020 by the Eritrean government to be a positive development but noted that Eritrea was yet to implement previous ACHPR decisions relating to freedom of expression, particularly in relation to the arbitrary detention and the enforced disappearance of journalists, writers, and dissenting politicians.¹⁴

B. National human rights framework

1. Constitutional and legislative framework

11. JS1 noted that although the Constitution of Eritrea had been formally ratified by the Constituent Assembly in 1997, it had not been implemented.¹⁵ JS3 stated that despite indications from the Eritrean government that a new constitution was being drafted, no new constitution had emerged.¹⁶

12. JS2 stated that the Eritrean government ruled by decree and that there were no independent mechanisms or processes through which citizens could voice their grievances on issues affecting them.¹⁷

2. Institutional infrastructure and policy measures

13. HRCE recalled that at the previous review, Eritrea was unwilling to support any of the relevant recommendations made or to take any notice of the urgent need to reform the

system of national service, notably calls to restrict the time served in adherence to the originally proclaimed limit of 18 months.¹⁸

14. JS3 stated that the military service regime remained indefinite. Recruits received minimum wage and were subjected to forced labour. Young female recruits faced sexual harassment and violations by senior officers. The Eritrean government had resorted to intensified mass conscription including of minors, the elderly, and the clergy, because of the war effort in Tigray. JS3 stated that collective punishment was inflicted on the families of those persons who fled the country or avoided military service.¹⁹

15. HRCE stated that since there was no legal avenue to exit national service, conscripts often found themselves effectively state prisoners in the military or in slave labour in state-owned mines, agriculture, constructions, and ministries' offices for the rest of their lives. Many young Eritreans had found ways of escaping from national service, and tens of thousands of them each year have made the dangerous journeys across closed borders to leave their country, despite the shoot-to-kill policy implemented by security personnel or the severe punishment imposed if caught.²⁰

C. Promotion and protection of human rights

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

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

16. JS1 recalled that recommendations from the previous review to abolish the death penalty and to declare a moratorium on executions had not enjoyed the support of Eritrea.²¹ It stated that although no death sentences had been imposed by the courts and no executions had taken place since the previous review, the death penalty had not been abolished, and there was no moratorium on executions. Also, the application of the death penalty was not limited to the most serious crimes.²²

17. JS1 stated that enforced disappearance continued to be a common occurrence in Eritrea, particularly of people who expressed opposition to the Eritrean government.²³

18. Recalling that relevant recommendations from the previous review had not enjoyed the support of the government of Eritrea, JS1 stated that there were reports of the continued use of torture by the Eritrean authorities, particularly in relation to political prisoners. Human Rights Defenders advocating for an end to the death penalty were similarly at risk of torture. JS1 noted reports from former prisoners of two specific forms of torture: "helicopter," in which an Eritrean government actor forced prisoners to lie face down on the ground and tied their hands and legs behind them; and "8," where prisoners were tied to a tree. Survivors also reported that authorities, including people conducting interrogations, commonly used psychological torture, such as conducting beatings within earshot of other prisoners for the purposes of intimidating them.²⁴

19. JS1 referred to two supported recommendations from the previous review on reforming the penitentiary system and considered them to have not been implemented. It noted reports of overcrowding and a general lack of adequate sanitation, health care and food in incarceration facilities, and stated that conditions in those facilities had been described as harsh and life-threatening.²⁵ JS8 noted that some prisoners were held in solitary confinement for long periods of time.²⁶

20. JS3 stated that tens of thousands of Eritrean citizens remain detained without charge or trial in life threatening conditions in more than 300 sites across the country. Among those incarcerated are prisoners of conscience, some of whom have been detained for decades due to peaceably expressed political views or religious beliefs. Conditions in these facilities are unsanitary and unsatisfactory; detention facilities can include shipping containers, underground cells, and the open air in the desert, and access to food, water and medical attention was insufficient and often withheld as punishment.²⁷ ECLJ stated that prison authorities had prohibited Christian detainees from praying, singing and reading religious texts.²⁸

International humanitarian law

21. JS7 stated that Eritrean armed forces had been accused of committing crimes during the armed conflict in the Tigray region of Ethiopia. Despite the ceasefire in November 2022, the Eritrean troops continued to be present in the region and reports of their perpetrated atrocities continued to be brought to light.²⁹ JS3 stated that the Eritrean troops continued to occupy parts Irob and Kunama in Tigray where crimes continued to occur.³⁰

22. JS7 stated that the armed conflict in the Tigray region had resulted in several cases of mass killing and extermination. While there were many actors responsible for the atrocities in the region, Eritrean armed forces were severely implicated.³¹

23. JS7 stated that there was also a growing body of evidence suggesting that starvation was not an unintended consequence of the conflict in the Tigray region but a method of war and in which Eritrean troops were also implicated.³²

24. JS3 stated that the Eritrean armed forces had been implicated in the perpetration of rape as a weapon of war, amongst other grave violations in the armed conflict in the Tigray region.³³ JS7 stated that approximately 120,000 women had reportedly been subjected to rape and sexual violence during the Tigray war but suggested that the actual number was likely to be higher, as these crimes continued to be underreported due to associated stigma and other reasons. While all parties to this conflict were said to have been involved in these crimes, Eritrean soldiers have been heavily implicated, and have also been involved in cases of rape and sexual violence after the ceasefire came into effect in November 2022.³⁴

25. JS7 stated that within the horrific atrocities against Tigrayans, there were small, targeted communities that required further attention due to the particular threats that they were facing. Among them were the Irob and Kunama minority communities. Since the early days of the conflict, the Irob community had faced an existential threat as the Irob district had been under the control of the Eritrean forces. Since the ceasefire, the situation of the Irob community had continued to be dire, as the Eritrean troops had continued to loot livestock and kidnap people in Irob. Eritrean troops had also kidnapped Kunama refugees and returned them to Eritrea.³⁵

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

26. JS3 stated that several prisoners were held without charge or trial, including seven church leaders who had been detained arbitrarily and incommunicado for almost two decades.³⁶

27. JS6 stated that the Eritrean authorities had repeatedly failed to allow journalists and writers who had been detained without charge or trial, access to legal counsel and visits from their families.³⁷

28. HRCE stated that the rule of law was flouted with widespread impunity. Arbitrary violence by the military, police units and security agents inflicted on unarmed civilians were a frequent occurrence, for which no one was charged, prosecuted, or punished. The security forces were not held accountable for arbitrary detention and enforced disappearances, which continued unabated.³⁸

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

29. JS2 expressed deep concern by the restrictions placed by Eritrea on basic fundamental freedoms and the persistent and violent suppression of civil society and human rights defenders.³⁹

30. ADF noted that Eritrea had acceded to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights without any reservations and stated that the hash restrictions on religious adherence and institutions were incompatible with its obligations under these Conventions.⁴⁰ JC stated that that Proclamation No. 73/1995 of 15 July 1995 to legally standardize and articulate religious institutions and activities bestowed upon the Eritrean government the sole authority to either confirm or reject faith denominations and their activities.⁴¹ JS2 stated that this Proclamation had been used to stifle and restrict freedom of religion and religious activities.⁴²

31. JC stated that only Sunni Islam, Eritrean Orthodox Christianity, Roman Catholicism and Evangelical Lutheranism were formally recognized by the Eritrean government. The recognition of Jehovah's Witnesses was rescinded in 1994.⁴³ JS8 stated that the World Evangelical Alliance no longer had a member alliance in Eritrea as the organization had been banned and its leadership was either imprisoned or living as refugees in other countries.⁴⁴

32. JS3 stated that there was a campaign of arbitrary arrest and indefinite detention targeting religious communities and even the Eritrean government-sanctioned religious groups had experienced harassment, and arbitrary detention.⁴⁵ The Eritrean government had continued to tighten its control over the Orthodox Church by administering Church finances, selling of its assets, and approving its highest officials. Priests seen as sympathetic to the last legitimate patriarch continued to be detained, harassed, forced out or conscripted.⁴⁶ ECLJ stated that Christians, particularly those belonging to non-registered denominations, had been specifically targeted because they had been viewed as "agents of the west" and therefore a threat to the Eritrean government.⁴⁷

33. HRCE stated that in April 2023, 103 young Christians had been arrested for trying to record Christian music on You Tube. They had enthusiastically gathered at a location in Asmara and had been singing and recording their songs of praise and worship when they were detained. They were not charged or accorded due legal process and were reported to have been taken to the notorious Mai-Serwa prison.⁴⁸

34. JS5 stated Jehovah's Witnesses had been stripped of their human rights and had continued to experience persecution by imprisonment, torture and harassment. Meetings for worship and public ministry had been banned, and religious literature produced by Jehovah's Witnesses could not be imported into Eritrea. Jehovah's Witness children who had respectfully declined to sing the national anthem because of their religious conscience had been expelled from school.⁴⁹

35. ADF stated that the denial of conscientious objection to military service had violated the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights since the use of lethal force may seriously conflict with the freedom of conscience and the right to hold and manifest one's deep held convictions.⁵⁰ JS5 stated that there was no provision for alternative civilian service for conscientious objectors.⁵¹

36. JS2 considered supported recommendations from the previous review relating to freedoms of expression and opinion and media freedom to have not been implemented. The Eritrean government continued to exercise control over the media and had power and wide discretion to censor all media outlets based on broad criteria, pursuant to the Press Proclamation No 90/1996, part II, section 4(c). Media organizations were directly controlled by the Ministry of Information and were subject to strict oversight. All media outlets were required to submit copies of every publication to the Minister of Information. Independent media organizations had been shut down in 2001 and they remained closed. Foreigners were not permitted to register any media organizations. Eritrean nationals intending to establish media organizations were required to comply with an onerous licencing procedure which included submitting annual financial reports to the Minister of Information.⁵²

37. JS6 stated that censorship was stringently and systematically employed by the Eritrean authorities as a way of controlling access and flow of information and the freedom of expression.⁵³ JS2 stated that freedom of expression was effectively suppressed by the fear instilled by the widespread arbitrary arrests and incommunicado detention of people and groups that were perceived as being critical of the authorities. Private discussions were severely inhibited by fear of Eritrean government informants.⁵⁴

38. JS6 noted that internet access remained low.⁵⁵ JS4 stated that Eritrean citizens were largely disconnected from the global community due to restricted internet access within the country. The Eritrean Telecommunication Services Corporation was the sole provider of internet services and the Eritrean government had imposed restrictions on the websites that might be accessed.⁵⁶ JS2 stated that the internet, social media platforms and internet cafes were often shut down by the authorities. Surveillance was permanent and ubiquitous. In internet cafes everyone, including journalists, must identify themselves before being allowed to connect to the internet.⁵⁷

39. JS2 referred to recommendations from the previous review relating to the protection of human rights defenders, civil society activists and journalists and considered them to have not been implemented. It noted the arbitrary arrest, torture, prolonged detention, and disappearances of human rights defenders who were critical of the Eritrean authorities and the illegal detention of journalists.⁵⁸

40. JS1 noted the continuation of threats against human right defenders despite Eritrea supporting a recommendation at the previous review to “adopt all the necessary measures to ensure a safe environment for the exercise of freedom of expression for those who work to promote and protect human rights, including human rights defenders and journalists, and investigate and punish all acts of violence against them”. Human Rights Defenders critical of Eritrean government policies were vulnerable to arbitrary arrest and detention, as well as enforced disappearance and torture. JS1 also noted attempts at stifling critics outside Eritrea and in that regard referred to reported harassment and threats of Eritrean human rights defenders in the diaspora by the Eritrean government and its supporters, following the previous review.⁵⁹

41. JS2 stated that Eritrea had persistently failed to address unwarranted restrictions on civic space since the previous review. It considered recommendations from the previous review relating to freedom of association that had enjoyed the support of Eritrea to have not been implemented.⁶⁰ Independent civil society organizations were not able to operate in Eritrea. Civil Society Organizations were heavily censored by the 2005 Proclamation Determining the Administration of Non-Governmental Organisations, which imposed onerous reporting guidelines and empowered the authorities to exert control over the activities of civil society organizations.⁶¹ JS4 noted that there were no functioning national or international non-governmental organizations operating in Eritrea.⁶²

42. JS2 stated that freedom of assembly was not recognised by the authorities. Public gatherings of more than seven people required a permit. Law enforcement officials had routinely used excessive force to disperse protests. Those who protested faced the threat of deadly force or prolonged periods of arbitrary detention. Since 2019, the authorities had tightened restrictions on the right to assembly, as illustrated by the wave of arrests of non-recognized Christian congregations during prayer gatherings.⁶³

43. Maat and JS6 noted that since the independence of Eritrea in 1993, no elections had been held in the country.⁶⁴

44. Maat noted that freedom of movement was not guaranteed or provided for in national law. Citizens were consistently required to inform local authorities when changing their place of residence and providing justification for travel at check points. Foreigners legally residing in the country also faced similar travel restrictions. Citizens were frequently denied passports and exit visas for reasons such as unfulfilled national service, unpaid income taxes or on arbitrary and undisclosed grounds.⁶⁵

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

45. JS2 stated that although Eritrea had ratified the eight fundamental Conventions of the International Labour Organization, there were no independent trade unions operating in the country. The only union umbrella group, the National Confederation of Eritrean Workers, was affiliated with the People’s Front for Democracy and Justice, the political party headed by the President of Eritrea. The Government had prevented the formation of new unions, particularly by some professionals who had been classified as providing essential services.⁶⁶

46. Maat highlighted the violation of workers’ rights. Noting that in 2017, Eritrea had introduced a “new wage system” which had resulted in a significant increase in civil service salaries, Maat stated that the national minimum wage for employees of state-owned enterprises and government employees fell below the poverty line and noted the lack of a mandated minimum wage for the private sector. Maat also stated that the labour laws were not applicable to those working in the informal sector.⁶⁷

Right to an adequate standard of living

47. Maat stated that with 66 percent of the population living below the poverty line, Eritrea ranked among the world's poorest nations, and its economic indicators did not present an optimistic outlook for eradicating poverty in the foreseeable future.⁶⁸

Right to health

48. Maat stated that the healthcare sector faced numerous challenges. There were about 6 doctors and 75 midwives for every 100,000 people, and healthcare services were predominantly concentrated in urban areas, disregarding the health care needs of the majority of the population who lived in rural areas. Malaria posed a significant challenge, particularly in impoverished areas where about 70 percent of the population resided. There was also a decline in capacity in immunization coverage.⁶⁹

49. Noting the persistence of mortality of children, Maat stated that about 50 percent of neonatal deaths occurred within the first 24 hours of birth and about 75 occurring within the first week of birth, primarily due to preventable and treatable causes. It also noted that only 9 of the 22 hospitals had neonatal intensive care units.⁷⁰

50. Maat stated that there was a lack of access to adequate healthcare services for pregnant women and girls in rural areas and a shortage of skilled healthcare professionals during childbirth.⁷¹

Right to education

51. Maat highlighted relatively low rates of enrolment in primary and secondary schools. It noted that the student-teacher ratio of 77:1 in primary schools and 99:1 in secondary schools. There were also insufficient educational facilities for deaf and blind children.⁷²

52. BC noted challenges in ensuring access to higher education for girls and young women, including in rural areas. This necessitated comprehensive, multifaceted approaches that addressed socio-economic, cultural and logistical barriers to education.⁷³

53. BC noted that access to education in nomadic and semi-nomadic communities was significantly lower when compared to regions where communities resided in concentrated settlements.⁷⁴

Development, the environment, and business and human rights

54. AU-ACHPR noted that in the implementation of Agenda 2063: The Africa We Want, Eritrea had achieved some positive results towards the achievement of goals relating to ensuring established and functional continental financial and monetary institutions and with regard to the African peace and security architecture. However, Eritrea was expected to work towards attaining the remaining goals.⁷⁵

2. Rights of specific persons or groups*Women*

55. HRCE stated that the abuse of women, especially during national service, was widespread and appeared to be tolerated at the highest level of government. Girls as young as 16 years of age were detained for compulsory military service and military officers were notorious for sexual and physical abuses of women and girls, who suffered a wide range of violations, including psychological abuse, systematic sexual harassment and rape.⁷⁶

56. Noting the establishment of a steering committee within the Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Welfare to combat harmful practices such as female genital mutilation and underage marriage, Maat stated that there were high rates of teenage pregnancy.⁷⁷

Children

57. ECP stated that corporal punishment of children was lawful, despite repeated recommendations to prohibit it by the Committee on the Rights of the Child and other treaty bodies. It stated that Article 32 of the Penal Code of 2015, which provides for the "right of

correction or discipline”, should be repealed and corporal punishment should be prohibited in all settings.⁷⁸

Persons with disabilities

58. Maat stated that persons with disabilities faced challenges in fully exercising their rights and in accessing necessary services.⁷⁹

Migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers

59. Maat stated that there was no law regulating asylum and refugee status applications, and as result affected persons were treated as economic migrants.⁸⁰

Internally displaced persons

60. Maat stated that, in the context of the conflict in Tigray, Eritrean security forces had escalated their violations against Eritrean refugees. They had actively participated in the destruction of two Eritrean refugee camps in Tigray. About 20,000 Eritrean refugees had been displaced, with some forcibly recruited into the Eritrean armed forces.⁸¹

Stateless persons

61. JS5 noted that the President of Eritrea had declared that the citizenship of Jehovah’s Witnesses who were Eritrean by birth had been revoked due to their refusal to participate in the referendum and to undertake national service.⁸²

Notes

¹ A/HRC/41/14, A/HRC/41/14/Add.1, and A/HRC/41/2.

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:

ADF	ADF International, Geneva (Switzerland);
BC	The Stichting Broken Chalk, Amsterdam (Netherlands);
CGNK	Center for Global Nonkilling, Geneva (Switzerland);
ECLJ	European Centre for Law and Justice, Strasbourg (France);
ECP	End Corporal Punishment, Geneva (Switzerland);
HRCE	Human Rights Concern-Eritrea, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
ICAN	International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Geneva (Switzerland);
JC	Jubilee Campaign, Addlestone, Surrey (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
Maat	Maat for Peace, Development, and Human Rights, Cairo (Egypt).

Joint submissions:

JS1	The Advocates for Human Rights, Minneapolis (United States of America) and The World Coalition Against the Death Penalty (Joint Submission 1);
JS2	CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Johannesburg (South Africa) and Surbana Vision Media and Community Services (Joint Submission 2);
JS3	Christian Solidarity Worldwide and Christian Solidarity Worldwide-Nigeria (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (Joint Submission 3);
JS4	The East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Kampala (Uganda)(Joint Submission 4);
JS5	African Association of Jehovah’s Witnesses, Krugersdorp (South Africa), The European Association of Jehovah’s Witnesses, Chelmsford (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Asia-Pacific Association of Jehovah’s

	Witnesses, Tokyo (Japan) and Asociación Simple de los Testigos de Jehová en las Américas, Nordelta (Argentina) (Joint Submission 5);
JS6	PEN International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and PEN Eritrea (Joint Submission 6);
JS7	International Bar Association's Human Rights Institute and the Coalition for Genocide Response, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (Joint Submission 7);
JS8	The Pentecostal World Fellowship, The Pentecostal Commission on Religious Liberty, The Anglican Consultative Council, The World Evangelical Alliance, Geneva (Switzerland), (Joint Submission 8).

Regional intergovernmental organization:

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

- ³ CGNK, p. 3, referring to A/HRC/41/14, para. 131.27 (Honduras), para. 131.29 (Armenia) and para. 131.30 (Rwanda) and A/HRC/41/14/Add.1.
- ⁴ JC, para. 3.
- ⁵ ICAN, p. 1.
- ⁶ JS8, para. 1.
- ⁷ JS6, paras. 1 and 9. JS6 made recommendations (para. 23).
- ⁸ See for e.g. A/HRC/41/14, para. 131.57 and A/HRC/41/14/Add.1.
- ⁹ HRCE, p. 5. HRCE made a recommendation (p. 5). See also JS6, para. 14. JS6 made a recommendation (para. 23).
- ¹⁰ JS8, para. 7.
- ¹¹ JS4, para. 1.4.
- ¹² JS2, paras. 1.7 and 6.5.
- ¹³ JS8, para. 5. JS8 made a recommendation (para. 16).
- ¹⁴ JS6, para. 13.
- ¹⁵ JS1, para. 8. JS1 made recommendations (para. 32.) See also JS4, para. 2.2. JS4 made a recommendation (para. 5); HRCE, p. 1. HRCE made recommendations (p. 1); JS6, paras. 8 and 11; and ECLJ, para. 4.
- ¹⁶ JS3, para. 3. JS3 made a recommendation (para. 5).
- ¹⁷ JS2, para. 2.2.
- ¹⁸ HRCE, p. 3. HRCE made recommendations (p. 4).
- ¹⁹ JS3, paras. 60–62. JS3 made recommendations (paras. 63–65). See also ADF, paras. 25 and 26.
- ²⁰ HRCE, p. 3. HRCE made recommendations (p. 4).
- ²¹ JS1, para. 6, referring to A/HRC/41/14, para. 131.18 (Uruguay), para. 131.19 (Australia), para. 131.20 (Rwanda), para. 131.142 (Armenia), para. 131.143 (France), and para. 131.144 (Iceland), and A/HRC/41/14/Add.1.
- ²² JS1, paras. 2, 6–10. JS1 made recommendations (para. 32).
- ²³ JS1, para. 21.
- ²⁴ JS1, paras. 11 and 14, referring to A/HRC/41/14, para. 131.14 (Uruguay), para. 131.36 (Chile), para. 131.54 (Uruguay), para. 131.58 (Czechia), para. 131.59 (Italy), para. 131.145 (Greece), para. 131.149 (Canada) and para. 131.176 (Slovakia), and A/HRC/41/14/Add.1. JS1 made recommendations (para. 32). See also HRCE, p. 3. HRCE made recommendations (p. 3).
- ²⁵ JS1, paras. 16, 18 and 19, referring to A/HRC/41/14, para. 131.159 (Georgia) and para. 131.177 (Norway), and A/HRC/41/14/Add.1.
- ²⁶ JS8, para. 8.
- ²⁷ JS3, para. 3. JS3 made recommendations (paras. 25 and 31). See also JS8, para. 15.
- ²⁸ ECLJ, para. 11. ECLJ made a recommendation (para. 29).
- ²⁹ JS7, para. 5. JS7 made recommendations (para. 45).
- ³⁰ JS3, paras. 66 and 69. JS3 made a recommendation (para. 71).
- ³¹ JS7, paras. 11 and 12. See also paras. 13–19 for specific cases documented by JS7.
- ³² JS7, para. 26.
- ³³ JS3, paras. 66 and 69. JS3 made a recommendation (para. 71).
- ³⁴ JS7, paras. 20 and 21. JS7 made a recommendation (para. 45). See also JS3, paras. 66 and 69. JS3 made a recommendation (para. 71).
- ³⁵ JS7, paras. 33, 34, 36, 37 and 41.
- ³⁶ JS3, para. 46. JS3 made recommendations (paras. 50–52).
- ³⁷ JS6, para. 18.

- ³⁸ HRCE, pg. 2. HRCE made recommendations (p. 2).
³⁹ JS2, para. 1.6.
⁴⁰ ADF, paras. 16 and 18. ADF made recommendations (para. 36).
⁴¹ JC, para. 6. JC made a recommendation (para. 18).
⁴² JS2, para. 4.10.
⁴³ JC, para. 7. See also JS8, para. 3.
⁴⁴ JS8, para. 6.
⁴⁵ JS3, para. 4. JS3 made recommendations (paras. 6 and 23). See also JC, paras. 7 and 8. JC made a recommendation (para. 20).
⁴⁶ JS3, para. 32. JS3 made recommendations (paras. 44 and 45).
⁴⁷ ECLJ, para. 9.
⁴⁸ HRCE, p. 1.
⁴⁹ JS5, paras. 1, 4 and 27. JS5 made recommendations (para. 56).
⁵⁰ ADF, para. 35.
⁵¹ JS5, para. 7. JS5 made a recommendation (para. 56(5)).
⁵² JS2, paras. 4.1–4.3 and Annex, referring to A/HRC/41/14, para. 131.185 (Luxembourg), para. 131.194 (Spain), para. 131.188 (Seychelles), para. 131.197 (Slovenia), 131.193 (Argentina) and A/HRC/41/14/Add.1. JS2 made recommendations (para. 6.3). See also JS4, para. 3.3. JS4 made recommendations (para. 5.2). See also HRCE, p. 1. HRCE made recommendations (p. 2).
⁵³ JS6, para. 15.
⁵⁴ JS2, paras. 4.8 and 4.9.
⁵⁵ JS6, para. 16.
⁵⁶ JS4, para. 3.7.
⁵⁷ JS2, para. 4.9.
⁵⁸ JS2, paras. 3.1, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6 and Annex, referring to A/HRC/41/14, para. 131.192 (Belgium), para. 131.197 (Slovenia), para. 131.193 (Argentina) and para. 131.196 (Greece), and A/HRC/41/14/Add.1. JS2 made recommendations (para. 6.2).
⁵⁹ JS1, paras. 27, 28 and 30. JS1 made recommendations (para. 32). See also JS4, para. 4.3. JS4 made recommendations (para. 5.3); and JS6, para. 12.
⁶⁰ JS2, para. 2.1 and Annex, referring to A/HRC/41/14, para. 131.185 (Luxembourg), para. 131.194 (Spain) and para. 131.186 (Sweden), and A/HRC/41/14/Add.1.
⁶¹ JS2, paras. 1.5 and 2.3. JS2 made recommendations (para. 6.1). See also Maat, p. 1.
⁶² JS4, para. 2.4. JS4 made recommendations (para. 5.1).
⁶³ JS2, paras. 5.3 and 5.4. JS2 made recommendations (para. 6.4).
⁶⁴ Maat, pg.2 and JS6, para. 12.
⁶⁵ Maat, p. 2.
⁶⁶ JS2, para. 2.4. See also Maat, p. 1.
⁶⁷ Maat, pp. 3–4.
⁶⁸ Maat, p. 3.
⁶⁹ Maat, p. 3.
⁷⁰ Maat, p. 3.
⁷¹ Maat, p. 4.
⁷² Maat, pp. 2–3.
⁷³ BC, paras. 14 and 18. BC made recommendations (para. 30).
⁷⁴ BC, paras. 20 and 21. BC made recommendations (para. 29).
⁷⁵ AU-ACHPR, p. 2.
⁷⁶ HRCE, p. 4. HRCE made recommendations (p. 5).
⁷⁷ Maat, p. 4.
⁷⁸ ECP, pp. 1–2.
⁷⁹ Maat, p. 4.
⁸⁰ Maat, p. 1.
⁸¹ Maat, p. 1.
⁸² JS5, para. 1.
-