



General Assembly

Distr.: General
20 January 2026

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Fifty-second session
Geneva, 4–15 May 2026

Summary of stakeholders' submissions on Estonia*

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 ten 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 the national human rights institution accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles

2. The Chancellor of Justice (CoJ) noted that the Equal Treatment Act prohibited discrimination based on religion or belief, age, disability or sexual orientation only in situations related to employment. The CoJ also noted the proposal to merge the Gender Equality Act and the Equal Treatment Act. However, it reported that civil society and the Equality Commissioner had expressed deep concern about the lack of transparency and public consultation in the drafting process of this new bill. The CoJ recommended that Estonia amend the Equal Treatment Act so that the law prohibits discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief, age, disability or sexual orientation in all areas.³

3. Regarding the right to privacy, the CoJ recommended that Estonia ensure that all surveillance measures and state data-processing systems be regulated by law, in line with the principles of legality, necessity, and proportionality. It also recommended to strengthen oversight mechanisms and transparency concerning access to personal data, and to guarantee that individuals are informed about and able to challenge unlawful data collection.⁴

4. The CoJ underlined that, despite a reform of the social welfare system in 2023, the quality of care largely depended on whether general care homes had enough care workers to assist the residents. It recommended that Estonia supervise compliance with the minimum legal staffing requirement in the general care homes.⁵

* The present document is being issued without formal editing.



5. On the right to health, the CoJ highlighted the long waiting lists for treatment of patients, in particular for psychiatric services. It recommended that Estonia ensure access to public health care, including mental health care, in a reasonable timeframe and distance for the patient.⁶

6. The CoJ highlighted that the stark differences between regions, cities and rural areas was a major challenge to implement the constitutional right to education. The regional education gap was significant both in general education schools and in opportunities for further studies. The CoJ noted the shortage of qualified teachers, an issue particularly acute in rural areas and in schools attended predominantly by children from lower-income families. It informed about the recent reform by Estonia to end the segregated education system for children whose home language was Estonian and those whose home language was Russian. The CoJ recommended to mitigate rising educational inequalities related to pupils' socio-economic background and regional differences, guarantee that teachers working in schools are qualified and take effective measures to address the shortage of teachers, and ensure adequate learning materials for the unified education system.⁷

7. The CoJ noted an increase in gender-based violence and indicated that the Penal Code was not fully aligned with the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence (Istanbul Convention), particularly around the consent-based definition of sexual violence. Legislative amendments (so-called "consent law") were under consideration. The CoJ recommended that Estonia continue enhancing its work on violence prevention and victim support, increase awareness about sexual violence and consent-based sex within society, and enhance the expertise and capabilities of investigators, prosecutors, and judges handling cases of sexual violence.⁸

8. The CoJ indicated that, although the 2017 administrative reform had changed the administrative-territorial organization of Estonia, the quality of child protection work was unequal among local authorities, with a need for more effective State supervision by the Social Insurance Board over the quality of social services and child protection work provided by local authorities. The CoJ recommended that Estonia guarantee that the help of professional child protection workers, preventive programmes, good quality services and assistance are available to all families regardless of a child's place of residence. It also recommended to strengthen the State supervision of local authorities, schools, kindergartens and other childcare institutions and ensure the child's right to participate in all decisions concerning them, including in national decision-making.⁹

9. The CoJ noted that most residential buildings remained inaccessible and there was no state or municipal plan to make them accessible for persons with disabilities. The CoJ indicated that persons with disabilities were twice as likely to live in poverty. The CoJ recommended that Estonia ensure the implementation of the Accessibility Task Force's proposals and create measures that would help property owners cope with the costs, empower local authorities, schools and kindergartens so that children with special needs can access support services corresponding to their actual needs, and review the work ability allowance to meet the requirements of the European Social Charter.¹⁰

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations¹¹ and cooperation with human rights mechanisms

10. JS2 recommended that Estonia consider withdrawing the reservation made to article 12 of the CRPD.¹²

11. The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) recommended that Estonia sign and ratify the United Nations Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.¹³

B. National human rights framework

1. Constitutional and legislative framework

12. JS1 reported that the government of Estonia had approved the draft Bill on the Amendments to the Penal Code to adopt a consent-based approach to sexual offenses, which considered non-consensual sex punishable even if no physical violence was used against the victim-survivor.

13. JS2 considered that the anti-discrimination legislation of Estonia was insufficient and its implementation weak. While discrimination was generally prohibited in the Constitution, the sectoral laws differentiated between different grounds. Gender-based discrimination was prohibited in all areas of social life according to the Gender Equality Act. Discrimination on the grounds of nationality (ethnicity), race or colour was prohibited in almost all areas of life, but discrimination based on religion or belief, age, disability or sexual orientation was prohibited only in the field of employment, according to Equality Treatment Act. JS2 recommended that Estonia advance the draft law of the Gender Equality and Equal Opportunities Act or amend the Equal Treatment Act, so that discrimination is prohibited in all areas on all grounds.¹⁴ The Gender Equality and Equal Treatment Commissioner (the GEET Commissioner) also recommended the amendment of the Equal Treatment Act so as to include a prohibition of discrimination of all forms of discrimination on all grounds.¹⁵ Furthermore, JS2 recommended to add new protected grounds in the legislation based on Constitution §12 but also state of health, gender identity, gender expression and sex characteristics.¹⁶

14. ADF International underlined that the right to freedom of opinion and expression was enshrined in the Constitution of Estonia. Section 151 of the Penal Code gave effect to the articles of the Constitution by prohibiting public incitement to hatred, violence, or discrimination based on nationality, race, colour, sex, language, origin, religion, sexual orientation, political opinion, or financial or social status, where such conduct endangered a person's life, health, or property.¹⁷ Despite this legal recognition, ADF International reported that the European Commission initiated infringement proceedings against Estonia in January 2023 arguing that Estonia had failed to transpose into national law the European Union Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia through criminal law.¹⁸

15. Following Estonia's 2023 parliamentary elections, the new governing coalition introduced the hate speech bill that broadened the conditions under which hate speech would be criminalized in the Penal Code. The bill passed its first reading (of three) in September 2023. However, ADF International stressed that, in practice, this bill would allow a person to be prosecuted solely because their opinions or views were deemed to 'give reason to fear' that a threat might arise. This lack of clear criteria created significant risks of arbitrary interpretation and enforcement. Furthermore, under the said bill, so-called 'hate speech' would no longer be a misdemeanour but a felony.¹⁹ ADF International recommended that Estonia withdraw the Bill 232 SE on Amendments to the Penal Code, the Code of Criminal Procedure, and the Code of Misdemeanour Procedure from Parliament to ensure full compliance with Estonia's obligations under international human rights law, including Articles 19(3) and 20 of the ICCPR.²⁰ JS2 recommended that Estonia properly criminalise hate speech and make hate motivation an aggravating circumstance when committing a crime. It also recommended to open discussions about new prohibited grounds such as citizenship, gender identity, gender expressions and sex characteristics.²¹

16. The GEET Commissioner recommended that Estonia criminalise hate speech and adopt provisions of the Penal Code making hate motivation an aggravating circumstance when committing a crime and update the legislation to provide better protection to victims of online harassment.²²

2. Institutional infrastructure and policy measures

17. The GEET Commissioner reported that, due to austerity measures, its funding had been significantly cut since 2025, despite the new obligations arising from transposition of the equality bodies' minimum standards directives ((EU)2024/1499 and 2024/1500). This

had serious implications on its capacity and performance. It recommended that Estonia ensure stable and sufficient funding for the Commissioner's office to fully and effectively implement its mandate.²³ JS2 made similar remarks.²⁴

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

18. OSCE/ODIHR observed that the law enforcement agencies and criminal justice authorities of Estonia did not record the bias motivations of hate crimes and recommended that Estonia review its existing legal framework to ensure that bias motivations can be effectively acknowledged and appropriate penalties can be imposed on the perpetrators.²⁵

19. The GEET Commissioner recommended that Estonia contribute to the implementation of the European Union Action Plan against Racism 2020-2025.²⁶

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

20. The Council of Europe considered that the material conditions of detention were mostly adequate, though some detention houses lacked proper exercise yards.²⁷ However, it stressed that the incarceration rate remained high, and greater use should be made of non-custodial measures, alternatives to imprisonment, and reintegration programmes.²⁸

21. The Council of Europe considered that healthcare provision in detention was generally good in Estonia, but significant shortages in mental health services and breaches of medical confidentiality remained. It underlined that the planned transfer of prison healthcare to the Ministry of Health in July 2024 should be accompanied by increased staffing and resources to improve access to psychiatric care.²⁹

22. The Council of Europe considered that the maximum legal duration of disciplinary solitary confinement remained excessive and that solitary confinement should never be used for juveniles.³⁰

23. The Council of Europe recalled the serious concern by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment about the use of mechanical restraints, including lack of direct nursing supervision, excessive duration, and the involvement of police or security staff.³¹

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

24. The Council of Europe indicated that access to lawyers and the right to notify a third party of detention were generally respected. However, it recalled the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment's long-standing recommendation to grant all detainees an express right of access to a doctor from the outset of deprivation of liberty, which remained to be implemented.³²

25. JS1 recommended that Estonia undertake gender sensitive and trauma-informed protocols to ensure that prosecutors and judges will treat the testimonies of victim-survivors of gender-based violence that is supported by a physical and psychological assessment of harm and assessed alongside existing evidence, as sufficient proof.³³

26. JS1 indicated the need to guarantee the proper protection for victim-survivors of rape. Article 141 of the Penal Code defined rape as sexual intercourse with a person against his or her will by using force, or by taking advantage of a situation in which the person was not capable of initiating resistance or comprehending the situation. Consent was not addressed in any part of this definition. The current legislation contained loopholes that provided the perpetrator with significant protections, thereby enabling them to evade accountability. Article 34 of the Code of Criminal Procedure granted the accused the right to refuse to provide testimony, meaning if no statement was made on behalf of the accused, then his/her version of the events was never challenged in court and the presumption of innocence and

any contradictions in the prosecution's case were interpreted in favour of the accused. In addition, the existing legislation was not gender-responsive and creates a structural imbalance between perpetrators and victim-survivors in rape cases. Article 7.1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure established the presumption of innocence, with the burden of proof lying with the prosecutor, and any doubts regarding the presented evidence were to be interpreted in favour of the accused. Furthermore, Article 288 of the Code of Criminal Procedure granted the defence the right to question the witnesses in court, which meant the victim-survivor was often subjected to aggressive cross-examination to question their credibility.³⁴ JS1 recommended to bring the Penal Code into line with the Istanbul Convention and to amend its article 141 to align the definition of rape with international standards, basing it on lack of consent rather than use of force or threat. JS1 also recommended to establish a consent-based approach to sexual violence so that to modify Articles 7.1 and 34 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which directly and indirectly contributed to legal gaps and stereotypes in the prosecution of rape, allowing for a shift in the burden of proof from demonstrating resistance to establishing whether there was freely given consent.³⁵

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political

27. Justice pour Tous Internationale (JPTI) noted that Estonia's application of state security legislation under Penal Code § 235 continued to generate profound concern about the erosion of fundamental rights. The 2019 amendments broadened the provision to encompass vaguely defined "support" for foreign entities, enabling the criminalization of peaceful political dissent, minority advocacy, and canonical religious affiliation. This ambiguity had facilitated opaque proceedings that contravened Articles 9 and 14 ICCPR and Article 6 European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), undermining legality and due process. According to JPTI, the legislative framework culminated in the Churches and Congregations (Amendment) Act of 18 June 2025, which prohibited "spiritual ties" with foreign religious authorities deemed as security threats, allowed deregistration of communities without judicial review, and permitted exclusion of clergy on opaque grounds. The organization considered that, taken together, these patterns revealed a securitized paradigm enveloping both political dissent and religious life. Civic activists and minority leaders were prosecuted as traitors, while a historic church faced leadership expulsion and potential dissolution, all justified under the rubric of national security. In particular, the Estonian Orthodox Christian Church (EOCC) continued to face sustained legislative, administrative, and executive repression.³⁶ JPTI highlighted the need to address arbitrary detentions and politically motivated prosecutions and to reinforce the integrity of Estonia's judiciary and its judicial oversight.³⁷ JPTI urged Estonia to repeal or substantially amend restrictive legislation, restore the autonomy and leadership of the EOCC, release and rehabilitate political prisoners, reform its penal provisions in line with international law, strengthen judicial independence, and guarantee equal protection and participation for minorities.³⁸

28. OSCE/ODIHR observed the parliamentary elections in 2023 and 2025. On the 2023 election, it concluded that the election process was administered efficiently, in line with the law, but with minor technical deficiencies. It formulated 16 recommendations related to the subjects of the political party and campaign finance regulations, internet voting and the participation of national minorities. On the 2025 parliamentary elections, OSCE/ODIHR recommended clarifying the legal framework to more explicitly safeguard the principles of universality, equality, and the free expression of the will of the voter.³⁹ OSCE/ODIHR also underscored the need for clear, objective criteria in law for any decision by the National Election Commission to suspend, terminate, or invalidate an Internet vote, thereby limiting administrative discretion. It further called for enhanced transparency and oversight by defining the legal requirements for individual and universal verifiability, clarifying the role of public observers, and ensuring all technical and security standards are developed transparently and updated regularly. Finally, OSCE/ODIHR recommended strengthening accountability through a dedicated complaints and appeals procedure for the Internet voting process and updating the criminal code to include specific offences and proportionate sanctions.⁴⁰

29. JS2 highlighted that all prisoners were automatically disenfranchised by law, amounting to a blanket ban on prisoners' voting rights. JS2 recommended that Estonia amend the relevant laws so that the voting ban only applies to prisoners who have it as an additional punishment in their sentence.⁴¹

Right to marriage and family life

30. The GEET Commissioner informed about the adoption, in June 2023, of the Family Law Act that established marriage equality. Consequently, as of January 2024, marriage may be contracted between two adult natural persons regardless of their gender.⁴²

31. JS2 indicated that the legal framework on the age of marriage and consent had improved. The minimum legal age of marriage was now 18 years, with no exceptions. Since 1 June 2022, the legal age of consent was 16 years, raised from the previous threshold of 14.⁴³

Prohibition of all forms of slavery, including trafficking in persons

32. The European Centre for Law and Justice (ECLJ) underscored that human trafficking was criminalized under Article 133 of the Penal Code of Estonia and the Victim Support Act (passed in 2022). This law provided victims with basic support services, had created women's support centres, and provided mental health assistance and other essential services for victims of human trafficking and domestic violence. However, Estonia was a source, transit and destination country for human trafficking with the number of registered cases increasing. The low number of convictions in cases of human trafficking and exploitation was extremely concerning given the number of registered cases. Contributing to this low number of convictions was a lack of dedicated prosecutors to handle human trafficking cases. ECLJ recommended that Estonia commit resources, especially for prosecutors, to investigate and prosecute cases of human trafficking in a timely manner. It also reminded Estonia that, to fully combat human trafficking, it must convict perpetrators of human trafficking.⁴⁴

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

33. JS2 indicated that the gender pay gap in Estonia was one of the highest in the EU and was primarily caused by gender stereotypes that influenced women's and men's educational and occupational choices, career paths, the division of care work, and employers' wage and personnel policies. In addition, there was a lack of obligatory childcare provision and a burden of care mainly affecting women. It also highlighted the gender segregation in the labour market of Estonia. JS2 recommended that Estonia apply measures, including temporary special measures, to advance the achievement of de facto gender equality, particularly in addressing the gender pay gap and unequal distribution of care responsibilities.⁴⁵

Right to health

34. ADF International considered that Estonia should focus on providing individuals with quality health care and treatment, ensuring that patients and other persons in situations of vulnerability have access to high-quality, comprehensive care, including medical, psychological, socio-economic, and spiritual assistance. It recommended that Estonia strengthen policies and increase investments to promote access to high-quality, comprehensive palliative and hospice care, as well as psychological, socio-economic, and spiritual assistance.⁴⁶

35. ADF International stressed that adult suicide rates in Estonia were significantly high and above those of most OECD countries.⁴⁷

2. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women

36. JS1 indicated that every police station in Estonia was mandated to respond to cases of domestic violence; however, not all stations had specialized domestic violence units and police responses and reporting on domestic violence varied significantly across the country. In addition, police academies did not offer mandatory training on gender and gender-based

violence. As a result, many police officers did not have enough knowledge or experience to notice domestic violence and react to the threat. Furthermore, the lack of practical cooperation and communication between the police and other key institutions impacted the safety and well-being of victim-survivors.⁴⁸ JS1 recommended that Estonia strengthen the capacity and the human, technical, and financial resources of all police stations, especially in rural areas, to expand the coverage of the joint rapid response unit to prevent domestic violence against women and girls across the territory. It also recommended that Estonia ensure mandatory and continuous training and accountability mechanisms for law enforcement officials on gender-based violence against women and ensure the practical implementation of inter-agency cooperation between law enforcement and other state bodies like the judiciary system, services providers and specialized NGOs with the objective of providing victim-survivors with improved case management and support.⁴⁹

37. JS1 highlighted the challenge in implementing protective orders against perpetrators of domestic violence as the orders were not consistently linked to mechanisms that ensured the accountability of perpetrators.⁵⁰ JS1 recommended that Estonia ensure timely and effective issuance, enforcement and monitoring of emergency barring orders in cases of domestic violence and impose adequate deterrent penalties for non-compliance with such orders. It also recommended that Estonia initiate criminal proceedings in a prompt manner against an individual issued with an emergency barring order, ensuring that these perpetrators of domestic violence are prosecuted and adequately punished.⁵¹

38. JS1 recommended that Estonia develop a comprehensive law on combating domestic violence that includes all forms of violence, covers all relations, recognize violence against women and girls as a gendered phenomenon rooted in inequality; ensure protection for all victims of domestic violence; strengthen existing protection measures and services; ensure accountability and data collection; and adequately sanction perpetrators and systems actors that perpetuate any form of violence or discrimination.⁵²

Persons with disabilities

39. JS2 considered that the national definition of disability remained narrower than that established under the CRPD. In addition, changes to administrative procedures for assessing disability had resulted in many children and adults previously recognised as persons with disabilities losing that status. This decline indicated that many individuals in need of support were no longer receiving appropriate assistance, as access to a wide range of state and municipal services and benefits remained dependent on the formal determination of disability severity.⁵³ JS2 recommended that Estonia bring the definition of “disability” into accordance with the CRPD.⁵⁴

40. JS1 underlined that the support of Estonia to women with disabilities remained limited and expressed concern about the lack of coherent legislative or policy framework addressing the rights of women with disabilities in the context of violence. The Gender Equality Act and other anti-discrimination statutes prohibit unequal treatment broadly. However, JS1 indicated that they did not contain provisions that specifically addressed the intersection of gender and disability. This also applied to national development plans and equality strategies.⁵⁵ JS1 also recommended that Estonia reform its disability assessment and welfare procedures to remove bureaucratic barriers that prevent women with disabilities from accessing social protection and victim support in cases of violence.⁵⁶

41. JS1 considered that Estonia’s frontline response to domestic violence remained insufficient for women with disabilities. It added that, despite legislative reforms and the establishment of a national victim support system, Estonia continued to neglect the specific needs of women with disabilities in its gender-based violence response, leaving women and girls with disabilities particularly vulnerable to abuse and social exclusion. JS1 underlined that, until Estonia embedded disability competence into guidelines, training, and monitoring, women with disabilities will continue to face systemic barriers to protection and justice.⁵⁷ JS1 recommended that Estonia strengthen national policies and strategies on gender-based violence to explicitly address the intersection of gender and disability, recognizing women with disabilities as a distinct target group.⁵⁸ JS1 recommended that Estonia adopt and implement disability-sensitive protocols for police, prosecutors, and frontline justice actors

to ensure effective communication and accessibility for women with disabilities at every stage of proceedings.⁵⁹

42. JS2 reported that the number of children with disabilities had increased over the past decade, while they continued to face inadequate protection against discrimination, limited inclusion and assistance, and restricted access to education.⁶⁰ JS2 underlined that no institution ensured integrated case management for children with disabilities, and information exchange remained minimal. As a result, families carried the main responsibility for coordinating support, adding a heavy administrative burden and hindering the effective realization of the rights of children with disabilities.⁶¹ JS2 recommended that Estonia provide equal and adequate social protection for children and adults with disabilities at municipal level, deriving from common methods of evaluation of their needs, and introduce real monitoring mechanisms for municipal service provision.⁶² JS2 also recommended to enhance coordination between the health, social services, and education sectors to ensure equal access and quality of support services for all children.⁶³

Indigenous Peoples and minorities

43. JPTI stated that the Russian speaking minority in Estonia continued to endure systemic marginalisation across political, educational, and religious domains. The constitutional amendment of 9 April 2025, which prohibited non-EU citizens from voting in local elections, disenfranchised approximately 80,000 Russian citizens and stateless residents. Religious institutions serving Russian-speaking communities were also targeted. In addition, political advocacy by Russian-speaking minorities had been criminalised. Educational reforms mandating the progressive elimination of Russian-language instruction by 2030 had further deepened inequalities. JPTI underlined that these developments demonstrated a securitised framework that entrenched exclusion rather than fostering integration. JPTI requested that Estonia take concrete steps to guarantee the equal participation of its Russian-speaking minorities in public life.⁶⁴

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons

44. The GEET Commissioner indicated that the legal gender recognition process had improved in 2025 when a new regulation was adopted. This new regulation updated the conditions and procedure for the medical expert commission to issue a decision on gender incongruence, which was required to request an amendment to gender data in the Population Register. It also highlighted that there was no definition of conversion therapy and therefore no ban on it, affecting the LGBTIQ+ community. In 2025, the government sent the Action Plan for the Promotion of Equal Opportunities for LGBTIQ People 2025–2030 for a public consultation. The GEET Commissioner was waiting for the formal adoption of the mentioned Action Plan. It recommended that Estonia reform the legal gender recognition process basing it on the self-determination of transgender people and define and prohibit conversion practices targeting LGBTIQ+ people.⁶⁵ JS2 recommended that Estonia adopt the Principles and Action Plan for Promoting Equal Opportunities for LGBTIQ People 2025–2030 and secure its full implementation.⁶⁶ JS2 made a similar remark and recommended that Estonia adopt a gender recognition framework that fully respects the principle of self-determination.⁶⁷

45. JS2 reported that one of the principal challenges faced by trans persons was the disproportionately long waiting time for legal gender recognition and trans-specific healthcare services. It recommended that information about the needs of LGBTIQ+ patients should be included in training for healthcare professionals. Primary and additional medical training should adopt a human rights-based approach.⁶⁸

Migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers

46. The Council of Europe reported that material conditions at Estonia's sole immigration detention facility were very good. However, the Council of Europe considered that outdoor space was oppressive, lacking shelter and seating, and no organised activities were offered to persons detained for extended periods. That organization stressed that, for long-term detainees, activities should be expanded and outdoor facilities improved to promote well-being and reduce idleness.⁶⁹

47. JS2 reported that the interpretation of family reunification rights remained unduly restrictive, particularly for LGBT refugees. JS2 recommended that Estonia lift restrictions that prevent LGBT refugees from reuniting with their partners and to recognise alternative forms of evidence of family life in cases where legal marriage or partnership registration is not possible due to discriminatory laws in the country of origin.⁷⁰

Notes

¹ A/HRC/48/7, A/HRC/48/7/Add.1, and A/HRC/48/2.

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:

ADF International	ADF International, 1202 Geneva (Switzerland);
The GEET Commissioner	The Gender Equality and Equal Treatment Commissioner, Tallinn (Estonia);
ECLJ	The European Centre for Law and Justice, Strasbourg (France);
ICAN	International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Geneva (Switzerland);
JPTI	Justice pour Tous Internationale, Geneva (Switzerland).

Joint submissions:

JS1	Joint submission 1 submitted by: Advocates for Human Rights, Minneapolis (United States of America); Women's Support and Information Centre NPO;
JS2	Joint submission 2 submitted by: Eesti Inimõiguste Keskus, Tallinn (Estonia); Estonian Human Rights Centre, the Estonian Union for Child Welfare, the Estonian Centre of Disabled Persons, Oma Tuba NGO, the Estonian LGBT Association, the Estonian Vegan Association, the Estonian National Youth Council, the Estonian Student Unions, Estonian Refugee Council, Women's Support and Information Centre, URALIC Centre and the Estonian Trans Alliance.

National human rights institution:

COJ	Chancellor of Justice (Õiguskantsler), Tallinn (Estonia).
-----	---

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):

CoE	Council of Europe, 67075 Strasbourg Cedex (France);
OSCE-ODIHR	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe/ Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, Warsaw (Poland).

³ CoJ, paras. 1–3. See also JS2, para. 5.

⁴ CoJ, paras. 4–8.

⁵ CoJ, paras. 15–17.

⁶ CoJ, paras. 13–14 and 21.

⁷ CoJ, paras. 9–12. See also JS2 para. 39.

⁸ CoJ, paras. 27–31. See also JS1, paras. 2 and 8–9.

⁹ CoJ, paras. 23–26.

¹⁰ CoJ, paras. 18–22. See also JS2, paras. 9, 11 and 31.

¹¹ The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

¹² JS2, para. 41.

¹³ ICAN, p. 1.

¹⁴ JS2, paras. 4–6.

¹⁵ The GEET Commissioner, pp. 1–3.

¹⁶ JS2, paras. 4–6 and 44.

¹⁷ ADF International, paras. 3 and 5.

¹⁸ ADF International, para. 6.

¹⁹ ADF International, paras. 12–13.

- ²⁰ ADF International, para. 36.
²¹ JS2, paras. 1–3.
²² The GEET Commissioner, pp. 2–3.
²³ The GEET Commissioner, pp. 3–4 and 6.
²⁴ JS2, paras. 15–16.
²⁵ OSCE/ODIHR, para. 11.
²⁶ The GEET Commissioner, p. 9.
²⁷ CoE, para. 6.
²⁸ CoE, para. 8.
²⁹ CoE, para. 10.
³⁰ CoE, para. 11.
³¹ CoE, para. 13.
³² CoE, para. 5.
³³ JS1, para. 32. See also JS2, paras. 24 and 27.
³⁴ JS1, paras. 2–7.
³⁵ JS1, para. 32.
³⁶ JPTI, pp. 1–4.
³⁷ JPTI, pp. 5–6.
³⁸ JPTI, p. 6.
³⁹ OSCE/ODIHR, paras. 4, 6, 7 and 9.
⁴⁰ OSCE/ODIHR, para. 9. See also JS2, para. 10.
⁴¹ JS2, paras. 7 and 11.
⁴² The GEET Commissioner, pp. 6–9. See also JS2, para. 42.
⁴³ JS2, para. 25.
⁴⁴ ECLJ, paras. 5–6 and 9–15.
⁴⁵ JS2, paras. 22–23 and 27.
⁴⁶ ADF International, paras. 33 and 37. See also JS2 para. 41.
⁴⁷ ADF International, para. 21.
⁴⁸ JS1, paras. 12–14.
⁴⁹ JS1, para. 32.
⁵⁰ JS1, paras. 20 and 25.
⁵¹ JS1, para. 32.
⁵² JS1, para. 32.
⁵³ JS2, para. 28.
⁵⁴ JS2, para. 41.
⁵⁵ JS1, para. 30–31.
⁵⁶ JS1, para. 32.
⁵⁷ JS1, paras. 23, 25 and 27.
⁵⁸ JS1, para. 32. See also JS2, para. 29.
⁵⁹ JS1, para. 32.
⁶⁰ JS2, para. 54.
⁶¹ JS2, para. 30.
⁶² JS2, para. 41.
⁶³ JS2, para. 57.
⁶⁴ JPTI, pp. 5–6. See also OSCE/ODIHR, para. 7 and JS2, para. 10.
⁶⁵ The GEET Commissioner, pp. 6–9. See also JS2, para. 42.
⁶⁶ JS2, para. 48.
⁶⁷ JS2, paras. 46 and 48.
⁶⁸ JS2, paras. 45 and 48.
⁶⁹ CoE, para. 7.
⁷⁰ JS2, paras. 19 and 21.
-