United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/40/MDA/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
1 November 2021

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Fortieth session
24 January–4 February 2022

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on the Republic of Moldova*

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. It is a summary of 39 stakeholders' submissions[1] to 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 Office of the People's Advocate of the Republic of Moldova (PAO) recommended that the Government strengthen it in accordance with the Paris Principles and international recommendations.[2]

3. The PAO stated that the rights of LGBT persons were among the least respected.[3]

4. The PAO stated that despite all the efforts, there were reported cases in institutions of forced treatment without a legal mandate, administration of psychotropic drugs without consent, violence, abuse, involuntary confinement, forced labour, and humiliating and degrading treatment.[4]

5. The PAO stated that overcrowding in detention facilities remained acute.[5]

6. The PAO noted the low level of independence, transparency and integrity in the judiciary, the non-transparent process of the selection and appointment of judges, the lack of real political will to carry out judicial reform, the low level of state-guaranteed legal aid services, the lack of effective corruption prevention mechanisms, and the low level of public confidence in the justice system.[6]

* The present document is being issued without formal editing.

7. The PAO stated that the harassment and intimidation by politicians of the most important and representative non-governmental organizations had had a negative impact on the activity of the associative sector.[7]

8. The PAO stated that journalists continued to be subjected to attacks and intimidation, and that the State failed to guarantee an environment that favored the activities of journalists and the freedom and pluralism of the media.[8]

9. The PAO stated that the employment rate of people with disabilities was twice lower than that of the general population.[9]

10. The PAO stated that the State social allowance covered only a third of the subsistence minimum for an elderly person.[10]

11. The PAO stated that disparities between urban and rural areas continued in the access and quality of water and sewerage services, and that it was estimated that almost one million people relied on drinking water from shallow polluted wells.[11]

12. The PAO stated that concerns remained valid about the access to medical, psycho-social and mental health services for all persons in detention, especially for those belonging to vulnerable groups.[12]

13. The PAO stated that most residential institutions suffered from a lack of medical staff, inadequate housing and sanitation units, and a lack of adequate accommodation for people with reduced mobility.[13]

14. The PAO stated that over a third of children enrolled in the education system did not have the opportunity to participate in online education because of the lack of computer technology or at least a telephone with internet connection.[14]

15. The PAO stated that there were no efficient mechanisms for the promotion and monitoring of human rights in the Transnistrian region, and that the assistance for victims of human rights violations in the Transnistrian region were most often provided by non-governmental organisations.[15]

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[16]

16. The Council for Preventing and Eliminating Discrimination and Ensuring Equality (Equality Council) recommended that the Government sign and ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.[17]

17. The Equality Council recommended that the Government sign and ratify the Optional Protocol to the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure, and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.[18]

18. The Council of Europe (CoE) noted that the CoE Commissioner for Human Rights had urged the Government to ensure a speedy ratification of the CoE Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence.[19]

19. The Equality Council recommended that the Government ratify the Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No. 190) of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).[20]

20. The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) recommended that the Government ratify Protocol No. 12 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.[21]

21. The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) recommended that the Government urgently sign and ratify the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.[22]

B. National human rights framework[23]

22. ECRI stated that the Equality Council and the Ombudsman severely lacked the financial and human resources necessary to carry out their mandates effectively.[24]

23. The Equality Council recommended that the Government ensure the appropriate and independent financing of the Council and grant it with the appropriate investigation and sanctioning powers.[25]

24. GENDERDOC-M Information Centre (GDM) recommended that the Government provide the Equality Council with adequate powers to examine acts of discrimination, ensure the execution of its recommendations, and ensure that the Equality Council has the right to refer matters to the Constitutional Court in order to exercise constitutional review in cases of discrimination.[26]

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

1. Cross-cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination[27]

25. The CoE stated that the CoE Commissioner for Human Rights had noted that representatives of certain groups in society, in particular Roma, migrants, LGBTI persons, persons with intellectual and psychosocial disabilities and people living with HIV/AIDS often became the target of hate speech.[28]

26. JS3 stated that as the legal framework remained incomplete, offenses motivated by prejudice could not be properly assessed and sanctioned. Impunity of hate speech determined its continued use, and victims of hate speech and crimes motivated by prejudice remained unprotected.[29]

27. JS2 stated that there were significant indications that the police failed to investigate hate crimes, especially when the complaints had been submitted by ethnic minorities, i.e. Roma.[30]

28. GDM recommended that the Government approve draft law no. 301 "On combating hate crimes", ensure protection against hate crimes against all marginalized groups, including LGBTQI+ persons, and ensure adequate training on combating hate crimes for police officials, prosecutors, judges and lawyers.[31]

29. GDM recommended that the Government develop a comprehensive strategy for preventing and combating hate speech, including the establishment of a hate speech monitoring mechanism, and develop and implement regular awareness raising campaigns on preventing and combating hate speech.[32]

30. The Alliance of Organizations for Persons with Disabilities (AOPD) stated that persons with disabilities and their families remained the most vulnerable group in the country, facing problems of poverty, access to public services; a low number of social services for the support and living in the community; access to education services at all levels and employment; access to rehabilitation and sanatorium services; and access to public transport and information.[33]

31. The CoE stated that the CoE Commissioner for Human Rights had noted that substandard living conditions of Roma families and limited access to education, employment and healthcare, and persisting societal prejudices had remained major obstacles hampering the successful inclusion of Roma in society.[34]

32. ECRI noted that the decentralisation reform in the country had negatively affected the system of Roma community mediators.[35]

33. GDM stated that LGBT persons remained one of the most marginalized and discriminated groups within society, and that they remained among those most affected by hate speech, especially in election campaigns.[36]

34. The Equality Council recommended that the Government ensure the integration of the principles of diversity, equality and non-discrimination in the educational process and in the elaboration of teaching materials.[37]

Development, the environment, and business and human rights[38]

35. Just Atonement Inc. (JAI) stated that corruption was present at all government levels, and that anti-corruption laws were inadequately enforced.[39]

36. JS11 recommended that the Government consider establishing a judicial protection mechanism for whistle-blowers, with a view to a more prompt and effective response to actions of retaliation.[40]

Human rights and counter-terrorism

37. The European Commission for Democracy through Law (Venice Commission) recommended that limitations on media reporting during a terrorist crisis should be of short duration, and concern only certain specific types of information, in line with the principle of proportionality.[41]

2. Civil and political rights

Right to life, liberty and security of person[42]

38. JS9 stated that most acts of torture and ill-treatment were not investigated or prosecuted and remained unpunished, including due to a lack of an effective and independent investigation mechanism, a lack of appropriate and impartial prosecution and trial proceedings, insufficient legal safeguards to protect victims and witnesses, and limited access to independent forensic documentation of physical and psychological trauma.[43]

39. JS9 recommended that the Government ensure that complaints regarding acts of torture and ill-treatment that are not prima facie unfounded receive a prompt, impartial, and effective investigation in accordance with the Istanbul Protocol.[44]

40. JS9 recommended that the Government secure access to medical and psychosocial rehabilitation services for torture victims. It also recommended that the Government amend national legislation, including Law no. 137, to include explicit provisions on the right of victims of torture and ill treatment to redress, including fair and adequate compensation and the means for as full a rehabilitation as possible.[45]

41. JS10 stated that overcrowding of prison facilities raised serious concerns. It recommended that the Government adopt measures of alternatives to detention and ensure their application by national courts at a larger scale.[46]

42. JS9 recommended that the Government take concrete steps to improve conditions in prisons and detention facilities in line with the relevant international standards.[47]

43. The European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) called upon the Government to take resolute action, without further delay, to prevent inter-prisoner violence and intimidation throughout the prison system.[48]

44. CPT recommended that the Government entirely abolish disciplinary solitary confinement for juveniles.[49]

45. CPT recommended that the Government put in place a clear and comprehensive legal framework governing the involuntary placement and stay of residents in social care homes.[50]

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law[51]

46. JS1 stated that the judiciary was perceived by society as politically dependent, severely affected by corruption and acting mainly in corporate interests.[52]

47. JS4 stated that the Government continued to struggle to establish a truly independent judiciary, and that undue political influence severely compromised the independence of the

justice sector. Many of those in power regularly manipulated judicial systems to protect their political allies and punish opponents.[53]

48. JAI stated that prosecutions could be politically-motivated, allegations of fabricated evidence were not uncommon, and judicial appointment processes lacked transparency and were susceptible to improper influences.[54]

49. The International Commission of Jurists (ICJ) reported that local stakeholders had stated that the Superior Council of Magistracy had become an instrument of pressure on individual judges and a threat to their independence, rather than playing an effective role of defending the independence of the judiciary, institutionally and in respect of individual judges.[55]

50. ICJ recommended that the Government take measures of reform in respect of the administration of justice with a view to ending the undue interference of the executive with the judiciary, including in the selection, appointment, promotion, transfer, secondment or any other aspect of the management of the career of judges.[56]

51. JS11 recommended that the Government implement a mechanism to ensure a genuine check of assets and integrity of all judges and prosecutors.[57]

52. JS4 recommended that the Government adopt constitutional changes eliminating the five-year probationary term for judges.[58]

53. JS4 recommended that the Government encourage the practice of whistleblowing in all justice sector bodies and ensure that whistle-blowers receive full protection under the law.[59]

54. The World Jewish Restitution Organization (WJRO) called upon the Government to adopt comprehensive legislation to provide restitution of, or compensation for, property that was nationalized during the communist era.[60]

Fundamental freedoms[61]

55. JS7 stated that the level of press freedom had declined since the previous universal periodic review, due to pressure on media workers and media outlets, media concentration and restricted access to information.[62]

56. Freedom House (FH) stated that the Government had not made significant efforts to improve access to information and ensure media diversity.[63]

57. JS7 stated that a significant part of the media institutions remained under the direct or indirect ownership of politicians, while their editorial policy depended on the political and business interests of the owners.[64]

58. FH stated that public officials consistently obstructed access to public interest information with impunity, or provided privileged access to preferred media outlets.[65]

59. FH stated that independent journalists experienced intense legal pressure and other forms of intimidation and harassment as a result of their work. Journalists who reported on corruption and integrity issues were regularly subjected to legal pressure in the form of defamation lawsuits put forward by the subjects of their investigations.[66]

60. FH recommended that the Government ensure that journalists can do their work without intimidation or harassment and that any violation of journalists' rights is fully investigated.[67]

61. JS19 stated that during the past five years, civil society organisations had been the target of attacks and defamation campaigns from politicians, affiliated mass media and online trolls, through legislative initiatives limiting the civic space, attacks during electoral campaigns, and secret surveillance.[68]

62. JS6 stated that intimidation and violation of women's rights activists and defenders had worsened in recent years.[69]

63. JS19 recommended that the Government protect human rights defenders, including from attacks by third parties, in particular those defenders working for the protection of children victims of violence and victims of domestic violence.[70]

64. The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE/ODIHR) stated that in its Opinion on the Law on Countering Extremist Activity it had recommended that the Government repeal or substantially revise broad and imprecise definitions, such as "extremism", "extremist activity", "extremist organizations" or "extremist materials". The vague definitions could hamper the dissemination of information to the public.[71]

Prohibition of all forms of slavery[72]

65. The European Centre for Law and Justice (ECLJ) recommended that the Government strengthen its efforts to combat human trafficking, provide resources and training for border protection officials to ensure the quick identification of trafficked individuals, and provide assistance to victims.[73]

66. The Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (GRETA) urged the Government to increase the number of labour inspectors and to enable them to play a frontline role in the prevention and identification of trafficking for the purpose of labour exploitation.[74]

67. GRETA urged the Government to strengthen efforts to improve the prevention of child trafficking and the identification of, and assistance to, child victims, by strengthening the capacity and resources of child protection professionals, and ensuring a protective environment for children in street situations and unaccompanied or separated asylum-seeking children.[75]

Right to privacy

68. JS10 recommended that the Government strengthen the national legal framework to provide sufficient guarantees against arbitrary phone tapping and introduce an adequate mechanism to monitor the compliance with wiretapping legislation.[76]

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work[77]

69. The European Committee of Social Rights (ECSR) stated that the labour inspection system was inefficient.[78]

70. The ECSR noted that self-employed workers were not covered by occupational health and safety legislation.[79]

71. The Equality Council stated that the most pressing issues affecting women included the gender pay gap, sexist advertising; refusals to employ persons with family obligations, harassment at work, and inefficiency of the mechanism sanctioning sexual harassment.[80]

72. JS6 recommended that the Government introduce the definitions of equal work and work of equal value into the national legal framework.[81]

73. AOPD recommended that the Government implement information campaigns for employers and people with disabilities for the use of measures to stimulate employment and develop the system of career guidance services for people with disabilities.[82]

74. JS20 stated that discrimination on the basis of age in the labour market was common, affecting not only the youngest, newcomers to the labour market, but also the oldest, from the age of 50 and even earlier.[83]

75. The ECSR stated that it had not been established that protection against acts of anti-union discrimination and interference was effectively ensured.[84]

Right to social security

76. The ECSR stated that the minimum unemployment benefit, the minimum old-age pension and the minimum sickness benefit were inadequate.[85]

77. The ECSR stated that efforts made to progressively raise the system of social security to a higher level were inadequate.[86]

78. The Equality Council recommended that the Government amend Law no. 133/2008 on social assistance, so as to provide a formula for calculating the minimum guaranteed monthly income per family, depending on the level of disability and work capacity of the applicant's family members.[87]

79. The CoE stated that the CoE Commissioner for Human Rights had recommended that the Government improve access to social protection entitlements to guarantee the right of all children to an adequate standard of living.[88]

Right to an adequate standard of living[89]

80. JS15 stated that most Roma families lived in poverty without the basic services they needed.[90]

81. The ECSR stated that it had not been established that Roma families were adequately protected with respect to housing.[91]

82. JS20 stated that among the groups of older persons at high risk of poverty and high risk of social exclusion were older women, older persons in rural and remote areas, older persons who had worked in the agricultural sector all their life, and older persons with disabilities.[92]

83. JS20 recommended that the Government ensure income security for the ageing population through decent pensions and review the pension reforms so as to better target the poverty levels in the country.[93]

84. JS21 stated that pre-schools charged fees for feeding children, which was often a significant burden for single mothers.[94]

Right to health[95]

85. JS15 stated that access to quality health services was disproportionate between urban and rural areas.[96]

86. JS15 stated that discrimination in the field of health was extremely high among socially vulnerable and Roma young persons.[97]

87. JS15 stated that young persons with disabilities were limited in access to health services, due to inaccessible public transport, roads and buildings, and limited access to adapted information, in Braille, sign language, or easy to read information.[98]

88. JS6 stated that women continued to face discrimination and difficulties in accessing health information and healthcare, in particular women in rural areas, women with special needs, displaced women and women from conflict areas, and women from ethnic minorities.[99]

89. JS20 stated that age discrimination still persisted in the healthcare system and flagged issues such as the insufficiency of geriatricians and geriatric beds, the lack of systematic training of specialists on communication and treatment of older patients, the need to bear the full cost of services and medicines not covered by the health insurance policy, and informal payments.[100]

90. The CoE stated that the CoE Commissioner for Human Rights had recommended that the Government improve the availability and accessibility of health services, including in rural areas, and address the barriers which were preventing the most vulnerable and poor members of society from accessing necessary medical services.[101]

91. JS21 recommended that the Government radically change the public policies with regard to public healthcare information delivery, and ensure that the information was

available in written, oral and electronic form, including in the Bulgarian language for the Taraclia district.[102]

92. The CoE stated that the CoE Commissioner for Human Rights had called for a more ambitious reform of mental health services, with the aim of progressively eliminating recourse to coercive practices in psychiatry.[103]

93. JS6 stated that levels of awareness on healthy lifestyles, reproductive health and family planning among teenagers and young women, especially those living in rural and remote areas, was very low, and adolescent pregnancy rates were on the rise as a result.[104]

94. JS14 stated that female sex workers and women who used drugs attested to widespread inadequacies in sexual and reproductive health coverage and treatment. When accessing such services, they often encountered stigma and discrimination, breaches of confidentiality, and inequitable treatment.[105]

95. JS9 stated that the healthcare in penitentiaries remained of a low quality because of a lack of qualified medical personnel, a lack of medicines, inadequate medical services, non-compliance with medical confidentiality, and a lack of psychological services.[106]

96. JS6 recommended that the Government ensure access to health services and basic hygienic needs of women in detention facilities.[107]

97. JS5 recommended that the Government provide adequate healthcare and harm reduction programs for drug users in prisons to fulfil their right to health and prevent ill-treatment.[108]

Right to education[109]

98. JS15 stated that the most significant discriminatory issues in the education sector were a lack of transport for children living away from school, random fees imposed by school principals for enrolling students, but also other supplementary money for teachers and different activities, inadequate endowment of schools with equipment for children with disabilities, hostile treatment of children belonging to other ethnic groups (especially Roma), and humiliating treatment of students who were part of sexual minorities. Students from different socially vulnerable groups were ignored and marginalized or stigmatized when it came to organizing and participating in school or extracurricular festivities.[110]

99. JS15 stated that many schools did not have a well-equipped indoor area with toilets and that toilets were usually situated at a distance from the school.[111]

100. The Centre for Medical and Social Rehabilitation for People with Low Vision (LOW VISION) stated that there was limited access to support services for students with disabilities at all levels of education.[112]

101. LOW VISION stated that the educational inclusion of children with visual impairments was limited due to limited access to assistive technologies.[113]

102. JS2 recommended that the Government ensure inclusive education for all children with disabilities, including those in temporary placement centers for persons with disabilities.[114]

103. JS15 recommended that the Government reduce inequalities and strengthen efforts to include children with special educational needs in the education system, as well as equip schools with buses adapted to the needs of children with disabilities.[115]

104. The Equality Council recommended that the Government promote sign language in the educational process.[116]

105. AOPD recommended that the Government continuously monitor the process of educational inclusion of children with special educational needs.[117]

106. JS2 stated that the education system was not adapted to the cultural needs of ethnic minorities and did not have sufficient capital resources to increase the number of Roma children in the education system.[118]

107. The ECSR stated that the measures taken to ensure that Roma children were enrolled in mainstream education were insufficient.[119]

108. JS16 stated that regarding distance learning, it was estimated that in Roma communities only 11% had computers and 10% had access to the internet, contributing to the drop-out of Roma children from schools. Children left without parental care, including orphans, children from poor families, and children with disabilities faced similar obstacles to access distance learning.[120]

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women[121]

109. JAI stated that women faced persistent societal issues such as employment discrimination, and discrimination in housing, education, and public service. Wider social reform and education was needed to combat attitudes that encourage discrimination and violence against women.[122]

110. JS12 stated that domestic violence was a widespread phenomenon in Moldova and that it often went unpunished. It stated that there was a lack of prompt action by the police when they were notified in cases of domestic and sexual violence, and that sometimes the police had a biased attitude towards perpetrators. It stated that there was no referral system for the rehabilitation of victims of gender-based violence.[123]

111. JS6 stated that almost all specialized services for victims of gender-based violence were provided by non-governmental organisations.[124]

112. JS14 stated that there were no specially targeted centres for female sex workers/women drug users who were victims of domestic violence or who were in other challenging situations.[125]

113. JS12 recommended that the Government ensure the effective investigation of all complaints of domestic and sexual violence, prosecution of perpetrators and the delivery of sentences proportionate to the seriousness of the violence committed.[126]

114. The CoE stated that the CoE Commissioner for Human Rights had urged the Government to expand the network of shelters and support services for victims of domestic violence and improve their access to justice.[127]

115. JS2 recommended that the Government ensure adequate initial and continuing training of law enforcement agencies on the management of domestic violence.[128]

116. JS2 stated that women continued to be under-represented in leadership positions.[129]

Children[130]

117. JS16 stated that the economy was very much dependent on external migration, which adversely affected both children migrating with their parents and children left behind. Children faced a huge risk of neglect and homelessness, falling into exploitation and sexual abuse, dropping out of school, and coming into conflict with the law.[131]

118. The CoE stated that the CoE Commissioner for Human Rights had recommended that the Government further strengthen the national framework for eliminating violence against children, including by encouraging a shift in attitudes in relation to corporal punishment.[132]

119. JS18 stated that child human rights defenders had informed it that adults in their immediate environment, including school staff, might resort to violence or punish children and young people, especially when they raised issues related to human rights and called authorities to account.[133]

120. The CoE stated that the CoE Commissioner for Human Rights had encouraged the Government to move further away from practices of institutionalising children, including on the basis of poverty or disability, to expand alternative care models in family-type settings, and allocate more resources and support to guardians and foster care providers.[134]

121. The CoE stated that the CoE Commissioner for Human Rights had recommended that the Government promote child-friendly justice aiming at rehabilitation and integration.[135]

122. JS16 recommended that the Government place children in special children's penitentiaries only as a last resort, improve conditions in penitentiaries, ensure maximum openness of these institutions to external monitoring, and create a procedure for regular visits to those places by relatives and representatives of independent non-governmental organisations.[136]

123. The ECSR stated that the legislation on the prohibition of employment under the age of 15 was not effectively enforced.[137]

124. JS8 stated that youth with fewer opportunities, such as youth with disabilities and Roma, were regularly not involved in youth activities and programmes, due to stereotypes, lack of resources to adapt events to the individual needs of youth with hearing, visual or mental disabilities, and the lack of accessible infrastructure for those with limited mobility.[138]

125. JS18 recommended that the Government ensure that all children in school, as part of compulsory national curricula, and out of school, receive human rights education.[139]

Persons with disabilities[140]

126. JS2 recommended that the Government eliminate the practice of illegal deprivation of liberty of persons with mental or intellectual disabilities, in the absence of consent and the absence of a court order on involuntary placement.[141]

127. LOW VISION stated that the process of deinstitutionalization was slow due to the underdevelopment of alternative community services. Persons placed in institutions had limited opportunities to develop their independent living skills, and faced a lack of educational and employment opportunities, and limited access to quality medical services.[142]

128. AOPD recommended that the Government stimulate the process of deinstitutionalization of persons with mental disabilities and develop alternative community services.[143]

129. The Equality Council stated that persons with disabilities faced a lack of access ramps in public buildings and educational institutions, including the inaccessibility of public toilets, as well as attitudinal barriers.[144]

130. AOPD stated that persons with disabilities faced problems accessing medical services, given the lack of adapted transport and conditions of accessibility of medical centers, which operated inside old buildings.[145]

131. AOPD stated that women with disabilities faced problems accessing reproductive health services.[146]

132. LOW VISION stated that mainstream services at community level, including educational, health and legal institutions, had no capacities to address the needs of persons with sensory disabilities.[147]

133. JS8 recommended that the Government ensure that all the information related to participation processes provided by State institutions was adapted to the needs of people with disabilities.[148]

Minorities[149]

134. JS2 recommended that the Government develop and implement strategies to recruit ethnic minorities into law enforcement bodies.[150]

135. JS2 recommended that the Government expand the network of community mediators and strengthen their capacities through adequate training and remuneration.[151]

136. The Equality Council recommended that the Government guarantee that persons belonging to national and linguistic minorities could effectively exercise their right to receive a reply in the language in which they had addressed public authorities.[152]

137. JS15 stated that the curriculum of Romanian language in minority schools was still ineffective, affecting the integration of minorities in universities and the labor market.[153]

Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers[154]

138. JS16 recommended that the Government stop immigration detention of children and separation from both parents, and elaborate adequate alternatives to detention.[155]

Stateless persons

139. JS17 recommended that the Government amend legislation to reinstate the full safeguard to ensure that all children born on the territory who would otherwise be stateless acquire Moldovan nationality automatically at birth, regardless of the residence status of their parents.[156]

140. JS17 recommended that the Government ensure that policies and practices relating to birth registration take into account UNHCR guidelines and good practices, to remove all practical barriers to birth registration with a particular focus on minority groups including Roma communities, so that all children born in Moldova are registered immediately regardless of their parents' documentation status.[157]

5. Specific regions or territories[158]

141. JS13 stated that it had denounced numerous human rights violations in the Transnistria region, including of the right to freedom of movement, the right to citizenship, the right to an adequate standard of living, the right to property, the right to health and the right to education. It had shed light on numerous cases of arbitrary detention, acts of torture and ill-treatment by the police as well as the critical detention conditions where overcrowding was the norm and detainees did not have access to health care services. It also stated that the de facto authorities restricted freedom of expression, association, the press and assembly, especially against persons whose opinions differed from the views of the de facto authorities.[159]

142. JS12 stated that in the Transnistria region there was a lack of services for victims of domestic violence and a lack of programs focused on perpetrators as a preventive measure. Victims received support only from non-governmental organizations.[160]

143. The European Association of Jehovah's Witnesses (EAJW) stated that the de facto authorities in the Transnistria region refused to extend legal status to congregations of Jehovah's Witnesses, and had restricted the rights of Jehovah's Witnesses who were conscientious objectors.[161]

144. JS22 recommended that the Government ensure access to quality journalism training for all its citizens, including those from the Transnistria region.[162]

145. JS13 encouraged the Government to take concrete steps to facilitate unconditional access of national and international human rights monitoring institutions to the Transnistrian region.[163]

Notes

[1] 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:

AOPD	The Alliance of Organizations for Persons with Disabilities, Chișinău (Republic of Moldova);
LOW VISION	The Centre for Medical and Social Rehabilitation for People with Low Vision, Chișinău (Republic of Moldova);
EAJW	European Association of Jehovah's Witnesses, Kraainem (Belgium);
ECLJ	European Centre for Law and Justice, Strasbourg (France);

FH	Freedom House, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
GDM	GENDERDOC-M Information Centre, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova);
ICAN	International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Geneva (Switzerland);
ICJ	International Commission of Jurists, Geneva (Switzerland);
JAI	Just Atonement Inc., New York (United States of America);
WJRO	World Jewish Restitution Organization, Jerusalem (Israel).

Joint submissions:

JS1	**Joint submission 1 submitted by**: Institute for European Policies and Reforms, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Legal Resources Centre from Moldova, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova);
JS2	**Joint submission 2 submitted by**: Coalition for Inclusion and Non-Discrimination, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova) on behalf of : Promo-LEX Association; Legal Resources Centre from Moldova; Center “Partnership for Development”; Informational Center "GENDERDOC-M"; Institute for Human Rights; Positive Initiative; Center for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities; Alliance of Organisations for People with Disabilities; National Youth Council of Moldova; Gender-Center; Union of Disability Organizations of the Republic of Moldova; Disability Rehabilitation Association from Moldova; Keystone Moldova;
JS3	**Joint submission 3 submitted by**: Promo-LEX Association, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); International Federation for Human Rights, Paris (France);
JS4	**Joint submission 4 submitted by**: Freedom House, Washington D.C. (United States of America); Public Association “Lawyers for Human Rights”, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova);
JS5	**Joint submission 5 submitted by**: Union for HIV prevention and Harm Reduction, Balti (Republic of Moldova); Promo-LEX Association, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Eurasian Harm Reduction Association, Vilnius (Lithuania);
JS6	**Joint submission 6 submitted by**: Platform for Gender Equality, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova) on behalf of : Association Against Violence in the Family “Casa Marioarei”; Association Modern Woman; Mildava; Moldsolidaritate; Forum of Women's Organizations of the Republic of Moldova; Gender-Center; Crime Prevention Foundation; Promo-Lex; Woman for the Future; Honor and Rights of the Contemporary Woman; Association of Women Entrepreneurs of Moldova; Center for Partnership for Development; Center for the Rights of People with Disabilities; Rehabilitation Center for Torture Victims “Memoria”; Resource Center for Human Rights; WPC 50/50; Group of Feminist Initiatives in Moldova; Woman for the Contemporary Society; AFINA; Human Rights Association LEX XXI; Pro-Cimişlia; Interaction; Keystone Moldova; Amnesty International Moldova; East European Foundation;
JS7	**Joint submission 7 submitted by**: Justice for Journalists Foundation, London (United Kingdom); Association of Independent Press, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova);
JS8	**Joint submission 8 submitted by**: National Youth Council of Moldova, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); European Youth Forum, Brussels (Belgium); Regional Youth Council from Floreşti, Floreşti (Republic of Moldova); Municipal Youth Council from Chişinău, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova);
JS9	**Joint submission 9 submitted by**: Rehabilitation Centre for Torture Victims “Memoria”, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Promo-LEX Association, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova);

	Legal Resources Centre from Moldova, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); World Organisation against Torture, Brussels (Belgium); European Prison Litigation Network, Paris (France);
JS10	**Joint submission 10 submitted by**: Legal Resources Centre from Moldova, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Promo-LEX Association, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova);
JS11	**Joint submission 11 submitted by**: Center for the Analysis and Prevention of Corruption, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Legal Resources Centre from Moldova, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Institute for European Policies and Reforms, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova);
JS12	**Joint submission 12 submitted by**: Women's Law Center, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Promo-LEX Association, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); International Center for Women's Rights Protection and Promotion "La Strada", Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Rehabilitation Center for Torture Victims “Memoria”, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Advocates for Human Rights, Minneapolis (United States of America);
JS13	**Joint submission 13 submitted by:**); International Federation for Human Rights, Paris (France); Promo-LEX Association, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova);
JS14	**Joint submission 14 submitted by**: Positive initiative, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Promo-LEX Association, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Union for HIV Prevention and Harm Reduction, Balti (Republic of Moldova); AO PULS Comunitar, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova);
JS15	**Joint submission 15 submitted by**: AEGEE-Chişinău, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); National Youth Council of Moldova, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); European Youth Forum, Brussels (Belgium); INVENTO, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); District Council of Youth from Floresti, Floresti (Republic of Moldova); GENDERDOC-M Information Centre, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Municipal Youth Council from Chisinău, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Association for Motivation and Community Development, Sîngera (Republic of Moldova); Youth Platform for Interethnic Solidarity, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova);
JS16	**Joint submission 16 submitted by**: Association for Child and Family Empowerment, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Anti-Discrimination Center “Memorial”, Brussels (Belgium);
JS17	**Joint submission 17 submitted by**: Institute on Statelessness and Inclusion, Eindhoven (the Netherlands); Law Center of Advocates, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); European Network on Statelessness, London (United Kingdom);
JS18	**Joint submission 18 submitted by**: Child Rights Information Centre, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Alliance of Active NGOs in the field of Child and Family Social Protection; Amnesty International Moldova, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Ave Copiii, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); National Centre for Child Abuse Prevention, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Promo-LEX, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova);
JS19	**Joint submission 19 submitted by**: CONTACT Centre, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Legal Resources Centre from Moldova, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); EXPERT-GRUP, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova); Association for Participatory Democracy “ADEPT“, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova);
JS20	**Joint submission 20 submitted by**: HelpAge International Moldova, Chişinău (Republic of Moldova) on behalf of the

	Platform on Active Ageing (Prudens; "Pro Community" Bahrinesti; Centre "RCTV Memory"; IDIS Viitorul (Future); Gender-Centre; Caritas Moldova; Inspiration Comrat; People for People; Stimulus Ocnita; PRO Democracy; Neo Humanist; Social Partnership; Concordia; DVV International Moldova; COPE Dialogue; Avante; "Future LRG"; HelpAge International Moldova);
JS21	**Joint submission 21 submitted by**: Human Rights Information Center, Chișinău (Republic of Moldova); TarSMI, Taraclia, (Republic of Moldova); Taraclia Single Mothers Group, Taraclia, (Republic of Moldova);
JS22	**Joint submission 22 submitted by**: HomoDiversus, Chișinău (Republic of Moldova); Centrul Media, Tiraspol (Republic of Moldova).
National human rights institutions:	
PAO	The Office of the People's Advocate of the Republic of Moldova, Chișinău (Republic of Moldova);*
Equality Council	The Council for Preventing and Eliminating Discrimination and Ensuring Equality, Chișinău (Republic of Moldova).
Regional intergovernmental organization(s):	
CoE	The Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France); Attachments: **CPT -** European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, Report to the Government of the Republic of Moldova on the visit to the Republic of Moldova carried out from 28 January to 7 February 2020 , CPT/Inf (2020) 27 (September 2020), Executive Summary; **ECRI** - European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, Report on the Republic of Moldova (fifth monitoring cycle), CRI(2018)34; **ECSR** – European Committee of Social Rights, Factsheet – The Republic of Moldova (March 2021); **GRETA -** Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, Evaluation Report on the Republic of Moldova (third evaluation round), Access to justice and effective remedies for victims of trafficking in human beings, GRETA(2020)11; **Venice Commission -** European Commission for Democracy through Law, Opinion on the Law on Preventing and Combating Terrorism, Opinion No. 936 / 2018, CDL-AD(2018)024;
OSCE-ODIHR	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe/Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, Warsaw (Poland).

[2] PAO submission to the universal periodic review of the Republic of Moldova, para. 6.
[3] Ibid., para. 43
[4] Ibid., para. 37.
[5] Ibid., para. 20.
[6] Ibid. para. 8.
[7] Ibid., para. 13.
[8] Ibid., para. 29.
[9] Ibid., para. 39.
[10] Ibid., para. 33.
[11] Ibid., para. 35.
[12] Ibid., para. 23.
[13] Ibid., para. 38.
[14] Ibid., para. 48.
[15] Ibid., para. 9.
[16] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, paras. 121.1-121.6, 121.8-121.13, 121.43, 122.1-122.16 and 123.1.
[17] Equality Council, paras. 1, 3 and 4. See also JS16, p. 4.

[18] Ibid.
[19] CoE, p. 2. See also JS2, p. 10; JS6, para. 4; JS12, p. 10.
[20] Equality Council, para. 19.
[21] ECRI, p. 10. See also Equality Council, paras. 1 and 4; JS2, p. 5.
[22] ICAN, p. 2.
[23] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, paras. 121.7, 121.14, 121.17-121.27, 121.30-121.39, 121.42 and 122.23.
[24] ECRI, p. 10.
[25] Equality Council, paras. 8 and 10.
[26] GDM, paras. 41, 45 and 47. See also JS2, p. 5.
[27] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, paras. 121.45, 121.60-121.62, 121.68-121.73, 121.153, 122.17-122.18, 122.20-122.22, 122.24-122.25 and 123.2.
[28] CoE, p. 3. See also JS3, para. 5.
[29] JS3, para. 31.
[30] JS2, para. 13.
[31] GDM, para. 24-25 and 28. See also JS3, p. 10; Equality Council, para. 12; JS2, p. 2. JS6, para. 36; JS15, p. 9.
[32] GDM, paras. 12-13. See also JS3, pp. 10-11. JS6, para. 37 ; JS15, p. 9.
[33] AOPD, paras. 1.2-1.3.
[34] CoE, p. 3.
[35] ECRI, p. 10.
[36] GDM, paras. 1 and 5.
[37] Equality Council, para. 43.
[38] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, para. 121.129.
[39] JAI, para. 38.
[40] JS11, p. 8.
[41] Venice Commission, para. 87.
[42] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, paras. 121.28-121.29, 121.74-121.82, 121.84 and 122.26.
[43] JS9, p. 3.
[44] Ibid.
[45] JS9, p. 4.
[46] JS10, pp. 6-7.
[47] JS9, p. 3.
[48] CPT, p. 2. See also JS9, p. 3.
[49] CPT, p. 4.
[50] Ibid., p. 5.
[51] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, paras. 121.63, 121.118-121.127 and 123.3.
[52] JS1, p. 2.
[53] JS4, para. 2.1.
[54] JAI, para. 35.
[55] ICJ, para. 6.
[56] ICJ, para. 20 (i). See also JS4, paras. 6.4-6.5.
[57] JS11, p. 5.
[58] JS4, para. 6.5.
[59] Ibid., para. 6.6.
[60] WJRO, paras. 21-22.
[61] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, paras. 121.64, 121.130-121.144, 121.166 and 122.28.
[62] JS7, para. 3.1.
[63] FH, para. 2.1.
[64] JS7, para. 3.5.
[65] FH, para. 2.1.
[66] Ibid., paras. 2.1 and 5.2.
[67] FH, para. 8.4. See also JS7, para. 4.1 and 4.3.
[68] JS19, paras. 10-14.
[69] JS6, para. 26.
[70] JS19, p. 10.
[71] OSCE/ODIHR, para. 6.
[72] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, paras. 121.108-121.116 and 121.128.
[73] ECLJ, paras. 18-19.
[74] GRETA, p. 4.

[75] Ibid.
[76] JS10, p. 4.
[77] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, para. 121.147.
[78] ECSR, p. 3.
[79] Ibid.
[80] Equality Council, para. 14.
[81] JS6, para. 53.
[82] AOPD, paras. 4.6.1 and 4.6.3.
[83] JS20, para. 17.
[84] ECSR, p. 5.
[85] Ibid., p. 4.
[86] Ibid.
[87] Equality Council, para. 30.
[88] CoE, p. 3.
[89] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, paras. 121.148-121.150 and 121.152.
[90] JS15, para. 58.
[91] ECSR, p. 6.
[92] JS20, para. 14.
[93] Ibid., paras. 5 and 10.
[94] JS21, p. 4.
[95] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, paras. 121.83, 122.19 and 122.29.
[96] JS15, para. 26.
[97] Ibid., para. 34.
[98] Ibid., para. 34.
[99] JS6, para. 71.
[100] JS20, paras. 25-26.
[101] CoE, p. 3.
[102] JS21, p. 5.
[103] CoE, p. 2.
[104] JS6, para. 71.
[105] JS14, paras. 34 and 37.
[106] JS9, p. 3.
[107] JS6, para. 77.
[108] JS5, p. 16.
[109] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, para. 121.151.
[110] JS15, para. 14.
[111] Ibid., para. 15.
[112] LOW VISION, para. 9.
[113] Ibid., para. 16.
[114] JS2, p. 8.
[115] JS15, p. 3.
[116] Equality Council, para. 27.
[117] AOPD, paras. 2.6.3 and 2.6.8.
[118] JS2, para. 14.
[119] ECSR, p. 6.
[120] JS16, paras. 8-9.
[121] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, paras. 121.16, 121.40, 121.46-121.59, 121.85-121.102 and 121.145-121.146.
[122] JAI, paras. 43 and 48.
[123] JS12, pp. 3, 7 and 8.
[124] JS6, para. 70.
[125] JS14, para. 30.
[126] JS12, p. 9.
[127] CoE, p. 2. See also JS2, p. 10.
[128] JS2, p. 10.
[129] JS2, para. 33. See also JS6, para. 3.
[130] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, paras. 121.41, 121.103-121.107 and 122.27.
[131] JS16, para. 6.
[132] CoE, p. 3.
[133] JS18, para. 6.
[134] CoE, p. 3.
[135] Ibid.

[136] JS16, p. 5.
[137] ECSR, p. 5.
[138] JS8, para. 23.
[139] JS18, para. 29.
[140] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, paras. 121.154-121.162 and 122.30.
[141] JS2, p. 8.
[142] LOW VISION, para. 5.
[143] AOPD, para. 5.3.4.
[144] Equality Council, para. 20. See also JS2, para. 17.
[145] AOPD, para. 3.3.
[146] Ibid., para. 3.4.
[147] LOW VISION, para. 12.
[148] JS8, p. 6.
[149] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, paras. 121.15, 121.44, 121.65-121.67, 121.163-121.165 and 121.167-121.172.
[150] JS2, p. 6.
[151] Ibid., p. 7.
[152] Equality Council, para. 52.
[153] JS15, para. 62.
[154] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, para. 122.31.
[155] JS16, p. 4.
[156] JS17, para. 28.
[157] Ibid.
[158] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/34/12, paras. 121.173-121.175.
[159] JS13, para. 4.
[160] JS12, p. 10.
[161] EAJW, paras. 3 and 5.
[162] JS22, para. 43.
[163] JS13, p. 11.