

Flygtningenævnets baggrundsmateriale

Bilagsnr.:	193
Land:	Eritrea
Kilde:	United Nations Human Rights Council
Titel:	Summary prepared by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 - Eritrea
Udgivet:	4. november 2013
Optaget på baggrundsmaterialet:	21. oktober 2014



General Assembly

Distr.: General
4 November 2013

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review

Eighteenth session

Geneva, 27 January–7 February 2014

Summary prepared by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21

Eritrea*

The present report is a summary of 17 stakeholders' submissions¹ to the universal periodic review. It follows the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council in its decision 17/119. It does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), nor any judgement or determination in relation to specific claims. The information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes and, to the extent possible, the original texts have not been altered. As provided for in Resolution 16/21 of the Human Rights Council, where appropriate, a separate section is provided for contributions by the national human rights institution of the State under review that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles. The full texts of all submissions received are available on the OHCHR website. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the periodicity of the review and developments during that period.

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

I. Information provided by stakeholders

A. Background and framework

1. Scope of international obligations

1. Amnesty International (AI) stated that although the Government of Eritrea accepted recommendations made at its universal periodic review on 30 November 2009 (UPR in 2009)² to ratify the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT), this Convention has not been ratified.³ Christian Solidarity Worldwide (CSW) and Human Rights Concern Eritrea (HRCE) recommended the ratification of CAT.⁴

2. CSW and HRCE recommended the ratification of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearances.⁵

3. CSW recommended the ratification of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.⁶

2. Constitutional and legislative framework

4. Joint Submission 2 stated that the Constitution of Eritrea, which was ratified in 1997, remained unimplemented.⁷ According to ARTICLE 19 (Article 19), implementation of the Constitution remained uncertain due to a continuing state of emergency.⁸ It recommended an end to this state of emergency and the promulgation of the Constitution.⁹ CSW, HRCE and Jubilee Campaign (JC) recommended that the Government of Eritrea implement the Constitution.¹⁰

5. Article 19 stated that although the Government of Eritrea expressed its commitment to work on developing its press laws and regulations consistent with the values, traditions, cultural practices and national interest at the UPR in 2009, no media law reform had taken place. The Press Proclamation No. 90/1996 continued to regulate professional journalism and the operation of the mass media. Numerous provisions of the Proclamation contravened internationally accepted standards on freedom of expression.¹¹ Article 19 recommended repealing this Promulgation; as well as those provisions in the Criminal Code that related to criminal defamation, calumny and insulting behaviour or outrage.¹²

3. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures

6. CSW stated that the Government of Eritrea allocated 25 per cent of its budget for military purposes with over 300 000 personnel in the military. Despite not having engaged in open warfare since 2000, the Government of Eritrea refused to demobilize the army. CSW recommended demobilization of those who have served excessive tours of duty.¹³

7. HRCE stated that the Government of Eritrea should end policies that target or punish family members of those who evade national service or seek to flee Eritrea.¹⁴

B. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

8. Joint Submission 3 (JS 3) stated that following the UPR in 2009 there has been no improvement in the human rights situation in Eritrea.¹⁵ AI stated that there has been no progress in nearly all of the issues highlighted during the UPR in 2009. The Government of Eritrea has failed to implement any of the major recommendations that were made. In this regard, no steps were taken to hold free and fair elections, to implement the 1997

Constitution, to lift restrictions on freedom expression and association and freedom of religion and belief, and to release all prisoners of conscience and charge or release other political prisoners.¹⁶

9. Reporters sans frontières (RSF) stated that during the UPR in 2009, the Government of Eritrea accepted recommendations on media freedom and on enforcement of constitutional guarantees and arbitrary detention. None of these recommendations has been implemented or, at best, there have been no more than initial moves towards implementation.¹⁷ RSF recommended the establishment of a sincere and effective mechanism to follow-up on accepted recommendations and the implementation of accepted recommendations.¹⁸

1. Cooperation with treaty bodies

10. AI stated that during the UPR in 2009, the Government of Eritrea accepted recommendations on cooperation with the UN Special Procedures and treaty bodies. However, no progress has been made on this front.¹⁹

11. Joint Submission 1 (JS 1) stated that Eritrea acceded to the OP-CRC-AC in 2005, but was yet to submit its initial report.²⁰

12. Article 19 noted that Eritrea acceded to the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) on 22 January 2002 and recommended that it submit its initial report.²¹

2. Cooperation with special procedures

13. The East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project (EHAHRDP) stated that Eritrea had not accepted any requests for country visits by the United Nations Special Rapporteurs.²²

14. EHAHRDP stated that the Government of Eritrea rejected the report presented at the 23rd session of the Human Rights Council by the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights Situation in Eritrea, citing amongst its objections, the methodology and sources of information used by the mandate-holder. However, the Government of Eritrea was yet to issue an invitation to the Special Rapporteur to visit the country and assess the situation at first hand.²³ CSW recommended that Eritrea fully implement all the recommendations in the report; and cooperate fully with the Special Rapporteur.²⁴ Human Rights Watch (HRW) also called for Eritrea to cooperate with the Special Rapporteur.²⁵

15. Joint Submission 2 (JS 2), CSW and HRW called for a standing invitation to be issued to all United Nations Special Procedures Mandate Holders.²⁶

16. Open Doors International (ODI) urged the Government of Eritrea to invite the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief.²⁷

17. ODI urged the Government of Eritrea to invite the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, as well as the International Committee of the Red Cross to assess the situation regarding the treatment of prisoners.²⁸

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

1. Equality and non-discrimination

18. Sexual Rights Initiative (SRI) noted that the Government of Eritrea had signed various international conventions relating to rights of girls and women and stated that although a lot of progress has been made on realising the rights of women, most notably their sexual rights, the existing structures for the advancement of women needed to be strengthened by the allocation of adequate resources. There was also a need for collaboration between Government institutions and local civil society organisations.²⁹

19. SRI stated that there were no laws that discriminated against women and on some issues, such as land ownership and citizen and nationality rights of children the relevant law provided that women had equal rights to that of men. However, challenges remained in terms of gaining support for and the understanding of those human rights and laws, as well as ensuring that they were respected, protected and fulfilled by the Government of Eritrea. Eritrean society remained traditional and patriarchal, and women were subjected to a perceived inferior status to that of men in their homes, communities, and work places. The Government of Eritrea was ineffective in addressing these discriminatory beliefs and attitudes.³⁰

2. Right to life, liberty and security of the person

20. HRCE stated that an unknown number of people have been shot near the Eritrean borders for attempting to leave Eritrea illegally, in line with standing orders to implement a shoot to kill policy.³¹ It recommended that the Government of Eritrea revoke the shoot to kill policy and institute humane policies for the control of its borders and for the treatment of detainees, civilians and those seeking refuge.³²

21. PEN International (PEN) stated that detainees were systematically tortured and subjected to other ill-treatment, for the purposes of punishment, interrogation and coercion.³³ HRCE stated that physical and psychological torture was used regularly in prisons, military barracks and training camps such as Sawa.³⁴ It recommended that the Government of Eritrea issues clear orders to the security forces to cease all forms of torture and inhuman treatment; establish adequate mechanisms to ensure the prompt and effective investigation of all allegations of torture and ill-treatment; and bring the perpetrators to justice.³⁵

22. Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) stated that corporal punishment was lawful and that recommendations made during the UPR in 2009 to prohibit corporal punishment was rejected by the Government of Eritrea.³⁶ It stated, in relation to corporal punishment at home, that Article 64(b) of the Transitional Penal Code of Eritrea (TPCE) provided that “acts reasonably done in exercising the right of correction or discipline” were not punishable; article 548 punished cruelty to children under 15 but stated that “[t]he right to administer lawful and reasonable chastisement is not subject to this provision (Art. 64).”³⁷

23. GIEACPC stated that with regard to corporal punishment in schools, a school code of conduct provided that corporal punishment should not be administered but there appeared to be no explicit prohibition in law. On the contrary, it was lawful under the “right of correction or discipline” in the TPCE.³⁸ GIEACPC stated that the Penal Code 1957 stated in article 172 that young offenders may be caned, up to 12 strokes on the buttocks; that there appeared to be no explicit provision of corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure in the penal system; and that corporal punishment was lawful in alternative care settings.³⁹

24. SRI stated that all forms of female genital mutilation (FGM) were prohibited by law.⁴⁰ However, FGM remained a common practice amongst almost all ethnic and religious groups because of misconceptions over what was religious and what was cultural, as well as negative perceptions against women's sexuality and bodily integrity.⁴¹ It recommended the elimination of FGM through measures which included awareness-raising of the prohibition of the practice and the inclusion of relevant information in sexual and reproductive health education curriculums in schools.⁴²

25. JS 1 stated that rape of women serving in the military was widespread, leading to frequent pregnancies and resulting in release from the military and social stigmatisation.⁴³

26. SRI stated that while early and forced marriages were prohibited by law, over the last few years, increases in cases of early and forced marriages have been observed.⁴⁴ It called for the raising of awareness of the relevant law among the girls, their parents and the community at large.⁴⁵ It also called for the establishment of multi-stakeholder committees by the Government of Eritrea to advocate against this phenomenon.⁴⁶

27. AI stated that it has documented the arbitrary arrest and detention of thousands of people without charge or trial for criticising or questioning Government policy or practice, for their work as journalists, for actual or suspected opposition to the Government of Eritrea, for practicing a religion not recognised by the Government of Eritrea, for evading or deserting national service conscription, and for trying to flee the country.⁴⁷ None of these persons have ever been charged with a crime, tried or brought before a judge or judicial officer with the authority to review the legality of their detention.⁴⁸ AI made recommendations including bring an immediate end to the practice of arbitrary detention and the immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners of conscience.⁴⁹ HRW called for the unconditional release or charge and ensure court appearances for all people arbitrarily detained,⁵⁰ as well as full enforcement of the writ of habeas corpus.⁵¹ ODI urged the Government of Eritrea to end the practice of *incommunicado* detentions.⁵²

28. JS 2 stated that there was a continued practice of arresting and detaining without charge any actual or suspected opponent of the Government of Eritrea, to which the lack of human rights monitoring and the shortage of information on human rights abuses can be attributed.⁵³

29. JS 2 stated that the 11 politicians that were imprisoned for calling for democratic dialogue and the enforcement of the rule of law remained in prison. They have never been brought to trial or even charged for any crime.⁵⁴

30. ODI stated that there were continued arrests of Christians.⁵⁵ It urged the Government of Eritrea to release all prisoners of conscience.⁵⁶

31. The European Association of Jehovah's Christian Witnesses (EAJCW) called for the release of 56 imprisoned Jehovah's witnesses, none of whom were formally charged, brought to trial, or sentenced.⁵⁷

32. AI stated with regard to detention conditions, that cells and other confinement spaces were generally severely overcrowded, damp and unhygienic. Provisions of food, water and sanitation were inadequate. Numerous detention centres used underground cells or metal shipping containers as cells. Many of these detention centres were in desert locations, meaning that those detainees held in cells underground or constructed of metal experienced extreme heat during the day and extreme cold during the nights. Underground cells and shipping containers were usually unventilated and the prisoners had severely restricted access to daylight. The cells had no sanitation facilities and prisoners were only allowed out for very short periods for toilet purposes, once or twice a day, according to numerous testimonies from former detainees. These conditions were exacerbated by overcrowding.⁵⁸ JC stated that detainees were not allowed to pray and all religious books

were prohibited.⁵⁹ JS 3 stated that most prisoners, especially political prisoners were not allowed visits by family members, as well as legal representation.⁶⁰

33. PEN stated that the International Community for the Red Cross (ICRC) did not have access to detention facilities in Eritrea and there were no civil society organisations to monitor or document conditions.⁶¹ CSW recommended that the granting of access to the ICRC.⁶² HRCE recommended the granting of access of all detention facilities to independent monitors.⁶³

34. HRW called for immediate respect for international standards of law in the treatment of prisoners by inter alia providing prisoners adequate food, water, and medical assistance and ending overcrowding; allowing independent monitors access to all known and secret detention facilities; notifying family members of the whereabouts of detainees; and restoring visiting rights and access to legal representation.⁶⁴

35. JS 1 stated that there was evidence to suggest that the age limits for military service were wilfully ignored and that children were recruited for military service.⁶⁵ HRCE stated that there were substantial numbers of students under 18 years of age in camps performing military training. Students in Grade 12 in school were forced to go to military training camps where they underwent 6 months of military training. Also, under age children, including children as young as 11 years of age, who did not attend school were detained and sent to military camps such as Wia.⁶⁶

36. AI stated that all schoolchildren were required to complete their final year of schooling (grade 12) at Sawa military training camp, where military training was conducted alongside schoolwork. This system effectively involved the conscription of children into the military. AI recommended that the Government of Eritrea bring an end to the policy of children undertaking their final year of school at Sawa military camp; and ensure that no-one under the age of 18 years is conscripted.⁶⁷

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

37. AI stated that Eritrea did not have an independent judiciary.⁶⁸ HRW called for the establishment of independent courts.⁶⁹

38. AI recommended that the Government of Eritrea take action to ensure that any detainee suspected of a recognizable criminal offence was promptly charged and tried within a reasonable time in a fair and public trial which complied with international fair trial standards; where such proceedings did not take place within a reasonable time detainees should be released pending trial, in particular those who have been detained for a prolonged period without charge.⁷⁰

39. AI stated that the Government of Eritrea must ensure that persons detained were given prompt access to lawyers of their choice, with whom they may communicate in private. They must be brought promptly before a judicial or other authority whose status and tenure afford the strongest possible guarantees of competence, impartiality and independence. Detainees must be able to challenge the lawfulness of their detention before a court and must have the lawfulness of their detention reviewed by a court or other authority at reasonable intervals.⁷¹

4. Right to privacy

40. JS 2 stated that consensual same-sex sexual conduct was criminalised under the Transitional Penal Code and punishable by imprisonment.⁷²

5. Freedom of movement

41. JS 1 stated that “[e]xit visas”, including for the purposes of studying abroad, were routinely denied to men below the age of 54 years and women below the age of 47 years, as they were deemed to be of an age to undertake military service. Children from the age of 11 years were also denied such visas as they were deemed to be approaching the age for military service.⁷³

6. Freedom of religion or belief, expression, association and peaceful assembly, and right to participate in public and political life

42. PEN International (PEN) stated that little has changed in Eritrea since the UPR in 2009. There remained no freedom of opinion or expression, no independent media since the government crackdown in September 2001, no political parties apart from the ruling People’s Front for Democracy and Justice (PFDJ), no national elections and no civil society.⁷⁴

43. European Centre for Law and Justice (ECLJ) stated that since the UPR in 2009, the Government of Eritrea has become even more restrictive on religious freedom. Christians faced discrimination, detention, arrest, imprisonment and abuse because of their religious beliefs, and were not provided with due process.⁷⁵

44. JS 2 stated that minority churches of various dominations remained banned with members continuing to be routinely arrested and detained without charge for long periods.⁷⁶

45. ODI stated that although the persecution against Christians was felt most severely by Christians belonging to the unregistered groups, officially recognised groups have also been affected.⁷⁷ ODI urged the Government of Eritrea to review the laws regarding religious groups and organizations and ensure their compliance with the obligations under the ICCPR.⁷⁸

46. EAJCW stated that following the Presidential Decree of 25 October 1994 which declared that Jehovah’s Witnesses who were Eritrean by birth have revoked their citizenship because of their refusal to take part in the referendum and in national service, has stripped Jehovah’s Witnesses in Eritrea of their basic civil rights. As a consequence, they were not allowed to work in Government offices; their business licenses were revoked, and their identity cards and travel documents confiscated.⁷⁹

47. JC stated that soldiers were banned from engaging in religious activities and were punished for possessing religious literature.⁸⁰

48. JS 1 stated that Eritrea did not recognise the right of conscientious objection to military service. Persons known to have declared conscientious objections to their military recruitment have been imprisoned.⁸¹ JS 1 stated that families of persons who did not report for military service have been subjected to arbitrary detention without trial, and released only when the missing conscript was produced or a fine is paid.⁸²

49. PEN stated that during the UPR in 2009, Eritrea accepted a number of recommendations relevant to the right to freedom of expression and to the situation of detained writers, but has failed to implement any of these recommendations.⁸³

50. EHAHRDP stated that there was no independent domestic media in Eritrea since 2001.⁸⁴ RSF stated that Radio Erena which broadcasts in Eritrea from a third country offered an alternative to Government propaganda. The success of this radio station has resulted in it being the target of repeated attacks such as the jamming of its satellite signal and the hacking of its website.⁸⁵ The Qatar-based Al Jazeera’s news channels were also censored by the authorities from 1 to 12 February 2012.⁸⁶

51. JS 2 stated that journalists suspected of sending information outside the country were arbitrarily detained without charge or trial. In 2012, 30 journalists were estimated to be in prison.⁸⁷ In 2011, 4 journalists working for the government-controlled radio Dimtsi Hafash, were arrested and were reportedly still held in incommunicado detention.⁸⁸ In 2001, about 10 journalists from the private press were arrested and continue to be held without charge in secret locations.⁸⁹ Article 19 recommended that Eritrea confirm the names, locations and health status of all detainees, and confirm any deaths that have occurred. It also called for the unconditional release of all detainees and adequate redress for the denial of their freedom of expression rights and prolonged arbitrary detention.⁹⁰

52. Article 19 stated that the low internet penetration levels and the lack of communications infrastructure remained a serious obstacle to the realisation of the rights to freedom of expression.⁹¹ It called for a plan of action to increase internet access and a strategy for the development of telecommunications infrastructure.⁹²

53. JS 2 stated that on 21 January 2013, a group of 200 soldiers occupied the Ministry of Information in Asmara and broadcast a message calling for the release of all political prisoners and for the implementation of the Constitution of Eritrea. Following the removal of the soldiers, a large number of arrests were made.⁹³

54. Article 19 called on the Government of Eritrea to refrain from harassing, threatening, criminalising or arresting writers, journalists, bloggers, political activists and other human rights defenders for reasons connected to their peaceful activities, including the legitimate exercise of their freedom of expression rights.⁹⁴

55. JS 2 stated that since the UPR in 2009 there has been no discernible improvement in the treatment of civil society and that state agents were the most frequent perpetrators of political violence and intimidation affecting civil society activists.⁹⁵

56. EHAHRDP stated that freedom of association was severely restricted with regard to non-governmental organisations. The Proclamation to Determine the Administration of Non-Governmental Organisations (2005) restricted the work of NGOs to relief and rehabilitation work. In addition, NGOs must work within the scope of the policies and priorities of the Government of Eritrea.⁹⁶ EHAHRDP called for the amendment of this proclamation to lift the aforementioned restrictions and to allow NGOs to carry out projections on the promotion and monitoring of human rights.⁹⁷

57. ODI stated that a vibrant civil society was crucial for the well-being of a country and its people and recommends the withdrawal of restrictive NGO laws.⁹⁸

7. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

58. HRCE stated despite the official length of service being 18 months, most have served 17 years or more.⁹⁹ JS 3 stated that the perpetual military service of all young men and women aged between 18 and 50 has been extended to those between 50 and 70. Elderly men and women were made to train and carry Kalashnikov rifles with a view to be militias protecting the cities.¹⁰⁰ HRCE recommended that the Government of Eritrea end the practice of indefinitely extending military service, initiate demobilization for those who have completed 18 months of service, and offer the option of civilian national service.¹⁰¹ HRW made a similar call.¹⁰²

59. JS 3 stated that the youth in the national service were forced to do unpaid, labour intensive work under harsh conditions, usually enduring abuse and maltreatment.¹⁰³

60. JS 2 stated that despite the labour laws that were in place, the Government of Eritrea respected neither the right to freedom of association nor the right to collective bargaining.¹⁰⁴

61. JS 2 stated that national service recruits were used as forced labour in the mining industry and on a wide range of Government projects.¹⁰⁵ HRW called for an end to the use of national service conscripts as forced labour.¹⁰⁶

62. HRCE stated that students at junior and secondary levels, many of whom under the age of 18 years, were required to attend summer vacation camps for 45 days where they were compelled to undertake manual labour.¹⁰⁷

8. Right to social security and to an adequate standard of living

63. HRCE stated that a food distribution coupon-system controlled food consumption of every household. For example, in the towns, a registered member in a household was allowed one piece of bread of a weight of 100 grams per day. Every registered Eritrean was allowed to buy 750 grams of sugar and 5 kilos of grain per month. The people in the villages were left to fend for themselves.¹⁰⁸

64. HRCE recommended that the Government of Eritrea allowed private businesses to operate freely and that citizens be allowed to buy their food from free markets without fear. It also recommended an end to the use of the coupon-system for controlling movements and for punishing citizens.¹⁰⁹

65. HRCE stated that there was a high need for a social service system to help those who were vulnerable and disabled.¹¹⁰

66. HRW stated that families were punished and threatened when relatives living abroad failed to pay a 2 per cent tax on foreign income. Such punishment could take the form of revocation of the resident family's business licence, confiscation of houses and other property and the refusal to issue passports.¹¹¹

67. HRCE stated that poverty was rampant with many families having a meal only once a day. Begging was common and the only means of income for many, even though it was not permitted.¹¹²

9. Right to education

68. SRI stated that the Government of Eritrea has placed special emphasis on girls' education by putting in place appropriate policies.¹¹³ However, factors in school, including inadequate educational facilities and materials, the distance between the girls' homes and schools, and the shortage of female teachers negatively contributed to the enrolment of girls in the primary and junior levels.¹¹⁴ SRI recommended that the Government of Eritrea take measures which included the conducting of public awareness campaigns, and the awarding of financial or other incentives to parents to send their daughters to school.¹¹⁵

69. AI stated that the education in final year of school was of a poor quality with the emphasis significantly weighed towards military training, which was conducted alongside school work.¹¹⁶

70. EAJCW stated that Jehovah's Witnesses could not receive a full secular education because students were required to register for military service, when registering for the 9th grade in high school. Upon completion of the 11th grade, students were obliged to go to Sawa military camp to complete their 12th grade.¹¹⁷

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.

*Civil society**Joint Submissions*

- JS 1 International Fellowship for Reconciliation, Geneva, Switzerland and Conscience and Peace Tax International, Essex, United Kingdom (Joint Submission 1);
- JS 2 CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Johannesburg, South Africa and Citizens for Democratic Rights in Eritrea (Joint Submission 2);
- JS 3 Eritreans for Human and Democratic Rights and Release Eritrea, Enfield, United Kingdom (Joint Submission 3);
- SRI Sexual Rights Initiative, Ottawa, Canada (Joint Submission);

Individual Submissions

- AI Amnesty International, London, United Kingdom;
- Article 19 ARTICLE 19, London, United Kingdom;
- CSW Christian Solidarity Worldwide, New Malden, United Kingdom;
- EAJCW The European Association of Jehovah's Christian Witnesses, Kraainem, Belgium;
- ECLJ The European Centre for Law and Justice, Strasbourg, France;
- EHAHRDP East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Kampala, Uganda;
- HRCE Human Rights Concern Eritrea, London, United Kingdom;
- HRW Human Rights Watch, Geneva, Switzerland;
- GIEACPC Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London, United Kingdom;
- JC Jubilee Campaign, Fairfax, United States of America;
- ODI Open Doors International, Harderwijk, The Netherlands;
- PEN PEN International, London, United Kingdom;
- RSF Reporters sans frontières, Paris, France.

- ² Report on the Working Group of the Universal Periodic Review, A/HRC/13/2, 4 January 2010.

- ³ AI, p. 1.

- ⁴ CSW, p. 1, para. 6. HRCE, p. 1, para. 3.

- ⁵ CSW, p. 1, para. 6. HRCE, p. 1, para. 3.

- ⁶ CSW, p. 1, para. 7.

- ⁷ JS 2, p. 3, para. 2.5.

- ⁸ Article 19, p. 2, para. 6.

- ⁹ Article 19, p. 5.

- ¹⁰ CSW, p. 2, para. 10. HRCE, p. 1, para. 6. JC, para. 18.

- ¹¹ Article 19, p. 2, paras. 9 and 10.

- ¹² Article 19, p. 5.

- ¹³ CSW, p. 2, paras. 17 and 18.

- ¹⁴ HRCE, p. 3, para. 14. See also HRW, p. 3.

- ¹⁵ JS 3, p. 2, para. 2.

- ¹⁶ AI, p. 1.

- ¹⁷ RSF, p. 1.

- ¹⁸ RSF, p. 5.

- ¹⁹ AI, p. 1.

- ²⁰ JS1, p. 4, para. 20.

- ²¹ Article 19, p. 1, para. 3 and p. 5.

- ²² EHAHRDP, p. 1.

- ²³ EHAHRDP, p. 1. JS 2 made recommendations, p. 8, para. 5.5. See also Article 19, p. 1, para. 4 and p. 5.

- ²⁴ CSW, p. 2, paras. 14 and 15.

- ²⁵ HRW, p. 4.

- ²⁶ JS 2, p. 8, para. 5.5. CSW, p. 2, para. 16. HRW, p. 5.

- ²⁷ ODI, p. 5, para. 18.

- 28 ODI, p. 5, para. 19.
- 29 SRI, p. 3, paras. 6- 9.
- 30 SRI, p. 3, paras. 6- 9.
- 31 HRCE, p. 4, para. 19. See also JS 3, p. 2, para. 10.
- 32 HRCE, p. 4, para. 20.
- 33 PEN, p. 5, para. 23.
- 34 HRCE, p. 3, para. 17. See also HRW, p. 3.
- 35 HRCE, p. 4, para. 18.
- 36 GIEACPC, p. 1.
- 37 GIEACPC, p. 2, para. 2.1.
- 38 GIEACPC, p. 2, para. 2.3.
- 39 GIEACPC, p. p. paras. 2.3 2.5.
- 40 SRI, p. 4, para. 11.
- 41 SRI, p. 4, para. 10.
- 42 SRI, p. 7, paras. 22 and 23.
- 43 JS 1, p. 3, para. 16.
- 44 SRI, p. 5, paras. 13 and 14.
- 45 SRI, p. 6, para. 17.
- 46 SRI, p. 7, paras. 27 and 28.
- 47 AI, p. 1. See also HRW, p. 2.
- 48 AI, p. 2.
- 49 AI, p. 4. See also, Article 19, p. 5. HRCE, p. 3, para. 16.
- 50 HRW, p. 4.
- 51 HRW, p. 5.
- 52 ODI, p. 5, para. 17.
- 53 JS 2, p. 5, para. 3.2. See also HRW, p. 2.
- 54 JS 2, p. 5, para.3.4. JS 2 made recommendations, p. 8, para. 5.3.
- 55 ODI, p. 4, para. 9.
- 56 ODI, p. 5, para. 15.
- 57 EACJW, p. 1, para. 1, p. 3 and pp. 5-6.
- 58 AI, p. 2. See also PEN, p. 5, para. 23.
- 59 JC, para. 4.
- 60 JS 3, p. 2, para. 6.
- 61 PEN, p. 5, para. 25.
- 62 CSW, p. 3, para. 21.
- 63 HRCE, p. 3, para. 16.
- 64 HRW, p. 5.
- 65 JS 1, p. 4, paras. 20 – 25.
- 66 (HRCE, p. 4, para. 21. HRCE made a recommendation (p. 4, para. 23.)
- 67 AI, p. 5.
- 68 AI, p. 2.
- 69 HRW, p. 5.
- 70 AI, p. 5.
- 71 AI, p. 5.
- 72 JS 2, p. 6, para. 3.12.
- 73 JS 1, p. 5, para. 26.
- 74 PEN, p. 2, para. 6.
- 75 ECLJ, p. 6, para. 19.
- 76 JS 2, p. 5, para. 3.4.
- 77 ODI, p. 4, para. 13.
- 78 ODI, p. 5, para. 16.
- 79 EAJCW, p. 1, para. 1.
- 80 JC, para. 4.
- 81 JS 1, p. 3, para. 17. See also AI, pp. 3 and 5. CSW, p. 2, para. 19. CSW, p. 3, para. 25.
- 82 JS 1, p. 5, para. 28.
- 83 PEN, p. 1, paras. 2 and 3.

- ⁸⁴ EHAHRDP, p. 1.
⁸⁵ RSF, p. 2.
⁸⁶ RSF, p. 2.
⁸⁷ JS 2, p. 6, para. 4.1. See also RSF, p. 2.
⁸⁸ JS 2, p. 7, para. 4.2.
⁸⁹ JS2, p. 8, para. 5.3.
⁹⁰ Article 19, p. 5. See also CSW, p. 5, paras. 34 – 37; HRW, p. 2 and 4.
⁹¹ Article 19, p. 4, para. 23.
⁹² Article 19, p. 5.
⁹³ JS 2, p. 5, para. 3.4
⁹⁴ Article 19, p. 5.
⁹⁵ JS 2, p. 4, para. 3.
⁹⁶ EHAHRDP, p. 1, para. 3.
⁹⁷ EHAHRDP, p. 2. JS 2 made recommendations, p. 7, para. 5.2.
⁹⁸ ODI, p. 5, para. 21.
⁹⁹ HRCE, p. 3, para. 13.
¹⁰⁰ JS 3, p. 3, para. 15.
¹⁰¹ HRCE, p. 3, para. 14.
¹⁰² HRW, p. 5.
¹⁰³ JS 3, p. 3, para. 16.
¹⁰⁴ JS 2, p. 6, para. 3.8.
¹⁰⁵ JS 2, p. 6, paras. 3.9 and 3.10. HRCE, p. 5, para. 24.
¹⁰⁶ HRW, p. 5.
¹⁰⁷ HRCE, p. 4, para. 22. HRCE made a recommendation. (p. 4, para. 23).
¹⁰⁸ HRCE, p. 5, para. 26.
¹⁰⁹ HRCE, p. 5, para. 27.
¹¹⁰ HRCE, p. 5, para. 27.
¹¹¹ HRW, p. 3.
¹¹² HRCE, p. 5, para. 26.
¹¹³ SRI, p. 6, para. 20.
¹¹⁴ SRI, p. 6, para. 18.
¹¹⁵ SRI, p. 7, paras. 23 – 26.
¹¹⁶ AI, p. 5.
¹¹⁷ EAJCW, p. 3, para. 11.
-