



General Assembly

Distr.: General
18 February 2021

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirty-eighth session
3–14 May 2021

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Namibia*

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 15 stakeholders' submissions¹ 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 stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies²

2. While noting that the Republic of Namibia (Namibia, Government and State, respectively) had ratified the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and the Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Criminal Court, PGA stated that the amendments to the Rome Statute in relation to the crime of aggression and the use of certain weapons, had not been ratified. The Convention of the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, had also not been ratified.³

3. AU-ACHPR expressed concern that Namibia had not ratified ILO Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and stated that Namibia should ratify these instruments.⁴

4. AU-ACHPR stated that despite the efforts by Namibia to comply with the provisions of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, the limited resources at its disposal, especially in relation to finances, human resources and infrastructure, had inhibited its ability to ensure that all its citizens enjoyed their rights.⁵

* The present document is being issued without formal editing.



B. National human rights framework⁶

5. JS1 stated that in June 2020, the access to information bill had been tabled before the National Assembly and was under consultation. The bill which provided for access to information, also facilitated transparency, accountability and good governance. However, there had been concerns over the exemptions in the bill, which included blanket confidentiality of cabinet proceedings, judicial functions and the nomination, selection and appointment of judicial officers, which defeated the purpose of access to information in the interest of the public.⁷

6. AU-ACHPR stated that Namibia should enact legislation that provided for adequate consultation with affected communities when considering applications for mining licences. Namibia should also enact legislative measures to ensure that people and communities living in or near areas rich with resources benefitted from, inter alia, employment opportunities, procurement and provision of services, scholarships and bursaries, social services such as schools, clinics, and development projects.⁸

7. JS6 stated that the Ombudsman's Office had been the voice of the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender community. It stated that the Ombudsman's bill to strengthen the institutional framework and independence and to broaden the mandate of the Office had been under discussion.⁹

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

1. Cross-cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination¹⁰

8. SHRL stated that there were no laws prohibiting discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and others.¹¹

9. JS6 stated that the Combating of Domestic Violence Act 4, 2003 (Act No. 4 of 2003) explicitly defined a domestic relationship as persons being of different sexes, live or have lived together in a relationship in the nature of marriage, although they are not, or were not, married to each other, are or were in an actual or a perceived intimate or romantic relationship. The amendment bills to the Combating of Domestic Violence Act, Combating of Rape Act, 2000 (Act No.8 of 2000), Maintenance Act, 2003 (No. 9 of 2003). and the Criminal Procedure Act, 1997 (Act No. 51 of 1977) which sought to provide greater protection to women and girls did not explicitly recognize same-sex relationships or lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons.¹²

10. JS2 stated that the National Plan of Action on Gender-Based Violence, 2019-2023, that had been adopted in 2019, had no budget for implementation. This Plan had exclusively focused on cisgender, heterosexual women, to the exclusion of lesbian, bisexual and queer women, as well as sex workers. The Plan had been based on discriminatory social norms and gender stereotypes that perpetuated discrimination against women.¹³

11. JS2 stated that same-sex conduct between men was criminalized. The criminalization of sodomy has had a significant and persistent negative impact on the lives of those who identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender persons and contributed to the on-going stigmatisation of the LGBT community.¹⁴ The Combating of Immoral Practices Act, 1980 (Act No. 21 of 1980), also had a negative impact on the lives of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender persons.¹⁵

12. JS3 stated that customary law had been used to discriminate against transgender people.¹⁶ While transgender persons could apply to change their sex description in the birth register, they barely had access to this service due to their unfavourable socio-economic position and the lack of qualified health practitioners who could provide affirming services.¹⁷

Development, the environment, and business and human rights

13. AU-ACHPR stated that Namibia had continued to experience prolonged drought which had made it more difficult and challenging for the State to address issues of poverty and inequality in the country.¹⁸

2. Civil and political rights

Right to life, liberty and security of person¹⁹

14. Referring to relevant information submitted for the previous review,²⁰ BWS stated that the Government had violated its domestic and international obligations due to its failure to investigate and ensure effective remedy for the torture and disappearances committed during the liberation struggle in Namibia. The families of the disappeared persons had been denied the right to know the fate and whereabouts of their loved ones and the survivors had the right to know the reasons for their torture, cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment.²¹ BWS stated that the Government ought to have taken appropriate action to remove the stigma experienced by the “victims of the Lubango dungeons” and ought to have issued a directive prohibiting any reference to them as spies, former spies or traitors.²² BWS further stated that the Government should establish an independent Commission to look into the “root causes of the Lubango saga” and to make recommendations on ensuring restorative justice for the victims.²³ IHRC cited cases of alleged human rights abuses by the police.²⁴

15. AU-ACHPR expressed concern about the lack of a comprehensive policy dealing with all public health concerns in prisons, especially in relation to the prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS.²⁵

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law²⁶

16. NMT stated that the Whistle-blower Protection Act, 2017 (Act 10 of 2017) and Witness Protection Act, 2017 (Act 11 of 2017), which had been signed into law in October 2017, was yet to come into force. These circumstances would deny legislative protection to a particular whistle-blower should he be required to present himself in person in Namibia for investigations or to appear as a witness in court proceedings in one of the biggest corruption cases in Namibia, referred to as the “Fishrot” case, allegedly involving two government ministers.²⁷

17. AU-ACHPR stated that Namibia should make the required declaration under Article 34(6) of the Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights on the Establishment of the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights and on accepting the competence of the Court to directly receive cases from individuals and non-governmental organisations.²⁸

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life²⁹

18. AU-ACHPR expressed concern about the criminalization of defamation.³⁰ It stated that Namibia should take appropriate measures to repeal the legislation which criminalized defamation.³¹

19. NMT stated that although Namibia had received positive ratings in the *Reporters Without Borders World Press Freedom Index* and had headed the Africa rankings, there were other independent assessments which had not rated the media landscape as so conducive and had highlighted the lack of transformation in the broadcasting industry.³² In addition, NMT stated that the Namibian Broadcasting Corporation had yet to be transformed into an autonomous public broadcaster in line with the best-practice guidelines articulated in the African Charter on Broadcasting, and had remained subject to political interference. The Communication Regulatory Authority of Namibia, which had the responsibility of regulating and issuing broadcasting and communication licences, was also not independent and free from political interference since its board was appointed by the Minister responsible for Information and Communication Technology, without public involvement. There had been no public oversight or transparency in the process.³³

20. JS1 stated that preferential treatment had been given to state-owned media and that state officials had threatened the independence of the media.³⁴ It also stated that there were laws, including the Protection of Information Act 84 of 1982 and the Namibia Central Intelligence Service Act 10 of 1997 that had restricted the freedom of expression and had been used by the authorities to silence the media.³⁵

21. While noting that citizens had used the media and social media to freely express themselves, NMT stated that there had been intermitted threats from parliamentarians to regulate social media platforms.³⁶

22. CCG stated that a public meeting it had organized on 8 July 2018 to discuss the possibility of calling on the Government to prosecute police officers who had allegedly tortured Caprivi secessionist suspects and to unearth a mass grave found in the Caprivi Strip, had been disrupted and its leaders and members had been arrested by the police.³⁷

23. AU-ACHPR expressed concern about the low representation of women in Parliament and in other decision making positions.³⁸

24. Expressing a concern about the inadequate political participation of indigenous communities, AU-ACHPR stated that Namibia should ensure such participation for all indigenous communities.³⁹

25. CCG stated that in 2006, Namibia had banned the United Democratic Party, a political party, based in the Caprivi Strip, that had advocated for the independence of the Caprivi Strip.⁴⁰

26. CCG stated that there had been systematic and premeditated human rights violations and political oppression against the people of the Caprivi Strip by Namibia, which had purposely denied them the right to self-determination, including their right to freely determine their political status.⁴¹

Prohibition of all forms of slavery⁴²

27. ECLJ noted that at the previous review, Namibia had supported 5 recommendations on trafficking in persons and had since taken great strides to combat human trafficking, which included the passage of the Combatting of Trafficking in Persons Act, 2018 (Act No. 1 of 2018). In addition, Namibia had launched the National Referral Mechanism and had introduced standard operating procedures.⁴³

Right to privacy and family life⁴⁴

28. Noting that Article 13 of the Constitution made provisions for the right to privacy, JS3 stated that the criminalization of consensual same-sex activities violated one's right to privacy.⁴⁵

29. JS2 stated that with the draft bill on the Recognition of Customary Marriages which had been introduced many years ago, had yet to be adopted. This had resulted in a lack of formal recognition of customary marriages and no general protection of property rights, leaving women married under customary law vulnerable during their marriage and in cases of divorce and death of their spouse. In addition, the failure to reform the archaic law on divorce, which was fault-based, had made it difficult and expensive to obtain a divorce.⁴⁶

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work⁴⁷

30. JS6 stated that the Labour Act 11, 2007 (Act No. 11 of 2007) had removed the explicit protection against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and that lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons had experienced sexual harassment and discrimination on the basis of their sexual orientation and gender identity or expression at their places of work.⁴⁸

*Right to social security*⁴⁹

31. JS6 stated that lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons had not been entitled to any benefits from their partners' pensions due to the lack of recognition of sexual orientation and gender identity within social services.⁵⁰

*Right to an adequate standard of living*⁵¹

32. AU-ACHPR expressed concern about challenges associated with access to land and housing, especially for poor households.⁵² It stated that Namibia should put in place comprehensive policies, plans and programmes aimed at making acquisitions of land and housing accessible and affordable.⁵³

*Right to health*⁵⁴

33. AU-ACHPR stated that Namibia should invest in the training of doctors, nurses, pharmacists and social workers to overcome the shortage of skilled health workers.⁵⁵

34. AU-ACHPR stated that Namibia should provide attractive working conditions for qualified health workers in order to retain an experienced and motivated workforce in health facilities countrywide.⁵⁶

35. AU-ACHPR stated that Namibia should increase the provision of medical services particularly in the rural areas and for the population requiring mental health services.⁵⁷

36. JS6 stated that lesbian, gay bisexual and transgender persons had faced barriers to accessing health care which included ridicule, prejudice and discrimination, fears that breaches of confidentiality would reveal their sexual orientation in a hostile environment, and the criminalization of consensual sodomy. Transgender persons had faced distinct discrimination and prejudice as the services they had received had not been gender affirming or appropriate to enhance their wellbeing. Health care workers had denied lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons access to health care because of the general assumption that homosexuality was illegal or in violation of their own moral values.⁵⁸

37. AU-ACHPR stated that Namibia should end discrimination and stigmatization limiting health care access for vulnerable groups in particular the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender community, commercial sex workers and other vulnerable groups.⁵⁹

38. AU-ACHPR stated that Namibia should put in place adequate resources in combatting maternal and child mortality.⁶⁰

39. JS2 stated that although the fight against HIV/AIDS was high on the Government's agenda, there were still serious challenges with access to health services for rural women and girls and their communities, as well as for sexual and gender minorities.⁶¹

40. BCU stated that the stigma faced by those living with HIV was widespread and had a damaging effect on the positive impact of the Government's education and awareness raising initiatives on the nature of HIV, the transmission of the disease, and the healthcare and treatment plans for those infected. While noting that there were a number of legal provisions and policies in place to combat stigma and discrimination, including Article 10 of the Constitution and the National Policy on HIV/AIDS, BCU stated that the protections laid out in the Constitution and the National Policy on HIV/AIDS had not gone far enough to protect women and girls from stigma and discrimination. Stigma and discrimination had led to women and girls being afraid of seeking out testing for HIV and ultimately receiving antiretroviral treatment. BCU stated that Namibia should focus its efforts on tackling stigma and discrimination against women and girls infected with HIV through the prioritization of support and education.⁶²

41. AU-ACHPR stated that Namibia should develop and implement campaigns that would educate the public on the dangers of seeking treatment from those who claim to treat HIV and to proscribe such persons from making such claims.⁶³

42. BCU stated that Namibia had made significant progress in the prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV. However, noting relevant data, BCU stated that it was

imperative that women sought early antenatal care in order to ensure that HIV-infected women begin antiretroviral treatment.⁶⁴

43. JS2 stated that under the Abortion and Sterilization Act of 1975, abortion was illegal for women and girls, except in extreme cases such as rape, incest, or when the life of mother or the child were at risk.⁶⁵

*Right to education*⁶⁶

44. NMT stated that the Research, Science and Technology Act 23 of 2004 and the Research, Science and Technology Regulations had placed severe restrictions on the conducting and publishing of research on any topic, which may only be done with the permission of the National Commission of Research, Science and Technology. Failure to secure such permission, would result in a fine or imprisonment of up to five years.⁶⁷

45. While noting that the National Curriculum on Comprehensive Sexuality Education included a section on sexual orientation, JS6 stated that lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender students had experienced discrimination and bullying in schools.⁶⁸

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

*Women*⁶⁹

46. JS2 referred to relevant supported recommendations relating to the rights of women and girls and expressed disappointment that none of the recommendations had been implemented with the exception of the adoption of the Child Care and Protection Act of 2015, which came into operation in 2019.⁷⁰

47. JS2 stated that gender based violence had continued to be extremely high and that in the recent months there had been a dramatic rise in rape and gender based violence cases.⁷¹

48. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, JS2 stated that the protection orders provided for under the Combating of Domestic Violence Act 4, 2003 (Act No. 4 of 2003), were still not available to those rural women who resided far from a magistrate's courts. In addition, same-sex couples were excluded from protections offered under this Act.⁷²

49. JS2 stated that despite participation in a National Dialogue on the Prevention of Harmful Cultural Practices in the Zambezi Region conducted by the Women's Leadership Centre in 2017, there had been no engagement by state actors to protect the dignity and rights of women and girls impacted by practices such as forcing young girls to pull their labia minora and endure emotional, physical and sexual violence during the sikege initiation ritual.⁷³

*Children*⁷⁴

50. AU-ACHPR stated that Namibia should review the legislation relating to the rights of children with a view to harmonizing the definition of a child with international human rights standards.⁷⁵

51. AU-ACHPR expressed concern about on-going traditional harmful cultural practice of child marriage, in some communities and lack of consistency in the legal definition of a child thereby subjecting some children to the risk of being married early.⁷⁶ It stated that Namibia should end child marriage by enacting 18 years as the minimum age for marriage.⁷⁷

52. Referring to Sections 7 and 14 of the Combating of Immoral Practices Act 21 of 1980, JS4 stated that children had not been exempted from offences committed under these sections which might result in child victims of prostitution being identified as offenders.⁷⁸ In addition, the lack of a clear definition of child pornography had left ambiguity as to what constituted an offence under Section 234(1)(d) of the Child Care and Protection Act.⁷⁹ There was no provision in the law that defined or criminalized forms of online child sexual exploitation other than the possession of child sexual abuse materials and another omission in the law was the lack of an exemption clause concerning sexting between minors.⁸⁰ There

was also no legal framework in place that protected children from sexual exploitation in the travel and tourism industry.⁸¹

*Minorities and indigenous peoples*⁸²

53. JS5 stated that the Constitution did not specifically recognise the rights of indigenous peoples or minorities and that there was no legislation with regard to indigenous peoples.⁸³

54. JS2 referred to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review and stated that the “White Paper on Indigenous Rights” had not been adopted and that little effort had been made by Namibia to implement the recommendations.⁸⁴ JS5 stated that the White Paper had been considered by the Government and community stakeholders in December 2019, but that neither the Rehoboth Basters nor the Zambesians who had identified themselves as indigenous peoples had been engaged in the process.⁸⁵

55. RGB stated that following the independence of Namibia, all land collectively own by the Rehoboth baster community had been expropriated without free, prior and informed consent, and no reparations had been paid. Also, traditional symbols had either been expropriated or destroyed.⁸⁶

56. Expressing concern about the lack of measures to comprehensively address the specific needs of the indigenous peoples, AU-ACHPR stated that Namibia should take urgent measures to address their specific needs in relation to land, education, health, employment and access to justice, and ensure that affirmative action policies and measures adopted in this respect effectively and adequately benefit indigenous peoples.⁸⁷

*Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons*⁸⁸

57. Expressing concern about the lack of legislation to protect the rights of refugees and migrant workers, AU-ACHPR stated that Namibia should adopt specific legislation that protected the rights of refugees and migrant workers as well as provided for proper management of refugees and migrant worker issues.⁸⁹

*Stateless persons*⁹⁰

58. JS2 stated that the law on birth registration had made it difficult to register a child when the parents had not been married to each other.⁹¹

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

Individual submissions:

BCU	BCU Centre for Human Rights, School of Law, Birmingham City University, Birmingham (United Kingdom);
BWS	Breaking the Wall of Silence, Windhoek (Namibia);
ECLJ	European Centre for Law and Justice, Strasbourg (France);
IHRC	International Human Rights Council, Mumbai (India);
MAAT	Maat Foundation for Peace, Development and Human Rights, Cairo (Egypt);
PGA	Parliamentarians for Global Action, New York (United States of America);
RGB	Rehoboth Baster Gemeente, Rehoboth (Namibia);
SHRL	Stockholm Human Rights Lab, Stockholm (Sweden).

Joint submissions:

JS1	Collaboration on International ICT Policy in East and Southern Africa (CIPESA), Kampala (Uganda), Small Media, London (United Kingdom), and Internet Society Namibia Chapter, Windhoek (Namibia) (Joint Submission 1);
JS2	Positive Vibes Trust, Women’s Leadership Centre, Young

JS3	Feminists Movement Namibia, Coalition of African Lesbians, AIDS and Rights Alliance for Southern Africa and, Sexual Rights Initiative, Geneva (Switzerland) (Joint Submission 2); TIAMON (Namibia), Wings to Transcend Namibia, Windhoek (Namibia), Gender Dynamix, Cape Town (South Africa) (Joint Submission 3);
JS4	LifeLine/ChildLine Namibia and ECPAT International, Bangkok (Thailand) (Joint Submission 4);
JS5	Unrepresented Peoples and Nations Organization, Brussels (Belgium), Captain's Council of the Rehoboth Basters (Namibia) and Movement for the Survival of the River Races in Zambesia (Namibia) (Joint Submission 5);
JS6	Namibia Diverse Women's Association, Khaibasen Trust of Namibia, Transgender Intersex Androgynous Movement of Namibia, Healing Wound Associations, Equal Rights For All Movement, Mental Medical Counselling Network, Trans Masculine Namibia, Namibia Sex Workers Alliance, and Young Girls and Women (Namibia) (Joint Submission 6).

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):

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

- ² For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/4, para. 137.1, para. 137.2, para. 137.13, para. 137.14, paras. 137.41–45, para. 137.47–50, para. 137.86, and paras. 137.98–107.
- ³ PGA, section I, paras. 2-5. PGA made recommendations (section IV, paras. 5-7.).
- ⁴ AU-ACHPR, paras. 30(x)-(xi) and paras. 48 (x)-(xi).
- ⁵ *ibid.*, para. 26.
- ⁶ For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/4, para. 137.52, para. 137.53, para. 137.60, para. 137.62, para. 137.69, para. 137.71, para. 137.74, paras. 137.78–80, paras. 137.82–85, paras. 137.93–95 and para.137.208.
- ⁷ JS1, para. 8. See also NMT, paras. 11–13.
- ⁸ AU-ACHPR, para. 60(i) and (ii).
- ⁹ JS6, para. 23.
- ¹⁰ For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/4, paras. 137.57–61, para. 137.63, para. 137.66, para. 137.68, para. 137.70, para. 137.72, para. 137.73, para. 137.81, para. 137.96, para. 137.108, para. 137.109, para. 137.111, para. 137.112, para. 137.119, para. 137.135, para. 137.148, para. 137.209, para. 137.212, and para. 137.215.
- ¹¹ SHRL, para. 7. SHRL made recommendations (p. 5).
- ¹² JS6, para. 27. JS6 made recommendations (para. 36). See also JS1, para. 6. JS1 made recommendations (p. 3).
- ¹³ JS2, para. 13. JS2 made a recommendation (para. 18).
- ¹⁴ *ibid.*, paras. 4 and 5. JS2 made recommendations (p. 3). See also SHRL, para. 12. SHRL made recommendations (p. 6).
- ¹⁵ *ibid.*, para. 10. JS2 made recommendations (p. 3).
- ¹⁶ JS3, p. 4. JS3 made recommendations (p.5).
- ¹⁷ *ibid.*, p. 5.
- ¹⁸ AU-ACHPR, para. 28.
- ¹⁹ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/4, paras. 137.16–30, paras. 137.32–39, para. 137.75, para. 137.153, and paras. 137.154–159.
- ²⁰ BWS, p. 2 referring to A/HRC/WG.6/24/NAM/3, para. 31.
- ²¹ *ibid.*, p. 6.
- ²² *ibid.*, p.4.
- ²³ *ibid.*, p.4. BWS made recommendations (p. 7).
- ²⁴ IHRC, p. 1.
- ²⁵ AU-ACHPR, para. 36(i). See also AU-ACHPR, para. 54(i).
- ²⁶ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/4, para. 137.124, para. 137.164–170, para. 137.173, para. 137.174, para. 137.176, and para. 137.196.
- ²⁷ NMT, paras. 3 and 4. NMT made a recommendation (para. 14.5).
- ²⁸ AU-ACHPR, para. 49.
- ²⁹ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/4, para. 137.179.
- ³⁰ AU-ACHPR, para. 34(i).
- ³¹ *ibid.*, para. 52(i). See also MAAT, p. 4.
- ³² NMT, para. 5.

- 33 *ibid*, paras. 3 and 4. NMT made a recommendation (para. 14.4).
- 34 JS1, paras. 7 and 14.
- 35 *ibid*, para. 6. JS1 made recommendations (para. 28).
- 36 NMT, para. 8.
- 37 CCG, para. 10. CCG made a recommendation (para. 23).
- 38 AU-ACHPR, para. 33(ii).
- 39 *ibid*, paras. 41(ii) and 58(ii).
- 40 CCG, para.6. CCG made a recommendation (para. 22).
- 41 *ibid*, para. 16. CCG made recommendations (paras. 26 and 27).
- 42 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/4, para. 173.64, para. 173.76, para. 173.77, para. 137.162, and para. 137.163.
- 43 ECLJ, para. 3, and paras. 6-9.
- 44 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/4, paras. 137.177–178.
- 45 JS3, p. 4.
- 46 JS2, paras. 19-21. JS2 made recommendations (p.6).
- 47 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/4, para. 137.46.
- 48 JS6, para. 16. JS 6 made a recommendation (p. 13).
- 49 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/4, para. 137.181.
- 50 JS6, para. 21.
- 51 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/4, para. 137.92, para. 137.182, paras. 137.183-189, and paras. 137.88-91.
- 52 AU-ACHPR, para. 32(i).
- 53 *ibid*, para. 50(i).
- 54 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/4, para. 137.51, paras. 137.190–195, and paras. 137.197–199.
- 55 AU-ACHPR, para. 50(iii).
- 56 *ibid*, para. 50(iv).
- 57 *ibid*, para. 50(v).
- 58 JS6, paras. 20, 22(a) and 34. JS6 made a recommendation (para. 38).
- 59 AU-ACHPR, para. 50(vi).
- 60 *ibid*, para. 50(i).
- 61 JS2, para. 30. JS2 made recommendations (pp. 9-10).
- 62 BCU, paras. 14-16. BCU made recommendations (pp. 7-8).
- 63 AU-ACHPR, para. 56(ii).
- 64 BCU, paras. 21 and 22. BCU made recommendations (pp. 7-8).
- 65 JS2, para. 35. JS2 made a recommendation (p. 9).
- 66 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/4, para. 137.31, paras. 137.200–206, and para. 137.218.
- 67 NMT, para. 9. NMT made a recommendation (para. 14.6).
- 68 JS6, para. 35. JS6 made a recommendation (para. 38).
- 69 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/4, para. 137.67, para. 137.110, paras. 137.113–118, para. 137.131, para. 137.133, paras. 137.136–147, paras. 137.149–152, para. 137.171, para. 137.172, and para. 137.175.
- 70 JS2, p. 5, para. 19, referring to A/HRC/32/4, para. 137.57 (Panama), para. 137.58 (Australia), para. 137.61 (Slovenia), para. 137.62 (Uruguay), para. 137.68 (Iceland), and A/HRC/32/4/Add.1, para. 52.
- 71 *ibid*, paras. 15 and 16.
- 72 *ibid*, p. 3 and para. 12, referring to A/HRC/32/4, para. 137.81 (Honduras), para. 137.133 (Argentina), para. 137.137 (Canada) and para. 37.175 (United States of America), and A/HRC/32/4/Add.1, paras. 24, 52 and 53. See also JS6, para. 18. JS6 made a recommendation (para. 36).
- 73 *ibid*, para. 25. JS2 made a recommendation (p. 6). See also MAAT, p.2, MAAT made recommendations (p. 5).
- 74 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/4, para. 137.15, para. 137.54, para. 137.55, para. 137.97, paras. 137.125–130, para. 137.132, para. 137.160, para. 137.161, and para. 137.214.
- 75 AU-ACHPR, para. 51(v).
- 76 *ibid*, para. 33(iii).
- 77 *ibid*, para. 51(iii).
- 78 JS4, paras. 18-20.
- 79 *ibid*, para. 22.
- 80 *ibid*, para. 24.
- 81 *ibid*, para. 33. JS4 made recommendations (p. 10).
- 82 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/4, para. 137.213, para. 137.216, para. 137.217, and para. 137.219.

⁸³ JS5, para. 17.

⁸⁴ JS2, pp. 6-7, referring to A/HRC/32/4, para. 137.215 (Uzbekistan), para. 137.204 (Fiji) and para.137.214 (Spain), and A/HRC/32/4/Add.1, paras 13 and 31.

⁸⁵ JS5, para. 19. JS5 made recommendations (p. 11). See also RGB, para. 11. RGB made recommendations (p. 5).

⁸⁶ RGB, paras. 5 and 8. RGB made recommendations (p. 5).

⁸⁷ AU-ACHPR, paras. 41(iii) and 58(iii).

⁸⁸ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/4, paras. 137.3–137.12, and para. 137.40.

⁸⁹ AU-ACHPR, paras. 40 and 57.

⁹⁰ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/4, para. 137.56, para. 137.87, paras. 137.120–123, and para. 137.180.

⁹¹ JS2, para. 22.
