

Flygtningenævnets baggrundsmateriale

Bilagsnr.:	220
Land:	Rwanda
Kilde:	UN General Assembly
Titel:	Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Rwanda
Udgivet:	16. november 2020
Optaget på baggrundsmaterialet:	10. februar 2021



General Assembly

Distr.: General
16 November 2020

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirty-seventh session
18–29 January 2021

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Rwanda*

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

2. NCHR stated that it had been entrusted with the mandate of the national preventative mechanism against torture.²

3. NCHR stated that several recommendations from the previous review had been implemented by the Republic of Rwanda ("Rwanda" and "Government", respectively) and believed that the remaining recommendations would be implemented by January 2021.³

4. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation,⁴ NCHR commended Rwanda for constructing new prisons and for renovating some prisons, the special treatment of pregnant women, nursing mothers, and of infants who could not be separated from their imprisoned mothers. It called for the renovation of all detention facilities and for the expeditious promulgation of the Presidential Order determining the modalities for community service.⁵

5. While noting relevant positive measures, NCHR stated that there was a persistent problem of school dropouts due to challenges which included teenage pregnancies, child labour, the inaccessibility of children with disabilities to educational materials and the insufficient number of qualified teachers in special needs education.⁶

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



6. While noting the incorporation of strategies into social programmes to improve the protection of children, NCHR stated that the persistent problem of street children must be addressed.⁷

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations⁸ and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies⁹

7. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review,¹⁰ JS7 stated that Rwanda was yet to ratify ICPPED.¹¹ AHR stated that Rwanda had not ratified OP-ICESCR.¹²

8. JS4 stated that Rwanda should ratify ILO Convention 169 and adopt the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.¹³

9. JS7 stated that a visit to Rwanda by the Subcommittee on the Prevention of Torture in 2017 had been suspended on the fifth day of the visit due to obstructions experienced by the Subcommittee in carry out its work.¹⁴

10. AU-ACHPR expressed concern by the withdrawal of the Declaration made under Article 34(6) of the Protocol to the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights, accepting the jurisdiction of the Court to receive cases under Article 5 (3) of the Protocol.¹⁵ HRW and MAAT stated that the Declaration, which allowed individuals to file complaints with the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights, had been withdrawn on the grounds that the procedure was being exploited by convicted genocide fugitives.¹⁶

B. National human rights framework¹⁷

11. AU-ACHPR stated that the lack of awareness by the majority of the population about regional and international human rights instruments that had been ratified by Rwanda had restricted the effective enjoyment of human rights in the country.¹⁸

12. JS5 expressed stated that there had been an omission of transgender, lesbians and intersex persons in the Government's policies and strategies, which had adhered to the binary vision of gender as man and woman.¹⁹

13. JS7 stated that during the first review, Rwanda had supported a recommendation to ratify OP-CAT and had since ratified this Convention.²⁰ In the previous review, Rwanda had supported recommendations to establish a National Preventative Mechanism (NPM), pursuant to OP-CAT.²¹ JS11 stated that the relevant law²² had been amended and in 2018 NCHR had been designated as the NPM. NCHR was yet to publish its annual report as required under NPM guidelines.²³

14. JS7 stated that there had been concerns about the independence of NCHR, which were all the more alerting considering that NCHR had held the mandate of the NPM. It stated that the independence of NCHR had been compromised by the appointment of its members by a Committee appointed by the President.²⁴

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

1. Cross-cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination²⁵

15. Citing articles 44 and 45 of Law N° 32/2016 of 28/08/2016 Governing Persons and Family,²⁶ JS5 stated that there had been a lack of legal recognition of gender identity for Intersex persons, and with the law providing that the sex of a person was that which had been

recorded in one's birth certificate, no provision had been made for sex reassignment in the birth records.²⁷

16. While commending Rwanda for criminalizing discrimination, JS5 expressed concern by the lack of explicit mention of gender identity as one of the prohibited ground of discrimination.²⁸

17. JS8 stated that sex workers had faced discrimination in their communities, religious spaces and even in civil society. Children of sex workers had been regarded as outcasts.²⁹

Development, the environment, and business and human rights

18. Expressing concerns in relation to extractive industries and the environment,³⁰ AU-ACHPR stated that Rwanda should adopt laws that protect the right to environment and establish a regulatory body to monitor implementation of these laws.³¹

19. JAI stated that Rwanda was highly vulnerable to climate change because its economy relied on agriculture and hydroelectric power. In 2020, Rwanda was the first African country, and the least developed country, to submit stricter emissions target for 2030.³²

2. Civil and political rights

Right to life, liberty and security of person³³

20. Referring to relevant supported recommendations for the previous review,³⁴ some of which Rwanda had considered to be implemented or in the process of being implemented,³⁵ HRW stated during the period under review, Rwanda had consistently failed to conduct credible and effective investigations into allegations of extrajudicial executions, enforced disappearances, arbitrary detention, torture and ill-treatment and to prosecute alleged perpetrators. Rwandan authorities had continued to arrest and detain people in unofficial military detention centres, where scores of detainees had been tortured.³⁶

21. HRW stated that it had documented how state security summarily killed at least 37 suspected petty offenders, in what appeared to be part of a broader strategy to spread fear, enforce order, and deter any resistance to Government orders or policies. A report by NCHR concluded that the research by HRW was "full of falsehoods". Rather than investigating and prosecuting those allegedly responsible, Government officials had threatened and coerced victims' families to present false information about what had happened to their loved ones.³⁷

22. AI stated that during the period under review, it had documented several cases of probable enforced disappearances.³⁸ JS7 stated that members of opposition political parties had been targeted for enforced disappearance.³⁹

23. HRW stated that it had documented how the military had frequently detained and tortured people, beating them, asphyxiating them, using electric shocks and staging mock executions in military camps around Kigali and in the northwest of the country. Most of the detainees had been held incommunicado for months on end in deplorable conditions.⁴⁰ AI cited cases of suspicious deaths in detention.⁴¹

24. AU-ACHPR stated that Rwanda should establish a database on torture-related complaints in order to determine the prevalence of torture in police stations.⁴²

25. AU-ACHPR stated that Rwanda should adopt laws to improve its programmes and policies with a view to eradicating harmful cultural practices.⁴³

26. JS5 stated that there had been a lack of adequate legislative protection against gender-based violence for LGBTI persons, as such violence had been defined in law as an act that resulted in a bodily, psychological, sexual and economic harm to female or male persons.⁴⁴

27. JS11 stated that suspects had not been separated from convicted persons and minors had not been separated from adults in detention facilities.⁴⁵

28. AU-ACHPR stated that Rwanda should effectively implement laws and policies on the granting of bail and sentencing to reduce prison overcrowding.⁴⁶

*Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law*⁴⁷

29. JS10 noted that irregularities had been observed in some politically motivated trials, and the interference of the Executive in politically motivated cases.⁴⁸

30. HRW stated that it had received reports of credible accounts of incommunicado detention, beatings and torture to obtain forced confessions at “Kwa Gacinya”, a police station in Gikondo, a residential suburb of Kigali. Many of the victims had been prosecuted on security related charges, and in some cases had been convicted.⁴⁹ HRW stated that fair trial standards had been routinely flouted in many sensitive political cases, in which security-related charges had been used to prosecute prominent Government critics.⁵⁰

31. FN stated that trials of Government critics had been replete with due process violations. It cited the examples of the trial of former military officers Frank Rusagara and Tom Byabagamba, where one of the prosecution witnesses had also served as a judge in a pre-trial hearing, and the case of Dianne and Adeline Rwigara, where the two women had been unable to review their own case files and the prosecution had failed to disclose its evidence to the defence.⁵¹

32. JS11 stated that legal aid services had been inadequately coordinated and funded and that there had been a gap between the high demand and low supply of legal representation services for the poor.⁵² AU-ACHPR stated that Rwanda should extend legal services to persons in police custody and should respect the 48 hours duration of police custody.⁵³

*Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life*⁵⁴

33. JS3 stated that at the previous review, Rwanda had committed to ensure the right to freedom of association, guarantee an adequate environment for the opposition and increase space for civil society. However, relevant supported recommendations had remained unimplemented.⁵⁵

34. ADF stated that although Rwanda had taken tentative steps to enhance freedom of religion or belief, incidents of discrimination against minority religious groups had remained significant.⁵⁶

35. ECLJ stated that in 2018, Rwanda had passed a law to regulate faith-based organizations, and even those who may become pastors. The law was long, complicated, and intrusive.⁵⁷ JC stated that faith-based organizations had been required to apply for legal-status and that leaders of such organizations must have academic qualifications. These requirements, amongst others, had hindered the free practice of religious groups. In August 2018, about 8000 churches and religious organizations had been shut down.⁵⁸ In addition, about 100 mosques had been closed, according to ECLJ,⁵⁹ who called for a revision of the law.⁶⁰

36. Referring to supported recommendations from the previous review, JS1 stated the protection of the right to freedom of expression in Article 38 of the Constitution⁶¹ was not aligned with international standards, pursuant to Article 19(3) of the ICCPR.⁶² In addition, the revision of the Penal Code in 2018, had led to the introduction of restrictive provisions.⁶³ Noting that the Supreme Court had repealed Articles 154 and 233 of the Penal Code, JS1 remained concerned by the retention of Articles 194 and 236.⁶⁴

37. ADF stated that the laws proscribing “genocide ideology” or “sectarianism” overstepped their intended purpose to curtail freedom of expression. These laws had been misused to erase Government criticism.⁶⁵

38. In relation to freedom of expression on-line, JS1 stated that the ICT Law⁶⁶ was incompatible inter alia with the ICCPR and referred to Articles 22, 60, 126 and 206 of that legislation.⁶⁷ JS3 stated that this Law had codified specific restrictions on internet activities that were antithetical to internet freedom.⁶⁸

39. JS6 stated that in a statement on 13 April 2020 regarding journalism during the COVID-19 pandemic, the Rwanda Media Commission stated that individuals with YouTube channels were not allowed to conduct and broadcast interviews as they were not journalists, despite the law recognising the right of everyone to receive, disseminate or send information through the internet.⁶⁹

40. Referring to Articles 2(19), 5, 9 and 13 of the Media Law, JS1 stated that this legislation lacked compliance with international standards on freedom of expression and privacy.⁷⁰ The Rwanda Media Commission had been unable to function as an independent, self-regulatory body because of its lack of recognition in the Media Law.⁷¹ JS1 noted that a report by a Committee of Inquiry established by Rwanda Utilities Regulatory Authority, had resulted in an indefinite ban on the British Broadcasting Corporation's Kinyarwanda service.⁷²

41. JS3 stated that although Article 169 of the Penal Code on criminal defamation had been repealed, other articles criminalizing defamation had been maintained.⁷³ AU-ACHPR stated that Rwanda should finalize the process of decriminalizing defamation by repealing relevant provisions in the Penal Code.⁷⁴

42. JS3 stated that the freedom of expression and media freedoms had been severely and unwarrantedly restricted.⁷⁵ Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, JS1 stated that journalists had continued to report concerning levels of harassment and intimidation.⁷⁶ JS3 stated that journalists had been unable to engage in investigative reporting on politically sensitive issues for fear of reprisals and related prosecutions, and when journalists had spoken out they had been routinely persecuted.⁷⁷ HRW stated that few journalists challenge official Government narratives and policies, or investigate allegations of human rights abuses, especially against senior Government officials. Harassment, suspicious disappearances, and the fear of prosecution had pushed many journalists to engage in self-censorship.⁷⁸

43. Noting that in 2019, Rwanda had been ranked 155th out of 180 in the World Press Freedom Index, JS7 stated that numerous independent news outlets and opposition blogs had remained inaccessible online.⁷⁹

44. HRW stated that civil society had been weak due to many years of intimidation and interference. Onerous registration requirements and bureaucracy had prevented human rights groups from operating effectively.⁸⁰

45. AI stated that despite the reform of the legislation governing non-governmental organizations,⁸¹ the registration process had remained overly burdensome.⁸² JS7 stated that the law governing the functioning of international organizations (Law No. 05/2012 of 17 February 2012) had impeded their freedom to determine their structure and activities.⁸³

46. JS3 stated that a new law on the prevention and punishment of cybercrimes⁸⁴ imposed a number of restrictions, and expressed concerns that this law would be used to crack down on opposition activities, as opposition figures and groups had been considered as terrorists.⁸⁵

47. JS3 stated that Rwanda had restricted access to public broadcasting for opposition political parties and civil society organizations critical of the Government, while the ruling party had dominated the public broadcaster.⁸⁶ Several websites and independent on-line news outlets had been restricted during the 2017 election period.⁸⁷

48. JS3 stated that since 2015, threats, arbitrary arrests, intimidation and harassment of human rights defenders and other dissenting voices had been matched by increasingly sophisticated online smear and intimidation campaigns.⁸⁸ In almost all instances, the Government had been responsible for human rights violations against human rights defenders who had dared to speak out against the Government.⁸⁹ JS10 stated that there had been a lack of policy and law to protect the work of human rights defenders.⁹⁰

49. JS3 stated that access to information and communication had improved due to a strategy by Rwanda to develop an information economy, and considered a relevant supported recommendation from the previous review to be partially implemented.⁹¹

50. Expressing concerns in relation to access to information,⁹² AU-ACHPR stated that Rwanda should take appropriate measures to ensure public institutions were empowered in their duty to promote the right to access information through training, advocacy, as well as material and financial resources, ensure that the public is aware of their rights with regards to access to information through capacity building programs, and ensure that the law relating to the protection of whistle-blowers was designed to protect whistle-blowers.⁹³

51. JS1 stated that the proper realisation of access to information had been inhibited by the lack of appropriate sanctions for information officers who had deliberately withheld information requested, as the discretionary power of the Office of the Ombudsman had not translated into appropriate sanctions following an officer's failure to disclose information. The right to access to information was also undermined by the National Security Ministerial Order.⁹⁴

52. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation from the previous review,⁹⁵ JS1 commended Rwanda for the steps taken to improve internet access, but noted that the uptake had been extremely low and that the rural-urban divide had not been narrowed.⁹⁶ JS6 stated that the internet had remained beyond the reach of many citizens, particularly those in rural areas.⁹⁷

53. JS3 stated that the political landscape was heavily tilted in favour of the ruling party, the Rwandan Patriotic Front.⁹⁸ Although the 2017 election was declared free and fair by the National Electoral Commission, independent election observers had disagreed, citing a climate of fear and intimidation of several independent candidates.⁹⁹ JS7 stated that the 2017 election had taken place in a context of closed political space.¹⁰⁰ HRW stated that before and after the 2017 election, Rwanda had limited the ability of civil society groups, the media, international human rights organizations, and political opponents to function freely and independently. Opposition candidates had reported harassment, threats, and intimidation. Government authorities had arrested, forcibly disappeared, or threatened political opponents.¹⁰¹

54. JS10 identified, as a challenge, the process of registering political parties and the requirement of prior approval from the authorities to hold meetings for members of political parties.¹⁰²

*Prohibition of all forms of slavery*¹⁰³

55. JC stated that there was a presence of sex trafficking and forced labour in Rwanda. Although several victims of trafficking were rescued, there were no reported convictions for trafficking.¹⁰⁴ There was no formal mechanism to proactively identify trafficking victims.¹⁰⁵

56. JS9 stated that there was a lack of a comprehensive policy specifically addressing trafficking in children and data on trafficking in children, amongst others.¹⁰⁶

57. ECLJ stated that Rwanda should increase its efforts to enforce the law to combat human trafficking, including by enhancing the training of its military and law enforcement agencies.¹⁰⁷

Right to privacy and family life

58. JS1 stated that, pursuant to Articles 33 and 180 of the ICT Law,¹⁰⁸ police officers and Rwanda Utilities Regulatory Authority had the authority to search, seize and/or inspect electronic communication systems or equipment, including radio communications without judicial oversight. Article 23 of this Law, placed a mandatory obligation on intermediaries to equip the electronic communications network and service with technical instruments and features that allow and facilitate the lawful interception of electronic communications and monitoring.¹⁰⁹

59. Referring to the Law on interception of communication,¹¹⁰ JS1 stated that this Law did not comply with international standards.¹¹¹ It failed to specify the types of communication that might be intercepted, did not provide for notice of such interception and made no allowance for damages were privacy had been violated. The Law provided a monitoring framework that lacked independence.¹¹² JS6 stated that the Law has had a chilling effect on exchange of information due to fear of persecution.¹¹³

60. JS6 stated that Rwanda had Pegasus, a sophisticated malware that is injected into a target's phone through text sent by "WhatsApp" and it had been reported that Rwanda had paid millions of dollars to spy on Government critics and dissidents through "WhatsApp".¹¹⁴

61. JS1 stated that the mandatory SIM card registration process, pursuant to the SIM Cards Regulations,¹¹⁵ had heightened the Government's ability to monitor and access data of

mobile phone users. Article 25 of the Regulations permitted the Rwanda Utilities Regulatory Authority to have potentially limitless access to an operator's SIM card registration database, which threatened to undermine the confidentiality of digital communications and place restrictions on digital anonymity. Rwanda was using Pegasus which allegedly permitted the remote installation of malware and designed to intercept and extract information and communications from mobile phones and devices.¹¹⁶

62. Noting that Rwanda had been working on establishing a national digital ID programme, JS1 stated that the mandatory use and collection of biometric data in the new digital ID card had raised unique concerns, including the unchecked and mass surveillance initiatives and the additional identity risks associated with malicious hacking and cyber intrusion. The aggregation and use of biometric data should be sharply limited, even if such aggregation and use is aimed at increasing convenience or justified as a way to enhance security.¹¹⁷ JS1 also stated that Rwanda had continued to operate without a functional and independent data protection authority.¹¹⁸

63. JS6 stated that the measures introduced to curb the COVID-19 pandemic had included mobile phone enabled contact tracing and registration requirements at restaurants and hotels and called for rigorous data protection and privacy safeguards, to prevent misuse of the data by state authorities.¹¹⁹

64. ADF stated that practicing Jehovah's Witnesses had experienced difficulties entering into marriage, because Government officials presiding over wedding ceremonies generally required couples to take a pledge while touching the national flag, a requirement that Jehovah's Witnesses rejected on religious grounds.¹²⁰

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

*Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work*¹²¹

65. Concerned with the persistently high rate of unemployment amongst the youth amidst the different strategies put in place by the Government,¹²² AU-ACHPR urged Rwanda to promote skills and innovation for new types of jobs to provide employment opportunities for them.¹²³

66. AU-ACHPR urged Rwanda to implement the National Employment Policy and ensure that programmes intended to promote employment had a component on financial literacy.¹²⁴

67. While welcoming the decriminalization of sex work,¹²⁵ JS5 stated that the national policy against delinquency,¹²⁶ which cites, amongst others, prostitution as a delinquent conduct, fuelled the stigma towards female sex workers.¹²⁷ It was concerned about the administrative detention of sex workers.¹²⁸ JS8 stated that the programme introduced to provide income generating activities to help sex workers leave the industry, presumed that sex workers can be persuaded to adopt alternative ways of providing for themselves and their families.¹²⁹

*Right to social security*¹³⁰

68. JS11 stated there had been inadequate monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to ensure that the policies to improve the welfare of Rwandans maximized their intended impact. Also, the full implementation of the policies had been affected by budget constraints.¹³¹

69. J11 expressed concern about the lack of inclusion of all vulnerable persons and historically marginalized groups in the social protection programmes and that the cash transfers from these programmes had not been commensurate with the cost of living.¹³²

*Right to an adequate standard of living*¹³³

70. JS7 stated that the closure of the Rwanda-Uganda border in February 2019 has had a far reaching impact on the lives and livelihoods of the local people and the local economy.¹³⁴

71. While commending Rwanda for providing assistance to people living in rural areas to acquire low cost housing, AU-ACHPR expressed concern about the need for adequate housing especially among widows and female headed households.¹³⁵

72. While noting relevant policies and programmes, JS10 stated that malnutrition and insufficient food persisted in some parts of the country.¹³⁶ JS11 was concerned by the relatively high levels of malnutrition amongst children and the inadequate funding for the agriculture sector.¹³⁷

73. JS10 stated that the right to property had been inter alia eroded by the expropriation of privately owned land by the authorities and destruction of houses without compensation.¹³⁸

*Right to health*¹³⁹

74. Recalling the pledge made by Rwanda during its first review,¹⁴⁰ JS7 stated that as of 2019, about 90 percent of Rwandans had health insurance under either Government or private schemes. Beneficiaries of the CBHI scheme “Mutulle de Sante” have raised concerns about the shortage of essential medicines and the irregularities with the “Ubudehe” system, which categorised beneficiaries based on socioeconomic status, had incorrectly categorised some beneficiaries.¹⁴¹

75. Referring to a supported recommendation from the previous review relating to access to obstetrical care, JS2 stated the law passed in 2016 on reproductive health,¹⁴² contained provisions which raised concern and omitted critical reproductive health services, as antenatal and postnatal care and abortion services.¹⁴³

76. JS2 stated that although the Maternal Mortality Ratio had dropped, it was still relatively high in light of the Sustainable Development Goal to reduce the maternal mortality ratio to less than 70 per 100,000 live births.¹⁴⁴ Citing a study from a referral hospital in Rwanda, JS2 stated that the most common preventable causes were medical errors, shortages of medical supplies, and the lack of patient education and understanding of obstetric emergencies.¹⁴⁵ More than half of the women did not attend the minimum four antenatal care visits,¹⁴⁶ as recommended by the World Health Organization. Also, continuous training opportunities for antenatal care providers was rare.¹⁴⁷

77. JS2 stated that in relation to abortion, Rwanda had taken steps to implement relevant supported recommendations from the previous review,¹⁴⁸ which had demonstrated the country’s commitment to ensuring compliance with international human rights standards. However, abortion was yet to be decriminalized.¹⁴⁹ Doctors alone were permitted to provide abortion services and where a request for an abortion was based on the risk of the woman, girl or the foetus, confirmation of such risk by two doctors was required. Considering the limited number of doctors in the country, these requirements served as a barrier to accessing safe and legal abortion, and exposed girls and women to unsafe abortions. The potential of prosecution, deterred girls and women from seeking the necessary post-abortion treatment after procuring unsafe abortions.¹⁵⁰

78. JS7 stated that it had been reported in 2018 that 38 percent of children under 5 years of age were stunted and 2 percent suffered from acute malnutrition. Land consolidation policies contributed to the problem of malnutrition as land consolidation lead to an increased consumption of roots and tubers and a decrease consumption of meat, fish and fruits, and a lower availability of vitamin B12.¹⁵¹

79. JS8 stated that sex workers had been afraid of accessing healthcare facilities and that pregnant sex workers had experienced difficulties in accessing prenatal and postnatal care since they were expected to be accompanied by their partners in some Government facilities.¹⁵²

80. JS5 stated that female sex workers and LGBTI persons had faced difficulties in accessing health services due to their perceived behaviour and physical appearance.¹⁵³ The Fourth Health Sector Strategic Plan (2018-2024), which set out the strategic direction for the health sector, made no specific mention of LGBTI persons or their health needs.¹⁵⁴ Concern had also been raised about the exclusion of Transgender persons from the guidelines on HIV and STIs.¹⁵⁵

*Right to education*¹⁵⁶

81. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review,¹⁵⁷ and while commending Rwanda for increasing education infrastructure, among other relevant initiatives, JS9 noted the long distances pupils had to walk to school in rural areas, and the lack of access to digital e-learning platforms, particularly for children in rural areas and children from poor households.¹⁵⁸ It also noted that although education in public schools was free, schools had continued to charge fees, leading to children dropping out of school.¹⁵⁹

82. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation from the previous review,¹⁶⁰ and while welcoming developments in the education sector, JS9 noted inter alia the high number of pupils per class and the lack of sufficient facilities such as laboratories.¹⁶¹

83. JS9 stated that there was an insufficient number of qualified teachers and a lack of facilities in schools for children with disabilities, amongst others.¹⁶² JS11 stated that there was a need to focus on education for children with disabilities and other special needs.¹⁶³

84. JS9 stated that there was a need for human rights education and training at all levels of learning.¹⁶⁴

85. While commending Rwanda for the introduction of school feeding programmes to promote child nutrition, JS9 noted that this programme had not reached some parts of the country.¹⁶⁵

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

*Women*¹⁶⁶

86. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review,¹⁶⁷ JS2 stated that while Rwanda had made progressive developments in attempting to eliminate gender based violence, sexual and gender-based violence had continued to be wide spread and a prevalent danger for adolescent girls and women.¹⁶⁸ JS11 stated that interventions had not adequately covered the medical, psycho-social, legal and economic dimensions and had been centred on perpetrators instead of victims.¹⁶⁹ JS2 stated that victims had faced significant barriers when accessing justice.¹⁷⁰

*Children*¹⁷¹

87. HRW stated that at the previous review, Rwanda had supported recommendations on the protection of children in difficult circumstances, such as street children and on the regulation of transit and rehabilitation centres.¹⁷² Transit Centres were now governed by a 2017 law establishing the National Rehabilitation Service, which states that anyone exhibiting “deviant behaviours”¹⁷³ can be held in the transit centre for up to two months, without any further legal justification or oversight. This law provided cover for the police to round up and arbitrarily detain children in transit centres.¹⁷⁴

*Persons with disabilities*¹⁷⁵

88. AU-ACHPR commended Rwanda for the establishment of the National Council for Persons with Disabilities and the Code of Practice on Disability Mainstreaming in Public Service.¹⁷⁶

89. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation from the previous review,¹⁷⁷ and while noting the initiatives taken by Rwanda, JS9 expressed concern about the stigma experienced by children with disabilities in their family and community.¹⁷⁸

*Minorities and indigenous peoples*¹⁷⁹

90. AU-ACHPR expressed concern that the post-genocide approach to ethnicity could impact negatively on indigenous groups such as the *Batwa*. It urged Rwanda to recognise indigenous communities, as well as promote their culture and tradition.¹⁸⁰

91. JS3 stated that the *Batwa* had been forcibly displaced from their ancestral forest lands without any compensation which had a negative impact on their livelihoods, way of life and culture.¹⁸¹

92. JS4 stated that the *Batwa* rarely had access to justice, with the majority of them not knowing their rights.¹⁸² The lack of representation of the *Batwa* in decision-making bodies, prevented the *Batwa* from injecting its aspirations and needs in the development of laws, policies and action plans in relation to their socio-economic well-being.¹⁸³ The *Batwa* faced challenges in accessing Government development and poverty reduction programmes.¹⁸⁴ Noting the policy of free primary and secondary education, JS4 stated that hunger, food insecurity and the lack of economic means and school materials had been the main causes of school dropouts.¹⁸⁵ JS12 stated that *Batwa* children had not benefitted from the Government's educational policies.¹⁸⁶

93. JS12 stated that the *Batwa* had faced disproportionate rates of malnutrition and related health problems in infants, children and pregnant women.¹⁸⁷ JS4 stated that the majority of the *Batwa* could not afford food and did not have cultivatable land to produce their own food.¹⁸⁸ The majority of the *Batwa* had not benefitted from the mutual health insurance and those who did benefit, did not have the user fees.¹⁸⁹

94. JS12 stated that the *Batwa* who had been given houses under the social housing policy had reported that the houses were too small in relation to the number of family members.¹⁹⁰ JS4 stated that some of the houses built were yet to be completed with door and windows, and some *Batwa* did not have appliances in their homes.¹⁹¹

*Refugees and asylum seekers*¹⁹²

95. AI stated that since September 2019, Rwanda has hosted African refugees and asylum-seekers evacuated from detention centres in a third country through an emergency transfer mechanism. The Memorandum of Understanding signed with United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the African Union states that the transfer would be voluntary. The options for durable solutions open to those transferred to Rwanda include resettlement into a third country, return to country of origin, return to a country of where first asylum had been granted, or remaining in Rwanda, subject to agreement with the authorities.¹⁹³

96. HRW stated that in February 2018, police fired live ammunition at unarmed refugees protesting outside UNHCR office in Karongi District Western Province, killing about 12 people. A report published by NCHR concluded that the police used force as a last resort, contradicting HRW's findings.¹⁹⁴

*Stateless persons*¹⁹⁵

97. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review,¹⁹⁶ JS9 welcomed the developments to ensure the birth registration of children including the country-wide mass campaigns, but noted that some parents did not understand the reasons for registering the births of children, amongst others.¹⁹⁷ JS11 stated that the majority of the children registered through the mass campaigns did not receive their birth certificates.¹⁹⁸

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:

ADF	ADF International, Geneva (Switzerland);
AHR	Advocates for Human Rights, Minneapolis (United States of America);
AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom);
ECLJ	European Centre for Law and Justice, Strasbourg (France);
FN	Freedom Now, Washington DC (United States of America);
HRW	Human Rights Watch, Geneva, (Switzerland);
JAI	Just Atonement Inc., New York, (United States of America);
JC	Jubilee Campaign, Surrey (United Kingdom of Great Britain)

MAAT	and Northern Ireland); Maat Foundation for Peace Development and Human Rights, Cairo (Egypt).
<i>Joint submissions:</i>	
JS1	ARTICLE 19, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), and Access Now (Joint Submission 1);
JS2	Center for Reproductive Rights, Health Development Initiative (Joint Submission 2);
JS3	CIVICUS, Johannesburg (South Africa) and East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project (Joint Submission 3);
JS4	Communauté des Piers du Rwanda, Kigali, Rwanda and Hope for Community Development Organization, Kigali (Rwanda) (Joint Submission 4);
JS5	Health Development Initiative, Ihorere Munyarwanda Organisation, Rwanda NGO Forum on HIV /AIDS and Health Promotion, Strive Foundation Rwanda, Amahoro Human Respect Organisation, My Rights, Safe Friendly Society, Horizon Community Association, Building hope future, RIFA, Bright Future Organization, Hope and Care, Joint Action for Bright Future, Pride Ark Organization, Health and Rights organization, ABAHUJUMUGAMBI, One for All, INDATWA, ABISHYZE HAMWE and IGITEGO, Kigali (Rwanda) (Joint Submission 5);
JS6	Small Media, London, (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and Collaboration on International ICT Policy in East and Southern Africa, Kampala (Uganda) (Joint Submission 6);
JS7	Ecumenical Network Central Africa, Berlin (Germany) (Joint Submission 7);
JS8	African Sex Workers Alliance, Nairobi (Kenya) and Sexual Rights Initiative, Geneva (Switzerland) (Joint Submission 8);
JS9	Coalition Umwana ku Isonga comprising of: AGR, AJPRODHO JIJUKIRWA, ARCT RUHUKA, Association BAMPOREZE, AVP, BLAO, CLADHO, CVT, CHRD, COPORWA, HAGURUKA, Association KANYARWANDA, VCO, UMUSEKE Association. Collectif TUBAKUNDE, WATOTO VISION FOR AFRICA, SAFI Life Organization, Lawyers of Hope, UMUHUZA Organization, Kigali (Rwanda) (Joint Submission 9);
JS10	La Ligue des Droits de la personne dans la région des Grands Lacs, L'Association Rwandaise pour la Promotion des Connaissances en Droits de l'Homme, Le Conseil National des Organisations Syndicales Libres au Rwanda, Hope for Community Development Organisation, Syndicat des Travailleurs Indépendants de l'Economie Informelle (Rwanda) (Joint Submission 10);
JS11	The Legal Aid Forum, Center for Human Rights and Development, Center for Rule of Law Rwanda, Fight Illiteracy Youth Organisation, Strive Foundation Rwanda, Rwanda NGO Forum on HIV/AIDS, Never Again Rwanda, National Union of Disability Organisations of Rwanda, Faith Victory Association, Hope for Community Development Organisation, Ihorere Munyarwanda Organisation, Association des Jeunes Avocats du Rwanda, Action pour le Développement du Peuple, Association Rwandaise pour la Défense des Droits de la Personne et des Libertés Publiques, Association de la Jeunesse pour la Promotion des Droits de l'Homme et du développement, Association Rwandaise pour la Défense des Droits de l'Homme, Communauté des Potiers du Rwanda, Human Rights First Rwanda Association, Inara Legal Aid Services, Independent Institute of Lay Adventists of Kigali- Legal Aid Clinic, Ligue Rwandaise pour la Promotion

JS12

et la Défense des Droits de l'Homme, The Network of Lawyers of Hope Rwanda, Mouvement des Peuples pour l'Education aux Droits Humains, Non Crime Rwanda, UMUSANZU Newspaper, IMPAMO Newspaper, IMANZI Newspaper, RUGALI Newspaper, AMAHORO Newspaper, PAX PRESS and Media Press House, Kigali (Rwanda) (Joint Submissions 11);
African Initiative for Mankind Progress Organization, Kigali (Rwanda), First People Development Organization, Kigali (Rwanda), Minority Rights Group International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and Women's Organization for Promoting Unity, Kigali (Rwanda) (Joint Submission 12).

National human rights institution:

NCHR

National Commission for Human Rights, Kigali (Rwanda).

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):

AU-ACHPR

African Union – African Commission of Human and Peoples Rights Banjul, (The Gambia).

- ² NHR, para. 2.
- ³ NCHR, paras. 9-10, referring to A/HRC/31/8, para. 133.22 (Egypt), para. 133.26 (Republic of Korea); para. 133.43 (Namibia); para. 133.44 (China); para. 133.45 (Colombia).
- ⁴ NCHR, para. 12, referring to A/HRC/31/8, para. 133.26 (Republic of Korea).
- ⁵ NCHR, paras. 12-14.
- ⁶ NCHR, paras. 15-17. NCHR made a recommendation (para. 18).
- ⁷ NCHR, para. 19. NCHR made a recommendation (para. 20).
- ⁸ The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

OP-ICESCR	Optional Protocol to ICESCR;
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT;
ICPPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.
- ⁹ For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/8, paras. 133.1, 134.1–16, 134.18, 134.25, 134.32–134.35, 134.42, 134.66, 135.1–20, 135.24, 135.25, 135.46–48, 135.52 and 135.74.
- ¹⁰ JS7, para. 23 and fn. 31, referring to A/HRC/31/8, para. 134.1 (Netherlands), para. 134.2 (Togo), para. 134.3 (Italy), para. 134.4 (Japan), para. 134.5 (Madagascar, Mali and Montenegro), para. 134.6 (Panama), para. 134.7 (Sierra Leone), para. 134.8 (Argentina), para. 134.9 (France), para. 134.10 (Cabo Verde), para. 134.11 (Chile), para. 134.12 (Costa Rica), and para. 134.13 (Greece).
- ¹¹ Ibid, para. 23. See also AHR, para. 8; JC para. 3. JC made a recommendation, para. 4.
- ¹² AHR, para. 3.
- ¹³ JS4, p. 12.
- ¹⁴ JS7, para. 33. JS7 made a recommendation (para. 37). See also MAAT, p. 8; and AHR, para. 9. AHR made a recommendation (p. 5).
- ¹⁵ AU-ACHPR, para. 32.
- ¹⁶ HRW, para. 35. MAAT, p. 8. See also AI, para. 6.
- ¹⁷ For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/8, paras. 133.2–5, 134.19–24, 134.27–30, 134.37, 134.72, 89, 134. 90, 135.56 and 135.58.
- ¹⁸ AU-ACHPR, para. 28.
- ¹⁹ JS5, para. 3.2.1.1. JS5 made a recommendation (para. 3.2.1.3).
- ²⁰ JS7, para. 31, referring to A/HRC/17/4, para. 79.1.
- ²¹ Ibid, para. 32 and 33, referring to A/HRC/31/8, para. 133.6 (Czech Republic) and 134.26 (Denmark). See also AHR, para. 3.
- ²² JS11 referred to Article 7 *bis* of the Law N° 61/2018 of 24/08/2018 modifying Law N° 19/2013 of 25/3/2013 (JS11, para. 2.3).
- ²³ Ibid, para. 2.3. JS11 made recommendations (para. 2.3).
- ²⁴ JS7, para. 36.
- ²⁵ For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/8, paras. 133.9 and 135.26.
- ²⁶ JS5, para. 3.2.1.1 and endnote I, citing Law N°32/2016 of 28/08/2016 governing persons and family published in the Official Gazette n°37 of 12/09/2016.
- ²⁷ Ibid, para. 3.2.1.1. JS5 made recommendations (para. 3.2.1.3). See also JS8, para. 30.
- ²⁸ Ibid, para. 3.2.4.1. JS5 made recommendations (para. 3.2.4.4).
- ²⁹ JS8, paras. 26-29. JS8 made recommendations (paras. 32-40).

- ³⁰ AU-ACHPR, para. 42.
- ³¹ Ibid, para. 57(i).
- ³² JAI, paras. 36-38.
- ³³ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/31/8, 133.6–8, 133.17, 133.18, 133.26, 133.27, 134.17, 134.26, 134.36, 134.48, 135.33–36 and 135.43.
- ³⁴ HRW, paras. 19-21 and footnotes 26 and 28, referring to A/HRC/31/8, para. 133.17 (Sweden), para. 188.18 (Cyprus), para. 133.26 (Republic of Korea), 133.28 (Singapore), 133.29 (Brazil).
- ³⁵ Ibid, paras. 19-21 and footnotes 26 and 29-31, referring to A/HRC/31/8, para. 134.36 (Canada), para. 134.29 (Italy), para. 134.30 (Egypt), para. 134.48 (Italy) and para. 134.49 (Germany).
- ³⁶ Ibid, paras. 19-21 and para. 30.
- ³⁷ Ibid, para. 22. See also JS7, para. 26. JS7 made a recommendation (para. 28).
- ³⁸ AI, para. 18. AI made recommendations (p. 5).
- ³⁹ JS7, para. 25. JS7 made a recommendation (para. 28). See also AHR, para. 14; JC paras. 29 and 30. JC made recommendations (paras. 31-35).
- ⁴⁰ HRW, paras. 26 and 30. See also MAAT, p. 7. MAAT made a recommendation (p. 10).
- ⁴¹ AI, para. 19. AI made recommendations (p. 5).
- ⁴² AU-ACHPR, para. 49(ii).
- ⁴³ Ibid, paras. 84 and 89.
- ⁴⁴ JS5, para. 3.2.3.1 and endnote vii, citing Law N°59/2008 of 10/09/2008 on prevention and punishment of Gender-based Violence published in the Official Gazette No 14 of 06/04/2009. JS5 made a recommendation (para. 3.2.3.4).
- ⁴⁵ JS11, para. 3.4. JS11 made recommendations (para. 3.4).
- ⁴⁶ AU-ACHPR, para. 49 (iii).
- ⁴⁷ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/31/8, paras. 133.28, 133.29, 134.39–51 and 135.28, 135.37, 135.38, and 135.40–44.
- ⁴⁸ JS10, para. 3.11. JS10 made recommendations (para. 3.11).
- ⁴⁹ HRW, para. 27. See also FN, para. 9. FN made recommendations (para. 20).
- ⁵⁰ Ibid, paras. 28 and 30.
- ⁵¹ FN, para. 8. FN made recommendations (para. 20).
- ⁵² JS11, para. 3.3. JS11 made recommendations (para. 3.3).
- ⁵³ AU-ACHPR, paras. 49 (iv) and (vii).
- ⁵⁴ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/31/8, paras. 133.30–34, 134.31, 134.52–55, 134.57–68, 135.21–23, 135.45, 135.49–51, 135.53–55, 135.57, 135.59–62.
- ⁵⁵ JS3, para. 4.1 and Annex, referring to A/HRC/31/8, para. 134.59 (Switzerland), para. 134.60 (Norway), para. 134.61 (Spain), para. 134.62 (Spain) and para. 134.67 (Australia).
- ⁵⁶ ADF, para. 13. ADF made a recommendation (paras. 16 (iv)-(vi)).
- ⁵⁷ ECLJ, paras. 6-10.
- ⁵⁸ JC, paras. 7 and 8. JC made a recommendation (para. 13). See also ECLJ, paras. 4 and 11.
- ⁵⁹ ECLJ, para. 4.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid, para. 25.
- ⁶¹ Constitution of the Republic of Rwanda (2003, revised in 2015).
- ⁶² JS1, paras. 4-6, referring to A/HRC/31/8, para. 133.1 (Chile) and para. 134.31 (Japan).
- ⁶³ Ibid, para. 7 and fn. 7 citing Law No. 68/2018 of 30/08/2018 Determining offences and penalties in general.
- ⁶⁴ Ibid, paras. 7-9. JS1 made a recommendation (p. 3). See also JS3, para. 2.5; AI, para. 13. AI made a recommendation (p.5); ADF, paras. 3 and 4.
- ⁶⁵ ADF, paras. 5 and 6.
- ⁶⁶ JS1, para. 10 and fn. 15, citing the Law Governing ICT, Law No. 24/2016 of 18 June 2016.
- ⁶⁷ Ibid, paras. 10 and 11. JS1 made recommendations (p. 6).
- ⁶⁸ JS3, para. 2.7.
- ⁶⁹ JS6, paras. 15 and 16, citing Article 56 of Law N°22/2009 of 12/08/2009.
- ⁷⁰ JS1, paras. 17-21 and fn. 36, citing Law N°02/2013 of 08/02/2013 Regulating Media (Official Gazette No. 10 of 11 March 2013).
- ⁷¹ Ibid, paras. 22-25. JS1 made recommendations (p. 11).
- ⁷² Ibid, para. 26. JS1 made recommendations (p. 11).
- ⁷³ JS3, para. 2.3. See also JS6, para. 7 and JS7, para. 42.
- ⁷⁴ AU-ACHPR, para. 50. See also JS1, para. 9.
- ⁷⁵ JS3, para. 2.4. JS3 made recommendations (para. 6.1).
- ⁷⁶ JS1, paras. 28-30 and fn. 58, citing A/HRC/31/8, para. 134.54 (Austria), para. 134.55 (Brazil) and para. 134.57 (Norway). JS1 made a recommendation (p. 11).
- ⁷⁷ JS3, para. 2.8. JS3 made recommendations (para. 6.1). See also JS7, paras. 48-50. JS7 made recommendations (paras. 51 and 52).

- ⁷⁸ HRW, paras. 12 and 18. For specific cases, see HRW, paras. 13-16. See also JAI, paras. 11-14; JC paras. 41-45; and JS10, para. 3.1.2. JS10 made recommendations (para. 3.1.2.).
- ⁷⁹ JS7, para. 47.
- ⁸⁰ HRW, para. 11.
- ⁸¹ AI, para 8 and endnote 9, citing the Republic of Rwanda, Law N°04/2012 of 17/02/2012 governing the organisation and the functioning of national non-governmental organizations and Law N°05/2012 of 17/02/2012 governing the organisation and functioning of international non-governmental organizations.
- ⁸² Ibid, para.8. AI made a recommendation (p. 4).
- ⁸³ JS7, para. 45. See also JS8, para. 21.
- ⁸⁴ JS3, para. 2.6 and fn. 7, citing Law on Prevention and Punishment of Cybercrimes, Official Gazette No. Special of 15/09/2018.
- ⁸⁵ Ibid, para. 2.6. JS3 made a recommendation (para. 6.1.).
- ⁸⁶ Ibid, para. 2.15, JS3 made recommendations (para. 6.3).
- ⁸⁷ Ibid, para. 2.14. See also JS6, para. 23. JS6 made a recommendation (para. 41(b)).
- ⁸⁸ Ibid, para. 3.4, JS3 made recommendations (para. 6.2).
- ⁸⁹ Ibid, para. 3.9.
- ⁹⁰ JS10, para. 3.1.4. JS10 made a recommendation (para. 3.1.4).
- ⁹¹ JS3, para. 2.1 and Annex, para. 1, referring to A/HRC/31/8, para. 133.34 (Haiti).
- ⁹² AU-ACHPR, para. 36.
- ⁹³ Ibid, para. 51.
- ⁹⁴ JS1, paras. 31-35 and fn. 64, citing Ministerial Order determining which information could destabilize national security (N°005/07.01/13 of 19/12/2013). JS1 made recommendations (p. 14).
- ⁹⁵ Ibid, para. 60 and fn. 101, referring to A/HRC/31/8, para. 133.34 (Haiti).
- ⁹⁶ Ibid, paras. 60-66. JS1 made recommendations (p. 21).
- ⁹⁷ JS6, para. 26.
- ⁹⁸ JS3, para. 3.7. See also JAI, para. 1.
- ⁹⁹ Ibid, para. 3.7.
- ¹⁰⁰ JS7, para.18. JS7 made a recommendation (para. 22).
- ¹⁰¹ HRW, paras. 5-8. For specific cases, see HRW, paras. 7-10. See also JS7, para.18. JS7 made a recommendation (para. 22); JAI, paras. 4 and 5; MAAT pp. 3-6. MAAT made a recommendation (p. 10); AI, para. 10. AI made a recommendation (p. 4); AHR, paras. 18 and 21. AHR made a recommendation (p. 5).
- ¹⁰² JS10, para. 3.1.3. JS10 made recommendations (para. 3.1.3).
- ¹⁰³ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/31/8, paras. 133.19–21, 134.38, 134.39, 134.46, 135.29, and 135.30.
- ¹⁰⁴ JC, para. 22.
- ¹⁰⁵ Ibid, para. 23. JC made recommendations (paras. 25-29).
- ¹⁰⁶ JS9, para. 5.1. JS9 made recommendations (para. 5.1). See also JS11, para. 3.9. JS11 made recommendations (para. 3.9).
- ¹⁰⁷ ECLJ, para. 26.
- ¹⁰⁸ JS1, para 41 and fn. 77, citing Law Governing ICT, Law No. 24/2016 of 18 June 2016.
- ¹⁰⁹ Ibid, paras. 42-44 and en.77 citing Law Governing ICT, Law No. 24/2016 of 18 June 2016. See also JS6, paras. 29-31. JS6 made a recommendation (para. 41(d)).
- ¹¹⁰ Ibid, footnote. 81, citing Law Regulating the Interception of Communications, Law N°60/2013 of 22/08/2013.
- ¹¹¹ Ibid, paras. 45-47.
- ¹¹² Ibid, paras. 48 and 49.
- ¹¹³ JS6, para. 36. JS6 made a recommendation (para. 41(d)).
- ¹¹⁴ Ibid, paras. 37 and 38.
- ¹¹⁵ Regulation N ° 004/R/ICT/RURA/2018 - Governing the SIM Cards Registration in Rwanda (JS1, fn. 86).
- ¹¹⁶ JS1, paras. 51 and 52. JS1 made a recommendation (p. 19).
- ¹¹⁷ Ibid, paras. 54-56. JS1 made a recommendation (p. 19).
- ¹¹⁸ Ibid, para. 59. See also JS6, para. 28. JS6 made a recommendation (para. 41(d)).
- ¹¹⁹ JS6, para. 40.
- ¹²⁰ ADF, para. 15.
- ¹²¹ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/31/8, paras. 133.35, 134.69 and 134.91.
- ¹²² AU-ACHPR, para. 39.
- ¹²³ Ibid, para. 54(ii). See also JS11, para. 3.13. JS11 made recommendations (para. 3.13).
- ¹²⁴ Ibid, para. 54(i).
- ¹²⁵ JS5, paras. 3.1.2 and 3.2,5 and endnote x, citing Law N°68/2018 of 30/08/2018 determining offenses

- and penalties in general(*Official Gazette no. Special of 27/09/2018*).
- 126 Ibid, para. 3.2.2.2, and endnote V, citing Ministry of Local Government *National Policy Against Delinquency* (2016).
- 127 Ibid, para. 3.2.2.2. JS5 made a recommendation (para. 3.2.2.4).
- 128 Ibid, para. 3.2.5.1. JS5 made recommendations (para. 3.2.5.3).
- 129 JS8, para. 11. JS8 made a recommendation, para. 35.
- 130 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/31/8, paras. 134.73.
- 131 JS11, para. 2.2. JS11 made recommendations (para. 2.2).
- 132 Ibid, para. 3.14. JS11 made recommendations (para. 3.14).
- 133 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/31/8, paras. 133.36, 133.37, 133.39, 133.40, 134.71, 134.74–77, 134.101, 135. 64 and 135.65.
- 134 JS7, para. 10.
- 135 AU-ACHPR, paras. 23 and 86.
- 136 JS10, para. 3.23. JS10 made recommendations (para. 3.2.3).
- 137 JS11, para. 3.16. JS11 made recommendations (para. 3.16.).
- 138 JS10, para. 3.2.4. JS10 made recommendations (para. 3.2.4).
- 139 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/31/8, paras. 133.41, 133.42, 134.78, 134.79, 135.66, and 135.67.
- 140 A/HRC/17/4 (14 March 2011), para. 84.
- 141 JS7, para. 9. See also JS10, para. 3.2.2. JS10 made recommendations (para. 3.2.2); and JS11, para. 3.12. JS11 made recommendations (para. 3.12).
- 142 Law N° 21/2016 of 20/05/2016 (Rwanda) (JS2, endnote 6.).
- 143 JS2, paras. 1-2.
- 144 Ibid, para. 4.
- 145 Ibid, para. 5 and endnote 14, citing Benimana C, Small M, Rulisa S, *Preventability of maternal near miss and mortality in Rwanda: A case series from the University Teaching Hospital of Kigali (CHUK)*. PLOS ONE 13(6): e0195711 (2018) available at: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0195711>.
- 146 Ibid, para. 5 and endnote 15, citing the National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda, et al., *Rwanda Demographic Health Survey 2014-2015: Key Findings 8* (2015) available at <http://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/SR229/SR229.pdf>.
- 147 Ibid, para. 5. JS2 made a recommendation (p. 9, para. I.).
- 148 Ibid, para. 16, citing A/HRC/31/8, para. 134.79 (Slovenia), para. 134.80 (Switzerland), para. 134.45 (Sweden).
- 149 Ibid, paras. 16 and 17.
- 150 Ibid, paras. 18-22. JS2 made a recommendation (p. 9, para. V.).
- 151 JS7, para. 8. JS7 made a recommendation (para. 12).
- 152 JS8, para. 16 and 18.
- 153 JS5, para. 3.2.6.
- 154 Ibid, para. 3.2.6.1.
- 155 Ibid, para. 3.2.6.1 and endnote xii, citing Rwanda Biomedical Centre *National Guidelines for Prevention and Management of HIV and STIs* (Edition 2016). JS5 made recommendations (para. 3.2.6.3).
- 156 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/31/8, paras.133.43, 133.44, 134.81-88, 134. 92-94 and 135.68.
- 157 JS9, para. 4.1, referring to A/HRC/31/8, para. 134.88 (Sudan), para. 134.92 (Turkey), para. 134.93 (Algeria), para. 134.94 (Armenia) and para. 134.81 (Holy See).
- 158 Ibid, para. 4.1. JS9 made recommendations (para. 4.1).
- 159 Ibid, para. 4.3. JS9 made recommendations (para. 4.3). See also JS10, para. 3.2.5. JS10 made recommendations (para. 3.2.5).
- 160 JS9, para. 2.2, referring to A/HRC/31/8, para. 134.33 (Portugal).
- 161 Ibid, para. 2.2. JS9 made recommendations (para. 2.2).
- 162 Ibid, para. 2.3. JS9 made recommendations (para. 2.3).
- 163 JS11, para. 3.11. JS11 made recommendations (para. 3.11).
- 164 JS9, para. 4.4. JS9 made recommendations (para. 4.4).
- 165 Ibid, para. 3.1. JS9 made recommendations (para. 3.1).
- 166 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/31/8, paras. 133.10–14, 133.24, 133.25, 134.43–45, 134.70 and 135.63.
- 167 JS2, para. 12, referring to A/HRC/31/8, para. 133.23 (Nicaragua), para. 133.24 (Singapore), para. 133.25 (Uganda), para. 134.41 (Portugal), para. 134.43 (Republic of Korea), para. 134.44 (Cuba) and para. 134.45 (Sweden).
- 168 Ibid, para. 14. JS2 made a recommendation (p. 9, para. II). See also JC, para. 17. JC made

recommendations (paras. 19 and 20).

¹⁶⁹ JS11, para. 3.8. JS11 made recommendations (para. 3.8).

¹⁷⁰ JS2, para. 15. JS2 made a recommendation (p. 9, para. III).

¹⁷¹ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/31/8, paras. 133.22, 133.23, 133.38, 133.45, 134.33, 134.41, 134.47, 135.31 and 135.32.

¹⁷² HRW, para. 31, referring to A/HRC/31/8, para. 133.22 (Egypt) and para. 133.27 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

¹⁷³ Defined in the law as “actions or bad behaviour such as prostitution, drug use, begging, vagrancy, informal street vending, or any other deviant behaviour that is harmful to the public.” See: Ministerial Order no. 001/07.01 of 19/04/2018 determining Mission, Organization and Functioning of Transit Centres, art. 2.2 (See HRW, para. 32 and fn. 51.).

¹⁷⁴ HRW, para. 31. See also JAI, paras. 17-24; JC paras. 63 and 64. JC made recommendations (paras. 67 and 68).

¹⁷⁵ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/31/8, para. 134.95.

¹⁷⁶ AU-ACHPR, para. 25.

¹⁷⁷ JS9, para. 3.2, referring to A/HRC/31/8, para. 3.2.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid, para. 3.2. JS9 made recommendations (para. 3.2).

¹⁷⁹ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/31/8, paras. 135.27, 135.69–73.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid, para. 58.

¹⁸¹ JS3, para. 2. JS3 made recommendations (pp. 10-11). See also JS12, para. 17. JS12 made recommendations (pp. 11-12).

¹⁸² JS4, para. 6.1.1. JS4 made recommendations (p. 5).

¹⁸³ Ibid, para. 6.1.2.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid, para. 6.2.1. JS4 made recommendations (p. 7).

¹⁸⁵ Ibid, para. 6.2.2. JS4 made a recommendation (p. 8).

¹⁸⁶ JS12, para. 6. JS12 made recommendations (p. 11).

¹⁸⁷ Ibid, para. 8.

¹⁸⁸ JS4, para. 6.2.3. JS4 made recommendations (p. 8).

¹⁸⁹ Ibid, para. 6.2.4. JS4 made a recommendation (p. 9).

¹⁹⁰ JS12, para. 20. JS12 made recommendations (p. 12).

¹⁹¹ JS4, para. 6.2.5. JS4 made a recommendation (p. 10).

¹⁹² For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/31/8, paras. 133.47, 133.48, 134.98-100, 135.76 and 135.77.

¹⁹³ AI, para. 23. AI made a recommendation (p. 5).

¹⁹⁴ HRW, para. 23. See also MAAT, p. 9. MAAT made a recommendation (p. 10); AI para. 12; JC para. 49. JC made a recommendation (para. 50); and JS11, para. 3.17. JS11 made recommendations (para. 3.17).

¹⁹⁵ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/31/8, paras. 133.15 and 133.16.

¹⁹⁶ JS9, para. 2.1, referring to A/HRC/31/8, para. 133.15 (Mexico) and para. 133.16 (Turkey).

¹⁹⁷ Ibid, para. 2.1. JS9 made recommendations (para. 2.1).

¹⁹⁸ JS11, para. 3.10. JS11 made recommendations (para. 3.10).
