



General Assembly

Distr.: General
5 August 2014

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review

Twentieth session

27 October – 7 November 2014

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

Republic of Angola*

The present report is a summary of 8 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.

GE.14-10333 (E)



* 1 4 1 0 3 3 3 *

Please recycle The recycling symbol, consisting of three chasing arrows forming a triangle.



Information provided by stakeholders

A. Background and framework

1. Scope of international obligations

1. Amnesty International (AI) noted that the Republic of Angola (Angola) accepted recommendations made during its universal periodic review in 2010 (2010 Review)² to ratify outstanding human rights instruments.³ In this context, AI welcomed the signing of the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty (ICCPR-OP2), the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT) and the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OP-CAT), the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD), and the Optional Protocol of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (OP-ICESCR).⁴ AI recommended that Angola complete the process of ratification of all signed Conventions in accordance with its undertakings at its 2010 Review.⁵ Human Rights Watch (HRW) stated that the signing of those Conventions was a positive step and looked forward to their prompt ratification.⁶

2. World Coalition Against the Death Penalty (WCADP) stated that Angola accepted recommendations at the 2010 Review to ratify ICCPR-OP2.⁷ This Protocol was signed on 24 September 2013, but was yet to be ratified.⁸ WCADP urged Angola to ratify this instrument.⁹

3. AI stated that Angola accepted recommendations to ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (CPED) and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families (ICRMW) but that those Conventions had not been signed.¹⁰

4. Joint Submission 1 (JS 1) stated that Angola should consider ratifying ICERD, CAT and ICRMW, and the ICCPR-OP2, as a further step in its progress towards the full enjoyment of human rights of its people.¹¹

2. Constitutional and legislative framework

5. AI stated that the Constitution of the Republic of Angola (Constitution) only recognised “the right to live in a healthy environment” and the “right to health care” but did not recognise the right to “the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health”, as provided for in the International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), to which Angola was a party. The Constitution also did not contain a prohibition against the collective expulsion of non-nationals, in accordance with the relevant provision in the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights.¹²

6. The Africa Freedom of Information Centre (AFIC) stated that the Constitution was silent on the right of access to information in the possession of the State, despite Angola’s ratification of key international and regional treaties that recognise this right.¹³

7. AI stated that in many cases there was a lack of legislation giving effect to human rights that was recognised in the Constitution and in ratified treaties. It cited as an example, Article 36 of the Constitution, which prohibited torture and ill-treatment but that such prohibition was yet to be enacted in national law.¹⁴ In addition, provisions in national law which could encourage ill-treatment and torture were yet to be repealed.¹⁵

8. AFIC stated that the Freedom of Information Act did not meet the standards on access to information as prescribed in the Draft Model Law for African Union Member States;¹⁶ and recommended amendment of this Act.¹⁷

9. AFIC stated that the Freedom of Information Act was not consistently implemented.¹⁸ It recommended the establishment of a monitoring committee to oversee the implementation of this Act.¹⁹

10. International Service for Human Rights (ISHR) noted the concern that some provisions of the draft Criminal Code were incompatible with Angola's human rights obligations and appeared to reveal the Government's intention to further suppress the activity of human rights groups.²⁰ It recommended thorough revision of the draft Criminal Code, with civil society participation, to ensure its compliance with international law.²¹

3. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures

11. ISHR recommended the establishment of a national human rights institution, in accordance with the Paris Principles. This institution should have a focal point for human rights defenders.²²

12. JS 1 referred to recommendations 106, 107, 108 and 110 made during the 2010 Review which inter alia related to human rights defenders and civil society organisations, and stated that there was no standardisation in the implementation of the Law of Associations and that the process was difficult for organisations from certain provinces in the country, whose registration and licencing took place in Luanda. There was also a lack of will on the part of the authorities to grant human rights organisations and association of human rights defenders public utility status.²³

B. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

13. HRW stated that Angola accepted the majority of the recommendations received during the 2010 Review, but has made little progress in implementing them.²⁴

Cooperation with special procedures

14. AI expressed regret that Angola rejected the four recommendations made during the 2010 Review which related to extending a standing invitation to the Special Procedures.²⁵

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

1 Right to life, liberty and security of the person

15. AI stated that the police and other security forces have used excessive force against and ill-treated street vendors in Luanda, peaceful demonstrators, and non-nationals in the course of forcibly expelling them from the country. In addition, it received reports of at least 19 individuals killed at the hands of the police between 2010 and December 2013 in circumstance which appeared to have been unlawful.²⁶

16. HRW stated that António Alves Kamulungue and Isaiás Cassule were separately abducted by security agents in plainclothes on 27 May 2012 and 29 May 2012, respectively, after they had organized a protest in Luanda by former presidential guards and war veterans over complaints of unpaid salaries and pensions. An internal government report in November 2013 stated that they were tortured and killed in custody by police and intelligence officials. On 15 November 2013, the then head of the domestic intelligence

services (SINSE), Sebastião Martins, was dismissed, and the Attorney-General's Office announced the arrest of four officials for their alleged involvement in this case. The men were yet to be brought to trial.²⁷

17. HRW stated that research in 2011 found that members of the security forces—including border police, rapid intervention police, and immigration officials—routinely committed violence against female migrants in a number of transit prison facilities where migrants are detained before deportation, particularly in the border provinces of Cabinda and Lunda Norte. Corroborated abuses targeting women included rape, sexual coercion, beatings, deprivation of food and water, and—in some cases—sexual abuse in the presence of children and other female inmates. HRW stated that it was not aware of any credible and thorough investigation and prosecution of those responsible for the violations.²⁸ HRW recommended inter alia thorough, credible, and impartial investigations into all allegations of serious abuse by members of the security forces against irregular migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and others during past expulsions, and publication of the findings; disciplining or prosecuting those responsible, including officials with oversight responsibility, and the adoption and implementation of a “no-tolerance policy” for sexual violence by security forces.²⁹

18. HRW stated that Angola had accepted recommendations to step up efforts to prevent arbitrary detentions, and to investigate all cases involving arbitrary arrest, detention and torture and to bring to justice those responsible. However, security forces continued to arbitrarily arrest alleged supporters of the separatist guerrilla movement Front for the Liberation of the Enclave of Cabinda (FLEC) and use torture in military custody to force detainees to confess or incriminate others. Defence lawyers representing detainees held on national security charges, such as Arão Tempo, a lawyer and local representative of the Angolan Bar have received repeated death threats from intelligence officials.³⁰

19. AI stated that police and security forces continued to carry out arbitrary arrests and detentions as well as acts of torture and ill-treatment against individuals in detention. In January and August 2013, two leaked video footages showed prison guards, police and, on one occasion, fire brigade officials, brutally beating prisoners in the Viana and Luanda Central Prisons. A number of officials have since been dismissed, suspended or faced disciplinary proceedings following the leaked video footages. However, it was not clear whether criminal proceedings had been instituted against any of those persons.³¹

20. AI stated that on 22 November 2012, nine men of foreign decent were arrested, held incommunicado and reportedly ill-treated. Although no longer held incommunicado, they reportedly remain in detention without trial, apparently on suspicion of attempting to destabilize the government of a third country.³²

21. Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) stated that the Child Law 2012 did not prohibit corporal punishment in the home or in any other setting.³³ The Domestic Violence Act 2010 made corporal punishment of a certain severity unlawful but did not effectively prohibit all forms of corporal punishment, however light, in childrearing and education.³⁴ There was no explicit confirmation of children's right not to be subjected to corporal punishment in any form in the Constitution.³⁵ There was also no explicit prohibition of all forms of corporal punishment in alternative care settings, day care facilities, schools and penal institutions.³⁶

2. Administration of justice and the rule of law

22. AI referred to recommendations 71 and 72³⁷ that had been made at the 2010 Review and stated that Angola had not fulfilled its commitment to investigate and end arbitrary arrests, detentions and torture.³⁸

23 HRW stated that in several cases, arrested protestors were denied due process and were held in pre-trial detention for long periods of time without charges, or were sentenced to imprisonment in unfair trials.³⁹

3. Freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly, and right to participate in public and political life

24. ISHR stated that during the 2010 Review, Angola accepted three recommendations in relation to human rights defenders, committing to guarantee their legitimacy and protection, as well as to pursue dialogue with civil society. Angola also committed to decriminalize press offences and to work to protect journalists. Regrettably, Angola had failed to take concrete steps to implement those recommendations. Moreover, there had been a range of new attacks and restrictions against human rights defenders since the 2010 Review.⁴⁰

25. Front Line Defenders (FLD) stated that human rights defenders campaigning against state and police corruption remained at particular risk and faced prosecution, often on the basis of charges of offending state authorities.⁴¹

26. ISHR stated that those human rights defenders from Angola who made statements at the 51st African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights session, during which the human rights situation in Angola was reviewed, were afraid to return home following threatening remarks from some members of the Angolan delegation.⁴²

27. AI stated that the authorities have continued to place restrictions on press freedom. Journalists faced harassment, arbitrary detention, beatings, as well as confiscation or destruction of their property while covering news stories. This has been particularly evident in the context of demonstrations.⁴³ Criminal defamation laws were used to restrict the right to freedom of expression, with journalists being sentenced to imprisonment for defamation of public officials.⁴⁴

28. HRW stated that the right to freedom of expression was severely restricted due to laws limiting private radio and television broadcasting, government censorship of state-owned media, and pervasive surveillance and intimidation of journalists, which encouraged self-censorship.⁴⁵ During the 2010 Review, Angola accepted the recommendations "to decriminalize press offenses" and to "strengthen the protection of journalists against harassment, attacks and arbitrary detention." However, the Government had not made any progress in the implementation of those recommendations.⁴⁶

29. HRW stated that defamation is a criminal offense. In recent years, a number of journalists have been prosecuted for criminal defamation in cases brought by senior Government officials. Many of the legal provisions to protect media freedom and access to information were vaguely formulated in Angola's 2006 press law, which limited the ability of journalists to publicly criticize the Government without fear of repercussions. HRW stated that in 2013, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights called Angolan legal provisions on defamation "a threat to investigative journalism" and added that "freedom to investigate and expose possible abuses should not be undermined by heavy-handed actions, threats and intimidation on the part of the authorities."⁴⁷ AI recommended that Angola repeal criminal defamation laws, particularly those providing special punishment for alleged defamation of the Head of State or other public officials.⁴⁸ ISHR also called for the defamation laws to be repealed and stated that Angola should ensure that public officials using state apparatus or the justice system to restrict and criminalize human rights and journalistic activities are sanctioned.⁴⁹

30. FLD stated that journalists and editors have been subjected to several restrictions that hindered freedom of expression. They have also been exposed to intimidation, attacks and arbitrary arrests. Many attempts have been made by public officials to silence and

prevent the publication of anti-government articles. A law affirming that “crimes of outrage” against the President threaten the security of the state further hindered freedom of expression and assembly.⁵⁰

31. FLD stated that in Cabinda Province, crimes against civilians were committed by both the Angolan army and the separatist guerrilla groups. The authorities often used the conflict to justify human rights violations. Under the pretext of security, military officials have arbitrarily arrested supporters of the separatist movement and lawyers who witness and document such abuses.⁵¹

32. AI stated that the authorities continued to arbitrarily arrest and detain individuals in Cabinda for peacefully expressing their view that Cabinda should not be part of Angola. Similar arrests have been carried out in the Lunda Norte and Lunda Sul provinces against members of the Commission of the Legal Sociological Manifesto of the Lunda-Tchokwe Protectorate (*Comissão do Manifesto Jurídico Sociológico do Protectorado da Lunda-Tchókwe* – CMJSP-Lunda).⁵²

33. FLD stated that peaceful demonstrations were met with excessive use of force and intimidating actions such as detaining and threatening protestors. In a number of cases, detained protestors were reportedly beaten and tortured while in police custody.⁵³ HRW stated that since 2011, the police and security agents have repeatedly used intimidation and excessive use of force to suppress peaceful protests by youth groups and war veterans, as well as several teachers’ and health worker union strikes and other protests. HRW stated that most protestors were arbitrarily detained and released the same day without charges.⁵⁴

34. AI stated that since 7 March 2011, youths, mainly in Luanda, regularly attempted to hold peaceful demonstrations calling for the resignation of President José Eduardo dos Santos, and to raise human rights and social justice concerns. During those demonstrations police carried out arbitrary arrests and detentions, punched and kicked peaceful demonstrators, and set dogs on them.⁵⁵

35. FLD stated that on 30 March 2013, several human rights defenders, protest organisers and peaceful demonstrators were arrested by police, and many others were dispersed, shortly before the scheduled start of a demonstration in Luanda.⁵⁶ FLD called for prioritization by the authorities of the protection of human rights defenders.⁵⁷

36. AI stated that individuals known colloquially as “Kaenches”, believed to be members of the State Information and Security Services, regularly carried out acts of vandalism and violence against demonstrators, and with impunity. The organisers of demonstrations faced intimidation and harassment. In May 2012, several organisers were attacked by the “Kaenches” while meeting in a private home. Also in May 2012, “Kaenches” kidnapped two of the organisers of a demonstration. In November 2013, the Public Prosecution Service publicly confirmed that four state agents had been arrested for their kidnapping and murder.⁵⁸

37. HRW stated that on 31 August 2012, Angola held its first elections under the Constitution. The elections were generally peaceful during campaigning and on polling day, yet fell short of international and regional standards for a fair vote. The playing field for political parties was uneven, with unequal access to state resources; the media was overwhelmingly dominated by the ruling Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) and the elections oversight body sided with the ruling party by not taking any action when it violated electoral laws. Independent observation of the elections was seriously hampered by massive delays and restrictions in the accreditation of domestic and international observers and international journalists.⁵⁹

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

38. AI stated that forced evictions continued with the most recent, at the time of its submission, having taken place on 3 January 2014 in Bairro A Resistencia, Cabinda Province, which affected 22 families. In addition, there have been large-scale evictions since the 2010 Review, including the eviction of 700 families in Luanda in February 2013, and of 3,000 families in Huíla province in March 2010. The authorities have done little to assist those left in destitute by forced evictions.⁶⁰

39. AI recommended that Angola stop all forced evictions and place a moratorium on mass evictions until a comprehensive human rights-based housing policy and a legal framework providing effective remedies were in place. It also recommended that Angola provide immediate assistance, including adequate housing, to those who have been forcibly evicted and remain homeless, and adequately compensate all victims.⁶¹

40. HRW stated that at the 2010 Review, Angola had accepted recommendations to take necessary measures to ensure that eviction was a last resort and to adopt legislation and guidelines that strictly define the relevant circumstances and safeguards for the moment when an eviction is carried out. Angola also accepted recommendations to provide the necessary assistance to evicted persons, especially members of vulnerable groups. However, the Government has continued mass forced evictions of informal settlements in areas that it claims were reserved for public use. In 2012, the Government stepped up efforts to remove street traders in Luanda. Those actions affected the poorest communities and were conducted with unnecessary brutality. HRW stated that the relevant laws did not adequately protect people from forced eviction.⁶²

41. HRW stated that mass forced evictions have generally occurred without adequate prior notice and have often been conducted with excessive use of force by security forces. In all cases, alternative housing and school and health infrastructure in areas of resettlement have been insufficient. Some evictions were carried out during the rainy season, inflicting additional hardship on the evicted communities.⁶³

42. JS 1 stated that the National Assembly adopted a resolution on forced evictions. However, there has been no oversight on the implementation of this resolution.⁶⁴

43. JS 1 stated that the number of evictions will likely be higher in the years to come for reasons which include the ongoing allocation of land reserves throughout the country which will set aside the land where construction will be considered lawful. Also, guidelines for evictions, suitable alternatives for accommodation, compensation, and access to legal remedies were lacking.⁶⁵

44. JS 1 stated that a number of housing projects have been planned and a special fund for loans to young people was created, but those people were required to have formal employment to qualify for such loans. The majority of people earn their income in the informal sector.⁶⁶

45. JS 1 stated that in order to improve the housing situation, Angola should firstly, prepare a master plan on housing with pro-poor policies, and disseminate clear public information on the requirements to access the housing; secondly, construct decent housing for families made homeless by demolitions and forced evictions in locations where they could access education and health; thirdly, enable the issuance of permanent title deeds for land for people who are re-settled; fourthly, ensure that all Government policies, programmes, and budgets relating to housing and the use of land systematically include a pro-poor component so as to start reversing the prevalence of social inequalities in the country; and finally, address the right to housing, as well as all other human rights, in decrees and bilateral and multilateral agreements.⁶⁷

5. Rights to health

46. JS 1 stated that the proportion of the Government's budget for 2014 allocated to the social sector, which included health, education and social welfare, was 6.3 percent; and that the combined budgets allocated to education and health were lower than budgetary allocations for defence and the police.⁶⁸ JS 1 called for an increase in investment in the health sector, while taking into account the needs of communities in the delivery of health services.⁶⁹

47. JS 1 stated that the infrastructure was inadequate and that there was a shortage of equipment, medication, and qualified health professionals.⁷⁰

48. JS 1 stated that there was a lack of competent health personnel as well as equipment adapted for people with disabilities.⁷¹ It called for operationalization of the national institute for the rehabilitation of people with disabilities.⁷²

6. Right to education

49. JS 1 stated that although the relevant law on education provided for free primary education, there were cases of students paying for tuition in addition to paying for examinations, and also paying for the maintenance of the school.⁷³ JS 1 stated that schools lacked adequate conditions conducive to teaching, including a shortage of classrooms, and that there was also corruption.⁷⁴

50. JS 1 called for the implementation of mechanisms for monitoring fees charged by schools and for support to disadvantaged children and adults, and people with disabilities, to access education.⁷⁵

51. JS 1 stated that a bureau for adult and youth education or a department within the Ministry of Education should be established to address specific problems relating to the education of youth, adults, and people with disabilities.⁷⁶ It also stated that mechanisms should be implemented that allowed for greater interaction between civil society and public bodies involved in adult and youth education.⁷⁷

52. JS 1 stated that the Coordinating Committee for the Integration of Human Rights in the Educational Subsystems has not submitted a national plan for a human rights oriented education, and that manuals for primary and basic education was yet to be produced.⁷⁸ JS 1 called for the incorporation of human rights education into the academic syllabus at all school levels and establish a specialised human rights course at the university level.⁷⁹

7. Minorities

53. JS 1 stated that despite significant advances, the law was not clear on the rights of traditional groups, particularly those of agro-pastoral societies, whose survival and development depends on their explicit recognition and defence by the Government. Farmers and cattle breeders, especially the agro-pastoral groups in the south of the country, have no access as a group to bank loans, particularly to the loans available through the Angolan Development Bank.⁸⁰

54. JS 1 stated that the Government should adopt specific legislation that recognised the existence of land belonging to indigenous agro-pastoral communities and implement concrete mechanisms for the defence and promotion of their economy based on cattle breeding and agriculture.⁸¹

55. JS 1 stated that there was increasing conflict caused by the unlawful occupation of lands belonging to pastoral communities by businesses, and that this threatened food security, social stability, as well as the survival of those communities.⁸² It called for the implementation of a system requiring corporate responsibility of extractive companies in

the areas of indigenous communities, respect for human rights, preservation of the environment, and free access of communities to legal remedies.⁸³

8. Right to development

56. HRW stated that political patronage and mismanagement of state funds derived from oil has meant that Angola's resources only benefitted a small minority of the population, leaving the country with some of the poorest development indicators in Africa.⁸⁴

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

Working Group on Human Rights Monitoring in Angola (GTMDH), comprising of:

Associação Construindo Comunidades (ACC); Acção Agolana para Mulher (AAM); Associação Justiça, Paz E Democracia (AJPD); Associação Juvenil Para Desenvolvimento Comunitário De Angola (AJUDECA); ANGOLA 2000; Fórum Regional Para O Desenvolvimento Universitário (FORDU); Missão De Beneficência Agropecuária Do Kubango, Inclusão, Tecnologias E Ambiente (MBAKITA); MOSAIKO – Instituto Para Cidadania; NCC – Centro Nacional De Aconselhamento; Associação Omunga; OSISA - Angola –Open Society Initiative For Southern Africa – Angola; PMA – Plataforma De Mulheres Em Acção; RNP+Angola – Rede Nacional De Pessoas Vivendo Com O Vih Sida; SCARJOV - Associação De Reintegração Dos Jovens/Crianças Na Vida Social; and Sos-Habitat: Acção Solidária (Joint Submission 1);

Individual submissions

AFIC

Africa Freedom of Information Centre, Kampala, Uganda;

AI

Amnesty International, London, UK;

FLD

Front Line Defenders, Dublin, Ireland;

GIEACPC

Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, UK;

HRW

Human Rights Watch, Geneva, Switzerland;

ISHR

International Service for Human Rights, Geneva, Switzerland;

WCADP

World Coalition Against the Death Penalty, Montreal, France.

² Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, Angola, A/HRC/14/11.

³ AI, pp. 1 and 5, and endnote 7 and 8.

⁴ AI, p. 1.

⁵ AI, 4.

⁶ HRW, p. 1.

⁷ WCADP, p. 1.

⁸ WCADP, p. 1.

⁹ WCADP, p. 2.

¹⁰ AI, p. 1 and p. 5, e.n 7 and 8.

¹¹ JS 1, p. 2, para. 1.

¹² AI, p. 1.

¹³ AFIC, pp. 1-2, pars. 3 and 4.

¹⁴ AI, p. 1. AI stated that the Penal Code was currently under revision and the most recent version of the draft Penal Code to which it had had access criminalizes torture, but it was not clear when this law will be passed (p. 1, endnote 18).

¹⁵ AI, p. 1.

- ¹⁶ AFCI, pp. 2-3, paras. 5 – 11.
¹⁷ AFCI, p. 4, para. 1.
¹⁸ AFCI, p. 4.
¹⁹ AFCI, p. 5, para. 2.
²⁰ ISHR, p. 1.
²¹ ISHR, p. 1.
²² ISHR, p. 2.
²³ JS I, p. 8, paras. 59-61 and 63-67.
²⁴ HRW, p. 1.
²⁵ AI, p. 1.
²⁶ AI, p. 2.
²⁷ HRW, p. 3.
²⁸ HRW, p. 4.
²⁹ HRW, p. 5.
³⁰ HRW, p. 3.
³¹ AI, p. 2.
³² AI, p. 2.
³³ GIEACPC, p. 2, para. 1.2.
³⁴ GIEACPC, p. 2, para. 1.3.
³⁵ GIEACPC, p. 3, para. 1.4.
³⁶ GIEACPC, p. 3, paras. 1.6 – 1.10.
³⁷ AI, p. 5, en. 22.
³⁸ AI, p. 2.
³⁹ HRW, p. 2. HRW informed of specific cases (pp. 2-3).
⁴⁰ ISHR, p. 1.
⁴¹ FLD, para. 22.
⁴² ISHR, p. 1.
⁴³ AI, p. 3.
⁴⁴ AI, p. 3.
⁴⁵ HRW, p. 1. HRW made recommendations (p. 4).
⁴⁶ HRW, p. 1.
⁴⁷ HRW, p. 2.
⁴⁸ AI, p. 4.
⁴⁹ ISHR, p. 2.
⁵⁰ FLD, para. 14. For specific cases see paras. 15 – 21.
⁵¹ FLD, para. 26.
⁵² AI p. 3.
⁵³ FLD, para. 3. See also paras. 4 – 13.
⁵⁴ HRW, p. 2. HRW informed of specific cases (pp. 2-3).
⁵⁵ AI, p. 2.
⁵⁶ FLD, para. 4.
⁵⁷ FLD, para. 25.
⁵⁸ AI, p. 3. See also FLD, para. 13.
⁵⁹ HRW, p. 1.
⁶⁰ AI, p. 2.
⁶¹ AI, p. 4.
⁶² HRW, p. 3.
⁶³ HRW, p. 3. HRW made recommendations (p. 5).
⁶⁴ JS 1, p. 3, para. 10.
⁶⁵ JS 1, p. 2, para. 8.
⁶⁶ JS 1, p. 2, para. 9.
⁶⁷ JS 1, p. 3, paras. 15 – 19.
⁶⁸ JS 1, p. 5, para. 30.
⁶⁹ JS 1, p. 6, para. 44.
⁷⁰ JS 1, p. 5, para. 6.
⁷¹ JS 1, p. 6, para. 42.

- ⁷² JS 1, p. 6, para. 46.
⁷³ JS 1, p. 4, para. 26.
⁷⁴ JS 1, p. 4, para. 26.
⁷⁵ JS 1, p. 5, para. 32.
⁷⁶ JS 1, p. 5, para. 33.
⁷⁷ JS 1, p. 5, para. 34.
⁷⁸ JS 1, p. 4, para. 27.
⁷⁹ JS 1, p. 4, para. 36.
⁸⁰ JS 1, pp. 6 – 7, paras. 49-51.
⁸¹ JS 1, p. 7, para. 58.
⁸² JS 1, p. 7, para. 50.
⁸³ JS1, p. 7, para. 58.
⁸⁴ HRW, p. 1.
-