



General Assembly

Distr.: General
17 August 2015

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review

Twenty third session

2–13 November 2015

Summary prepared by the Office of the United Nations 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

Saint Kitts and Nevis*

The present report is a summary of 4 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 Human Rights Council resolution 16/21, 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.



Information provided by stakeholders

A. Background and framework

1. Scope of international obligations²

1. Amnesty International (AI) stated that during its first Universal Periodic Review (UPR) in January 2011, Saint Kitts and Nevis had accepted recommendations to consider the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, on the involvement of children in armed conflict and on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, and to review national legislation to ensure compliance with the principles and provisions of the Convention³. AI highlighted that despite this commitment, at the time of writing, Saint Kitts and Nevis had not yet ratified these Optional Protocols.⁴ United and Strong Inc-CariFLAGS-ILGA-ARC (JS2) reported that the State had not yet taken any action to implement them and recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis ratify as soon as possible OP-CRC-AC and OP-CRC-SC.⁵

2. AI stated that in its first review, Saint Kitts and Nevis had not expressed a clear position on recommendations to consider signing and ratifying a number of core international human rights standards, including ICESCR and CAT.⁶ AI asserted that the government had taken no action in this respect, and that the ratification of these treaties was still outstanding.⁷ JS2 recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis ratify and implement key international human rights instruments, including ICESCR, ICCPR, CAT, CERD, and CEDAW.⁸

3. JS2 reported that subsequent to UPR 2011 the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis had promised to sign and ratify the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and that this was still pending. It considered that in so doing the Government had largely failed to adequately promote and protect the rights of persons with disabilities as per recommendation 76.30 delivered in its UPR 2011.⁹ It recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis sign and ratify CRPD.¹⁰

4. GREATER CARIBBEAN FOR LIFE-WORLD COALITION-THE ADVOCATES (JS1) affirmed that Saint Kitts and Nevis stated in its first UPR that it had established a national core committee to review what core international human rights instruments it should adopt and to present its recommendations to the decision-making body for consideration.¹¹ JS1 affirmed that it was generally unclear whether Saint Kitts and Nevis's establishment of the national core committee had garnered any appreciable results.¹²

5. JS2 encouraged the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis to make a greater effort to collaborate with civil society to empower, sensitize and educate the general public on these international instruments and to facilitate the country's accession, ratification and compliance with core human rights obligations.¹³

6. JS2 recognized the efforts of Saint Kitts and Nevis in signing and committing to the following Conventions and international instruments: The Inter-American Convention on the Prevention, Punishment and Eradication of Violence against Women; The Inter-American Convention on the Granting of Civil Rights to Women and the Inter-American Convention on the Granting of Political Rights to Women; The Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women; The Beijing Platform for Action; The United Nations Millennium Declaration; and Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) on women, peace and security.¹⁴

2. Constitutional and legislative framework

7. JS2 stated that the Constitution of Saint Kitts and Nevis entitled every person to the protection of fundamental rights and freedoms, that is, the rights without discrimination on the basis of race, place of origin, birth, political opinions, colours, creed or sex, but subject to respect for the rights and freedoms of others and for the public interest. JS2 asserted that the Constitution included a fundamental rights section. It included, among others, protection from inhuman treatment, protection from discrimination on grounds of race and others, protection of freedom of expression, freedom of movement and of freedom of assembly and association.¹⁵

8. JS2 recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis implement domestic legislation in line with all of the international instruments to which Saint Kitts and Nevis is party, in order for citizens to have direct access to the protection under these instruments. JS2 also recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis enact domestic legislation to incorporate fully all the principles of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.¹⁶

B. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

Cooperation with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

9. AI welcomed the fact that Saint Kitts and Nevis had previously expressed interest in receiving technical assistance from the international community and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, including support for the ratification of and compliance with core human rights obligations.¹⁷

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

1. Equality and non-discrimination

10. JS2 reported that during the 2011 review, despite several recommendations made to decriminalize consensual same sex relations¹⁸, Saint Kitts and Nevis stated that a popular “mandate” was necessary for state protection of the rights of sexual minorities, and that continued criminalization of consensual sex under sections 56 and 57 of the Offences against the Person Act was justified because of “strong opposition” by citizens to repeal these laws.¹⁹

11. JS2 affirmed that subsequent to UPR 2011, acts of violence committed against persons because of their sexual orientation or gender identity continued to occur, and persons who defended the rights of these individuals were often subjected to verbal attacks.²⁰

12. JS2 explained that the Constitution of Saint Kitts and Nevis did not protect persons of different sexual orientation or gender identity from discrimination but reserved this protection for persons only on the basis of traditional grounds such as: race, sex, religion, etc.²¹ It recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis amend the Constitution to include sexual orientation and gender identity as part of the classification of persons who must be protected from discrimination.²²

13. JS2 recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis implement a policy moratorium on prosecutions of consensual same sex relations. It further recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis decriminalize consensual same-sex relations in all provisions of the country’s legislation especially Sections 56 and 57 of the Offences against the Person Act, and bring

its legislation into conformity with its commitment to equality and non-discrimination. JS2 also recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis raise public awareness regarding non-discrimination of LGBT persons and include sexual orientation as part of the curriculum in Health and Family Life Education for schools.²³

14. Regarding discrimination against women, JS2 recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis implement temporary special measures in order to increase participation by women in public and political life.²⁴

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

15. JS1 asserted that during the 2011 UPR Saint Kitts and Nevis received recommendations requesting the abolition of the death penalty and/or a moratorium on the use of the death penalty, and that the country had noted these recommendations.²⁵ It stated that however, Saint Kitts and Nevis accepted several other recommendations pertaining to the death penalty more generally, including the acceptance of the recommendation to review the administration of legal rights of prisoners sentenced to death and ensure access to the appeals process and adequate resources for the defence in capital cases.²⁶ JS1 affirmed that it was generally unclear whether Saint Kitts and Nevis had made significant progress towards implementing these accepted recommendations and that there was similarly no indication that Saint Kitts and Nevis had improved access to appeal and adequate resources for defence in death penalty cases.²⁷

16. AI continued to be particularly concerned about the increase of crimes in Saint Kitts and Nevis and stated that there was no convincing evidence to support the argument that the death penalty prevented crime more effectively than other punishment.²⁸ AI expressed that the government acknowledged that capital punishment was not necessarily a deterrent to crime but given the escalation in violent crime, it could not justify a decision to abolish the death penalty.²⁹ AI asserted that claiming to reflect the will of the people and public support for the death penalty, the authorities had failed to ensure that people had enough information on the death penalty to be able to develop an informed view about its effectiveness as a deterrent to crime.³⁰

17. JS1 stated that the government of Saint Kitts and Nevis had continued to support the use of the death penalty, that public support for hangings likewise remained high and that despite this, the actual imposition of the death penalty remained relatively rare and the steady decline of the death row population and the absence of new death sentences imposed were trends welcomed by the international community.³¹ AI asserted that since 2008, no death sentences were known to have been imposed in Saint Kitts and Nevis, although one person was believed to be on death row by the end of 2014.³² JS1 explained that the country had not executed any prisoner in the last six years and that it had held five people on death row at the end of 2011, but this number had since declined to one due to commutations of the sentences of four individuals and the fact that no new death sentences had been imposed in the last three years.³³

18. AI noted that despite executions being rare, the death penalty was still provided for in domestic law for the crime of murder under the Offences Against the Person Act and treason in the 1983 Constitution.³⁴ JS1 affirmed that the adhering to a Directive from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (JCPC) – the highest court of appeal for the country, Saint Kitts and Nevis had decreased the number of death sentences imposed.³⁵

19. JS1 reported that Saint Kitts and Nevis had currently one inmate on death row, who had been on death row for over thirteen years.³⁶ JS1 explained that the JCPC had established a presumptive five-year maximum time limit after sentencing for incarceration on death row before a sentence should be commuted to life imprisonment. It stated that nonetheless, it did not appear that Saint Kitts and Nevis was operating in accordance with

these requirements.³⁷ JS1 recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis immediately conduct a review of the status of all prisoners on death row and commute to life imprisonment the death sentence of any inmate sentenced more than five years ago.³⁸

20. JS1 also considered that this inmate was de facto being held in isolation on an indefinite basis, that isolation was a severe form of punishment and that this indefinite isolation constituted cruel and inhuman treatment.³⁹ It recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis amend any prison policies which result in the indefinite isolation of death row inmates and immediately re-examine its detention policies for death row and ensure that none of these policies will result in an inmate being confined without social contact for an indefinite period, including during periods in which only one inmate is present on death row.⁴⁰

21. AI called on the government to repeal all provisions in domestic law allowing for the death penalty and to establish an official moratorium on executions with a view to abolishing the death penalty, as called for in five United Nations General Assembly resolutions, including most recent resolution 69/186 of 18 December 2014. It also called on the Government to commute all death sentences to terms of imprisonment and pending abolition of the death penalty, to ensure rigorous application of international standards for fair trial in all death penalty cases and respect national legal procedures and the standards required by the Privy Council for the protection of the rights of prisoners sentenced to death.⁴¹

22. JS1 asserted that Saint Kitts and Nevis should make publicly available reliable information regarding the death row population and any changes in its composition. It recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis regularly publish and update statistics on the number of executions, number of death sentences imposed, number of people on death row, number of sentences commuted or otherwise reduced, the identities of all death row inmates, dates of conviction and sentencing, and any other pertinent information.⁴²

23. Regarding treatment in prisons in general, JS1 recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis implement appropriate training and disciplinary protocols to prevent abuse of inmates, including death row inmates, by prison guards and officials.⁴³

24. Regarding domestic violence, JS2 asserted that the laws in Saint Kitts and Nevis did not provide for independent prosecution of perpetrators and that it was vital that the state intervened in prosecuting acts where there was sufficient evidence to charge the perpetrator, as the cycle of domestic violence was such that victims were either afraid of the perpetrators or too emotionally or financially invested in the relationship to pursue these violations.⁴⁴

25. JS2 recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis adopt laws that allow for state intervention and independent prosecution of perpetrators of domestic violence, without the victim having to lodge a complaint. JS2 also recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis collaborate with civil society, non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders to provide relevant support for victims of domestic violence.⁴⁵

26. JS2 stated that while rape was prohibited by law in the country, it did not provide redress against marital rape, and that despite last year's re-establishment of a Special Victims Unit within the Police Force, rape was often underreported due to survivors' fear of stigma, retribution, further violence, or lack of confidence in the authorities.⁴⁶ JS2 recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis amend the laws with respect to rape to include marital rape within the classification of the crime of rape and strengthen the Vulnerable Persons Unit with the Police Force by providing specialized training to officers and maintaining well-trained staff within the unit.⁴⁷

27. JS2 considered that data collection on domestic and sexual violence was fragmented and impaired policy, planning and prosecution of perpetrators. It was therefore necessary for such data to be organized so that government could deliberately pursue appropriate and targeted policy development to effect necessary change.⁴⁸ JS2 recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis seek technical support to establish a centralized data register which would capture information relating to domestic and sexual violence complaints and prosecutions within the Department of Gender Affairs.⁴⁹

28. JS2 stated that in August 2014 the government had sought to amend the Domestic Act now retitled “The Domestic Violence Bill” (2014) which was still in draft form, and mentioned that one of the key provisions of this bill was the promotion of economic independence for victims in abusive relationships. It recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis swiftly implement the new Domestic Violence Bill (2014).⁵⁰ JS2 also reported that Saint Kitts and Nevis had made remarkable strides in empowering women through awareness campaigns, programs and policy development, a work executed largely by the Department of Gender Affairs which included training for police, nurses and counsellors.⁵¹

29. Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) stated that in its first UPR the issue of corporal punishment of children was raised in the compilation of UN information and the summary of stakeholders’ submissions⁵². It highlighted that during the review, the Government stated that discipline was important in society and that corporal punishment was regulated under the Education Act to ensure it did not cross the line into abuse.⁵³ GIEACPC stated that the following recommendations were not accepted by Saint Kitts and Nevis in its first UPR: “76.42. Continue adopting measures to put an end to corporal punishment”; “76.43. Outlaw corporal punishment in the context of juvenile justice, school education and at home”.⁵⁴

30. GIEACPC highlighted that in Saint Kitts and Nevis, corporal punishment of children was lawful in the home, alternative care settings, day care, schools and penal institutions.⁵⁵

31. Regarding treatment at home, GIEACPC stated that in Saint Kitts and Nevis parents had the right to inflict “reasonable chastisement” on their children.⁵⁶ It also stated that provisions against violence and abuse under the Probation and Child Welfare Board Act 1994, the Offences Against the Person Act 1861, the Child Justice Act 2013 and the Children (Care and Adoption) Act 2013 were not interpreted in the country as prohibiting corporal punishment in childrearing. In addition GIEACPC asserted that the Children (Care and Adoption) Act 2013 protected children from abuse and from harm from exposure to domestic violence (art. 12) but it did not prohibit all corporal punishment in childrearing.⁵⁷

32. Regarding treatment in schools, GIEACPC affirmed that corporal punishment was lawful in Saint Kitts and Nevis under the Education Act (2005), the Corporal Punishment Act (1967) and the common law disciplinary power of teachers.⁵⁸ GIEACPC underscored that Article 50 of the Education Act allowed for the Minister to “suspend or abolish corporal punishment in public schools and assisted private schools” but that this had not occurred.⁵⁹ JS2 recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis prohibit all forms of corporal punishment and especially invoke Section 50 of the Education Act to abolish corporal punishment in schools and that it immediately enforce Section 49 subsection 4 of the Education Act so that unauthorized teachers who unlawfully administer corporal punishment are prosecuted on every occasion.⁶⁰

33. On judicial corporal punishment for children, GIEACPC explained that the Child Justice Act (2013) did not explicitly prohibit corporal punishment and that it did not repeal all other laws which provide for judicial corporal punishment in Saint Kitts and Nevis.⁶¹ GIEACPC affirmed that recent law reform appeared to ensure that corporal punishment could no longer lawfully be imposed on juveniles as a sentence for crime, but that this punishment remained on the statute book and further reform to formally repeal these

provisions was required.⁶² GIEACPC considered that further reform was necessary to completely remove judicial whipping of juveniles from the statute books.⁶³

34. Regarding penal institutions, GIEACPC stated there was no prohibition of corporal punishment.⁶⁴

35. JS2 commended Saint Kitts and Nevis for informative consultations leading to the drafting, formalizing and implementation of the Children and Marginalized Youth policies including The Guardianship Act (2012), Maintenance of Children Act (2012) and The Child Justice Bill (2013) in keeping with recommendation 76.48 which expanded the areas of protection of the rights of children in Saint Kitts and Nevis.⁶⁵ However, JS2 stated that unfortunately these laws did not address the eradication of corporal punishment of children within schools, home and penal or alternative care institutions.⁶⁶

3. Administration of justice and the rule of law

36. JS1 stated that criminal defendants were constitutionally entitled to a fair, speedy, and public trial by jury, with a presumption of innocence, and the right to confront and question witnesses.⁶⁷ JS1 stated that it was unclear what, if any, steps had been taken since the last execution of a person in 2008, to better protect the right to legal representation in Saint Kitts and Nevis, especially in cases of capital punishment.⁶⁸

37. JS2 affirmed that in Saint Kitts and Nevis, cases that were appealed from the national High Courts proceeded to the Eastern Caribbean Supreme Court or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London (JCPC) for review and determination.⁶⁹ JS1 stated that the JCPC helped promote consistency and stability in the judicial system in Saint Kitts and Nevis, and better align the country with international standards concerning the death penalty. JS1 recommended the State to remain within the jurisdiction of the JCPC.⁷⁰

38. JS1 stated that although it was reported that prison staff received periodic training in human rights, prisoners still complained of harsh treatment from guards. JS1 recommended Saint Kitts and Nevis to take appropriate action to prevent these abuses, including efforts to further improve training or strengthen disciplinary procedures to ensure compliance with standards of appropriate conduct.⁷¹

39. JS1 asserted that Saint Kitts and Nevis accepted recommendation 75.40 to “[i]dentify its needs in terms of technical and financial assistance to improve prison conditions and consequently seek assistance from relevant international institutions and programmes competent in this area.”⁷² JS1 affirmed it was generally unclear whether Saint Kitts and Nevis had made significant progress towards implementing the recommendations on prisons it had accepted⁷³ and that by 2014 there were indications that the construction of a new correctional facility was in progress. JS1 also stated that despite this, Her Majesty’s Prison in Basseterre remained extremely overcrowded.⁷⁴

4. Right to health

40. JS2 asserted that LGBT individuals continued to confront unacceptable levels of discrimination and stigma when visiting health clinics and that the fact that sexual acts between consenting same sex adults were criminalized impeded access to necessary healthcare.⁷⁵ It recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis ensure all state-run healthcare facilities adopt policies which unequivocally prohibit discrimination of all people accessing healthcare and have measures in place to sanction those who violate these regulations.⁷⁶

5. Persons with disabilities

41. JS2 stated that during the UPR 2011 the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis had reported on building codes catered to the needs of persons with disabilities, but that

however, discussions with the Saint Kitts and Nevis Association of Persons with Disability (SKNAPD) reported that these codes were not always complied with or enforced.⁷⁷ JS2 highlighted that to date the government had taken no action to build the necessary roads and sidewalks that facilitated the movement of persons with physical disability. It also underscored that although the Government had held meetings and consultations on this matter, there had been no outcome.⁷⁸

42. JS2 stated that the laws in Saint Kitts and Nevis do not specifically prohibit discrimination against persons with physical, sensory, intellectual, and mental disabilities in employment, air travel, transportation, access to healthcare or the provision of other services.⁷⁹

43. JS2 recommended that Saint Kitts and Nevis, inter alia, renew its effort to promote and protect the rights of persons with disabilities and increase efforts to support and empower them.⁸⁰

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:

- | | |
|---------|---|
| AI | Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland); |
| GIEACPC | Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children. |

Joint submissions:

- | | |
|-----|---|
| JS1 | Joint submission 1 submitted by: The Advocates for Human Rights (the Advocates); The Greater Caribbean for Life; and The World Coalition against the Death Penalty; |
| JS2 | Joint submission 2 submitted by: United and Strong Inc(U&S); CariFLAGS; International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA); and Allied Rainbow Communities (ARC). |

² The following abbreviations have been used in the present document:

- | | |
|------------|---|
| ICERD | International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination |
| ICESCR | International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights |
| OP-ICESCR | Optional Protocol to ICESCR |
| ICCPR | International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights |
| ICCPR-OP 1 | Optional Protocol to ICCPR |
| ICCPR-OP 2 | Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty |
| CEDAW | Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women |
| OP-CEDAW | Optional Protocol to CEDAW |
| CAT | Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment |
| OP-CAT | Optional Protocol to CAT |
| CRC | Convention on the Rights of the Child |
| OP-CRC-AC | Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict |
| OP-CRC-SC | Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography |
| OP-CRC-IC | Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure |
| ICRMW | International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families |
| CRPD | Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities |
| OP-CRPD | Optional Protocol to CRPD |
| ICPPED | International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. |

³ Recommendation 75.1 (Hungary), recommendation 75.3 (Guatemala), recommendation 75.30 (Slovakia). For the full text of the recommendations see: UN Doc. A/HRC/17/12.

⁴ AI, p.1.

⁵ JS2, pp. 1 and 3. See also: AI, p. 1.

⁶ Recommendations 76.1(Brazil), 75.38 (Uruguay), 76.2 (Mauritius), 76.9 (Argentina), 76, 19 (Poland). For the full text of the recommendations see: UN Doc. A/HRC/17/12.

⁷ AI, p. 1.

⁸ JS2, p. 3. See also: AI, p.3.

⁹ JS2, p.7. Recommendation 76.30 (Cuba). For the full text of the recommendations see: UN Doc. A/HRC/17/12.

¹⁰ JS2, p. 7.

¹¹ JS1, p. 7.

¹² JS1, p. 8.

¹³ JS2, p. 2.

- ¹⁴ JS2, p. 2.
- ¹⁵ JS2, pp. 1-2.
- ¹⁶ JS2, p. 3.
- ¹⁷ AI, p. 2.
- ¹⁸ Recommendation 76.49(Sweden), recommendation 76.50 (Sweden), recommendation 76.51 (Spain), recommendation 76.52 (Uruguay), recommendation 76.53 (Canada), recommendation 76.54 (Norway), recommendation 76.55 (United States of America), recommendation 76.56 (France). For the full text of the recommendations see: UN Doc. A/HRC/17/12.
- ¹⁹ JS2, p. 3.
- ²⁰ JS2, p. 4.
- ²¹ JS2, p. 4.
- ²² JS2, p. 5.
- ²³ JS2, p. 5.
- ²⁴ JS2, p. 6.
- ²⁵ JS1, p. 7. See also: AI, p. 1. Recommendation 77.1 (Germany), recommendation 77.2 (Canada), recommendation 77.3 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), recommendation 77.4 (Norway), recommendation 77.5 (Hungary), recommendation 77.6 (Sweden), recommendation 77.7 (Slovakia), recommendation 77.8 (France), recommendation 77.9 (Spain), recommendation 77.10 (Slovenia), recommendation 77.11 (Norway), recommendation 77.12 (Sweden), recommendation 77.13 (Australia). For the full text of the recommendations see: UN Doc. A/HRC/17/12.
- ²⁶ JS1, p. 7. Recommendation 75.32 (Canada). For the full text of the recommendations see: UN Doc. A/HRC/17/12.
- ²⁷ JS1, pp.7-8.
- ²⁸ AI, p.2.
- ²⁹ AI, p.1.
- ³⁰ AI, p. 2.
- ³¹ JS1, p. 6.
- ³² AI, p. 2. See also: JS1, p. 6.
- ³³ JS1, p. 10.
- ³⁴ AI, p. 2.
- ³⁵ JS1, p. 10.
- ³⁶ JS1, p.3 See also JS1, p.5.
- ³⁷ JS1, p. 8.
- ³⁸ JS1, p.11.
- ³⁹ JS1, pp.3, 9-10.
- ⁴⁰ JS1, p. 11.
- ⁴¹ AI, p. 3. See also JS1, pp. 10-11.
- ⁴² JS1, p. 11.
- ⁴³ JS1 p. 11.
- ⁴⁴ JS2, p. 6.
- ⁴⁵ JS2, pp. 6-7.
- ⁴⁶ JS2, p.5.
- ⁴⁷ JS2, pp. 6-7.
- ⁴⁸ JS2, p. 6.
- ⁴⁹ JS2, p. 6.
- ⁵⁰ JS2, p. 6.
- ⁵¹ JS2, p. 5.
- ⁵² For the full text of the Compilation of UN Information and Summary of stakeholders' information see: A/HRC/WG.6/10/KNA/2 and A/HRC/WG.6/10/KNA/3.
- ⁵³ GIEACPC, p. 2.
- ⁵⁴ GIEACPC, p. 1. Recommendation 76.42 (Chile), recommendation 76.43 (Germany). For the full text of the recommendations see: UN Doc. A/HRC/17/12.
- ⁵⁵ GIEACPC, p. 2.
- ⁵⁶ GIEACPC, p. 2.
- ⁵⁷ GIEACPC, p. 2.
- ⁵⁸ GIEACPC, pp. 1- 2. See also: JS2, p. 2.

- ⁵⁹ GIEACPC, p. 2.
⁶⁰ JS2, p. 3.
⁶¹ GIEACPC, p. 2.
⁶² GIEACPC, p. 2.
⁶³ GIEACPC, p. 2.
⁶⁴ GIEACPC, p. 2.
⁶⁵ Recommendation 76.48 (Turkey). For the full text of the recommendations see: UN Doc. A/HRC/17/12.
⁶⁶ JS2, p.2.
⁶⁷ JS1, p. 4.
⁶⁸ JS1, p. 6.
⁶⁹ JS2, p.1.
⁷⁰ JS1, p. 11.
⁷¹ JS1, p. 11.
⁷² JS1, p. 7. Recommendation 75.40 (Algeria). For the full text of the recommendations see: UN Doc. A/HRC/17/12.
⁷³ JS1, p. 7. Recommendation 75.40 (Algeria), recommendation 75.32 (Canada), recommendation 75.33 (Slovakia), recommendation 75.34(Ecuador). For the full text of the recommendations see: UN Doc. A/HRC/17/12.
⁷⁴ JS1, p. 7.
⁷⁵ JS2, p. 4.
⁷⁶ JS2, p. 5.
⁷⁷ JS2, p. 7.
⁷⁸ JS2, p. 7.
⁷⁹ JS2, p. 7.
⁸⁰ JS2, p. 7.
-