United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/16/RUS/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
28 January 2013

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Sixteenth session
Geneva, 22 April – 3 May 2013

Summary prepared by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in accordance with paragraph 5 of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 16/21

Russian Federation*

The present report is a summary of 32 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review. It follows the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council in its decision 17/119. It does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), nor any judgement or determination in relation to specific claims. The information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes and, to the extent possible, the original texts have not been altered. As provided for in Resolution 16/21 of the Human Rights Council, where appropriate, a separate section is provided for contributions by the national human rights institution of the State under review that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles. The full texts of all submissions received are available on the OHCHR website. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the periodicity of the review and developments during that period.

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

I. Information provided by the accredited national human rights institution of the State under review in full compliance with the Paris Principles

A Background and framework

1. The Commissioner of Human Rights in the Russian Federation (CHRRF) stated that citizens' insufficient awareness of their constitutional rights and the lack of ability to properly claim those rights remained one of the problems impeding the full realisation of rights enshrined in the Constitution and domestic legislation. He noted the existing discrepancy between the principles and provisions of the Constitution and legislation, and their implementation in practice.[2]

B. Implementation of international human rights obligations

2. CHRRF stated that comprehensive measures are required to address human rights violations by law enforcement bodies and in penitentiary institutions.[3]

3. CHRRF highlighted a need for reform of the judiciary as public trust in the judiciary remained low despite a number of positive changes documented in the administration of justice.[4]

4. CHRRF reported the re-criminalisation of libel in 2012 - few months after it was de-criminalised in 2011.[5]

5. The 2012 amendments to the law on NGOs, requiring that NGOs involved in 'political activities' and receiving financial support from foreign sources register as foreign agents, raised serious concerns in the human rights community. The lack of a legal definition of the term "political activity" could result in a broad interpretation whereby almost all human rights organisations would fall in the category of a 'foreign agent'.[6]

6. While the law on peaceful assemblies was in line with international standards, its application in practice caused a pressing problem as the notification procedure for peaceful assemblies became de facto a procedure for obtaining official authorisation to organise such events.[7] CHRRF reported that the 2012 legal amendments increased fines for violation of procedures for organising and holding demonstrations and other public events. The amount of those fines became higher than fines for some criminal offences, such as malicious destruction of someone else's property.[8]

7. CHRRF reported on positive changes in legislation regarding political parties, including a decrease in the number of members required for registration of political parties.[9]

8. CHRRF considered that the Government provided effective protection of social and economic rights of its citizens. However, problems with pension benefits remained, and in particular, the rate of pension benefits was below the standards provided in the ILO Convention no. 102.[10]

II. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Background and framework

Scope of international obligations[11]

9. Amnesty International (AI)[12], the International Commission of Jurists (ICJ) [13] and the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe (CoE-Commissioner)[14] recommended the ratification of the CPED. AI recommended the ratification of OP-CAT.[15] ICJ recommended the ratification of ICMWR, ICCPR-OP2, OP-ICESCR, OP-CRC-SC and the Rome Statute of the ICC.[16] The Institute for Human Rights and Business (IHRB) recommended the ratification of ILO Convention no. 169.[17]

B. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

10. Human Rights Watch (HRW) recommended that the Government issue a standing invitation to the special procedures of the HRC and agree to visits by the Special Rapporteurs on human rights defenders and extrajudicial executions.[18] It also recommended that the authorities ensure the access of international monitors to the North Caucasus, including the Working Group on Enforced Disappearances and the Special Rapporteurs on torture and on extrajudicial executions.[19]

11. ICJ recommended that the Government present to the HRC, as soon as possible after the 2013 review, a national plan of action for the implementation of accepted recommendations and voluntary pledges and commitments as well as a mid-term progress report on the status of their implementation two years after the adoption of the outcome document.[20]

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations

1. Equality and non-discrimination

12. Joint Submission (JS) 4 highlighted the lack of anti-discrimination legislation and effective measures for the protection of victims of discrimination despite recommendations put forward during the universal periodic review of 2009 (the 2009 review) to combat discrimination and to strengthen anti-discrimination legislation.[21] Similarly, the CoE Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (CoE-ACFC) highlighted a need for a comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation, covering all spheres of life and containing a clear definition of discrimination. An independent and specialised body dealing solely with the issue of discrimination should be set up to conduct monitoring of the situation in the area of discrimination and to raise awareness of discrimination-related problems in society.[22]

13. AI stated that in some North Caucasus republics, gender inequalities were growing under the pretext of ethnic or religious traditions that resulted in an increasing vulnerability of women and girls to violence.[23]

14. JS6 reported on the problems of gender inequality, gender pay gap and gender segregation in the labor sphere and highlighted several obstacles that women faced when seeking legal remedies for workplace discrimination.[24]

15. JS4 referred to discrimination against ethnic minorities, including those from the North Caucasus, indigenous peoples of the North, migrants and Roma.[25] CoE-ACFC reported that some minorities, in particular those originating from the Caucasus, Central

Asia and the Roma, continued to face widespread discrimination in access to employment and housing.[26]

16. Human Rights First (HRF) reported that hate crimes against members of ethnic and religious minorities had been a growing problem and that many such crimes went unreported as victims were reluctant to inform police for fear of retribution or discrimination and abuse by law enforcement officials.[27] CoE-ACFC stated that racially-motivated crimes, particularly targeting persons from Central Asia, the Caucasus, Africa and Roma, remained alarming. It referred to frequently reported expressions of Islamophobia and anti-Semitism, and an increasing use of xenophobic and racist rhetoric by politicians, especially during electoral campaigns. The media was disseminating prejudice, including hate speech, regarding groups from the Caucasus, Central Asia and Roma.[28]

17. The Institute on Religion and Public Policy (IRPP) reported on the atmosphere of intolerance and discrimination against religious minorities.[29] The Church of Scientology International (CSI) made a similar observation.[30]

18. The Russian LGBT-network (LGBTNET) and JS6 stated that homosexual, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) persons faced discrimination and violence.[31] ARTICLE 19 reported that the Moscow City Court upheld a district court decision to ban gay pride marches in the city for the next 100 years.[32] AI was concerned that laws introduced in several regions banning propaganda of homosexuality, lesbianism, bisexualism and transgenderness amongst minors were used to restrict freedom of expression and assembly of LGBTI individuals. AI stated that the term 'propaganda' remained undefined, or unclear, enabling its arbitrary use by the authorities and that the majority of regional laws conflated the issue of sexual orientation with pedophilia.[33] ICJ reported on arrests under those laws and pointed out a case in St. Petersburg, where the police detained several activists for violating the law by holding up rainbow flags.[34] LGBTNET[35], HRF[36], JS4[37] and JS6[38] made similar observations. ILGA-Europe concluded that by adopting such laws, public authorities inscribe discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in the law and thus legitimize social exclusion and stigmatization of LGBT people.[39]

19. AI recommended repealing regional laws and regulations promoting or condoning discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation.[40] ICJ recommended rejecting the draft amendment to the Code of Administrative Offences on establishing administrative responsibility for the promotion of homosexuality among minors.[41] LGBTNET recommended that the grounds of homophobic and transphobic hatred be included in the Criminal Code as an aggravating factor.[42]

20. The Center for Reproductive Rights (CRR) recommended that legal and policy measures be put in place to prohibit discrimination against individuals living with HIV.[43]

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

21. Welcoming the extension of the moratorium on the death penalty, AI recommended the abolition of the death penalty.[44]

22. Despite the recommendation of the 2009 review accepted by the Government to combat torture, AI stated that torture and other forms of ill-treatment remained widespread and that allegations of torture used to extract confessions were seldom effectively investigated.[45] ICJ reported that charges that were brought regarding allegations of torture would often be for lesser crimes than the crime of torture, as the offence might instead be prosecuted under articles on abuse of or coercion to give testimony or other provisions, which carry lesser sentences.[46] ICJ recommended that a conduct amounting to torture be prosecuted as torture under the Criminal Code, rather than as more minor offences carrying lighter penalties.[47]

23. JS5 referred to continuing reports of hazing (*dedovschina*) and other torture related practices within the army. It highlighted inadequate medical assistance and a lack of psychological rehabilitation services to victims of torture and ill-treatment in the army.[48]

24. AI reported on practices of secret detentions and enforced disappearances, which were particularly widespread in the North Caucasus, and about the failure of the authorities to effectively and impartially investigate such cases.[49] The CoE-Commissioner stated that while the number of abductions and disappearances in Chechnya may have decreased in comparison to 2009, the situation remained far from normal.[50] HRW recommended stopping the practices of extrajudicial executions, enforced disappearances, and abduction-style detentions in the North Caucasus.[51]

25. Noting a decrease in prison population, JS5 stated that pre-trial detention facilities still faced overcrowding in many regions and that many cells did not meet hygienic norms. It reported on the lack of improvements in the human rights situation in the penitentiary system and referred to reports of killings, torture and inhuman treatment by the prison officers. JS5 stated that representatives of the Public Oversight Commissions and NGOs were obstructed from visiting detention centres in many regions.[52]

26. Noting widespread domestic violence against women, AI was concerned that no specific legislation on combating domestic violence was adopted despite the recommendation of the 2009 review accepted by the Government to adopt such legislation.[53] JS6 stated that various forms of violence against women, particularly domestic violence, were not recognized by the Criminal Code as separate offences.[54] AI was concerned at an inadequate provision of services for women facing domestic violence. It recommended adopting without delay specific legislation for prevention of domestic violence and allocating adequate resources for the provision of services to support victims of domestic violence, including the establishment of additional shelters.[55] The Advocates for Human Rights (AHR) recommended that the authorities adopt a comprehensive program to protect women from sexual violence.[56]

27. The Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) expressed hope that during the 2013 review the Russian Federation will be recommended to enact legislation to explicitly prohibit corporal punishment of children in all settings.[57]

28. STELLIT recommended that the Government, inter alia, develop and implement a comprehensive national plan of action against commercial sexual exploitation of children and provide a comprehensive victim assistance, recovery and reintegration by allocating state funds to organisations providing such services.[58]

29. JS5 referred to reports of widespread practices of using soldiers' involuntary and unpaid labor by their superiors for private purposes or by 'leasing' them to private businesses.[59]

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

30. AI reported on the failed efforts of the Government to ensure judicial independence despite the recommendations of the 2009 review accepted by the Government to reform the judiciary. AI explained that the current judicial reform appeared to have stronger focus on increasing material resources rather than on ensuring judicial independence.[60] ICJ recommended strengthening the independence of the judiciary, including through reforms in judicial appointment and promotion.[61]

31. AI referred to complaints of the denial of detainees' right to access to lawyers and the failure by the investigative authorities to promptly inform the lawyer and the family about the person's detention.[62]

32. ICJ reported that judicial review of detention remained ineffective and that the pre-trial detention continued to be a norm, despite alternatives to detention enshrined in law.[63] JS5 concluded that the recommendation of the 2009 review on the use of non-detention measures for pregnant inmates and inmates with children, as well as ensuring contact between children and their mothers, was not fully implemented.[64]

33. ICJ recommended conducting prompt, thorough and effective investigations into acts of torture and other ill-treatment, as well as preventing and putting an end to the practice of and impunity for torture by military, security services or other State agents.[65]

34. The CoE-Commissioner noted the lack of effective investigations into human rights violations in the North Caucasus where law enforcement or other security officials were implicated.[66] The Society for Threatened Peoples International (STP) stated that such situation contributed to the continuation of serious human rights abuses in the region and resulted in a climate of impunity.[67] Noting the ineffective investigations of tortures and abductions, the Inter-regional NGO Committee against Torture (ICAT) reported on the incapacity of the Chechen Investigative Administration to carry out such investigations and on the cases of refusal of the police to take part in such investigations.[68] JS5 concluded that the investigative bodies failed to conduct investigations even in the presence of evidence collected by human rights organisations due to the resistance of the police.[69]

35. STP recommended that the Government suspend from official capacity suspected perpetrators of human rights violations until the cases are adjudicated. It also recommended the deployment of an international commission of inquiry with a mandate to investigate violations of international humanitarian law, and the commission of war crimes and crimes against humanity in Chechnya since 1994.[70]

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

36. The FORUM 18 stated that the country's record on freedom of thought, conscience and belief worsened in comparison with the situation in the period of the 2009 review. It reported that treatment of certain groups within Orthodoxy, Islam, Judaism and Buddhism as the nation's privileged "traditional religions" – to the exclusion of others – was routine.[71] IRPP stated that the 2002 Extremism Law was increasingly used to censor religious scriptures and to target minority faiths under the pretext of 'religious extremism'.[72] CSI stated that once religious materials were included in the Federal List of Extremist Materials, the Government opened investigations, raided homes and churches, seized the works and prosecuted and convicted individuals.[73] The European Association of Jehovah's Christian Witnesses (EAJCW) referred to a number of criminal investigations on 'extremism' charges launched against members of Jehovah's Witnesses.[74]

37. JS7 stated that the duration of alternative civilian service was longer than the duration of military service and that the remuneration remained at the subsistence level.[75]

38. JS4 stated that the recommendations of the 2009 review to investigate cases of violence against journalists, bring the perpetrators to justice and to ensure better conditions for the functioning of independent media were not implemented.[76] PEN International (PEN) remained concerned about the lack of progress towards justice for murdered journalists and referred to the emblematic cases, such as the murder of Anna Politkovskaya (2006) that remained unresolved.[77] ARTICLE 19 and Reporters without Borders (RSF) made similar observations.[78] RSF concluded that attacks against media professionals remained widespread and impunity continued to prevail in the majority of cases.[79] ARTICLE 19 recommended that the Government prevent the killing, disappearances and attacks against journalists and media workers and carry out thorough and impartial investigations with a view to bringing the perpetrators to justice.[80]

39. HRW stated that, in 2011, the State Duma adopted legislative amendments decriminalizing libel, but seven months later it reintroduced criminal sanctions for libel and set out financial penalties that were far harsher than those established in the previous legislation.[81] AI[82], ARTICLE 19,[83] PEN[84], HRF[85], JS2[86] and JS4[87] made similar observations. JS4 referred to a large number of defamation lawsuits against media representatives.[88] ARTICLE 19 stated that media's fear of defamation lawsuits restrained alternative critical voices and that self-censorship was practised by media outlets.[89]

40. ARTICLE 19 reported that the recent amendments to the Law on the Protection of Children from Information Detrimental to their Health and Development introduced the possibility for 'illegal' websites to be blocked without due process and on an arbitrary basis within 72 hours.[90] PEN referred to concern that the amendments, which were intended to protect children by targeting websites promoting child pornography and drugs, introduced a possibility for a government control.[91] JS4[92], HRW[93], RSF[94] and IHRB[95] made similar observations.

41. PEN was concerned by the use of hooliganism laws to suppress free speech. Hooliganism, as an offense under the Criminal Code, remained poorly defined, which allowed it to be used to target those speaking or writing in support of the political opposition.[96] Similarly, PEN stated that the lack of a clear definition of extremism in legislation led to its misuse in courts, in numerous cases targeting journalists, writers and artists.[97] ARTICLE 19 remained concerned about the lack of a clear definition of 'extremist act' which established self-censorship of media.[98] AI, ARTICLE 19 and JS4 noted that the Law on Combating Extremist Activities was not amended despite the accepted recommendations of the 2009 review to do so.[99]

42. JS4 reported on the arbitrary and discriminatory application of legislation in all stages of creation and functioning of NGOs. It stated that NGO registration was more complicated and expensive than business entities' registration and noted a large number of rejections of NGO-registration applications.[100]

43. JS4 reported that the 2012 amendments to legislation on NGOs imposed stringent restrictions on the activities of NGOs by requiring NGOs that receive foreign funding and engage in 'political activities' to be registered as 'foreign agents' – a term that is synonymous with the term 'spy'.[101] AI reported that failure to comply with these regulations envisaged heavy fines and imprisonment and that the amendments undermined financial viability of NGOs and created new opportunities for authorities to subject civil society organizations to harassment and pressure.[102] JS2[103], JS3[104], JS4[105], HRF[106], HRW[107], ICJ[108], ARTICLE 19[109], STP[110], and PEN[111] made similar observations. HRW recommended repealing the above-mentioned amendments.[112]

44. HRF stated that independent civil society organisations and human rights defenders increasingly faced, inter alia, legal and administrative restrictions, and government stoked hostility.[113] AI reported that human rights defenders continued to face harassment and intimidation, and often physical violence, while the perpetrators enjoyed impunity.[114]

45. HRW stated that human rights defenders faced serious threats in Chechnya.[115] JS4 referred to cases of physical attacks against human rights defenders committed by state and non-state actors as well as of criminal prosecution and short-term detention of human rights defenders in the North Caucasus.[116] AI[117], STP[118], JS2[119], JS4[120] and CoE-Commissioner[121] made similar observations.

46. HRW concluded that the Government did not demonstrate the political will to genuinely implement recommendations of the 2009 review to respect and protect the rights of human rights defenders.[122] AI recommended that the Government respect and observe the right of human rights defenders to undertake their legitimate work without the fear of harassment, criminal prosecution or other pressure.[123] JS2 recommended that those

violations should be independently investigated and the perpetrators should be brought to justice.[124]

47. HRW reported that the 2012 legal amendments increased fines for violating rules on holding public events, and imposed various other restrictions making it more difficult and costly to engage in public protests.[125] AI[126], ARTICLE 19[127], JS2[128], JS4[129], HRF[130] and PEN[131] made similar observations. The CoE-Commissioner noted the absence of legal provisions on spontaneous assemblies in the legislation.[132]

48. The CoE-Commissioner noted information indicating that on many occasions law enforcement officials' actions were aimed at intervening in or dispersing assemblies, which were regarded by the authorities as "unlawful", despite compliance by organisers with the notification procedure. He stated that force was often used – at times excessively - and participants in assemblies were apprehended, even during peaceful events.[133] AI also noted growing number of instances of arbitrary restrictions on the right to freedom of assembly and increasingly harsh sentencing of peaceful protesters. AI stated that during the demonstrations, which took place after the 2011 parliamentary elections, over 1,000 protesters were detained and more than 100 sentenced to administrative detention in proceedings that frequently violated their right to a fair trial. [134] JS2[135], JS4[136] and HRW[137] made similar observations.

49. PEN reported that LGBT activists continued to face repressive actions from the authorities.[138] LGBTNET noted the practice of refusing the registration of LGBT organizations.[139] HRF stated that the Government continued to deny freedom of assembly and association to gay rights activists by banning gay pride parades and events and denying registration to groups seeking to confront homophobia and promote tolerance and non-discrimination.[140]

50. JS4 highlighted some positive changes in the electoral legislation, including the simplified registration procedure for political parties and the reduced number of signatures required for registration of candidates. However, it noted that legal amendments resulted in narrowing down the opportunities for public organisations and independent candidates to run for elections. Furthermore, JS4 suggested that the influence of the executive branch over electoral processes should be significantly reduced by inter alia excluding it from participating in the formation of the electoral commissions and impartial investigations should be carried out in cases of allegations of electoral misconduct during candidate registrations, pre-election campaign and vote counting.[141]

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

51. IHRB reported that employers were repeatedly accused of non-payment of wages, absence of employment contracts, and denial of access to remedy. It referred to concerns reported with respect to health and safety at the workplace.[142]

52. JS6 reported that the minimum wage remained low and that most of the low-wage employees worked in the state-owned enterprises. It highlighted that the authorities did not ratify ILO conventions nos. 26 and 131 regarding minimum wage regulations.[143]

53. IHRB reported on the lack of independent and influential trade unions.[144] JS6 reported on continuous interference by the Government in the trade unions' work and indicated that there was no effective mechanism for protecting employees from discrimination if they were involved in trade union work. It stated that trade unions were denied the right to conduct strikes for years because of legal limitations to the right to declare a strike and complicated procedures for conducting the strike.[145] IHRB recommended that the Government create an enabling environment for trade unions to ensure protection of workers' rights.[146]

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

54. JS6 stated that the lack of effective measures in the period of 2009-2012 to combat poverty and social vulnerability had considerable social and economic implications, in particular an increase in the unemployment rate, reduction of wages and deterioration of living standards.[147]

7. Right to health

55. CRR reported that there was no comprehensive sexual and reproductive health strategy and that contraception was not covered by the public health insurance scheme.[148] JS2 stated that the high cost of modern contraception made it unaffordable for most women, especially women with lower income living in rural areas.[149] CRR and JS1 stated that although emergency contraception was legal, most women were unable to access it and that many low-income women were unable to afford to purchase them.[150] CRR noted that police did not regularly provide emergency contraception to victims of sexual violence.[151]

56. CRR, JS1 and JS4 referred to the recent amendments to the law governing abortion, which established so called waiting periods for a woman who decided to undergo abortion.[152] JS1 explained that mandatory waiting periods affect women's timely access to abortions and thus, make abortion more dangerous.[153] JS1 and JS4 reported that the amendments also introduced provisions on conscientious objection to give doctors the right to refuse abortions.[154]

57. CRR recommended ensuring that women have access to affordable contraceptive methods and to safe and legal abortions.[155] JS1 recommended amending public health insurance schemes to cover hormonal contraception, including emergency contraception.[156]

58. JS1 stated that forced and coerced sterilizations might occur as a result of formal or informal policies, improper incentive programs, or a lack of procedural safeguards to ensure informed consent. It referred to recent reports suggesting that the practice occurred regularly.[157]

59. CRR referred to information indicating a high HIV prevalence rate. It also referred to concern expressed by treaty bodies about the increasing number of children born of HIV-positive mothers.[158] CRR recommended: increasing efforts to prevent mother-child transmission, guaranteeing antiretroviral treatment to new-borns with HIV-positive mothers and most-at risk populations and introducing without delay sexual and reproductive health education and public awareness campaigns as a means to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS.[159]

60. JS8 stated that opioid substitution therapy (OST) with methadone and buprenorphine continued to be legally banned. [160] In this respect, JS8 proposed several measures, including a) repealing the legal ban on the medical use of narcotic drugs in the treatment of drug dependence and introducing OST programs and b) adopting legislation or regulations removing the uncertainty regarding the legal status of needle and syringe programs and overdose prevention programs, so as to allow these health services to operate effectively.[161]

8. Persons with disabilities

61. JS6 stated that segregation of children with disabilities in education increased. It reported that educational authorities were encouraging parents to place their children with disabilities in specialized educational institutions and that the development of inclusive schools was slow, with most cities having no or only one or two inclusive schools.[162]

62. JS6 stated that large residential institutions remained the only available arrangement for persons with mental or physical disabilities. Initiatives to improve lives of persons in institutions were limited to improving their physical conditions, and thus perpetuated social

exclusion and stigmatization. It noted some improvements in physical accessibility of persons with disabilities, especially in larger cities. However, the measures undertaken remained inadequate and consequently, most wheel-chair users or persons with mobility impairments remained isolated in their homes or specialized residential institutions.[163]

63. JS1 reported that women with mental disabilities were subjected to forced and coerced sterilizations and abortions.[164] CRR recommended reforming law and practice related to access to reproductive health care services for women with disabilities in accordance with the CRPD, and ensuring that all such services, including sterilizations and abortions, are provided with the full and free informed consent of the women concerned.[165]

9. Minorities and indigenous peoples

64. CoE-ACFC stated that no effective mechanism was in place to ensure that national minorities' members have an opportunity to influence decisions on issues concerning them.[166]

65. CoE-ACFC stated that few opportunities existed for access to secondary education in minority languages and that the ongoing process of 'optimisation' of schools resulted in the closure of various schools with instruction in and of minority languages.[167] It stated that while minority languages continued to be used in rural areas where minorities lived in substantial numbers, the use of minority languages in urban centres appeared to be decreasing. The amount of television and radio programmes broadcast in minority languages also decreased.[168]

66. JS4 noted difficulties in the realisation of the right of Roma children to education. It stated that most Roma children never graduate secondary school and many of them did not even finish elementary school.[169] CoE-ACFC stated that Roma children were often placed in separate 'Gypsy' classes or schools, with very low quality of education.[170]

67. The European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC) reported that Roma faced various barriers in obtaining personal documents and that the lack of personal documents prevented the Roma from accessing employment, social allowances, healthcare, education or voting, as many rights and benefits were dependant on having personal documents.[171] CoE-ACFC reported about continued forced evictions of the Roma without alternative accommodation or adequate compensation and often involving excessive use of force by the police. CoE-ACFC noted the lack of a comprehensive strategy to tackle the multiple disadvantages facing Roma in many areas of life.[172]

68. ERRC recommended that the Government adopt a national plan of action, which includes special measures for the promotion of access by Roma to personal documents, employment, residence registration, adequate housing with legal security of tenure, and other economic, social and cultural rights, and allocate sufficient resources for the effective implementation of that plan.[173]

69. CoE-ACFC stated that the implementation of the concept paper on indigenous peoples' sustainable development was slow and that it was offset by simultaneous legislative developments that resulted in reduced access of numerically small indigenous peoples to their traditional territories and natural resources.[174] IHRB explained that a number of norms providing for the realization of traditional land-use rights and livelihoods were removed from the legislation, including such privileges as priority allocation of land-plots and ranges for fishing and hunting. Indigenous peoples were not able to prevent forced resettlement and land acquisition. IHRB referred to concerns expressed by several United Nations treaty bodies about granting licenses for lands traditionally owned by indigenous people to private enterprises for development projects, such as the construction of pipelines or hydroelectric dams.[175]

70. JS3 concluded that in most regions, indigenous communities had no guaranteed and sustainable access to those territories and resources on which they depend for their collective survival, no effective remedies against encroachment by third parties and no guarantee of adequate compensation for damages suffered as a result of third-party activities.[176] JS3 stated that it would be, in practice, impossible for indigenous peoples to enjoy their legal right to traditional fishing because most fishing grounds close to indigenous settlements were put on tenders and leased out to private businesses under long-term lease contracts.[177]

71. Furthermore, JS3 stated that the Government should eliminate discrimination against indigenous peoples in the labour market, and ensure that wages and pensions of indigenous peoples are above the subsistence minimum. The Government should ensure that all indigenous peoples have access to free healthcare of sufficient quality, including annual health check-ups.[178] JS3 stated that the Government should ensure that indigenous peoples are duly represented at all levels of government and administration.[179]

10. Migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers

72. IHRB referred to registered cases of violations of migrant worker rights, especially in the construction industry.[180] JS6 reported that migrant workers were not entitled to benefits under the state healthcare insurance and that the regional healthcare departments refused to accept migrant children and pregnant migrant women for treatment at clinics, but they had to buy health insurance or used paid services – something that the majority of migrants could not afford. Migrant women with residency permits did not have a right for paid sick leave and state benefits during pregnancy and after childbirth.[181] JS4 reported that migrant workers' children were not allowed to reside in the country longer than three months, whereas their parents with work permits could legally reside for a year.[182]

73. ICJ recommended that the Government respect the principle of *non-refoulement* and, cease its reliance on diplomatic assurances against torture and other ill-treatment.[183]

11. Human rights and counter-terrorism

74. The CoE-Commissioner referred to concerns about unlawful killings and forced disappearances, perpetrated under the banner of counter-terrorist operations in the North Caucasus. He highlighted the need for additional efforts to ensure proportionality for counter-terrorism measures and accountability for any infringements of human rights, fundamental freedoms and the rule of law.[184]

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

AHR	The Advocates for Human Rights, Minneapolis, United States of America
AI	Amnesty International, London, United Kingdom
ARTICLE 19	ARTICLE 19:Defending Freedom of Expression and Information, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and the Northern Ireland;
CRR	Centre for Reproductive Rights, New York, United States of America;
CSI	Church of Scientology International, Washington DC, United States of America;
EAJCW	European Association of Jehovah's Christian Witnesses, Kraainem, Belgium;
ERRC	European Roma Rights Centre, Budapest, Hungary;

FORUM 18	Forum 18 News Service, Oslo, Norway;
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London, United Kingdom;
HRF	Human Rights First, New York, United States of America
HRW	Human Rights Watch, New York, United States of America
ICJ	International Commission of Jurists, Geneva, Switzerland;
ICAT	Inter-regional NGO 'Committee Against Torture', Nizniy Novgorod, Russian Federation;
IHRB	Institute for Human Rights and Business, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and the Northern Ireland
ILGA-Europe	ILGA Europe: Equality for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, trans and intersex people in Europe, Brussels, Belgium
IRPP	The Institute on Religion and Public Policy, Alexandria, United States of America;
JS1	Joint Submission by *the Federation for Women and Family Planning* (Pro Femina" Association; NEUTRUM - Association for Ideologically-Free State; Polish YWCA - Young Women Christian Association; League of Polish Women; Democratic Union of Women (Pozna Branch); Association "Assistance Center for Families" and Family Development Association) and *the Sexual Rights Initiative* (Coalition of NGOs, including Action Canada for Population and Development, Akahatá Equipo de Trabajo en Sexualidades y Generos (Latin America), Coalition of African Lesbians, Creating Resources for Empowerment in Action (India), Federation for Women and Family Planning (Poland), Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights, and others);
JS2	Joint Submission by CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizens Participation, Citizens' Watch (South Africa), Citizens' Watch (Russian Federation) and GOLOS Association for Protection of Voters' Rights (Russian Federation)
JS3	Joint Submission by the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North – RAIPON (Russian Federation), the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (Denmark) and the Institute for Ecology and Action Anthropology (Germany);
JS4	Joint Submission by Center for the Development of Democracy and Human Rights, GOLOS Association for Protection of Voters' Rights, Interregional Human Rights Group, International Youth Human Rights Movement, Foundation for Environmental and Social Justice, Center for the Protection of Media Rights, SOVA Center for Information and Analysis, and "Memorial" Anti-Discrimination Centre. (Russian Federation)
JS5	Joint Submission by Institute for Human Rights, "Social Partnership" Foundation, "Public Verdict" Foundation, Soldiers' Mothers of Saint Petersburg, "Memorial" Human Rights Center, Interregional Committee against Torture, and the Center for the Development of Democracy and Human Rights (Russian Federation)
JS6	Joint Submission by Center for Social and Labor Rights, Center "Anna" for the Prevention of Violence against Women, "Rights of the Child" Charitable Foundation, "Perspektiva" Regional NGO of Persons with Disabilities, LGBT Network, and the Center for the Development of Democracy and Human Rights (Russian Federation)
JS7	Joint Submission by the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, (The Netherlands) and Conscience and Peace Tax International (Belgium)
JS8	Joint Submission by Andrey Rylkov Foundation for Health and Social Justice (Russian Federation) and Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network (Canada)
LGBTNET	Russian LGBT Network, St. Petersburg, Russia
LIENIP	L'auravetl'an Information and Education Network of Indigenous Peoples, Moscow, Russian Federation
PEN	PEN International with Russian PEN, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and the Northern Ireland
RSF	Reporters without Borders, Paris, France
STELLIT	Stellit NGO, ST. Petersburg, Russian Federation
STP	Society for Threatened People International, Bern Switzerland, Berlin, Germany.

National human rights institution

CHRRF*	Commissioner for Human Rights in the Russian Federation , Moscow, Russian Federation

Regional intergovernmental organization

CoE	Council of Europe Attachments: CoE-ACFC Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention For the Protection of National Minorities, Strasbourg, 25 July 2012, ACFC/OP/III(2011)010 (CoE-Commissioner: Findings and Observations) Commissioner of Human Rights: Finding and Observations of the Commissioner for Human Rights on the right to freedom of assembly, 21 July, 2011, CommDH(2011)31, Ref: CommHR/TH/sf 081-2010; (CoE-Commissioner:Report) Report by Thomas Hammarberg, Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe following his visit to the Russian Federation from 12 to 21 May 2011, Strasbourg, 6 September, 2011, CommDH(2011)21.

[2] CHRRF, pp. 1-2.
[3] CHRRF, p. 4.
[4] CHRRF, p. 4.
[5] CHRFF, p. 7.
[6] CHRRF, p. 7.
[7] CHRRF, p. 4.
[8] CHRRF, p. 6.
[9] CHRRF, p. 5.
[10] CHRRF, p. 3.
[11] The following abbreviations have been used for this document:

ICMWR	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families
CPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT;
ICCPR-OP 2	Optional Protocol to International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
OP-ICESCR	Optional Protocol to International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
OP-CRC-SC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography.

[12] AI, p. 5.
[13] HRW, p. 5.
[14] CoE-Commissioner: Report, p. 13, para. 51.
[15] AI, p. 5.
[16] HRW, p. 5.
[17] IHRB, p. 6.
[18] HRW, p. 5. See also ICJ, p. 5.
[19] HRW, p. 5.
[20] ICJ, p. 5.
[21] JS4, p. 9.
[22] CoE-ACFC, para. 13.
[23] AI, p. 4.
[24] JS6, pp. 2-3.
[25] JS4, p. 10.
[26] CoE-ACFC, para. 17.
[27] HRF, paras. 6-10.
[28] CoE-ACFC, para. 16. See also JS4, pp. 8-10.
[29] IRPP, p. 5;
[30] CSI, para. 26.
[31] LGBTNET, p. 1 and JS6, p. 9.

[32] ARTICLE 19, para. 19.
[33] AI, p. 4. See also HRW, p. 4.
[34] ICJ, para. 18.
[35] LGBTNET, p. 2.
[36] HRF, para. 20.
[37] JS4, p. 9.
[38] JS6, p. 9.
[39] ILGA-Europe, p. 1.
[40] AI, p. 6.
[41] ICJ, p. 4. See also LGBTNET, p. 2.
[42] LGBTNET, p. 3.
[43] CRR, p. 8.
[44] AI, pp. 2-5. See also JS5, p. 1.
[45] AI, pp.1-3. See also ICJ, p. 1 and JS5, pp. 4-5.
[46] ICJ, para. 8.
[47] ICJ, p. 4.
[48] JS5, p. 8.
[49] AI, p. 3.
[50] CoE-Commissioner: Report, p. 2.
[51] HRW, p. 5.
[52] JS5, pp. 3-4.
[53] AI, p. 1. See also JS4, p. 9.
[54] JS6, p.6.
[55] AI, pp. 4-5. See also JS1, para. 24.
[56] AHR, p. 7, para. 17 (e).
[57] GIEACPC , p. 1.
[58] STELLIT, pp. 2-4.
[59] JS5, p. 8. See also JS7, paras. 22-24.
[60] AI, pp.1-3; see also JS5, p. 1.
[61] ICJ, p. 4. See also AI, p. 5.
[62] AI, p. 4. See also JS5, p. 2.
[63] ICJ, paras. 5-6. See also JS5, pp. 2-3.
[64] JS5, p. 3.
[65] ICJ, p. 4. See also CoE-Commissioner: Report, p. 17.
[66] CoE-Commissioner: Report, p. 3.
[67] STP, p. 6.
[68] ICAT, pp. 1-3.
[69] JS5, p. 10.
[70] STP, p. 6.
[71] FORUM 18, paras. 1-2.
[72] IRPP, p. 1.
[73] CSI, para. 11.
[74] EAJCW, para. 6.
[75] JS7, paras. 3, 4 and 5.
[76] JS4, p. 6.
[77] PEN, para. 8.
[78] ARTICLE 19, para. 10 and RSF, pp. 1-2.
[79] RSF, p. 1; see also STP, p. 2.
[80] ARTICLE 19, para. 25; see also RSF, p. 4.
[81] HRW, p. 2.
[82] AI, p. 2.
[83] ARTICLE 19, para. 13.
[84] PEN, para. 10.
[85] HRF, para. 16.
[86] JS2, para. 4.5.
[87] JS4, pp. 4 and 7.

[88] JS4, pp. 4 and 7.
[89] ARTICLE 19, para. 12.
[90] ARTICLE 19, para. 20.
[91] PEN, para. 19.
[92] JS4, p. 8.
[93] HRW, p. 3.
[94] RSF, pp. 3-4.
[95] IHRB, p. 5.
[96] PEN, paras. 13-14; see also JS2, para. 3.4 and AI, p.2.
[97] PEN, para. 16.
[98] ARTICLE 19, para. 21. See also JS4, p. 8 and RSF, p. 2.
[99] AI, p. 1, ARTICLE 19, paras. 16 and 21, and JS4, pp. 3 and 8.
[100] JS4, p. 3.
[101] JS4, p. 3.
[102] AI, p. 3.
[103] JS2, para. 2.3.
[104] JS3, para. 40.
[105] JS4, pp. 3-4.
[106] HRF, para. 16.
[107] HRW, p. 1.
[108] ICJ, paras.11, 12 and 13.
[109] ARTICLE 19, para. 18.
[110] STP, p. 3.
[111] PEN, paras. 22 -23.
[112] HRW, p. 5. See also JS3, para. 40.
[113] HRF, para. 13.
[114] AI, p. 2.
[115] HRW, p. 4.
[116] JS4, pp. 4-5.
[117] AI, p. 2; see also ICJ, para. 4 and JS2, para. 5.2.
[118] STP, pp. 2-3.
[119] JS2, para. 5.6.
[120] JS4, pp. 4-5.
[121] CoE-Commissioner: Report, p. 18.
[122] HRW, p. 2. see also STP, p. 5 and JS4, p. 4.
[123] AI, p. 5; see also STP, p. 3 and JS2, para. 6.1.
[124] JS2, para. 6.5.
[125] HRW, p. 3.
[126] AI, p. 2.
[127] ARTICLE 19, para. 17.
[128] JS2, para. 3.2.
[129] JS4, p. 5.
[130] HRF, para. 16.
[131] PEN, paras. 27-29.
[132] CoE-Commissioner: Findings and Observations, para. 7.
[133] CoE-Commissione: Findings and Observations, para. 9.
[134] AI, p. 2.
[135] JS2, paras. 3.1-3.2.
[136] JS4, p. 5.
[137] HRW, p. 4.
[138] PEN, para. 31. See also JS2, para. 2.5.
[139] LGBTNET, p. 4.
[140] HRF, para. 20. See also PEN, para. 3.1.
[141] JS4, p. 2.
[142] IHRB, p. 4.
[143] JS6, p. 2.

144 IHRB, p. 3.
145 JS6, p. 5.
146 IHRB, p. 6.
147 JS6, p. 1.
148 CRR, pp. 2-3, paras. 4 and 6.
149 JS2, paras. 5-6.
150 CRR, p. 3 and JS1, paras. 8-9.
151 CRR, p. 3, para. 6.
152 CRR, p. 4, JS1, para. 14 and JS4, p. 10.
153 JS1, para. 15.
154 JS1, para. 20 and JS4, p. 10.
155 CRR, p. 7, para. 26 (b) and (f).
156 JS1, p. 9.
157 JS1, para. 22.
158 CRR, pp. 5-6, paras. 19 and 21.
159 CRR, p. 8, para. 26 (l) and (o).
160 JS8, para. 4.1.
161 JS8, pp. 5 -6.
162 JS6, pp. 8-9.
163 JS6, p. 8.
164 JS1, para. 23.
165 CRR, p. 7. See also JS1, p. 9.
166 CoE-ACFC, p. 2, See also para.20.
167 CoE-ACFC, para. 24.
168 CoE-ACFC, para. 22.
169 JS4, p. 10.
170 CoE-ACFC, para. 23.
171 ERRC, p.1.
172 CoE-ACFC, paras. 17-18.
173 ERRC, p. 4.
174 CoE-AC, p. 2. See also para.21.
175 IHRB, pp.4-5.
176 JS3, para. 8.
177 JS3, para. 18. See also LIENIP, paras. 16, 17 and 18.
178 JS3, para. 38.
179 JS3, para. 31.
180 IHRB, p. 4.
181 JS6, pp. 4-5.
182 JS4, p. 10.
183 ICJ, p. 4.
184 CoE-Commissioner: Report, p. 9.