



General Assembly

Distr.: General
7 November 2014

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twenty-first session
19–30 January 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

Armenia*

The present report is a summary of 15 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.



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

1. The Human Rights Defender (the Defender) welcomed the Action plan for the National Strategy on Human Rights Protection which was approved in 2014 and reflected numerous recommendations of the Defender.² He also welcomed the National Action Plan for the Protection of Children's Rights (2013-2016), but listed the challenges in the protection of children's rights which remained to be resolved.³

2. The Defender considered that the legislative basis for the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) under the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OP-CAT) was insufficient and that the budget for civil society participation in the NPM was inadequate.⁴

3. The Law on Equal Rights and Equal Opportunities for Men and Women was adopted in 2013, but there was a lack of specific measures for its implementation. Cases of hidden discrimination against women continued.⁵ Comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation, providing protection for underrepresented groups and minorities, and a separate equality body to protect the rights of victims of discrimination were needed.⁶

4. The Defender recommended the provision of video recording equipment in the interrogation rooms of police stations to prevent possible ill-treatment in this situation.⁷

5. In a number of cases prison conditions recorded by the NPM could be qualified as inhumane and degrading treatment. Inadequate medical provision was also recorded.⁸ The frequent hunger-strikes and cases of self-harm, which were aimed at drawing attention to the problems, were worrying.⁹

6. Violence against women continued to be a concern. The Government's decision to discontinue the preparation of the draft Law on Domestic Violence, and amend other laws instead, meant that there was a lack of comprehensive legislation to combat the widespread cases. There was also a lack of shelters and protection mechanisms.¹⁰

7. The Defender noted that certain long-running high-profile criminal cases remained uncompleted. He recommended that measures be taken to complete them in the shortest possible timeframe and inform the public of progress in the investigations.¹¹

8. Guaranteeing judicial independence and impartiality remained a major issue. Disciplinary proceedings were a dangerous tool for exerting pressure on judges. The Defender referred to his 2013 report on the right to a fair trial and listed his concerns. He noted the approval of an action plan for the period 2012-2016, but the process of implementation needed strengthening.¹²

9. A juvenile justice system had not yet been implemented. There were problems in the realisation of juvenile convicts' right to education as well as complaints of the ill-treatment of juveniles in police stations and of their interrogation without the knowledge of their parents.¹³

10. There were cases of intimidation of and physical violence against human rights defenders. The threats against women's rights non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were highly reprehensible.¹⁴

11. The Defender welcomed the draft Law on the Freedom of Conscience and Religion, but noted that it was still to be adopted. There were negative public attitudes and intolerance towards religious minority organizations.¹⁵

12. Freedom of speech, particularly of the media, newspapers, magazines, TV and radio and the Internet had improved significantly since 2010. There were, however, still challenges concerning the independence and working environment of journalists. The Defender noted public distrust in the investigation of cases of hindrance of journalists in their activities.¹⁶ The decriminalization of defamation and insult in 2010 had been a big step forward, however, the courts' had made journalists pay the maximum amounts of compensation under the Civil Code and this policy had imposed a financial burden upon newspapers. A 2011 decision of the Constitutional Court had reduced the problem.¹⁷ The Defender noted that continuous delays and cancellations in the changeover process from analogue to digital broadcasting had restricted the number of television channels.¹⁸

13. The Defender considered that the police had sometimes applied the legislation relating to freedom of assembly incorrectly and subjected participants to administrative detention or other restrictions. He recommended that the state respect the freedom of assembly at all times and, if necessary, make relevant legislative amendments.¹⁹

14. The local and national elections held in 2012 and 2013 were peaceful and more competitive than in previous years with equal opportunities in campaigning and reporting by journalists and NGO observers, even of minor violations. However, despite the improvements, the Defender listed a number of problems.²⁰

15. Effective measures had not been undertaken to provide for an adequate standard of living.²¹ The calculation of pensions and social payments for vulnerable groups did not take into account the consumer prices. The withdrawal of unemployment benefits under a 2014 law on employment was in contravention of Armenia's international obligations.²²

16. The Defender was also concerned at the ineffective deinstitutionalization of orphanages; lack of adoptions of children with disabilities; high rates of child poverty, especially for children with disabilities; and the lack of collaboration between bodies responsible for the protection of children's rights.²³

II. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Background and framework

1. Scope of international obligations²⁴

17. Joint submission 6 (JS6) and the London Legal Group (LLG recommended ratification of the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).²⁵

18. Joint submission 2 (JS2) recommended ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) on a Communications Procedure.²⁶

19. In 2011, the Council of Europe's (CoE) European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (CoE-ECRI) recommended making the declaration under article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.²⁷

20. LLG recommended ratification of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.²⁸

21. Joint submission 1 (JS1) and JS6 recommended ratification of the Optional Protocol to Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (OP-CRPD).²⁹

22. JS6 recommended ratification of the Additional Protocol to the European Social Charter Providing for a System of Collective Complaints, the CoE Convention on Access to Official Documents and the European Convention in the Recognition of the Legal Personality of International Non-Governmental Organizations.³⁰ CoE-ECRI recommended ratification of the European Convention on Nationality and the European Convention on the Participation of Foreigners in Public Life at Local Level.³¹

2. Constitutional and legislative framework

23. JS6 stated that although the protection of fundamental freedoms and human rights was guaranteed in the Constitution, the Government failed to ensure proper implementation of human rights and freedoms, both in the legislation and in practice.³² It called for full and effective implementation of the decisions of the Constitutional Court.³³

3. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures

24. JS1 stated that, following pressure from civil society, the Government formed a working group on implementation of the universal periodic review (UPR) recommendations, but that the process was not a true attempt to follow-up on the recommendations as it failed to address the most urgent and important issues. No real and practical changes were registered.³⁴

25. JS1 considered that the legislative and policy frameworks for the protection of human rights were insufficient, as civil society lacked effective mechanisms to influence the policymaking process.³⁵ Civil society involvement in decision-making processes had a superficial and formalistic nature, especially in the sphere of government transparency and accountability.³⁶ It called for broad consultations with civil society and all relevant stakeholders in the making of domestic and foreign policy.³⁷

26. CoE referred to the finding of the CoE-ECRI that the budget of the Defender's Office was insufficient.³⁸

27. JS6 recommended that governmental agencies provide annual reports to the Parliament on the human rights situation on their spheres of operation.³⁹

28. JS1 stated that, while the National Strategy on Human Rights Protection went into force in 2012 and its action plan was adopted in 2014, recommendations from NGOs were largely disregarded.⁴⁰ It called for the provision of sufficient financial resources for effective implementation of the plan.⁴¹

29. JS2 considered that the legislation regulating children's rights was vague and did not guarantee mechanisms for full protection.⁴² It called for the development of indicators to measure progress towards implementation of the National Action Plan for the Protection of Children's Rights for 2013-2016.⁴³

30. JS1 recommended trainings for police, medical and other professionals on the rights of minorities and individuals belonging to vulnerable groups.⁴⁴

B. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

1. Cooperation with treaty bodies

31. JS6 stated that, in general, the Government had not taken any steps towards disseminating information about the international human rights instruments and procedures.⁴⁵ It recommended raising public awareness on the First Optional Protocol to the ICCPR.⁴⁶

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

1. Equality and non-discrimination

32. C:\Users\Paul.Miller\AppData\Local\Temp\Source BM\JSTMP6_UPR21_ARM_E_Main BM.docx - T_A_ADLS1 stated that there was widespread societal and institutional discrimination, intolerance and harassment, victimization and stigmatization of certain groups.⁴⁷ The authorities had taken little action to counter discrimination.⁴⁸ The provisions on non-discrimination were scattered across various legislation.⁴⁹ JS6 and JS1 called for standalone anti-discrimination legislation.⁵⁰

33. JS2 stated that gender equality was not a priority for the Government and that this was evident in the inadequate measures which were in place to overcome discriminatory practices that targeted women.⁵¹ JS1 considered that while the legislation stipulated equal rights for men and women, gender-discrimination persisted in all aspects of life.⁵²

34. JS2 noted that unequal economic development in past years had resulted in decreased male unemployment and increased female unemployment.⁵³ Women's average salaries were 64.4 per cent of those of men and the gap resulted from a concentration of women in low-paid work, including in the public sector, which did not provide career growth and decent wages. It recommended the adoption of specific legislative norms to attain de facto equal opportunities for women at all levels of the labour market.⁵⁴ It called on the Government to introduce quotas to ensure the adequate presence of women at the top level of management in the economy and state-run organizations and in companies' boards of directors.⁵⁵

35. Joint submission 3 (JS3) stated that discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity was widespread in all spheres of the society and the Government had not adopted adequate legislation in this field.⁵⁶ JS3 and Human Rights Watch (HRW) noted hate speech by private and public actors, including statements by parliamentarians, justifying violence against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people.⁵⁷ JS1 reported that the authorities failed to carry out credible investigations into cases involving violence against LGBT persons.⁵⁸ JS3 and HRW had similar observations.⁵⁹ Both mentioned the submission in 2013 of draft amendments to the Criminal Code on Administrative Infringements by the police which would introduce fines for the promotion of "non-traditional" relationships.⁶⁰

36. JS1 noted that, because of inaccurate perceptions of the risk of transmission, persons living with HIV, drug users and sex workers were discriminated against in the provision of healthcare and in the legal protection they received.⁶¹

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

37. JS1 noted that there were no comprehensive, independent and effective investigations when people died in penitentiaries, psycho-neurological medical institutions or in the armed forces.⁶² JS2 provided information about the inadequacies of healthcare provided to conscripts and noted an increase in the number of their deaths of the latter due to poor healthcare between 2011 and 2013.⁶³ Joint submission 5 (JS5) and HRW were also concerned about the high rate of non-conflict deaths in the armed forces and that some findings of "suicide" may have been used to shield perpetrators of violence.⁶⁴

38. JS1 considered that the State did not have a comprehensive national plan or policy for the prevention of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.⁶⁵ The Civil Society Institute (CSI) recalled the UPR recommendation to review the definition of torture in Armenia's national legislation and noted that proposed amendments had not been

passed and that the Criminal Code continued to fall short of the requirements of the CAT.⁶⁶ LLG, HRW and JS1 had similar concerns.⁶⁷ JS1 noted that the definition did not provide for public officials to be held accountable for direct involvement in acts of torture and this resulted in a heightened atmosphere of impunity.⁶⁸

39. JS6 stated that the Law on the Human Rights Defender did not adequately regulate the activities of the NPM and left the involvement of NGOs in the mechanism to the discretion of the Defender. It called for the adoption of a separate law.⁶⁹

40. CSI noted that in the first UPR Armenia had consented to “ensure that all allegations of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment are investigated promptly and that perpetrators are brought to justice”, but in 2012 the Committee against Torture had highlighted the failure to conduct, prompt, impartial and effective investigations into allegations of torture perpetrated by law enforcement officials.⁷⁰ JS1 noted that torture was used by police to coerce self-incriminating evidence in investigating rooms which could not be monitored by civil society organizations and that such evidence continued to be used during trials. Victims were reluctant to file complaints and lacked trust in the investigations.⁷¹ LLG noted that in 2013, for the first time, two police officers were sentenced to 3 years’ imprisonment for violence committed with the aim of extracting self-incriminatory confessions.⁷²

41. CoE referred to the 2011 findings of European Committee for the Prevention of Torture (CoE-CPT) which heard a significant number of allegations of police ill-treatment and recommend that a message of “zero tolerance” be delivered to all officers; that further training for officers and safeguards for detainees be reinforced, such as notification of custody, access to lawyers and doctors.⁷³ It also recommended that more independence be given to the Special Investigation Service, which investigates complaints.⁷⁴ JS6 considered that the State had taken few or no steps towards the effective implementation of the recommendations of CoE-CPT.⁷⁵

42. CoE-CPT heard in 2010 that the overwhelming majority of prisoners were treated in a correct manner, but received a few allegations of physical ill-treatment in Nubarashen prison. It noted concerns about overcrowding, limited activities, and allegations of corrupt practices by staff.⁷⁶ In a 2011 follow-up visit to sections of two prisons CoE-CPT did not receive allegations of deliberate physical ill-treatment, but was concerned about the conditions of prisoners on life sentences in Kentron prison.⁷⁷ CSI had detailed concerns about poor prison conditions, including poor food and healthcare and overcrowding.⁷⁸

43. CoE-CPT noted new regulations on restraint methods in psychiatric and social care institutions, but a lack of improvements in the provision of psychiatric care and the implementation of legal safeguards for involuntary hospitalization.⁷⁹

44. CSI stated that the legal and practical safeguards protecting people with mental disorders against unlawful deprivation of liberty were insufficient. It recommended amendments to the legislation including allowing judicial review and ensuring due process when committing persons to psychiatric institutions or removing their legal capacity.⁸⁰

45. JS2 reported that domestic violence was endemic and that there was an absence of adequate legal mechanisms to protect victims.⁸¹ There were no support services for victims and police discouraged them from filing complaints.⁸² JS3 noted the drafting of the Law on domestic violence following the first UPR, but that the Government had rejected the draft in January 2014.⁸³ JS6, JS1 and JS3 called for the adoption of such a law.⁸⁴ JS3 noted that women victims lacked trust in the police and there was a lack of female officers.⁸⁵ It proposed campaigns to deal with the problem of cultural acceptance and gender-sensitive training for police, prosecutors, judges and counsellors.⁸⁶

46. JS3 stated that female sex workers were subject to violence and degrading treatment by law enforcement officials and that laws relating to infectious diseases were being applied in a discriminatory manner.⁸⁷

47. The Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment urged that draft amendments to the Family Code include explicit prohibition of corporal punishment and that the new law be enacted and implemented as a priority.⁸⁸

48. JS2 stated that legislation regulating children's rights was vague and did not guarantee mechanisms for full protection.⁸⁹ It noted actions undertaken by the Government since the CRC's review of Armenia in 2012, but considered that the National Committee for Child Protection still did not function adequately.⁹⁰ The legislation prohibited violence against children, but did not specify the types of violence and did not provide working mechanisms for reporting cases of abuse. Criminal cases were usually not initiated. In many cases the child victims were returning home to the same situation.⁹¹

49. CoE referred to the 2014 findings of the Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings. It made recommendations relating to strengthening prevention among vulnerable groups, including children without parental care or in state institutions; victims should receive assistance regardless of whether they cooperated with the law enforcement authorities; assistance should be available to men and children as well as women; the right to compensation should be made effective in practice.⁹²

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

50. JS1 referred to a finding that 67 per cent of Armenians viewed the judiciary as corrupt or extremely corrupt.⁹³ Problems affecting judicial independence included the President's discretionary power to influence the process of judicial appointment, termination or disciplinary measures and pressure applied on first instance courts by the Court of Cassation.⁹⁴ The Legal and Judicial Reform Program of 2012-2016 lacked an assessment on the implementation of past strategies and largely disregarded commitments to secure access to justice and the rule of law.⁹⁵

51. JS1 considered that adoption of a new Criminal Procedure Code was an imperative, but the draft contained problematic provisions, including those relating to confessions, arrest procedures and the means of restraint for persons accused of grave crimes and the provisions for access to the Court of Cassation.⁹⁶

52. JS1 noted the expanded list of persons entitled to free legal aid under the 2012 Law on Advocacy and recommended amending the legislation to increase access to free legal aid as the workload on the providers was unrealistic.⁹⁷ JS6 and JS1 recommended abolition of the regulations requiring appeals to be submitted through a licenced advocate as these could be a disproportionate barrier to the protection of an individual's rights.⁹⁸

53. CSI observed that decisions were made on the initiation of criminal proceedings or interpretation of the facts based upon the political affiliation or economic status of the parties.⁹⁹ JS1 noted the problem of lack of equality of arms when one of the parties was a Government entity, the strong influence of the prosecutors in criminal prosecutions and a low rate of acquittal.¹⁰⁰

54. JS1 stated that access to justice was problematic for drug users, people with psychosocial disabilities, and members of the LGBT community. They were generally given public defenders at the last minute and judges did not take into account the specificities of their situation.¹⁰¹

55. CSI noted the excessive use of prolonged and unjustified pre-trial and administrative detention. Courts routinely approved extensions to detention and did not seriously consider bail as an alternative.¹⁰² JS1 considered that the implementation of the constitutional

provisions on the right of liberty and security was problematic and there the legislation did not provide any safeguards for the protection of persons imprisoned under administrative procedures.¹⁰³ It described a case in which detention was imposed in order to neutralize opponents of the Government.¹⁰⁴

56. JS6 recommended the adoption of legislative amendments stipulating the right of NGOs to bring action *actio popularis* cases before courts.¹⁰⁵

57. CSI, JS1 and CoE mentioned the lack of effective investigations into the death of 10 persons in the events of 1 March 2008 and made related recommendations.¹⁰⁶ The CoE Commissioner for Human Rights (CoE-Commissioner) noted the steps taken by the authorities, but stated that more needed to be done to promote reconciliation in society and reinforce public trust towards the authorities.¹⁰⁷ CSI noted that in March 2014 the Parliament voted against the creation of an interim parliamentary commission charged with investigating the actions of the law enforcement authorities concerning these events.¹⁰⁸ JS1 noted the relevant recommendations from the first UPR.¹⁰⁹

58. JS2 recommending the establishment of a juvenile justice system, including specialized juvenile justice courts and properly trained judges.¹¹⁰

59. CoE highlighted the 2012 compliance report of the Group of States against Corruption.¹¹¹ It noted, *inter alia*, the reforms to address the transparency of political funding, including the establishment of an Oversight and Audit Service next to the Central Electoral Commission and reinforcement of the its independence from political parties, although further action was needed to make the supervision more effective.¹¹²

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

60. JS1 stated that the current Law on Religious Organizations was not in conformity with the Constitution or Armenia's international human rights commitments.¹¹³

61. JS1 noted that the mandatory subjects on the History of the Armenian Church and Christian Education violated the secularity of education. Attendance at religious classes was mandatory. JS2 stated that 20 school teachers had been dismissed because of their adherence to a church other than the Armenian Apostolic Church.¹¹⁴

62. The European Association of Jehovah's Christian Witness (EAJCW) referred to arbitrary and discriminatory taxation of religious literature of the Jehovah's Witnesses and the denial of permits to allow them to build places of worship.¹¹⁵

63. HRW, EAJCW, LLG and JS5 welcomed the amendment of the law on military service in 2013 which ended the military supervision of the alternative labour service and reduced its length.¹¹⁶

64. JS6 and CoE noted the decriminalization of defamation in 2010.¹¹⁷ JS1 recommended amending the Civil Code to reduce the levels of compensation for slander and prevent its use to put pressure on the mass media.¹¹⁸

65. JS1 called for the amendment of the Law on Television and Radio to ensure transparency of media ownership, diversity in television programming, and simplify licencing procedures and also ensure transparency in the digital switchover.¹¹⁹ HRW had similar concerns.¹²⁰

66. LLG, JS1, HRW and CoE noted concerns about physical attacks on journalists, some of them concerning journalists reporting on elections.¹²¹ HRW called for thorough and effective investigations into the incidents, including the identification of the perpetrators.¹²² CoE-Commissioner called on the country's leadership to condemn such attacks and welcomed the adoption in 2010 of legislation toughening the penalties for

hindering journalists in their work.¹²³ HRW was concerned about a statement from the Prosecutor's Office in May 2014 in which it threatened to prosecute journalists who reported details of ongoing criminal investigations. It noted fears that the Criminal Code would be used to arbitrarily silence journalists reporting on corruption.¹²⁴

67. HRW welcomed the lifting of the ban on rallies in Freedom Square, Yerevan.¹²⁵ JS1 welcomed the adoption of the new Law on Freedom of Assembly in 2011 and the decrease in the number of rejected assembly notifications.¹²⁶ However, HRW noted several instances in 2013 in which the police used violence against people who had participated in peaceful protests and that the authorities also failed to effectively investigate a spate of attacks against peaceful protesters by unidentified assailants.¹²⁷ JS6 noted the lack of legal certainty in the new law in relation to notification of demonstrations under which police may provide an opinion which prohibits and assembly.¹²⁸

68. JS6 stated that the authorities had not only failed to ensure the effective engagement of human rights defenders in human rights protection, but had also extensively used the police to limit their work.¹²⁹ There was government propaganda against those involved in the protection of the rights of women, LGBT persons, religious and national minorities, soldiers, election observers and advocates of Armenia's European integration as well as against NGOs which received foreign funding.¹³⁰ Complaints against reprisals and intimidation submitted by human rights organizations and activists were, in general, not properly registered; attacks and violence against human rights defenders had been perpetrated and encouraged by the police.¹³¹ JS3 recommended that the Government express support for the work of human rights defenders and establish legal safeguards and mechanisms for those working on the rights of women and LGBT persons.¹³²

69. JS1 stated that the elections remained among the most problematic institutions in the system of governance.¹³³ The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe – Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (OSCE-ODIHR) noted the positive amendments made to the 2011 Electoral Code, including the provision of judicial remedies for all electoral disputes and quotas for women in electoral commissions.¹³⁴ It stated that legislation could not alone ensure the conduct of democratic elections and political will was needed.¹³⁵ JS1 stated that the lack of political will in the law's implementation had resulted in the use of existing loopholes to cover up election fraud.¹³⁶ OSCE-ODIHR highlighted the findings of its Election Observation Missions in 2012 and 2013.¹³⁷ HRW called for full implementation of all the recommendations in the OSCE-ODIHR election monitoring report recommendations.¹³⁸

70. JS2 noted that despite the legal guarantees, 10.7 per cent of the members of parliament; 2 of the 18 ministers and 7 of the 56 deputy ministers were women. There were no female regional governors, mayors or deputy mayors. It recommended raising the quota for women's representation in political party lists and related measures.¹³⁹

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

71. JS2 stated that the application of labour contracts, working conditions, minimum pay and the right to rest remained problematic.¹⁴⁰ Most labourers were poorly informed of their rights.¹⁴¹ In 2013 the Labour Inspectorate was merged with the Inspectorate on Hygiene and Epidemics and 90 per cent of its functions had subsequently concerned health and safety issues. The lack of independent trade unions and other mechanisms exacerbated the situation.¹⁴² JS2 recommended creating a separate government entity with a specific mandate for effective oversight over labour rights and adopting measures to prevent discrimination in employment.¹⁴³

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

72. CoE referred to the 2013 findings of the European Committee on Social Rights that personal coverage of medical care was insufficient and that the minimum level of old age benefit was inadequate.¹⁴⁴

73. JS2 noted that the State did not provide guarantees for the protection of the rights of its citizens whose property was alienated for “society and state needs” and mentioned people who were made homeless when replacement housing was not provided after land was confiscated.¹⁴⁵ It recommended legislative changes including: clarification of the grounds for public need; ensuring stakeholder participation; providing adequate compensation; and ensuring access for NGOs to challenge unlawful acts by administrative bodies.¹⁴⁶

74. JS2 noted that expansion of mining, irresponsible construction and fish farms posed a threat to the quality of and access to water and made related recommendations.¹⁴⁷

7. Right to health

75. JS2 stated that discrimination in access to healthcare was widespread, with socially marginalized or vulnerable groups being denied services, or being disproportionately affected due to high costs.¹⁴⁸ There were no effective mechanisms to ensure the right to free medical care for vulnerable groups.¹⁴⁹

76. JS2 noted barriers in accessing methadone substitution programmes for injecting drug users and recommended ending police participation in the programmes and harmonizing national guidelines with the recommendations of the World Health Organization.¹⁵⁰

77. Joint submission 4 (JS4) noted a deteriorating health situation among communities in the vicinity of metallurgical mining sites; the absence of a comprehensive system to gather information on the impact on their health and the sporadic provision of special healthcare services for these communities.¹⁵¹

78. HRW noted that inadequate provision of morphine and strong opioid medicines was obstructing the provision of palliative care and causing suffering to terminally-ill patients.¹⁵² JS2 also called for the purchase of morphine for the treatment of people with life-threatening illnesses.¹⁵³

8. Right to education

79. JS2 stated that despite reforms, numerous studies pointed to degradation in the quality of, access to, and equity in education. Insufficient legislation regulating the education sector had led to unnecessary state interference in the functioning of educational institutions.¹⁵⁴ Corruption particularly affected access to education for the 32.4 per cent of the population living at or below the poverty line.¹⁵⁵ Expenditure on education was declining continuously and would go down to 2.56 per cent of GDP in the next three years.¹⁵⁶ There were not equal opportunities for access to school and university education for vulnerable groups, such as children from poor families, from remote rural areas, or those belonging to minority groups.¹⁵⁷

80. JS5 considered that the “conscription bond” of the equivalent of USD 20,000, introduced in 2014 for men of military age wishing to study abroad, made the cost of study abroad prohibitive for the poor.¹⁵⁸

9. Cultural rights

81. JS2 stated that legislation had not been updated or decisions revised to comply with the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe which Armenia ratified in 2008.¹⁵⁹

10. Persons with disabilities

82. JS1 stated that opportunities for education, work and recreation for people with psycho-social, mental and physical disabilities remained limited. The State continued to fail in ensuring the principles of equal opportunities, reasonable accommodation and universal design. Violations did not trigger any legal mechanisms for redress and liability.¹⁶⁰

83. According to JS2, access to community based services for people with mental disabilities remained a problem, despite the National Mental Health Strategy and ratification of the CRPD. Mental health services were still provided in psychiatric institutions, where involuntary institutionalization was practiced. This led to the ill-treatment and abuse of patients.¹⁶¹

11. Minorities

84. CoE referred to the 2012 resolution of the Committee of Ministers on the protection of national minorities in Armenia.¹⁶² Issues for immediate action included: ensuring that the procedures for censuses, and other data collection, on national minorities was disaggregated in lined with the principles of free self-identification and internationally-recognized data collection and protection standards; and continue to consult persons belonging to national minorities in relation to local government reform.¹⁶³

12. Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers

85. OSCE-ODIHR noted that Armenia's policies fell below international, European Union and other European legal standards and national practices on family reunion and permanent residence procedures, the absence of immigrant consultative bodies, and the absence of a dedicated anti-discrimination law and independent equality agency.¹⁶⁴

13. Right to development and environmental issues

86. JS2 noted that although Armenia had ratified the Aarhus Convention¹⁶⁵, there was a lack of public participation in environmental decision-making.¹⁶⁶ JS4 and JS2 recommended prescribing the right of NGOs to access courts in matters of public interest related to the environment.¹⁶⁷ JS4 stated that, when granting mining permits, the Government failed to take into account damage to human well-being and the economy by environmental degradation and pollution.¹⁶⁸ The property rights of communities and individuals had been violated in decision-making on the allocations of land for mining in Teghut Forest.¹⁶⁹

Notes

¹ The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org. (One asterisk denotes a national human rights institution with “A” status).

Civil society:

Individual submissions:

CoE	Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France);
CSI	Civil Society Institute, Yerevan (Armenia);
EAJCW	European Association of Jehovah’s Witness Christians, Kraainem (Belgium);
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
HRW	Human Rights Watch, Geneva (Switzerland);
LLG	London Legal Group, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);

Joint submissions:

JS1	Joint submission 1 submitted by: A Group of Civil Society Organizations for UPR Armenia: A.D.Sakharov Armenian Human Rights Protection Center NGO; Agate Center for Women with Special Needs; Analytical Centre on Globalization and Regional Cooperation; Armavir Development Center; Armenian Association of Women with University Education; Boundaries of Our Rights NGO; Center for Rights Development NGO; Collaboration for Democracy Centre; Committee to Protect Freedom of Expression; Goris Press Club; Helsinki Citizens’ Assembly –Vanadzor; Helsinki Committee of Armenia Human Rights Defender NGO; Journalists’ Club Asparez; Khoran Ard Intellectual Centre NGO; New Generation Humanitarian NGO; Open Society Foundations–Armenia; Parliament Monitoring/Mandate Informative-NGO; Protection of Rights without Borders NGO; Public Information and Need of Knowledge NGO; Rule of Law Human Rights NGO; Society Without Violence NGO; Transparency International Anticorruption Center; Unison NGO for Support of People with Special Needs; Women’s Resource Center NGO; Women’s Support Center NGO; and We Plus Social NGO; Yerevan (Armenia);
JS2	Joint submission 2 submitted by: TIAC and Coalition of NGOs for UPR-Armenia: Agate Center for Women with Special Needs; Analytical Centre on Globalization and Regional Cooperation; Arena of Education NGO; Arevamanuk Family and Child Care Foundation; Armavir Development Center; Armenian Association of Women with University Education; Biosophia Healthcare, Environment, and Agriculture Development Center NGO; Center for Rights Development NGO; Centre of Political Culture and Agreements Development Shirak NGO; Collaboration for Democracy Centre; Ecoera NGO; Ecological Right NGO; Ecolur Informational NGO; Helsinki Citizens’ Assembly–Vanadzor; Helsinki Committee of Armenia Human Rights Defender NGO; Journalists’ Club Asparez; Khoran Ard Intellectual Centre NGO; Martuni Women’s Community Council NGO; Mission Armenia NGO; Open Society Foundations–Armenia; Parliament Monitoring/Mandate Informative-NGO; Public Information and Need of Knowledge NGO; Real World, Real People NGO; Save Teghut Civic Initiative; Save the Children; Sexual Assault Crisis Center NGO; Society Without Violence NGO; Transparency International Anticorruption Center; Unison NGO for Support of People with Special Needs; Victims of State Needs NGO; We Plus Social NGO; Women’s Resource Center NGO; and Women’s Support Center NGO, Yerevan (Armenia);
JS3	Joint submission 3 submitted by: Public Information and Need of Knowledge (member of the Human Rights House Yerevan), Society Without Violence, Women’s Resource Center (member of the Human Rights House Yerevan),

- Women's Support Center , all from Yerevan (Armenia), with the support of the Human Rights House Foundation (HRHF), Geneva (Switzerland);
- JS4 Joint submission 4 submitted by: Save Teghut Civic Initiative, Ecoright NGO, Ecodar NGO (Armenia);
- JS5 Joint submission 5 submitted by: Conscience and Peace Tax International, Leuven (Belgium) and International Fellowship of Reconciliation, Geneva (Switzerland);
- JS6 Joint submission 6 submitted by: Helsinki Citizens' Assembly – Vanadzor, Vanadzor (Armenia) and the Norwegian Helsinki Committee, Oslo (Norway).

National human rights institution:

Defender Human Rights Defender Institution of the Republic of Armenia* , Yerevan (Armenia).

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):

CoE The Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France);

Attachments:

CoE-Commissioner – Report by Thomas Hammarberg, Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe, Following his visit to Armenia from 18 to 21 January 2011, Strasbourg, 9 May 2011 CommDH(2011)12;

CoE-ECRI – European Commission against Racism and Tolerance (ECRI), Report on Armenia (fourth monitoring cycle) Published on 8 February 2011, CRI(2011)1;

CoE-CPT(2011) – European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT), Report to the Armenian Government on the visit to Armenia from 10 to 21 May 2010, Strasbourg, 17 August 2011, CPT/Inf (2011) 24;

CoE-CPT(2011 Response) – Response of the Armenian Government to the report of the CPT on its visit to Armenia from 10 to 21 May 2010, Strasbourg, 17 August 2011, CPT/Inf (2011) 25;

CoE-CPT(2012) – CPT Report to the Armenian Government on the visit to Armenia carried out from 5 to 7 December 2011, Strasbourg, 3 October 2012, CPT/Inf (2012) 23;

CoE-CPT(2012 Response) – Response of the Armenian Government to the report of the CPT on its visit to Armenia from 5 to 7 December 2011, Strasbourg, 3 October 2012, CPT/Inf (2012) 24;

CoE-ECSR(2010) – European Committee of Social Rights, Conclusions 2010, (Armenia), Articles 2, 4, 5, 6, 22 and 28, of the Revised Charter, December 2010;

CoE-ECSR(2011) – European Committee of Social Rights, Conclusions 2011, (Armenia), Articles 7, 8, 17,19 and 27of the Revised Charter, January 2012;

CoE-ECSR(2012) – European Committee of Social Rights, Conclusions 2012, Articles 1, 15, 18, 20 and 24 of the Revised Charter, January 2013;

CoE-ECSR(2013) – European Committee of Social Rights, Conclusions 2013, Articles 3, 12, 13 and 14 of the Revised Charter, January 2014;

CoE-GRETA – Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (GRETA), Report concerning the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings by Armenia. First evaluation round, Strasbourg, 21 September 2012, GRETA(2012)8;

CoE-GRECO – Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) Compliance Report on Armenia, Incriminations (ETS 173 and 191, GPC 2), Transparency of Party Funding, Third Evaluation Round, Adopted by GRECO at its 58th Plenary Meeting. (Strasbourg, 3-7 December 2012), , Greco RC-III (2012) 21E;

CoE-ACFC – Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Third Opinion on Armenia, adopted on 14 October 2010, Strasbourg, 20 April 2011, ACFC/OP/III(2010)006;

CoE-CM – Resolution CM/ResCMN(2012)1 on the implementation of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities by Armenia, Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 1 February 2012;

OSCE-ODIHR Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe – Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, Warsaw (Poland).

- ² Defender, para. 5. See also JS1, pp. 1 and 6.
- ³ Defender, para. 6. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras.93 and 93.14.
- ⁴ Defender, para. 4. See also JS6, pp. 5 and 9; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.6, 94 and 94.4.
- ⁵ Defender, para. 8. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.1, 94 and 94.3.
- ⁶ Defender, para. 10. See also JS6, pp. 7 and 10; JS1, pp. 15-16
- ⁷ Defender, para 11. See also CSI, para. 2.1; LLG, para. 12.
- ⁸ Defender, para. 12. See also CoE, p. 1; CoE-CPT(2011), pp. 35-57; CoE-CPT(2011 Response), pp. 11-24; CoE-CPT(2012), pp. 9-17; CoE-CPT(2012 Response), pp. 4-11; LLG, para. 15; A/HRC/15/9, paras 93 and 93.33.
- ⁹ Defender, para. 12.
- ¹⁰ Defender, para. 13; JS2, p. 3; JS3, pp. 4 and 13; Defender, para. 13; JS6, p. 7; JS1, p. 16; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.21 and 93.23.
- ¹¹ Defender, para. 15.
- ¹² Defender, para. 16. See also JS1, pp. 2-3; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94, 94.16, 94.17, 94.18 and 95.3; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras. 6-7.
- ¹³ Defender, para. 17. See also JS2, p.5/ln:1; HRW, p. 2; JS3, p. 10 and 14; JS1, p. 15; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94 and 94.19.
- ¹⁴ Defender, para. 18. See also JS6, pp. 3 and 7; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94, 94.15 and 94.24.
- ¹⁵ Defender, para. 19. See also JS1, pp.15-16; EAJCW, pp. 3 and 5-6.
- ¹⁶ Defender, para. 20. See also JS1, pp. 13-14; LLG, para. 10; HRW, pp. 3 and 5; CoE, p. 3; Defender, para. 20; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94, 94.15 and 94.20.
- ¹⁷ Defender, para. 20.
- ¹⁸ Defender, para. 21. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94 and 94.21.
- ¹⁹ Defender, para. 22. See also HRW, p. 2; JS1, p. 9; JS6, p. 5; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94, 94.20, 94.24, 94.25, 94.26 and 95.5; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras. 10-12.
- ²⁰ Defender, para. 23. See also JS1, p. 17; HRW, pp. 1 and 5; LLG, para. 11; OSCE-ODIHR, pp 3-4; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.37.
- ²¹ Defender, para. 26. See also, CoE, pp. 9-11; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.40; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, para. 40.
- ²² Defender, para. 26.
- ²³ Defender, para. 6. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.14, 93.15, 93.45, 93.47, 94 and 94.14; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras. 41-50.
- ²⁴ 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

- ²⁵ JS6, p. 9, LLG, para 3. See also Defender, para. 2.
- ²⁶ JS2, p. 4.
- ²⁷ CoE-ECRI, para 6. See also A/HRC/15/9, para. 95.1
- ²⁸ LLG, para. 4. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94 and 94.1.
- ²⁹ JS6, p 9, JS1, p. 16. See also Defender, para. 2. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.3, A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, para. 13.
- ³⁰ JS6, p. 9.
- ³¹ CoE-ECRI, para. 6.
- ³² JS6, p. 4.
- ³³ JS6, p. 9.
- ³⁴ JS1, p.1. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94 and 94.5.
- ³⁵ JS1, p. 1. See also A/HRC/15/9, para. 94 and 94.5.
- ³⁶ JS1, p. 10.
- ³⁷ JS1, p. 10.
- ³⁸ CoE, p. 5. See also, CoE-ECRI, paras.30, 32 and p. 38 (Government response).
- ³⁹ JS6, p 10.
- ⁴⁰ JS1, pp. 1 and 6. See also Defender, para. 5. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.9.
- ⁴¹ JS1, p. 10. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.9.
- ⁴² JS2, p. 4.
- ⁴³ JS2, p. 4.
- ⁴⁴ JS1, p. 16.
- ⁴⁵ JS6, p. 4.
- ⁴⁶ JS6, pp. 4 and 9.
- ⁴⁷ JS1, p. 15.
- ⁴⁸ JS1, p. 15.
- ⁴⁹ JS1, p. 15.
- ⁵⁰ JS6, pp. 7 and 10, JS1; pp 15-16. See also Defender, para. 10; CoE, pp. 5 and 6; CoE-ECRI, pp. 7, 12, and 35 (Government response)
- ⁵¹ JS2, p. 2. See also Defender, para. 8; JS3, para. p. 4; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.17, 94, 94.3 and 94.10.
- ⁵² JS1, p. 16. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.17, 94, 94.3, 94.9, 94.10 and 95.2, A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras. 3-5.
- ⁵³ JS2, p. 3. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94, 94.9, 94.10 and 95.2; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras. 3-5.
- ⁵⁴ JS2, p.3. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94, 94.9, 94.10 and 95.2; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras. 3-5.
- ⁵⁵ JS2, p. 3. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94, 94.9 and 94.10.
- ⁵⁶ JS3, pp. 7. See also HRW, p. 4; JS1, p. 15.
- ⁵⁷ JS3, pp.7-9; HRW, p. 4.
- ⁵⁸ JS1, p. 15.
- ⁵⁹ JS3, pp. 9-10; HRW, p. 4.
- ⁶⁰ JS3, pp.8; HRW, p. 4.
- ⁶¹ JS1, p. 15. See also JS2; p. 8; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94 and 94.2.
- ⁶² JS1, p. 5
- ⁶³ JS2, p. 7.
- ⁶⁴ JS5, paras. 29-33; HRW, p. 4. See also HRW, p. 5; JS1, p. 5.
- ⁶⁵ JS1 p. 1. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.20 and 93.26.
- ⁶⁶ CSI, para. 2.1. See also LLG, para 12. Defender, para. 3; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.5; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, para 15.
- ⁶⁷ LLG, para. 12; HRW, p. 3; JS1, p. 6. See also JS1, p. 7; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.5.

- ⁶⁸ JS1, p. 6. See also JS1, p. 7; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94 and 94.4.
- ⁶⁹ JS6, pp. 5 and 9. See also Defender, para. 4; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.6; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, para. 15.
- ⁷⁰ CSI, para. 2.3. See also LLG, para. 13; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.20 and 93.26.
- ⁷¹ JS1, p. 6. See also CSI para. 2.8; HRW, p. 3; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.32, 93.20 and 93.26; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, para. 30; CoE-CPT(2011 Response), p. 6.
- ⁷² LLG, para 14. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.20 and 93.26.
- ⁷³ CoE, p. 1. See also CoE-CPT(2011), para. 14; CoE-CPT(2011 Response), p. 5; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.19.
- ⁷⁴ CoE, p. 1. See also CoE-CPT(2011), para. 26; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.20 and 93.26.
- ⁷⁵ JS6, p. 4. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.20 and 93.26.
- ⁷⁶ CoE, p. 1. See also CoE-CPT(2011), para. 64; CoE-CPT(2011 Response), p. 13; LLG para. 15; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.20 and 93.26.
- ⁷⁷ CoE, pp. 1-2. See also CoE-CPT(2012) paras, 8 and.15; CoE-CPT(2012 Response), pp. 4-6.
- ⁷⁸ CSI, paras. 5.1-5.7. See also JS1, p. 7.
- ⁷⁹ CoE, p. 1. See also CoE-CPT(2011), paras. 146-148; CoE-CPT(2011 Response), p. 25.
- ⁸⁰ CSI, paras. 4.5-4.8.
- ⁸¹ JS2, p. 3. See also JS3, p. 4; Defender, para. 13; A/HRC/15/9 paras. 93, 93.21, 93.23, 94 and 94.9; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, para 21.
- ⁸² JS2, p. 3. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94, 94.10 and 94.12.
- ⁸³ JS3, p. 5. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.21, 93.23, 94 and 94.9; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, para 21.
- ⁸⁴ JS6, p. 7, JS1, p. 16, JS3, p. 13. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.21, 93.23, 94 and 94.9; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, para 21.
- ⁸⁵ JS3, p. 5. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.21, 93.23, 94 and 94.9; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, para. 21.
- ⁸⁶ JS3, p. 4.
- ⁸⁷ JS3, pp. 6-7.
- ⁸⁸ GIEACPC, p. 2. See also CoE, p. 11; CoE-ECSR(2011), p. 18; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.25.
- ⁸⁹ JS2, p. 4. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.14.
- ⁹⁰ JS2, p. 4. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.14.
- ⁹¹ JS2, p. 4. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.14, 94, 94.12, 93.23 and 93.25; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, para. 21.
- ⁹² CoE, p. 8. See also CoE-GRETA, pp. 38-41 and 46-47 (Government response). A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.24, 94 and 94.13; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras. 22-24.
- ⁹³ JS1, p. 2. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94, 94.16 and 94.18.
- ⁹⁴ JS1, pp. 2-3. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.29, 94, 94.16, 94.17, 94.18 and 95.3; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras. 6-7.
- ⁹⁵ JS1, p. 2.
- ⁹⁶ JS1, p. 2. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.32 and 95.3; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras. 6-7.
- ⁹⁷ JS1, p. 4. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.7; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras. 16-17.
- ⁹⁸ JS6, p. 9; JS1, p. 3.
- ⁹⁹ CSI, para. 3.1. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94, 94.16, 94.17, 94.18, 95.3; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras. 6-7.
- ¹⁰⁰ JS1, p. 3. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94, 94.17 and 94.18.
- ¹⁰¹ JS1, p. 4. See also JS3, pp. 9-10.
- ¹⁰² CSI, paras. 4.1-4.2.
- ¹⁰³ JS1, p. 9.
- ¹⁰⁴ JS1, p. 9.
- ¹⁰⁵ JS6, p. 9. See also p. 6, JS4, p. 6, JS2, p. 9.
- ¹⁰⁶ JS1, p. 4; CSI, para. 3.3; CoE, p. 2. See also CoE-Commissioner, pp. 2, 5-14 and 27-30; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.27 and 93.28.
- ¹⁰⁷ CoE, p. 2. See also CoE-Commissioner, pp. 11 and 14.
- ¹⁰⁸ CSI, para. 3.3.
- ¹⁰⁹ JS1, p. 4. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.27 and 93.28.
- ¹¹⁰ JS2, p. 5. See also Defender, p. 4; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94, 94.19.
- ¹¹¹ CoE, p4. See also CoE-GRETA, p. 14; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.31.
- ¹¹² CoE, pp. 3-4. See also CoE-GRECO, pp. 14-15.

- ¹¹³ JS1, p. 11. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.35; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras. 31-37.
- ¹¹⁴ JS2, p. 14. See also JS1, p. 11.
- ¹¹⁵ EAJCW, pp.4 and 6. See also p. 3; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.35; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras. 31-37.
- ¹¹⁶ HRW, p. 4; EAJCW, pp. 1-2; JS5, paras. 9-26; LLG, para 5.
- ¹¹⁷ JS6, p. 4; CoE, pp.2-3. See also CoE-Commissioner, pp. 15 and 30 (Government response); A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94 and 94.23.
- ¹¹⁸ JS1, p. 14. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.23 and 93.24; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, para. 21-24.
- ¹¹⁹ JS1, pp. 13-14. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.36, 94, 94.21 and 94.22; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras. 38-39.
- ¹²⁰ HRW, p. 5.
- ¹²¹ JS1, p. 13; LLG, para. 10; HRW, p. 3, CoE, p. 3. See also CoE-Commissioner, p. 16 and 31 (Government response); Defender, para. 20. A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94 and 94.15.
- ¹²² HRW, p. 5. See also JS1, p. 14; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94 and 94.15.
- ¹²³ CoE-Commissioner, pp. 3, 16, 18-19. See also p. 31 (Government response); A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94 and 94.15.
- ¹²⁴ HRW, pp. 2-3. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94 and 94.24.
- ¹²⁵ HRW, p. 2. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94, 94.20, 94.24, 94.25, 94.26 and 95.5; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras. 10-12.
- ¹²⁶ JS1, p. 9. See also Defender, para. 22.
- ¹²⁷ HRW, p. 2. See also JS6, pp. 5 and 8; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94, 94.15, 94.20, 94.24, 94.25, 94.26 and 95.5; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras 10-12.
- ¹²⁸ JS6, p. 5. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94, 94.20, 94.24 and 94.25.
- ¹²⁹ JS6, p. 3. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94 and 94.15.
- ¹³⁰ JS6, p. 7. See also HRW, p. 2; JS3, pp. 10-11; JS1, p. 15.
- ¹³¹ JS6, p. 7. See also Defender, para. 18.
- ¹³² JS3, p. 14.
- ¹³³ JS1, p. 17. See also HRW, p. 1; LLG, para. 11; Defender, para. 23; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.37.
- ¹³⁴ OSCE-ODIHR, p. 3.
- ¹³⁵ OSCE-ODIHR, pp. 3-4.
- ¹³⁶ JS1, p. 17.
- ¹³⁷ OSCE, p. 3.
- ¹³⁸ HRW, p. 5; OSCE, p. 3.
- ¹³⁹ JS2, p. 2-3. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras.93 and 93.38.
- ¹⁴⁰ JS2, p. 13.
- ¹⁴¹ JS2, p. 13.
- ¹⁴² JS2, pp.13-14. See also CoE, p. 10; CoE-ECSR(2010), pp. 9, 11, 14 and 19.
- ¹⁴³ JS2, p. 14.
- ¹⁴⁴ CoE, p. 9. See also CoE-ECSR(2013), p. 11; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.42 and 93.43.
- ¹⁴⁵ JS2, pp. 14-15.
- ¹⁴⁶ JS2, p.16.
- ¹⁴⁷ JS2; pp. 9-10.
- ¹⁴⁸ JS2, p. 6. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.17, 93.42 and 93.43.
- ¹⁴⁹ JS2, p. 6.
- ¹⁵⁰ JS2, pp. 5-6.
- ¹⁵¹ JS4, para. 7/p. 4. See also para. 6; See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.43.
- ¹⁵² HRW, pp.5-6.
- ¹⁵³ JS2, pp.6-7.
- ¹⁵⁴ JS2, p. 11. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.41, 93.42, 93.47 and 93.51; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras. 41-50.
- ¹⁵⁵ JS2, p. 11.
- ¹⁵⁶ JS2, p. 11.
- ¹⁵⁷ JS2, p. 11. See also CoE, p. 11; CoE-ECSR(2011), p. 19.
- ¹⁵⁸ JS5, para. 27. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93 and 93.41.
- ¹⁵⁹ JS2, p. 17.
- ¹⁶⁰ JS1, p. 16. See also CoE, p. 9; CoE-ECSR(2012), p. 14; Defender, para. 9; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 94

and 94.27.

¹⁶¹ JS2, p. 6. See also A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.43, 94 and 94.27.

¹⁶² CoE, p. 6. See also CoE-CM, pp 1-3; CoE-ACFC, pp 23-24; Defender, para. 25; A/HRC/15/9, paras. 93, 93.25, 93.47, 93.50, 93.51, 96, 96.1 and 97; A/HRC/15/9/Add.1, paras. 41-50.

¹⁶³ CoE, p. 6. See also CoE-ACFC, pp 23-24.

¹⁶⁴ OSCE-ODIHR, p. 11; CoE, p. 9; CoE-ECSR(2012), p. 17.

¹⁶⁵ Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters.

¹⁶⁶ JS2, p. 9. See also JS4, paras. 1 and 3; A/HRC/15/9, paras.93 and 93.12.

¹⁶⁷ JS4, p. 6; JS2, p. 9. See also JS6, pp. 6 and 9.

¹⁶⁸ JS4, para. 4.

¹⁶⁹ JS4, para. 11.
