



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
7 November 2013  
English  
Original: English/Spanish

---

**Human Rights Council**  
**Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review**  
**Eighteenth session**  
27 January–7 February 2014

**Compilation prepared by the Office of the United Nations  
High Commissioner for Human Rights in accordance with  
paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Human Rights Council  
resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council  
resolution 16/21**

## Uruguay

The present report is a compilation of the information contained in the reports of treaty bodies and special procedures, including observations and comments by the State concerned, and of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), and in other relevant official United Nations documents. It is presented in a summarized manner due to word-limit constraints. For the full text, please refer to the document referenced. This report does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of OHCHR other than those contained in public reports and statements issued by the Office. It follows the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council in its decision 17/119. Information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the periodicity of the review and developments during that period.

## I. Background and framework

### A. Scope of international obligations<sup>1</sup>

#### International human rights treaties<sup>2</sup>

	<i>Status during previous cycle</i>	<i>Action after review</i>	<i>Not ratified/not accepted</i>
Ratification, accession or succession	ICERD (1968)	CRPD (2009)	
	ICESCR (1970)	CPED (2009)	
	ICCPR (1970)		
	ICCPR-OP 2 (1993)		
	CEDAW (1981)		
	CAT (1986)		
	OP-CAT (2005)		
	CRC (1990)		
	OP-CRC-AC (2003)		
	OP-CRC-SC (2003)		
	ICRMW (2001)		
Reservations, declarations and/or understandings	CRC (general declaration/reservation, art. 38, paras. 2–3), 1990)		
Complaint procedures, inquiry and urgent action <sup>3</sup>	ICERD, art. 14 (1972)	OP-ICESCR (2013)	OP-ICESCR, arts. 10 and 11
	ICCPR-OP 1 (1970)	OP-CRC-IC (signature only, 2012)	ICCPR, art. 41
	OP-CEDAW, art. 8 (2001)	ICRMW, art. 77 (2012)	ICRMW, art. 76
	CAT, art. 20 (1986)/ arts. 21 and 22 (1988)	OP-CRPD, art. 6 (2011)	
		CPED, arts. 31 and 32 (2009)	

### Other main relevant international instruments

	<i>Status during previous cycle</i>	<i>Action after review</i>	<i>Not ratified</i>
Ratification, accession or succession	Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1967)	Additional Protocol (III) to the 1949 Geneva Conventions (2012) <sup>8</sup>	ILO Convention No. 169 <sup>10</sup>
	Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (2002)	ILO Convention No. 189 (2012) <sup>9</sup>	
	Palermo Protocol (2005) <sup>4</sup>		
	Conventions on refugees (1970) and stateless persons (2004 and 2001) <sup>5</sup>		
	Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 (1969) and Additional Protocols I and II (1985) <sup>6</sup>		
	ILO fundamental conventions <sup>7</sup>		
	UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education (2004)		

1. In 2011, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) recommended that Uruguay ratify the amendments to article 8, paragraph 6, of the Convention.<sup>11</sup>
2. In 2010, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR) encouraged Uruguay to ratify ILO Convention No. 187 (2006) concerning the Promotional Framework for Occupational Safety and Health.<sup>12</sup>
3. CERD encouraged Uruguay to ratify ILO Convention No. 169 (1989) concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries.<sup>13</sup>
4. The United Nations country team in Uruguay (UN-Uruguay) recommended that the State ratify the ILO Maternity Protection Convention, 2000 (No. 183).<sup>14</sup>

### B. Constitutional and legislative framework

5. UN-Uruguay recommended that Uruguay incorporate into its Constitution the international human rights treaties ratified under national law, and that it establish the hierarchical precedence of these treaties in accordance with its international obligations.<sup>15</sup>
6. The Special Rapporteur on the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation recommended that Uruguay fully guarantee the recognition of economic, social and cultural rights in domestic law, including by ensuring that these rights are justiciable in national courts.<sup>16</sup>
7. While noting some legislative developments to combat racial discrimination,<sup>17</sup> CERD was concerned at the absence of provisions in the legislation that specifically prohibit racism and racial discrimination.<sup>18</sup> CESCR recommended adopting a comprehensive anti-discrimination law.<sup>19</sup>
8. CERD was concerned that the criminal legislation of Uruguay, particularly the Criminal Code, was not in full compliance with article 4 of the Convention. It recommended criminalizing the dissemination of theories of racial superiority or inferiority and prohibiting organizations which promote and incite racial discrimination.<sup>20</sup>

9. While enforced disappearance was classified as an offence (Act 18.026, art. 21), the Committee on Enforced Disappearances (CED) noted with concern the wide gap between the minimum and maximum penalties prescribed for the offence. It recommended adopting legislative measures to ensure that the minimum sentence is in line with article 7 of the Convention.<sup>21</sup>

10. The Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment noted the definition of the offence of torture set out in the law governing cooperation with the International Criminal Court<sup>22</sup> and recommended that Uruguay criminalize torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment in separate legislation, in accordance with the Convention against Torture.<sup>23</sup>

11. UN-Uruguay said that, following the collection of signatures by certain political groups, a referendum would be held in 2014 on a constitutional reform that would reduce the age of criminal responsibility to 16 years for various offences.<sup>24</sup>

## C. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures

### Status of national human rights institutions<sup>25</sup>

<i>National human rights institution</i>	<i>Status during previous cycle</i>	<i>Status during present cycle<sup>26</sup></i>
National Human Rights Institution and the Ombudsman's Office	-	-

12. CED applauded the establishment of the National Human Rights Institution and Ombudsman's Office and its designation as the national preventive mechanism under OP-CAT.<sup>27</sup> CESCR urged Uruguay to render it operational, in conformity with the Paris Principles.<sup>28</sup> The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) reported that the institution had become operational and that the members of its Executive Council had been designated in 2012.<sup>29</sup> CED,<sup>30</sup> UNCT in Uruguay<sup>31</sup> and the Special Rapporteur on water and sanitation<sup>32</sup> recommended that Uruguay ensure that the institution receive adequate resources. The Special Rapporteur also called on the institution to fulfil its mandate, including monitoring economic, social and cultural rights, and receiving individual complaints.<sup>33</sup> In 2009, the Special Rapporteur on the question of torture recommended that sufficient budgetary and human resources be allocated in order to ensure that the sound legal basis of the national preventive mechanism translates into effective functioning in practice.<sup>34</sup>

13. UN-Uruguay recommended that Uruguay give greater prominence and adequate resources to the National Women's Institute, the body responsible for gender equality policies.<sup>35</sup>

14. The Special Rapporteur on water and sanitation recommended that Uruguay adopt a comprehensive national plan that guarantees the right to water and sanitation by, inter alia: clearly designating the responsibilities of different actors; allocating sufficient resources; and ensuring meaningful participation of civil society in its design.<sup>36</sup>

15. UN-Uruguay said that a programme to combat racial discrimination had yet to be implemented.<sup>37</sup> CERD urged Uruguay to accelerate the adoption of the National Plan against Racism and Discrimination.<sup>38</sup>

16. CERD recommended that the State pursue its efforts to introduce the ethno-racial dimension in all plans and programmes in order to combat structural discrimination.<sup>39</sup>

17. UN-Uruguay said that civil society organizations played an important role in the implementation of public policies and programmes but had little involvement in the design of those policies or the evaluation of their results.<sup>40</sup>

## II. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

### A. Cooperation with treaty bodies<sup>41</sup>

#### 1. Reporting status

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Concluding observations included in previous review</i>	<i>Latest report submitted since previous review</i>	<i>Latest concluding observations</i>	<i>Reporting status</i>
CERD	August 1999	2010	March 2011	Twenty-first to twenty-third reports due in 2014
CESCR	December 1997	2009	November 2010	Fifth report due in 2015
HR Committee	April 1998	2012	–	Fifth report pending consideration in October 2013
CEDAW	October 2008	–	–	Eighth and ninth reports due in 2014
CAT	November 1996	2012	–	Third report pending consideration
CRC	June 2007	2012	–	Third to fifth reports and initial reports on OP-CRC-AC and OP-CRC-SC pending consideration in January 2015
CMW	–	2013	–	Initial report pending consideration
CRPD	–	2013	–	Initial report pending consideration
CED	–	2012	April 2013	Second report due in 2019

#### 2. Responses to specific follow-up requests by treaty bodies

##### Concluding observations

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Due in</i>	<i>Subject matter</i>	<i>Submitted in</i>
CERD	2012	Discrimination against peoples of African descent, particularly women. <sup>42</sup>	–
HR Committee	–	–	–
CEDAW	2010	Women's employment and participation; trafficking in women and girls. <sup>43</sup>	2012; <sup>44</sup> dialogue ongoing <sup>45</sup>
CAT	–	–	–
CED	2014	Investigations; legislation review; adoptions and enforced disappearances. <sup>46</sup>	–

---

**Views**


---

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Number of views</i>	<i>Status</i>
HR Committee	2 <sup>47</sup>	Dialogue ongoing

---

**B. Cooperation with special procedures<sup>48</sup>**


---

	<i>Status during previous cycle</i>	<i>Current status</i>
Standing invitation	Yes	Yes
Visits undertaken	None	Torture (21–27 March 2009) Trafficking (13–17 September 2010) Water and sanitation (13–17 February 2012) Right to truth (30 September–4 October 2013)
Visits agreed to in principle	None	–
Visits requested	None	–
Responses to letters of allegations and urgent appeals	During the period under review two communications were sent. The Government replied to both communications.	
Follow-up reports and missions	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the question of torture (2011), <sup>49</sup> mission of the Special Rapporteur on the question of torture (2–6 December 2012) and report <sup>50</sup>	

---

18. In 2013, the Working Group on enforced or involuntary disappearance noted that since its establishment, it had transmitted 31 cases to the Government of Uruguay; of those, one case had been clarified based on information provided by the source, 11 had been clarified based on information provided by the Government, and 19 remained outstanding.<sup>51</sup>

19. In 2012, Uruguay invited the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression to conduct a visit to the country.

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

20. The OHCHR Regional Office for South America in Chile covers cooperation with Uruguay.<sup>52</sup> During the last four years, OHCHR has been assisting Uruguay with: establishing the national human rights institution (NHRI) in compliance with the Paris Principles and a national preventive mechanism in accordance with OP-CAT and the guidelines on national preventive mechanisms;<sup>53</sup> enhancing the application of international human rights standards by the judiciary;<sup>54</sup> increasing the use by key civil society organizations, indigenous organizations and NHRIs of the United Nations human rights mechanisms;<sup>55</sup> ratifying OP-ICESCR;<sup>56</sup> incorporating a human-rights based approach in the United Nations Development Assistance Framework in Uruguay 2011–2015;<sup>57</sup> and implementing the State's human rights obligations, including the preparation of reports and follow-up to recommendations from treaty bodies, special procedures and the UPR.<sup>58</sup>

21. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights visited Uruguay in 2011.<sup>59</sup> Uruguay contributed financially to OHCHR in 2010<sup>60</sup> and 2013.<sup>61</sup>

### **III. Implementation of international human rights obligations**

#### **A. Equality and non-discrimination**

22. CESCR noted with concern that the provisions of certain penal laws, including the prohibition on remarriage within 300 days of the dissolution of marriage and public decency laws, in practice affected mostly women. It recommended the repeal of all provisions with a discriminatory effect on women.<sup>62</sup>

23. CESCR was concerned about inequalities between men and women, noting that women of African descent were particularly disadvantaged. It recommended that Uruguay strengthen measures to combat discrimination against women, including Law 18.104 on the Promotion of Equal Rights and Opportunities between Men and Women and the First National Plan for Equal Opportunities and Rights.<sup>63</sup> CERD raised concerns regarding double discrimination against women of African descent based on their ethnic origin and on their sex.<sup>64</sup>

24. In 2012, in the framework of follow-up to concluding observations, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) recommended that Uruguay take additional temporary special measures aimed at de facto equality of women, in particular for women of African descent.<sup>65</sup>

25. CERD recommended that Uruguay eliminate stereotypes of Afro-descendant and indigenous people through awareness-raising campaigns.<sup>66</sup>

26. CERD was concerned that people of African descent were victims of inequalities, particularly in employment, housing and education.<sup>67</sup> CERD recommended that Uruguay accelerate the collection and publication of statistical data on the composition of its population and its economic and social indicators disaggregated by ethnicity and race.<sup>68</sup> CESCR had similar concerns regarding discrimination and social and economic marginalization of minority groups.<sup>69</sup>

27. CESCR noted with concern widespread discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, particularly in health care, education, employment and access to housing.<sup>70</sup>

28. UN-Uruguay said that legislative advances had been made in combating discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity. It pointed out that transgender identity had been recognized in resolutions adopted by the Social Insurance Bank and in affirmative action measures taken by the Ministry of Social Development.<sup>71</sup> UN-Uruguay recommended that Uruguay develop information campaigns and policies to combat homophobia and transphobia.<sup>72</sup>

29. CESCR was concerned about widespread de facto discrimination against children born out of wedlock. It recommended that Uruguay amend its family law and conduct awareness-raising programmes.<sup>73</sup>

#### **B. Right to life, liberty and security of the person**

30. CED urged Uruguay to ensure that women and children who are victims of enforced disappearance are provided with special protection and assistance.<sup>74</sup>

31. In 2013, the Special Rapporteur on the question of torture noted that, while acts of torture and ill-treatment were not a systematic problem in Uruguay, during his visit to detention centres he had learned about cases in which prison staff had engaged in violent behaviour or used excessive force.<sup>75</sup>
32. CESCR was concerned about the poor conditions in prisons and police cells, including overcrowding, inadequate sanitation and lack of access to health care.<sup>76</sup>
33. The Special Rapporteur on the question of torture recognized the overall progress the Government had made,<sup>77</sup> but noted that conditions of detention for both adults and children in conflict with the law remained disturbing. The causes of the situation seemed to include the abuse of pretrial detention, the growing prison population and the failure to use alternatives to imprisonment or release during proceedings. The Special Rapporteur recommended that Uruguay prioritize comprehensive prison reform, including a review of legislation and the ingrained use of pretrial detention.<sup>78</sup>
34. With regard to disciplinary sanctions, the Special Rapporteur on the question of torture recommended restricting the use of solitary confinement and limiting its duration and prolongation, ensuring that such sanctions were imposed only after proceedings that respected the minimum guarantees of due process.<sup>79</sup>
35. CESCR recommended that Uruguay ensure that all detainees receive fair remuneration for their work.<sup>80</sup>
36. CESCR noted with concern widespread domestic violence and recommended that Uruguay enforce existing legislation; conduct public awareness campaigns; and ensure psychosocial support and access to shelters for victims.<sup>81</sup>
37. In 2013, the Special Rapporteur on the question of torture acknowledged the Government's efforts but expressed concern about information he had received on the number of cases of domestic violence. He believed that efforts should be stepped up, with emphasis on prevention, education and awareness-raising among the general public and police and judicial officers, protection for victims and proper monitoring of the rehabilitation of persons convicted.<sup>82</sup>
38. UN-Uruguay recommended that Uruguay adopt regulations relating to Act No. 18.561 (2009) on sexual harassment.<sup>83</sup>
39. CESCR was concerned about the incidence of child labour. It recommended that Uruguay strengthen its legal framework in line with the Covenant and other international legal standards, including ILO Convention No. 182 (1999).<sup>84</sup>
40. CESCR was concerned that many people, the majority of whom were children, lived on the streets. It recommended that Uruguay address such phenomenon and ensure access to health care, education and social security.<sup>85</sup>
41. While noting steps taken to combat trafficking in women and girls, CEDAW requested additional efforts in that regard.<sup>86</sup>
42. In 2011, the Special Rapporteur on human trafficking, especially women and children, highlighted progress made, such as the enactment of legislation, the establishment of specialized courts and prosecutors to address organized crime, including the issue of human trafficking. She observed a number of challenges<sup>87</sup> and recommended that Uruguay carry out a national survey in order to obtain updated information,<sup>88</sup> design a comprehensive, holistic and integrative national plan of action,<sup>89</sup> and consider the establishment of a central agency to address human trafficking and to enhance coordination among central authorities and between central authorities and those at local levels.<sup>90</sup> She also recommended that campaigns be launched to raise public awareness<sup>91</sup> and that training and capacity-building be provided to State authorities.<sup>92</sup>



43. The Special Rapporteur on trafficking noted that although Law 18.250 penalizes human trafficking, it does not provide for assistance and redress to victims.<sup>93</sup> She recommended that the judiciary establish mechanisms for witness protection and access to justice for victims, their families and civil society actors who might be assisting them.<sup>94</sup> She further recommended strengthening efforts to tackle the root causes that make potential victims more vulnerable to trafficking.<sup>95</sup>

44. UN-Uruguay recommended that Uruguay draw up a comprehensive programme to combat trafficking in persons.<sup>96</sup>

### **C. Administration of justice, including impunity and the rule of law**

45. CED took note of the legislation on the transfer and dismissal of judges and recommended consolidating the independence of the judiciary.<sup>97</sup>

46. While noting measures taken, CERD recommended that Uruguay make additional efforts to facilitate equal access to judicial and administrative remedies for people of African descent and of indigenous origin.<sup>98</sup>

47. CERD recommended that Uruguay train prosecutors, judges, lawyers, police officers and other law enforcement officials on how to detect and provide redress for acts of racial discrimination.<sup>99</sup>

48. The Special Rapporteur on the question of torture recommended that all allegations of torture and ill-treatment be promptly and thoroughly investigated ex officio by an independent authority.<sup>100</sup>

49. The Special Rapporteur recommended that Uruguay remove the impediments to access to justice in relation to complaints of acts of torture and ill-treatment, regardless of whether they had occurred during the dictatorship or more recently.<sup>101</sup>

50. The Special Rapporteur recommended that Uruguay ensure that prisons and juvenile detention centres were appropriate places for rehabilitation and early social and community reintegration<sup>102</sup> and that it prioritize reform of the juvenile justice system.<sup>103</sup>

51. With regard to universal periodic review recommendations 59 and 67 to 69,<sup>104</sup> UN-Uruguay reported that the measures taken concerning the detention of young people had not changed the conditions of their detention. No progress had been made in efforts to make the juvenile justice system more specialized, and detention was still the most commonly used precautionary measure.<sup>105</sup>

52. With regard to universal periodic review recommendations 64 to 66,<sup>106</sup> UN-Uruguay said that, as a result of various legal steps, it had become possible to prosecute serious human rights violations committed during the dictatorship, despite the Act on the Expiry of the Punitive Claims of the State (Act No. 15.848 of 1986). However, it was concerned about the legal uncertainty over whether the prosecutions would continue.<sup>107</sup> In 2013, a Supreme Court judgement declared unconstitutional Act No. 18.831, which had re-established the validity of the punitive claims of the State and had declared that the serious crimes committed during the dictatorship constituted crimes against humanity and were therefore not time-barred, thereby enabling access to justice. UN-Uruguay expressed concern that this judgement impeded the right to justice and meant that the country was no longer in compliance with international standards.<sup>108</sup> In 2013, several special procedures mandate holders expressed their concern over the decisions issued by the Supreme Court since February 2013.<sup>109</sup>

53. In 2011, the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights encouraged authorities to continue to tackle long-standing human rights concerns, such as the investigation and prosecution of past human rights violations.<sup>110</sup>

54. In 2013, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence called for a review of legislation so as to eliminate the incompatibilities between the right to redress and other rights and to eliminate classification processes that could lead to revictimization.<sup>111</sup> The Special Rapporteur made a special appeal to the Supreme Court, asking it to ensure that its decisions gave consideration to the rights of victims as well as defendants. The Special Rapporteur recommended that Uruguay provide the necessary support to the National Human Rights Institution and the Ombudsman's Office.<sup>112</sup>

55. CED noted with concern that, according to the Supreme Court of Justice judgement, persons disappeared for more than 30 years were considered to be deceased and those accused of the disappearance were charged with homicide.<sup>113</sup> It urged Uruguay to ensure effective investigation of all enforced disappearances;<sup>114</sup> punish perpetrators; and train all State officials on the Convention.<sup>115</sup> It recommended establishing a specialized unit under the Public Prosecution Service to pursue investigations and coordinate criminal prosecution policy;<sup>116</sup> and ensuring that persons suspected of having committed an enforced disappearance do not influence investigations.<sup>117</sup>

56. CED noted with concern that Uruguayan legislation did not provide for the complainant, the victim or relatives to participate fully as parties in criminal proceedings. It encouraged Uruguay to adopt the amendments to the Code of Criminal Procedure and ensure that article 13 of Act 18.026 is applied in accordance with the definition of victim contained in the Convention.<sup>118</sup>

57. With regard to universal periodic review recommendation 7 on the participation of victims in criminal proceedings,<sup>119</sup> UN-Uruguay said that parliament was considering a new Code of Criminal Procedure.<sup>120</sup>

58. While acknowledging the protection of victims and witnesses under Acts 18.026 and 18.315, CED was concerned that there were no mechanisms to ensure that such measures were applied effectively.<sup>121</sup> It recommended ensuring that the term "victim" in Act 18.026 is applied in accordance with the Convention<sup>122</sup> and the full satisfaction of the rights of victims.<sup>123</sup>

59. CED encouraged Uruguay to regulate the exercise of habeas corpus.<sup>124</sup>

#### **D. Right to privacy, marriage and family life**

60. CESCR called on Uruguay to raise the minimum age of marriage to 18 years for both boys and girls.<sup>125</sup>

61. With regard to universal periodic review recommendations 28, 32, 34 and 35,<sup>126</sup> UN-Uruguay said that Act No. 19.075 on equal marriage had been adopted in 2013, setting the minimum age of marriage at 16 years.<sup>127</sup>

62. UN-Uruguay expressed satisfaction with the changes made in adoption procedures and said that the Code on Children and Adolescents included broad procedural guarantees.<sup>128</sup>

63. CED recommended establishing specific procedures for the review and, where appropriate, the annulment of adoptions or placements that originated in an enforced disappearance.<sup>129</sup>

## **E. Freedom of expression and right to participate in public and political life**

64. UNESCO indicated that in 2009, the Penal Code (art. 336) was amended and criminal penalties for defamation on issues of public interest involving officials were dropped. UNESCO encouraged Uruguay to continue with its positive steps to decriminalize defamation, especially in regard to the Penal Code (arts. 333 and 334) and to review the Freedom of Information Law to guarantee the independence of the oversight authority. It further recommended that Uruguay develop media self-regulatory mechanisms.<sup>130</sup>

65. UN-Uruguay recommended that Uruguay guarantee the independence of the appellate and monitoring body for the Access to Public Information Act and legally guarantee a media environment that promotes free, independent and pluralistic media from the private, public and community sectors.<sup>131</sup>

66. CESCR noted with concern the underrepresentation of women at all government levels and recommended that Uruguay address such disparities.<sup>132</sup>

67. In relation to universal periodic review recommendations 72 to 75,<sup>133</sup> UN-Uruguay said that Uruguay had taken a partial step forward by adopting Act No. 18.476, which establishes, for the first and only time, the obligation to include persons of both sexes in each shortlist of three candidates put forward for a particular election cycle (2014–2015).<sup>134</sup> UN-Uruguay recommended that Uruguay evaluate the implementation of the quota law, make the necessary amendments to it and extend its validity.<sup>135</sup>

68. CERD recommended that Uruguay promote the participation of people of African descent and indigenous origin in public affairs<sup>136</sup> and their representation in parliament and other institutions.<sup>137</sup>

## **F. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work**

69. CESCR noted with concern that women were overrepresented in the informal economy and in unskilled and less remunerative employment. It recommended that Uruguay address the disparities in access to and conditions of employment.<sup>138</sup> While noting some temporary special measures implemented in the area of women's employment, CEDAW considered that those were not sufficient and requested information on additional steps being taken.<sup>139</sup>

70. UN-Uruguay said that some of the remaining problems included high youth unemployment and gender gaps in the labour market.<sup>140</sup>

71. CERD was concerned that people of African descent occupied low-skill jobs. It recommended that Uruguay promote their employment in public administration and private enterprises;<sup>141</sup> and promote the integration of women of African descent into the labour market.<sup>142</sup>

72. UN-Uruguay referred to the ratification by Uruguay of the ILO Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189) in 2012, and said that only about 50 per cent of female domestic workers had been registered in the social security system.<sup>143</sup>

73. CESCR was concerned that the minimum wage remained insufficient to ensure a decent living and recommended that it be increased.<sup>144</sup>

74. CESCR expressed its concern over the relatively high number of workplace accidents. It recommended that Uruguay strengthen the occupational safety and health commissions and its regulatory framework.<sup>145</sup>

75. UN-Uruguay recommended that Uruguay increase maternity leave to 14 weeks and expand paternity leave and parental leave.<sup>146</sup>

76. CESCR noted with concern the inadequacy of legislation on employment security for pregnant women and leave for employees with children requiring medical attention. It recommended that Uruguay ensure the right to just and favourable conditions of work for women and men.<sup>147</sup>

## **G. Right to social security and to an adequate standard of living**

77. In relation to universal periodic review recommendations 76 to 83,<sup>148</sup> UN-Uruguay said that the increase in public social spending since 2005 was encouraging. It also stated that, according to data from the National Institute of Statistics, between 2009 and 2012 the poverty rate for the population as a whole had fallen from 20 per cent to 12.4 per cent, while extreme poverty had fallen from 1.6 per cent to 0.5 per cent.<sup>149</sup>

78. CESCR called on Uruguay to step up efforts to reduce poverty and allocate resources for disadvantaged individuals and groups.<sup>150</sup> CERD emphasized the need to further develop special measures in favour of the disadvantaged sectors of the population.<sup>151</sup>

79. CESCR recommended that Uruguay address disparities in access to social security, paying particular attention to the enjoyment of social security benefits by people of African descent, detainees and their families, and persons employed in the informal economy.<sup>152</sup>

80. CESCR was concerned about the high number of irregular settlements in urban and suburban areas. It urged Uruguay to provide access to adequate housing, with a focus on assistance to low-income families and other disadvantaged individuals and groups and the provision of adequate sanitation facilities.<sup>153</sup>

81. UN-Uruguay said that it was worth noting the adoption in 2011 of Act No. 18.795 on access to social housing, which had boosted the housing supply through tax incentives.<sup>154</sup>

82. CERD was concerned that people of African descent lived in the poorest neighbourhoods and recommended that Uruguay integrate the ethnic or racial dimension in housing programmes.<sup>155</sup>

83. The Special Rapporteur on water and sanitation concluded that Uruguay had made important efforts in ensuring access to safe drinking water and sanitation for its population.<sup>156</sup> Nevertheless, more efforts were needed in order to reach certain groups. She recommended that Uruguay ensure the enjoyment of the rights to water and sanitation, including for people living in the street or in informal or rural settlements, as well as in all public places, including juvenile detention centres.<sup>157</sup>

84. The Special Rapporteur on water and sanitation recommended that Uruguay evaluate the extent to which people living in poverty face challenges in relation to the affordability of water and sanitation services, ensuring adequate dialogue with them and increasing coordination among various stakeholders.<sup>158</sup>

## **H. Right to health**

85. CESCR recommended that Uruguay ensure access to universal health care and address regional disparities in access.<sup>159</sup>

86. UN-Uruguay drew attention to the establishment of the Comprehensive National Health System, which guaranteed the right to health, regardless of ability to pay, resulting in increased coverage and new services.<sup>160</sup>

87. Concerned that unsafe abortion was a leading cause of maternal death, CESCR urged Uruguay to incorporate sexual- and reproductive-health education into school curricula and introduce awareness-raising programmes.<sup>161</sup>

88. UN-Uruguay recommended that Uruguay promote policies and programmes aimed at achieving universal access to sexual and reproductive health and non-formal sex education for young people not attending school.<sup>162</sup>

89. UN-Uruguay recommended that Uruguay promote the rights of people living with HIV and of high-risk groups, inter alia by expanding the coverage of antiretroviral treatment.<sup>163</sup>

90. CESCR recommended that Uruguay improve the treatment of detainees and prisoners infected with HIV/AIDS.<sup>164</sup>

## **I. Right to education**

91. UNESCO encouraged Uruguay to strengthen measures to guarantee greater social inclusion in the national education system; to step up efforts to address the problem of high school dropout rates, particularly in secondary schools; and to continue to invest in education.<sup>165</sup>

92. UN-Uruguay highlighted the progress achieved in access to nursery education and the fact that the goal set for children's attendance at compulsory nursery schools (ages 4 and 5 years) had been reached.<sup>166</sup> UN-Uruguay said that current challenges related to the quality of education and the development of policies to include children from the most vulnerable groups.<sup>167</sup> It recommended introducing reforms in the education system to reduce school dropout rates, particularly in secondary education.<sup>168</sup>

93. CESCR was concerned at secondary school dropout rates and poor literacy levels in rural areas and among Afro-descendants. It recommended that Uruguay improve access to and the quality of primary and secondary education.<sup>169</sup> CERD recommended the implementation of the 2008 law on education and the reduction of school dropout rates of children of African descent and indigenous origin.<sup>170</sup>

## **J. Persons with disabilities**

94. UN-Uruguay welcomed the adoption of Act No. 18.651 (2010) on Comprehensive Protection for Persons with Disabilities.<sup>171</sup> UN-Uruguay recommended that Uruguay implement programmes to improve accessibility for persons with disabilities and to include children and adolescents with disabilities. It also recommended regulating the role of personal assistants for persons with severe disabilities.<sup>172</sup>

95. CESCR was concerned that persons with disabilities lacked access to employment. It recommended that Uruguay take additional measures to promote equality of access to employment, paying particular attention to private sector employment.<sup>173</sup>

96. CESCR recommended the improvement of standards of care for persons with mental disabilities and an update of the Mental Health Act of 1934.<sup>174</sup>

97. CESCR was concerned about the situation of people with mental health disorders, particularly those treated in the Bernardo Etchepare and Santin Carlos Rossi clinics. It

recommended that Uruguay improve living conditions for persons suffering from mental health disorders.<sup>175</sup>

### **K. Minorities and indigenous peoples**

98. CERD was concerned at the insufficiency of measures promoting the cultural identity of people of African descent and indigenous origin. It recommended that Uruguay include in the school curricula their contribution in the shaping of the identity and culture of the country.<sup>176</sup>

### **L. Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers**

99. UN-Uruguay recommended that Uruguay strengthen the institutional structure of the National Migration Board, so as to guarantee the rights of migrants.<sup>177</sup>

100. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) referred to the Refugee Law 18.076 (2006), which enshrines provisions regarding the refugee status determination procedure and durable solutions, and which established a refugee commission.<sup>178</sup> UNHCR recommended that Uruguay: complete the refugee and migratory legal framework with the adoption of rules of procedure and internal regulations to facilitate their effective implementation; ensure that gender-related claims are properly considered; incorporate child-sensitive elements into the refugee status determination procedure; and establish standard operating procedures for prevention and response to sexual gender-based violence.<sup>179</sup> UNHCR further recommended that Uruguay promote and assume responsibility for the local sustainable integration of refugees and the gradual phase-out of UNHCR activities in this sector.<sup>180</sup>

101. UNHCR also recommended that Uruguay develop a standard operating procedure for the identification of victims of trafficking and those who may be in need of international protection; and establish a referral mechanism for victims of trafficking to enable them to apply for asylum, whenever appropriate.<sup>181</sup>

102. UNHCR welcomed pledges made by Uruguay in 2011 to adopt a formal statelessness status determination procedure and to launch a pilot resettlement programme in rural settings to benefit refugees with such profiles.<sup>182</sup> It noted that, with technical support from UNCHR, a proposal for a law on statelessness was drafted by the refugee commission in 2012 and was currently under revision by the National Congress. UNHCR recommended that Uruguay adopt a statelessness determination procedure and implement national legislation that codifies the protections guaranteed in the 1954 Convention.<sup>183</sup>

### **M. Right to development and environmental issues**

103. The Special Rapporteur on water and sanitation recommended that Uruguay ensure that investment projects do not cause negative impact on the quantity and quality of water;<sup>184</sup> and that environmental impact studies are undertaken and monitored by independent actors.<sup>185</sup>

104. UN-Uruguay said that Uruguay continued to attract investment, which gave rise to debate on the right to a healthy environment.<sup>186</sup> UN-Uruguay recommended that Uruguay strengthen the capacity of the ministries responsible for developing a sustainable mining strategy.<sup>187</sup>

*Notes*

<sup>1</sup> Unless indicated otherwise, the status of ratifications of instruments listed in the table may be found in the official website of the United Nations Treaty Collection database, Office of Legal Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat, <http://treaties.un.org/>. Please also refer to the United Nations compilation on Uruguay from the previous cycle (A/HRC/WG.6/5/URY/2).

<sup>2</sup> The following abbreviations have been used for this 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
CPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance

<sup>3</sup> Individual complaints: ICCPR-OP 1, art. 1; OP-CEDAW, art. 1; OP-CRPD, art. 1; OP-ICESCR, art. 1; OP-CRC-IC, art. 5; ICERD, art. 14; CAT, art. 22; ICRMW, art. 77; and CPED, art. 31. Inquiry procedure: OP-CEDAW, art. 8; CAT, art. 20; CPED, art. 33; OP-CRPD, art. 6; OP-ICESCR, art. 11; and OP-CRC-IC, art. 13. Inter-State complaints: ICCPR, art. 41; ICRMW, art. 76; CPED, art. 32; CAT, art. 21; OP-ICESCR, art. 10; and OP-CRC-IC, art. 12. Urgent action: CPED, art. 30.

<sup>4</sup> Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

<sup>5</sup> 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol, 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons and 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.

<sup>6</sup> Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field (First Convention); Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea (Second Convention); Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (Third Convention); Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (Fourth Convention); Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I); Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II). For the official status of ratifications, see Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, at [www.eda.admin.ch/eda/fr/home/topics/intla/intrea/chdep/warvic.html](http://www.eda.admin.ch/eda/fr/home/topics/intla/intrea/chdep/warvic.html).

<sup>7</sup> International Labour Organization Convention No. 29 concerning Forced or Compulsory Labour; Convention No. 105 concerning the Abolition of Forced Labour; Convention No. 87 concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise; Convention No. 98 concerning the Application of the Principles of the Right to Organise and to Bargain Collectively; Convention No. 100 concerning Equal Remuneration for Men and Women Workers for Work of Equal Value; Convention No. 111 concerning Discrimination in Respect of Employment and Occupation; Convention No. 138 concerning Minimum Age for Admission to Employment; Convention No. 182 concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour.

- <sup>8</sup> Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Adoption of an Additional Distinctive Emblem (Protocol III). For the official status of ratifications, see Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, at [www.eda.admin.ch/eda/fr/home/topics/intla/intrea/chdep/warvic.html](http://www.eda.admin.ch/eda/fr/home/topics/intla/intrea/chdep/warvic.html).
- <sup>9</sup> International Labour Organization Convention No. 189 concerning Decent Work for Domestic Workers.
- <sup>10</sup> International Labour Organization Convention No. 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries.
- <sup>11</sup> CERD/C/URY/CO/16-20, para. 24.
- <sup>12</sup> E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 32.
- <sup>13</sup> CERD/C/URY/CO/16-20, para. 20.
- <sup>14</sup> UNCT submission to the UPR on Uruguay, para. 102.
- <sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 91.
- <sup>16</sup> A/HRC/21/42/Add.2, para. 57 (b).
- <sup>17</sup> CERD/C/URY/CO/16-20, para. 5.
- <sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 9.
- <sup>19</sup> E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 7.
- <sup>20</sup> CERD/C/URY/CO/16-20, para. 13.
- <sup>21</sup> CED/C/URY/CO/1, paras. 11–12.
- <sup>22</sup> A/HRC/22/53/Add.3, para. 65.
- <sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 87.
- <sup>24</sup> UNCT submission, para. 26.
- <sup>25</sup> According to article 5 of the rules of procedure for the International Coordination Committee (ICC) Sub-Committee on Accreditation, the different classifications for accreditation used by the Sub-Committee are: A: Voting Member (fully in compliance with each of the Paris Principles), B: Non-Voting Member (not fully in compliance with each of the Paris Principles or insufficient information provided to make a determination), C: No Status (not in compliance with the Paris Principles).
- <sup>26</sup> For the list of national human rights institutions with accreditation status granted by the International Coordination Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (ICC), see A/HRC/23/28, annex.
- <sup>27</sup> CED/C/URY/CO/1, para. 9. See also UNCT submission, para. 5.
- <sup>28</sup> E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 5. See also CED/C/URY/CO/1, para. 10 and CERD/C/URY/CO/16-20, para. 7.
- <sup>29</sup> *OHCHR Report 2012*, “OHCHR in the field”, p. 229. Available from [http://www2.ohchr.org/english/ohchrreport2012/web\\_en/pages/ohchr\\_field.html](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/ohchrreport2012/web_en/pages/ohchr_field.html).
- <sup>30</sup> CED/C/URY/CO/1, para. 10.
- <sup>31</sup> UNCT submission, para. 86.
- <sup>32</sup> A/HRC/21/42/Add.2, para. 57 (d).
- <sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 57 (d).
- <sup>34</sup> A/HRC/13/39/Add.2, para. 105 (p).
- <sup>35</sup> UNCT submission, para. 94.
- <sup>36</sup> A/HRC/21/42/Add.2, para. 57 (f).
- <sup>37</sup> UNCT submission, para. 19.
- <sup>38</sup> CERD/C/URY/CO/16-20, para. 11.
- <sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 12.
- <sup>40</sup> UNCT submission, para. 74.
- <sup>41</sup> The following abbreviations have been used for this document:
- |              |  |
|--------------|--|
| CERD         | Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination  |
| CESCR        | Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights  |
| HR Committee | Human Rights Committee   |
| CEDAW        | Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women                                   |
| CAT          | Committee against Torture  |
| CRC          | Committee on the Rights of the Child   |
| CMW          | Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families |
| CRPD         | Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities   |



- CED Committee on Enforced Disappearances
- 42 CERD/C/URY/CO/16-20, para. 27.
- 43 CEDAW/C/URY/CO/7, para. 57.
- 44 CEDAW/C/URY/CO/7/Add.1.
- 45 Letter dated 19 September 2012 from CEDAW to the Permanent Mission of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, available from <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cedaw/docs/followup/CEDAW-LetterUruguay.pdf>.
- 46 CED/C/URY/CO/1, para. 41.
- 47 CCPR/C/100/D/1887/2009, 19 October 2010, and CCPR/C/103/D/1637/2007,1757&1765/2008, 24 October 2011.
- 48 For the titles of special procedures, see [www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/SP/Pages/Themes.aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/SP/Pages/Themes.aspx) and [www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/SP/Pages/Countries.aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/SP/Pages/Countries.aspx).
- 49 A/HRC/16/52/Add.2.
- 50 A/HRC/22/53/Add.3.
- 51 A/HRC/22/45 and Corr.1, para. 503.
- 52 *OHCHR Report 2011*, “OHCHR in the field: Americas”, p. 287. Available from [http://www2.ohchr.org/english/ohchrreport2011/web\\_version/ohchr\\_report2011\\_web/pages/ohchr\\_field.html](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/ohchrreport2011/web_version/ohchr_report2011_web/pages/ohchr_field.html).
- 53 A/68/208, para. 27. See also *OHCHR Management Plan 2012–2013: Working for Results*, p. 43.
- 54 *Ibid.*
- 55 *Ibid.*, p. 79.
- 56 *OHCHR Report 2011*, p. 288.
- 57 *Ibid.*, p. 289.
- 58 *OHCHR Report 2010*, p. 164 and A/68/208, para. 27.
- 59 OHCHR press release, “UN Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights concludes visit to Uruguay”, 26 October 2011.
- 60 *OHCHR Report 2010*, p. 79.
- 61 Note verbale to OHCHR from the Permanent Mission of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, 8 March 2013.
- 62 E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 16.
- 63 *Ibid.*, para. 9.
- 64 CERD/C/URY/CO/16-20, para. 15.
- 65 Letter dated 19 September 2012 from CEDAW (note 45 above), p. 2.
- 66 CERD/C/URY/CO/16-20, para. 19.
- 67 *Ibid.*, para. 14.
- 68 *Ibid.*, para. 8.
- 69 E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 7.
- 70 *Ibid.*
- 71 UNCT submission, paras. 16–17.
- 72 *Ibid.*, para. 104.
- 73 E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 14.
- 74 CERD/C/URY/CO/1, para. 38.
- 75 A/HRC/22/53/Add.3, para. 23. See also A/HRC/13/39/Add.2, para. 99.
- 76 E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 22.
- 77 A/HRC/22/53/Add.3, paras. 78–79.
- 78 *Ibid.*, para. 81.
- 79 *Ibid.*, para. 83.
- 80 E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 13.
- 81 *Ibid.*, para. 15.
- 82 A/HRC/22/53/Add.3, para. 77.
- 83 UNCT submission, para. 100.
- 84 E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 18.
- 85 *Ibid.*, para. 21.
- 86 Letter dated 19 September 2012 from CEDAW (note 45 above), p. 2.
- 87 A/HRC/17/35/Add.3, p. 1.
- 88 *Ibid.*, para. 73.

- <sup>89</sup> Ibid., para. 75.
- <sup>90</sup> Ibid., para. 76.
- <sup>91</sup> Ibid., para. 74.
- <sup>92</sup> Ibid., para. 77.
- <sup>93</sup> Ibid., para. 71.
- <sup>94</sup> Ibid., para. 78.
- <sup>95</sup> Ibid., para. 79.
- <sup>96</sup> UNCT submission, para. 111.
- <sup>97</sup> CED/C/URY/CO/1, paras. 15–16.
- <sup>98</sup> CERD/C/URY/CO/16-20, para. 16.
- <sup>99</sup> Ibid., para. 18.
- <sup>100</sup> A/HRC/13/39/Add.2, para. 105 (l).
- <sup>101</sup> A/HRC/22/53/Add.3, para. 88. See also A/HRC/13/39/Add.2, para. 105 (m).
- <sup>102</sup> A/HRC/22/53/Add.3, para. 85.
- <sup>103</sup> Ibid., para. 86. See also A/HRC/13/39/Add.2, para. 105 (q).
- <sup>104</sup> A/HRC/12/12, para. 78, recommendations: 59. Take further measures to improve conditions in the juvenile detention centres and further structural measures to promote rehabilitation of minors in conflict with the law and prepare them for integration into the society (Netherlands); 67. Improve the judicial system that is specialized for minors (France); 68. Implement alternative measures to the deprivation of liberty, especially with regard to minors (Chile); 69. Continue developing its juvenile justice system in terms of both legislation and practice. In particular, ensure that there are adequately trained professionals and adequate infrastructure and that deprivation of liberty is only used as a measure of last resort in the case of under-aged persons (Finland).
- <sup>105</sup> UNCT submission, paras. 7 and 10.
- <sup>106</sup> A/HRC/12/12, para. 78, recommendations: 64. Review and where necessary abolish the laws resulting in impunity for those who committed crimes during the dictatorships, in particular the Law on the Expiry of the Punitive Claims of the State, No. 15848, and remove all obstacles to finding the truth about the past, in particular with regard to families of victims of enforced disappearance (Czech Republic); 65. Ensure that the Executive continues providing all necessary support to the judiciary to make progress in the investigation of cases of human rights violations which took place during the dictatorship, and that it further continues providing all necessary support to the work of the Comisión de Seguimiento de la Comisión para la Paz (Colombia); 66. Abolish the Law on the Expiry of the Punitive Claims of the State to allow for thorough and all-encompassing investigation and prosecution of all human rights violations in the past (Germany).
- <sup>107</sup> UNCT submission, para. 9.
- <sup>108</sup> Ibid., para. 33.
- <sup>109</sup> OHCHR, press release, “‘Justicia o impunidad, Uruguay debe escoger’ – expertos de la ONU”, 25 June 2013. Available from [www.ohchr.org/SP/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=13486&LangID=S](http://www.ohchr.org/SP/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=13486&LangID=S).
- <sup>110</sup> OHCHR press release of 26 October 2011 (note 59 above).
- <sup>111</sup> Observaciones preliminares del Relator Especial para la promoción de la verdad, la justicia, la reparación y las garantías de no repetición al final de su visita oficial a la República Oriental del Uruguay, 4 October 2013, available from: [www.ohchr.org/SP/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=13849&LangID=S](http://www.ohchr.org/SP/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=13849&LangID=S).
- <sup>112</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>113</sup> CED/C/URY/CO/1, para. 13.
- <sup>114</sup> Ibid., paras. 37 and 14.
- <sup>115</sup> Ibid., paras. 14 and 30.
- <sup>116</sup> Ibid., para. 22.
- <sup>117</sup> Ibid., para. 20.
- <sup>118</sup> Ibid., paras. 21–22.
- <sup>119</sup> A/HRC/12/12, para. 78, recommendation 7. Speed up its prospective plan to address the legal gap in its criminal law system so that victims can better exercise the right to participate in the proceedings (Syrian Arab Republic).
- <sup>120</sup> UNCT submission, para. 3.
- <sup>121</sup> CED/C/URY/CO/1, para. 17.

- <sup>122</sup> Ibid., para. 32.
- <sup>123</sup> Ibid., para. 37.
- <sup>124</sup> Ibid., para. 26.
- <sup>125</sup> E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 17.
- <sup>126</sup> A/HRC/12/12, para. 78, recommendations: 28. Eliminate discriminatory legal provisions in matters relating to family and marriage, for example by raising the minimum age of marriage for both men and women to 18 years, eliminating the concepts of “modesty”, “virtue” and “public scandal” from the characterization of sexual offences and making marital rape an offence under the Penal Code, as recommended by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (Portugal); 32. Reform provisions of the civil code that discriminate against women, such as those that set a minimum age of 12 for marriage, prohibit widows and divorced women from getting married again before 300 days, or provide a food pension for women who lead a “disorganized life” (Spain); 34. Consider raising the minimum age for marriage to 18 years for both women and men (Republic of Korea); 35. Amend the Civil Code to raise the minimum age for marriage for both women and men to 18 years according to international standards (Netherlands).
- <sup>127</sup> UNCT submission, para. 4.
- <sup>128</sup> Ibid., para. 35.
- <sup>129</sup> CED/C/URY/CO/1, para. 36.
- <sup>130</sup> UNESCO submission to the UPR on Uruguay, paras. 26, 47–49.
- <sup>131</sup> UNCT submission, paras. 92–93.
- <sup>132</sup> E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 9 and in particular 9 (b). See also the letter dated 19 September 2012 from CEDAW (note 45 above), pp. 1–2; and CEDAW/C/URY/CO/7/Add.1, paras. 1–3.
- <sup>133</sup> A/HRC/12/12, para. 78: recommendations 72. Continue to promote gender equity and the empowerment of women in all decision-making processes and in the design of public policies (Nicaragua); 73. Ensure women’s adequate representation in high-level policy and decision-making institutions (Ukraine); 74. Continue its efforts to promote gender equality, and greater participation of women in the public and private sectors (Philippines); 75. Promote equality between women and men, in particular concerning the level of participation of women in public life and in the employment sector (Germany).
- <sup>134</sup> UNCT submission, para. 11.
- <sup>135</sup> Ibid., para. 95.
- <sup>136</sup> CERD/C/URY/CO/16-20, para. 17.
- <sup>137</sup> Ibid., para. 14 (a).
- <sup>138</sup> E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, paras. 9 and 9 (b).
- <sup>139</sup> Letter dated 19 September 2012 from CEDAW (note 45 above), pp. 1–2. See also CEDAW/C/URY/CO/7/Add.1, paras. 10–34.
- <sup>140</sup> UNCT submission, paras. 39–40.
- <sup>141</sup> CERD/C/URY/CO/16-20, para. 14, and in particular 14 (a).
- <sup>142</sup> Ibid., para. 15.
- <sup>143</sup> UNCT submission, para. 41.
- <sup>144</sup> E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 12.
- <sup>145</sup> Ibid., para. 11.
- <sup>146</sup> UNCT submission, para. 102.
- <sup>147</sup> E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 10.
- <sup>148</sup> A/HRC/12/12, para. 78, recommendations: 76. Continue with current efforts to eradicate poverty, indigence and social exclusion (Cuba); 77. Continue efforts to fight poverty (Russian Federation); 78. Expedite the process of eradicating poverty through targeted programmes and social inclusion policies (South Africa); 79. Continue to work on its national plans for social inclusion and poverty alleviation (Nicaragua); 80. Continue to scale up national efforts to eliminate poverty particularly targeting disadvantaged groups, with the support of the international community (Bangladesh); 81. Provide more allocations for social expenditures that could sufficiently benefit women and children, in particular, from the poor, rural and vulnerable sections of society (Malaysia); 82. Continue paying particular attention to the conditions of vulnerable groups such as persons with disabilities and indigenous peoples (Djibouti); 83. Continue with its sound social programmes and plans undertaken to satisfy the most basic needs of people living in extreme poverty, including food, education, housing, health and work (Venezuela).

- <sup>149</sup> UNCT submission, para. 12.  
<sup>150</sup> E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 19.  
<sup>151</sup> CERD/C/URY/CO/16-20, para. 10.  
<sup>152</sup> E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 29.  
<sup>153</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 20.  
<sup>154</sup> UNCT submission, para. 49.  
<sup>155</sup> CERD/C/URY/CO/16-20, para. 14, and in particular 14 (b).  
<sup>156</sup> A/HRC/21/42/Add.2, para. 56.  
<sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 57 (a).  
<sup>158</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 57 (e).  
<sup>159</sup> E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 23.  
<sup>160</sup> UNCT submission, para. 56.  
<sup>161</sup> E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 24.  
<sup>162</sup> UNCT submission, paras. 101 and 114.  
<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 117.  
<sup>164</sup> E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 27.  
<sup>165</sup> UNESCO submission, paras. 44 and 45.  
<sup>166</sup> UNCT submission, para. 63.  
<sup>167</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 64.  
<sup>168</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 115.  
<sup>169</sup> E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 28.  
<sup>170</sup> CERD/C/URY/CO/16-20, para. 14 (c).  
<sup>171</sup> UNCT submission, para. 75.  
<sup>172</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 118–120.  
<sup>173</sup> E/C.12/URY/CO/3-4, para. 8.  
<sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 25.  
<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 26.  
<sup>176</sup> CERD/C/URY/CO/16-20, para. 19.  
<sup>177</sup> UNCT submission, para. 112.  
<sup>178</sup> UNHCR submission to the UPR on Uruguay, p. 1.  
<sup>179</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.  
<sup>180</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.  
<sup>181</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.  
<sup>182</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2.  
<sup>183</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.  
<sup>184</sup> A/HRC/21/42/Add.2, para. 57 (g).  
<sup>185</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 57 (h).  
<sup>186</sup> UNCT submission, para. 82.  
<sup>187</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.
-