



Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirty-sixth session
4–15 May 2020

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on the United States of America*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 139 stakeholders' submissions¹ to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Information provided by stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations² and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies³

2. Concerning recommendations from the previous universal periodic review (UPR) on the ratification of international instruments,⁴ HRW indicated that no new human rights treaty had been signed or ratified.⁵

3. Several submissions recommended that the United States of America (USA) ratify: ICESCR,⁶ CEDAW,⁷ CRC,⁸ ICRMW,⁹ CRPD,¹⁰ ICPPED,¹¹ ICCPR-OP 2,¹² OP-CAT,¹³ the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness,¹⁴ and ILO Conventions N° 87 on Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise,¹⁵ 98 on the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining,¹⁶ and 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples.¹⁷

4. The USA was also called upon to ratify the Protocols I and II additional to the Geneva Conventions,¹⁸ the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court,¹⁹ the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty,²⁰ the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons,²¹ and the Arms Trade Treaty.²²

5. AI noted that the USA had not accepted requests for invitations for official visits from the Special Procedures since 2018 and that in June 2018, it had withdrawn from the Human

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



Rights Council.²³ SBCC noted that the USA had withdrawn from the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration.²⁴ HRW indicated that the USA had announced that it would no longer cooperate with the International Criminal Court and that in April 2019, had revoked the visa of the Prosecutor of the Court.²⁵

6. JS62 recommended that the USA pursue negotiations on nuclear arms control and the global elimination of nuclear weapons.²⁶

B. National human rights framework²⁷

7. JS16 recommended taking steps to create a national human rights institution.²⁸

8. JS5 recommended that the USA support the establishment of effective federal mechanisms to coordinate with state and local officials on international human rights monitoring and implementation regarding engagement with Treaty Bodies, Special Procedures, and the UPR.²⁹

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

1. Cross-cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination³⁰

9. JS5 stated that discrimination and inequality were longstanding challenges in the USA and that over the past two years there had been an increase in acts of harassment and discrimination.³¹

10. Several submissions expressed concerns about certain statements and language of the Executive³² regarding, inter alia, race relations, indigenous peoples, people from African and Muslim countries, and immigrants and refugees.³³

11. CCR indicated that the USA had attempted to exclude transgender people from the military and had rescinded guidance or changed agency rules protecting LGBTQIA+ people's access to healthcare and their rights in school.³⁴ HRC indicated that LGBTQ people remained vulnerable to hate crimes particularly in those states that did not provide them with specific protection³⁵ and AI reported that incidents of hate crimes based on sexual orientation or gender identity had increased each year from 2015 to 2017.³⁶

Development, the environment, and business and human rights³⁷

12. JS54 stated that the energy policy was still mostly focused on the use of fossil fuels and that oil and gas industries benefited from favourable taxation.³⁸ JAI noted that the USA had failed to implement effective controls over corporations contributing to greenhouse gas emissions, and was taking steps to remove regulations so that these corporations could increase their emissions.³⁹ JS16 indicated that the USA had repealed water pollution regulations for fracking on federal and indigenous lands.⁴⁰

13. According to JS53, farmlands, and agriculture and food systems had been taken over by giant corporate monopolies who built their empires on mono-crops, genetically modified seeds, harmful pesticides, abusive livestock practices, and destructive soil technologies.⁴¹

14. Guale-Nation invited the USA to fulfil its commitments under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.⁴² JS54 recommended reinstating the Paris Agreement.⁴³

15. Several submissions highlighted the negative impact of the imposition by the USA of unilateral coercive measures on third countries,⁴⁴ in particular on the right to health,⁴⁵ as well as the right to food.⁴⁶

*Human rights and counter-terrorism*⁴⁷

16. Concerning UPR recommendations regarding the closure of the Guantánamo Bay detention centre,⁴⁸ several submissions noted that the prison remained open.⁴⁹ IACHR-OAS condemned the Executive Order, announced in 2018, that called for the military prison facilities at Guantánamo Bay to remain open and opening the possibility that additional detainees may be transferred to the detention centre.⁵⁰

17. CCR reported that forty men remained imprisoned at Guantánamo Bay and that these prisoners comprised an aging, increasingly sick population.⁵¹ AI indicated that seven of the detainees faced trials by military commission where they were eligible for the death penalty if convicted. The trial for those accused of crimes related to the 11 September 2001 attacks was scheduled to begin in 2021.⁵² JS40 noted concerns at the conditions of detention at the Guantánamo Bay detention centre,⁵³ and JS59 stated that medical care was deficient and that the health condition of the detainees had worsened by their prolonged detention.⁵⁴ CVT recommended that the USA allow the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment to visit Guantánamo to conduct a comprehensive assessment, including unmonitored interviews with detainees.⁵⁵

18. AI stated that no perpetrators had been brought to justice for crimes, including torture and enforced disappearance, committed in the CIA-operated secret detention program authorised from 2001-2009 and that the limited investigations conducted had since been closed.⁵⁶

2. Civil and political rights

*Right to life, liberty and security of person*⁵⁷

19. AI stated that under its “global war” doctrine, the USA had repeatedly resorted to lethal force in countries around the world, including using armed drones, and that despite calls for clarification, the USA was not transparent regarding the legal and policy standards and criteria applied for the use of lethal force outside the country.⁵⁸

20. GICJ raised concerns about the invasion and occupation of a third country⁵⁹ and lack of accountability.⁶⁰ JS2 was concerned about the role of USA security assistance to a coalition engaged in an armed conflict in a third country.⁶¹ ADHRB was concerned about security assistance to a third country where there were allegations of widespread human rights abuses.⁶²

21. ACLU reported that the use of the death penalty was in large part declining and limited to select jurisdictions, though substantial problems remained. Twenty-nine states formally retained the death penalty, as did the federal and the military systems. In these jurisdictions, it was applied in an arbitrary and discriminatory manner, based on race, geography, socioeconomic status, and the quality of representation.⁶³ Several submissions noted that in July 2019, the Department of Justice had announced it would resume the federal death penalty,⁶⁴ which had not been used since 2003.⁶⁵

22. AI stated that in numerous cases, prisoners had gone to their deaths despite serious doubts about the proceedings that led to their convictions.⁶⁶ Two submissions indicated that in 2002, the Supreme Court had ruled that persons with serious mental and intellectual disabilities were exempt from the death penalty.⁶⁷ JS55 noted, however, that states had a wide latitude in determining what qualified as an intellectual disability resulting in inconsistencies and persons with such disabilities being sentenced to death.⁶⁸

23. JS38 recommended the imposition of a moratorium on the death penalty at the federal and state level aiming at its complete abolition.⁶⁹

24. Referring to recommendations on the excessive use of force by law enforcement,⁷⁰ HRW stated that even when there was strong evidence of excessive, often lethal force, officers had usually not been criminally charged or otherwise held accountable.⁷¹ AI indicated that although the government did not effectively track how many such deaths occurred annually, the limited data available suggested that African Americans were disproportionately impacted by police use of lethal force.⁷² JS18 stated that racial profiling within policing remained pervasive.⁷³

25. It was recommended that the USA: ensure that state legislatures introduce, or review and amend, statutes that authorize the use of lethal force to ensure they are in line with international law and standards;⁷⁴ provide technical assistance to local governments on best practices for police use of lethal force, including de-escalation;⁷⁵ and commit to passing legislation that aims to reduce incidents of profiling by law enforcement.⁷⁶

26. JS20 stated that the USA had taken no steps to implement UPR recommendations⁷⁷ on gun violence.⁷⁸ AmProg reported that tens of thousands of persons were killed with guns every year in suicides, homicides, and unintentional shootings.⁷⁹ JS20 indicated that roughly two-thirds of gun deaths were suicides.⁸⁰

27. Several submissions stated that a large number of gun-related deaths and injuries disproportionately affected racial and ethnic minorities;⁸¹ particularly impacting African American men.⁸²

28. JS30 indicated that mass shootings took place with alarming frequency⁸³ and that school shootings had become a common occurrence.⁸⁴

29. Several submissions noted reports that firearm related injuries was the second leading cause of death for children and adolescents.⁸⁵ JS30 noted that there were no federal laws mandating the use of safe storage of firearms in households with children.⁸⁶

30. BRADY stated that more than half of all women murdered in the country were murdered by an intimate partner and half of these murders were caused by firearms.⁸⁷ AmProg noted that though federal law prohibited persons convicted of domestic violence crimes or subject to a restraining order from owning a gun, gaps remained leaving victims of domestic violence vulnerable.⁸⁸

31. BRADY indicated that certain laws contributed to the gun violence epidemic by providing special protections for gun dealers with inadequate business practices.⁸⁹ Several stakeholders indicated that certain laws protected the gun industry from liability in most tort actions; and had led to a near complete ban on federally-funded research related to firearms and gun violence, severely decreasing the Center for Disease Control and Prevention's funding for such research.⁹⁰

32. It was recommended that the USA: improve and expand the background check system to cover all firearms transactions;⁹¹ adopt a ban on assault-style semi-automatic rifles and high-capacity magazines;⁹² and support safe storage laws.⁹³

33. CGJC stated that the USA had failed to implement UPR recommendations⁹⁴ on sexual violence in the military.⁹⁵ Servicewomen and men reporting violence were still frequently subjected to retaliation and barred from seeking civil or constitutional remedies in federal civilian courts.⁹⁶

34. AFSC noted reports on the use of extreme solitary confinement, often for years, from people in prisons, jails and immigrant detention facilities.⁹⁷ JS55 stated that typically people under sentence of death were held in solitary confinement.⁹⁸

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law⁹⁹

35. HRW indicated that racial disparities persisted throughout the criminal justice system;¹⁰⁰ and AFSC noted reports that African Americans were nearly six times more likely and Hispanics were over three times more likely to be incarcerated.¹⁰¹

36. JS24 stated that over the past four decades the prison population had quadrupled, resulting in the phenomena of mass incarceration.¹⁰² JAI indicated that many persons were detained in pre-trial detention due to an inability to post bail, contributing to the high levels of incarceration.¹⁰³

37. ACLU indicated that one in nine people in prison were serving life sentences, more than a third of whom were sentenced to life without the possibility of parole.¹⁰⁴ Since the mid-1970s, there had been an explosive growth in the number of people serving life and life-without-parole sentences, largely because of "tough-on crime" policies that drove state and federal legislators to pass laws creating draconian sentencing and parole schemes.¹⁰⁵

38. HRW stated that a significant proportion of non-violent offenders had convictions for drug offenses that would be better addressed through an approach focused on treatment and public health.¹⁰⁶ JS46 stated that the privatization of prisons and detention centres incentivized mass incarceration.¹⁰⁷

39. JS24 reported that the number of women who were incarcerated continued to grow,¹⁰⁸ noting, particularly, the dramatic increase of African American women who were incarcerated.¹⁰⁹

40. JS31 stated that incarceration contributed to poverty by creating employment barriers, making access to public benefits difficult and disrupting communities.¹¹⁰ Justice-Strategies referred to research indicating that mass incarceration involving generations of young Black men and women had devastating effects on their children.¹¹¹

41. ACLU stated that in 2018 federal legislation (the First Step Act) had been passed, including important sentencing reform provisions but that much more comprehensive reform was required.¹¹² It was recommended that: congress and state legislatures enact comprehensive sentencing reform legislation, including federal legislation that eliminates mandatory minimums for drug crimes;¹¹³ and treating drug addiction as a public health issue.¹¹⁴

*Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life*¹¹⁵

42. DRAD stated that in recent years the USA had used the Espionage Act against whistleblowers who acted as sources for journalists, and recently for publishing information from a whistleblower.¹¹⁶

43. DRAD stated that a number of states and even the federal government had considered or passed laws aimed at chilling protest.¹¹⁷ JS36 reported that in June 2019, the federal government had announced that it would seek to expand criminal penalties for pipeline protests,¹¹⁸ which was followed by numerous anti-protest bills proposed by 35 state legislatures, 16 of which had passed into law.¹¹⁹ DRAD indicated that some 27 states had adopted laws aimed at proponents of the Boycotts, Divestment and Sanctions movement and noted challenges in the courts to such laws but indicated they remained on the books in many states.¹²⁰

44. FLD indicated that human rights defenders working with migrants and asylum seekers, particularly at the border, were being criminalised, intimidated and harassed by both state and non-state actors.¹²¹ IACHR-OAS called on the USA to adopt measures to ensure an environment in which immigrant human rights defenders can do their work freely, without threat of immigration detention and deportation.¹²²

45. JS11 stated that there were many obstacles and barriers to people voting including: the fact that people were required to vote on a weekday making it difficult for working people to vote;¹²³ registration and identification requirements;¹²⁴ and purges of a high number of persons from voter rolls.¹²⁵ AFSC reported that mass incarceration, and the consequences of certain criminal convictions had disenfranchised many African Americans.¹²⁶

46. Several submissions highlighted that the citizens of Washington D.C. did not have voting representation in the federal Congress.¹²⁷

47. OSCE/ODIHR recommended, inter alia, that states refrain from introducing voter identification requirements that have or could have a discriminatory impact on voters;¹²⁸ and consider establishing independent bodies to draw district boundaries, noting that districting should respect the equality of the vote, not discriminate against any group, and be free from political influence.¹²⁹ It also recommended that citizens residing in the District of Columbia be provided with full representation rights in Congress.¹³⁰

*Prohibition of all forms of slavery*¹³¹

48. JS51 stated that policy on trafficking remained heavily focused on domestic sex trafficking, leaving labour trafficking victims with fewer protections.¹³² JS18 stated that young girls coerced into sex trafficking were often treated as perpetrators rather than victims and faced unnecessary prison sentences.¹³³ JS12 stated that employers must be held accountable for labour trafficking.¹³⁴

49. JS51 recommended requiring federal immigration enforcement officers to effectively screen to identify victims of human trafficking prior to detaining or removing a person from the country.¹³⁵

*Right to privacy and family life*¹³⁶

50. EPIC stated that the law did not prevent arbitrary or unlawful interference with the right to privacy in conducting foreign intelligence surveillance and that wide ranging surveillance continued.¹³⁷ JS32 was concerned at the use of surveillance, particularly targeting the Muslim community.¹³⁸

51. EPIC indicated that the USA had failed to protect the right to privacy with respect to private sector data collection and use, and that the country still lacked both a data protection authority and comprehensive privacy legislation.¹³⁹ AccessNow recommended the implementation of a comprehensive data privacy and protection framework that would guarantee fundamental privacy rights and control over one's personal information for everyone whose data passes through the USA, whether it be through a government agency or private company.¹⁴⁰

52. JS45 stated that due to the complexity of international adoption procedures, a large number of adoptees, although legally adopted, never received U.S. citizenship.¹⁴¹

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

*Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work*¹⁴²

53. JS51 stated that though both federal and state law guaranteed protections to workers, penalties for non-compliant employers were minimal; and that the agencies charged with enforcing those laws lacked resources and were complaint-driven.¹⁴³ JS51 also indicated that problems faced by workers to secure their wages and other workplace rights were exacerbated in industries with high subcontracting rates;¹⁴⁴ and that migrant workers, especially those with irregular status, were particularly vulnerable to labour exploitation.¹⁴⁵

54. JS49 highlighted that domestic workers and farmworkers had been exempted from the protections afforded to most workers by the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) and the National Labor Relations Act.¹⁴⁶ JS23 stated that due to exemptions to the FLSA, child protection was minimal for agriculture, and indicated that a high number of predominately Hispanic children harvested produce, working very long hours, and that the high-school dropout rate for these children was high.¹⁴⁷

55. JS51 recommended that the USA remove exemptions from the FLSA so that all workers receive minimum wage and overtime protections, regardless of industry or type of worker, especially in high risk industries such as construction, domestic service, and agriculture.¹⁴⁸

56. JS54 stated that penal labour carried out by government or private operations, exacerbated poverty as prisoners were paid far less than the federal minimum wage.¹⁴⁹ Two submissions indicated that individuals in the Voluntary Work Programs in immigration detention centres were paid about \$1 per day.¹⁵⁰

*Right to an adequate standard of living*¹⁵¹

57. JS47 stated that racial minority populations often experienced higher hunger rates linked to the poverty rates experienced by such groups, noting the higher poverty rates for African Americans and Hispanics.¹⁵² HRC indicated that LGBTQ families and older adults were at an increased risk of poverty.¹⁵³ JS53 highlighted that the Native American population suffered from high poverty and unemployment rates.¹⁵⁴

58. JS58 indicated that the law provided no entitlement to housing assistance for low income people; and that recognition of a right to even basic shelter was extremely limited to a few communities.¹⁵⁵ Two submissions reported that encampments had increased significantly since 2007.¹⁵⁶ Several submissions referred to the criminalisation of homeless persons for engaging in life sustaining activities.¹⁵⁷

59. JS24 stated that institutional problems the Fair Housing Act was designed to solve, such as inequality in mortgage lending and landlords who avoided renting to minorities, endured.¹⁵⁸ JS53 stressed that homelessness and the inability to access affordable housing was a reality for indigenous peoples, and that the 2018 cut of the US Department of Housing and Urban Development budget had severely impacted indigenous communities.¹⁵⁹

60. It was recommended that the USA affirm housing as a human right and commit to its implementation in a non-discriminatory way;¹⁶⁰ and increase enforcement of existing fair housing and lending laws.¹⁶¹

61. JS4 stated that many rural communities lacked access to basic sanitation¹⁶² and that there was a lack of political will to fully investigate the problem and its impacts and to provide adequate infrastructure funding.¹⁶³

*Right to health*¹⁶⁴

62. HRW stated that despite accepting UPR recommendations related to health-care,¹⁶⁵ federal and state authorities continued to take actions to restrict access to health-care, targeting changes to the Medicaid program, private insurance subsidies, and other key elements of the 2010 Affordable Care Act (ACA).¹⁶⁶

63. JS1 stated that the wealth inequality increased inequality in health care because of the private insurance financing, with numerous coverage gaps.¹⁶⁷ Higher levels of income inequality coincided with increased mortality for lower income individuals, and inequality in life expectancy was growing.¹⁶⁸

64. JS1 noted reports that from 2013-2016, medical problems and expenditures contributed to personal bankruptcies.¹⁶⁹ JS37 stated that health issues increased the risk of homelessness and that individuals experiencing homelessness lacked access to quality health care.¹⁷⁰

65. JS1 stated that suicide was the 10th cause of mortality in 2017, rising every year from 2008 indicating that Native Americans and Alaska Natives had the highest rates and veterans took their lives at the rate of some 20 deaths per day.¹⁷¹

66. JS42 stated that about one in every 5 deaths in the USA was due to tobacco.¹⁷²

67. HRW reported on the deaths of tens of thousands of Americans of drug overdose in 2017 and stated that the USA's response to the crisis was increasingly punitive. In many states, criminal laws blocked expansion of proven public health interventions, such as syringe exchange programs and supervised consumption sites. Reduced access to Medicaid, threatened to put drug treatment out of reach for millions of Americans.¹⁷³

68. Several submissions noted the high and increasing¹⁷⁴ rates of maternal mortality; particularly among black women;¹⁷⁵ but also among indigenous women, low income women and women in poor rural areas.¹⁷⁶ PPFA indicated that, according to reports, maternal mortality was the sixth most common cause of death among women aged 25-34.¹⁷⁷ JS14 stated that the lack of systematically collected maternal mortality and morbidity data precluded comparisons across states and regions and undermined accountability for preventable maternal deaths.¹⁷⁸

69. AI was gravely concerned about the curtailment of sexual and reproductive rights, specifically, increasing efforts to criminalize pregnancy and abortion, and limiting access to reproductive health services.¹⁷⁹

70. Highlighting the Mexico City policy, several submissions were concerned about restrictions to foreign assistance related to abortion,¹⁸⁰ while two submissions welcomed such restrictions.¹⁸¹

71. HRW highlighted the adoption of a rule in 2019 to ban organizations providing abortion services from receiving federal family planning money, known as Title X, and to eliminate a requirement that doctors give neutral and factual information to pregnant women.¹⁸²

72. SRI stated that religious freedom had become an "opt out" strategy used to deny services related to health care, abortion and contraception,¹⁸³ and that many such efforts

promoted discrimination against often already-marginalized groups.¹⁸⁴ JS14 stated that an array of federal and state laws permitted individual and institutional health care providers to opt out of providing critical health services, including abortion (46 states) and contraception (12 states).¹⁸⁵ Two submissions welcomed action taken by the USA to support persons voicing religious or moral objections to abortion.¹⁸⁶

73. JS14 stated that a number of state legislatures were enacting increasingly extreme abortion bans, noting that these state laws were the subject of ongoing litigation.¹⁸⁷ Several stakeholders indicated that some of these bans made no exceptions for rape or for ectopic pregnancies,¹⁸⁸ and that many women seeking an abortion must now travel as abortion services were not available.¹⁸⁹

74. UFI was concerned about third party reproduction including surrogacy.¹⁹⁰

75. interACT reported that children with intersex traits had been, and continued to be, subjected to unnecessary medical interventions without their consent.¹⁹¹

*Right to education*¹⁹²

76. USHRN-SEWG stated that in the public education system, school funding was based primarily on local taxes, creating a system where wealthier neighbourhoods had wealthier schools.¹⁹³ Low-income, often immigrant, primarily communities of colour did not have the same access to the same standard of education as wealthier communities.¹⁹⁴

77. JS50 recommended that the USA fully implement UPR recommendation in paragraph 176.319,¹⁹⁵ by enhancing the quality of education in low income areas.¹⁹⁶

78. It was also recommended that the USA take steps to implement human rights education;¹⁹⁷ and ensure that education in human rights and international humanitarian law is provided in public schools, colleges and universities.¹⁹⁸

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

*Women*¹⁹⁹

79. UNA-USA stated that the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) had lapsed in February 2019 and was yet to be renewed by Congress.²⁰⁰ Several organizations recommended that the Senate ratify the reauthorization of the VAWA.²⁰¹

80. JS12 stated that sexual violence against women and girls remained a prevalent issue, and that young girls were at the highest risk.²⁰² JS24 indicated that women of African-descent faced higher instances of domestic violence;²⁰³ and JS12 stated that LGBTI people and women of colour had less access to support services.²⁰⁴ JS49 stated that low-paid migrant women workers risked deportation if they reported gender-based violence (GBV).²⁰⁵ JS34 stated that women and girls with disabilities were more likely to experience abuse over a longer period of time.²⁰⁶

81. AI stated that indigenous women suffered disproportionately high levels of rape and sexual violence.²⁰⁷ CS noted that indigenous women were murdered at much higher rates; that many were reported missing, and that many serious crimes committed on Tribal lands fell under a mishmash of federal, state and Tribal jurisdictions, and were difficult to prosecute.²⁰⁸ TTI³ alliance recommended fully funding the investigation of Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and setting up a special commission within the FBI to coordinate efforts with state, local, and tribal law enforcement.²⁰⁹

82. JS49 indicated that that workplace harassment remained a persistent and under-reported problem; and that women experienced various forms of sexual misconduct in hostile working environments.²¹⁰

83. JS12 stated that women still faced a significant gender wage gap.²¹¹ JS50 observed that progress to close the gender pay gap was extremely slow and that for women of colour the rate of change was slower.²¹²

*Children*²¹³

84. GIEACPC noted that the prohibition of corporal punishment of children had not been achieved in the home, and in some alternative care settings, day care, schools and penal institutions.²¹⁴

85. CFYJ stated that all 50 states allowed children to be transferred to adult courts in some manner resulting in tens of thousands children being tried as adults each year.²¹⁵ HRW indicated that over one thousand people were serving sentences of life without parole for crimes they were found to have committed while under 18²¹⁶ and recommended that the USA commit to ending the trial of children as adults and ending life-without-parole sentences for crimes committed as children.²¹⁷

86. JS12 recommended passing a federal law banning child marriage.²¹⁸

Persons with disabilities

87. JS34 stated that women, girls, and non-binary persons with disabilities faced challenges in accessing quality health information and services, often created by discrimination and stereotypes.²¹⁹ JS34 recommended enforcing the Americans with Disabilities Act's requirement of non-discrimination and reasonable accommodation concerning health facilities and services.²²⁰

*Indigenous peoples*²²¹

88. Guale-Nation invited the USA to implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), as pledged in the 2nd UPR cycle.²²² Two organizations recommended incorporating UNDRIP into domestic policies and laws.²²³

89. CS stated that the Non-recognized Tribes faced an expensive and daunting process to submit applications for acknowledgement, noting that federal services reserved for Native Americans and Alaska Natives were contingent on securing federal recognition.²²⁴

90. JS21 stated that the USA had not taken concrete measures to protect sacred places for the Navajo people from business developments.²²⁵ HIHR made similar observations regarding the Kanaka Maoli of Hawai'i.²²⁶

91. CS referred to increasingly difficult battles for land and protection of natural resources,²²⁷ illustrating increasing federal disregard for indigenous sovereignty in favour of business and competitive interests.²²⁸ JS53 reported on the pollution and extermination of fragile eco-systems that indigenous peoples depended on for their livelihood,²²⁹ resulting in forced displacement of people.²³⁰ CS recommended that the USA ensure indigenous participation in decision-making in all matters affecting them.²³¹

92. Two submissions referred to the denial of the right to self-determination of the Hawaiian people.²³² JS57 asserted the right of Alaska and Hawaii to claim self-determination and self-governance.²³³

*Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers*²³⁴

93. UNA-SNY stated that beginning in 2017, the USA had issued several executive orders or taken other actions designed to restrict immigration.²³⁵ JS28 indicated that the government had issued a series of executive orders and proclamations, including some which became known as "Muslim travel bans", that undermined refugee protection.²³⁶ AI stated that resettlement of refugees to the USA had plummeted.²³⁷

94. JS56 stated that as of May 2018, the USA had pursued a policy of "zero tolerance" toward migrants attempting to cross the border at places other than ports of entry. Under the policy, all adults entering without inspection at the border would face criminal prosecution.²³⁸ HBI indicated that since immigrant children could not be detained with their parents in adult prisons, they were detained separately.²³⁹ JS3 stated that this policy made no exceptions for asylum seekers.²⁴⁰

95. JS28 indicated that on 20 June 2018, an Executive Order was issued ending the separation of immigrant children from their parents. However, the order failed to reunite all

children with their parents.²⁴¹ JS56 indicated that on 26 June 2018, a District Court granted a preliminary injunction to end, at least temporarily, the practice of family separation.²⁴²

96. JS3 highlighted the adoption of the “Migrant Protection Protocols” (MPP) forcibly sending asylum seekers to a neighbouring country pending their immigration hearings.²⁴³ JS56 stated that as a result of MPPs, vulnerable individuals were often forced to live in unstable camps or on the streets in a neighbouring country while awaiting the eventual adjudication of their asylum claims in the USA.²⁴⁴

97. Several submissions highlighted a decision announced in June 2018 that curtailed claims of domestic and gang violence as relevant factors in asylum cases.²⁴⁵

98. MWAN was concerned with changes in the procedure of the medical “deferred action” policy which permitted immigrants with medical needs or their relatives to avoid deportation while they were undergoing treatment.²⁴⁶

99. SBCC referred to reports of excessive use of force by border officials.²⁴⁷ JS19 stated that there were reports of repeated collaboration between Customs and Border Protection personnel and armed militias.²⁴⁸

100. JS28 indicated that since the previous review, the USA had continued to require mandatory detention of certain categories of immigrants without adequate due process or legal representation.²⁴⁹ AI stated that the authorities had increasingly imposed arbitrary and indefinite detention of asylum-seekers,²⁵⁰ and that some asylum seekers had been detained for periods lasting up to several years.²⁵¹

101. Several submissions noted reports of inhumane conditions of detention of migrants including severe overcrowding, exposure to extreme temperatures, and lack of adequate access to food, water, medical care, and hygiene products.²⁵² JS28 stated that sexual assault and abuse of migrants in detention was a serious concern.²⁵³ JS9 noted reports that GBV in immigration detention facilities was common.²⁵⁴ JS63 highlighted the limited access to reproductive health services for women in immigration detention.²⁵⁵

102. UNA-SNY stated that conditions of confinement of children were reported to vary greatly, from limited to deplorable, with review by outsiders highly circumscribed.²⁵⁶ PHR indicated that the deaths of several children highlighted the deficient care provided.²⁵⁷ JS22 stated that children experienced additional trauma due to the harmful and inhumane conditions of detention.²⁵⁸

103. It was recommended that the USA: seek alternatives to the present immigration detention system and improve conditions of confinement to meet basic human rights standards;²⁵⁹ end the use of immigration detention for children, unaccompanied and with families; and halt family separations, except following a determination of the best interests of the child.²⁶⁰

Stateless persons

104. JS45 indicated that U.S. law offered no definition of statelessness, nor a procedure for identifying stateless persons.²⁶¹ Certain loopholes increased the risk of statelessness regarding children born to surrogate parents outside of the USA.²⁶²

5. Specific regions or territories

105. UNPO noted the disenfranchisement of the people of the five, permanently-inhabited, “unincorporated” U.S. territories (Puerto Rico, Guam, U.S. Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands).²⁶³ JS27 was concerned about the effect of the non-self-governing status of the U.S Virgin Islands on the exercise by the population of their right to self-determination.²⁶⁴

106. AHRC highlighted that the support provided in response to Hurricane Maria in Puerto Rico, had been much less than that provided for another similar event.²⁶⁵

107. OSCE/ODIHR recommended that citizens residing in U.S. overseas territories be provided with full representation rights in Congress and indicated additionally that the right to vote in presidential elections should be extended to them.²⁶⁶

Notes

- ¹ The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org.

*Civil society**Individual submissions:*

AccessNow	AccessNow, New York (United States of America);
ACLU	American Civil Liberties Union, New York (United States of America);
ADHRB	Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
AFSC	American Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia (United States of America);
AHRC	Atlantic Human Rights Centre, Fredericton (Canada);
AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
AISSA	Association of Iranian Short Statured Adults, Tehran (Islamic Republic of Iran);
AmProg	Center for American Progress, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
ASHNYM	At-sik:hata :Nation of :Yamasee-Moors, New York (United States of America);
BRADY	Brady Center to Prevent Gun Violence, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
CCR	Center for Constitutional Rights, New York (United States of America);
CEIN	Creative Educators International Network Inc., Washington D.C. (United States of America);
C-FAM	Center for Family and Human Rights, New York (United States of America);
CFYJ	Campaign for Youth Justice, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
CGJC	Cornell Gender Justice Clinic, Ithaca (United States of America);
CLS IRC	Columbia Law School Immigrants' Rights Clinic, New York (United States of America);
CNWN	Network of Women's Non-governmental Organizations in the Islamic Republic of Iran, Tehran (Islamic Republic of Iran);
CS	Cultural Survival, Cambridge (United States of America);
CVT	The Center for Victims of Torture, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
DHF	The Dui Hua Foundation, San Francisco (United States of America);
DRAD	Defending Rights & Dissent, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
ECLJ	European Centre for Law and Justice, Strasbourg (France);
EPIC	Electronic Privacy Information Center, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
FFF	Four Freedoms Forum, Kaneohe (United States of America);
FHA Iran	Family Health Association of Iran, Tehran (Islamic Republic of Iran);
FLD	Front Line Defenders - The International Foundation for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders, Blackrock (Ireland);
GICJ	Geneva International Centre for Justice, Vernier (Switzerland);
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
GJC	Global Justice Center, New York (United States of America);
GLC	Giffords Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence, San Francisco (United States of America);
Guale-Nation	Guale Nation, Savannah (United States of America);
Haas Institute	Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society, Berkeley

	(United States of America);
HBI	Hope Border Institute, El Paso (United States of America);
HGCR	Harlan Group for Civil Rights Inc., Halto Rey (Puerto Rico);
HIHR	Hawai'i Institute for Human Rights, Honolulu (United States of America);
HRE USA	Human Rights Educators USA, Ithaca (United States of America);
HRW	Human Rights Watch, Geneva (Switzerland);
HRC	Human Rights Campaign, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
IAPD	The International Alliance for Peace and Development, Geneva (Switzerland);
ICAN	International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Geneva (Switzerland);
IFLA	International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, Den Haag (The Netherlands);
ILIA	Ertegha Keyfiat Zendegi Iranian Charitable Institute, Tehran (Islamic Republic of Iran);
interACT	interACT: Advocates for Intersex Youth, Sudbury (United States of America);
JAI	Just Atonement Inc., New York (United States of America);
Justice-Strategies	Justice Strategies, Toronto (Canada);
LSFA	Lovers of Successful Families Association, Theran (Islamic Republic of Iran);
MCCR	Minneapolis Commission on Civil Rights, Minneapolis (United States of America);
MCLI	Meiklejohn Civil Liberties Institute, Berkeley (United States of America);
MGEC	Maryam Ghasemi Educational Charity Institute, Theran (Islamic Republic of Iran);
MSAUIP	Medical Support Association for Underprivileged Iranian Patients, Theran (Islamic Republic of Iran);
MWAN	Medical Whistleblower Advocacy Network, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
NRPTT	Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational Transparty, Rome (Italy);
ODVV	Organization for Defending Victim of Violence, Tehran (Islamic Republic of Iran);
PC(USA)	Presbyterian Church (USA), New York (United States of America);
PHR	Physicians for Human Rights, New York (United States of America);
PPFA	Planned Parenthood Federation of America, New York (United States of America);
Priests for Life	Priests for Life, Cocoa (United States of America);
SBCC	Southern Border Communities Coalition, San Diego (United States of America);
SCU-IHRC	Santa Clara University - International Human Rights Clinic, Santa Clara (United States of America);
SIPC	Southeast Indigenous Peoples' Center, Eatonton (United States of America);
SRI	The Sexual Rights Initiative, Ottawa (Canada);
Students for D.C. Statehood	Students for D.C. Statehood, Washington D.C. (United States of America);
The Harvest	The Harvest, Tempe (United States of America);
TKF	The Koani Foundation, Lihue (United States of America);
TTI ³ alliance	TTI ³ alliance, Seattle (United States of America);
UCCHRE	University and College Consortium for Human Rights Education, New York (United States of America);
UNA UH-Manoa	United Nations Association, University of Hawaii - Manoa, Honolulu (United States of America);
UNA-SNY	United Nations Association - Southern New York State Division, Ossining (United States of America);
UNA-USA	United Nations Association of the United States of America,

UNPO	Washington D.C. (United States of America); Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization, The Hague (The Netherlands);
USHRN-SEWG	U.S. Human Rights Network Students & Education Working Group, San Diego (United States of America);
UST Profile Center	University of St. Thomas ProLife Center, Saint Paul (United States of America).
<i>Joint submissions:</i>	
JS1	Joint submission 1 submitted by: National Lawyers Guild; International Association of Democratic Lawyers; People's Action Institute; Rights and Democracy Institute; New York (United States of America);
JS2	Joint submission 2 submitted by: Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain; European Centre for Democracy and Human Rights; Washington D.C. (United States of America);
JS3	Joint submission 3 submitted by: MADRE; Human Rights and Gender Justice Clinic; Center for Gender & Refugee Studies; Florence Immigrant and Refugee Rights Project; New York (United States of America);
JS4	Joint submission 4 submitted by: The Center for Rural Enterprise and Environmental Justice; The Columbia Law School Human Rights Institute; The Program on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in the Institute for the Study of Human Rights at Columbia University; New York (United States of America);
JS5	Joint submission 5 submitted by: Columbia Law School Human Rights Institute; The International Association of Official Human Rights Agencies; New York (United States of America);
JS6	Joint submission 6 submitted by: New York Campaign for Alternatives to Isolated Confinement / #HALTsolitary Campaign; Citizen Action of New York; NAMI NYS Criminal Justice; NAMI Huntington; New Hour for Women and Children; T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights; VOCAL-NY; New York (United States of America);
JS7	Joint submission 7 submitted by: The United Nations Association-New York; The United Nations Association- Greater Detroit; The United Nations Association of the United States of America; New York (United States of America);
JS8	Joint submission 8 submitted by: The United Nations Association-Saint Louis Chapter; The United Nations Association-Southern New York State Division; Saint Louis (United States of America);
JS9	Joint submission 9 submitted by: Indigenous Alliance Without Borders/ Alianza Indígena Sin Fronteras; International Mayan League; Tucson (United States of America);
JS10	Joint submission 10 submitted by: International Human Rights Clinic of Seattle University School of Law; Global Rights Advocacy; Seattle (United States of America);
JS11	Joint submission 11 submitted by: National Lawyers Guild; International Association of Democratic Lawyers; New York (United States of America);
JS12	Joint submission 12 submitted by: The United Nations Association-Southern California Division; The United Nations Association-Greater Chicago Chapter; The United Nations Association-Greater Detroit Chapter; The United Nations Association-Kentucky Division; The United Nations Association-Whittier Chapter; The United Nations Association of the United States of America; Santa Monica (United States of America);
JS13	Joint submission 13 submitted by: The United Nations Association —Westchester Chapter; The United Nations

- Association — Southern New York State Division; Hastings (United States of America);
- JS14 **Joint submission 14 submitted by:** The Center for Reproductive Rights; Abortion Care Network; Amnesty International; Black Mamas Matter Alliance; The City University of New York Law School, Human Rights and Gender Justice Clinic; National Advocates for Pregnant Women; If/When/How: Lawyering for Reproductive Justice, National Asian Pacific American Women’s Forum, SisterSong, Women of Color Reproductive Justice Collective, Women Enabled International; Geneva (Switzerland);
- JS15 **Joint submission 15 submitted by:** Birmingham City University, Pace University; Birmingham (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
- JS16 **Joint submission 16 submitted by:** Edmund Rice International, Augustinians International; Dominican Leadership Conference; Tri-State Coalition for responsible investment; Religious of the sacred heart of Mary; International Presentation Association; Congregation of Notre Dame; Vivat International; Loretto Community; Maryknoll; The Congregation of our lady charity of the good; Geneva (Switzerland).
- JS17 **Joint submission 17 submitted by:** The United Nations Associations-University of Hawai’i Manoa Chapter, The United Nations Associations Southern New York State Division; Honolulu (United States of America);
- JS18 **Joint submission 18 submitted by:** Blacks in Law Enforcement of America; The United Nations Association — Southern New York State Division; White Plains (United States of America);
- JS19 **Joint submission 19 submitted by:** University of Dayton Human Rights Center; Border Network for Human Rights; Dayton (United States of America);
- JS20 **Joint submission 20 submitted by:** International Law Association, American Branch, Subcommittee on U.S. Compliance with International Human Rights Law; International Human Rights Law Institute, DePaul University College of Law; Just Planet; Human Rights Research League; Phoenix (United States of America);
- JS21 **Joint submission 21 submitted by:** Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission; Diné Hataalii Association Inc.; Saint Michaels (United States of America);
- JS22 **Joint submission 22 submitted by:** Lawyer Moms of America; Project Amplify; Woodinville (United States of America);
- JS23 **Joint submission 23 submitted by:** US Human Rights Network with the contribution of 78 organisations and stakeholders; Atlanta (United States of America);
- JS24 **Joint submission 24 submitted by:** World Council of Churches Commission of the Churches on International Affairs; National Council of Churches of the Christ USA; Geneva (Switzerland);
- JS25 **Joint submission 25 submitted by:** Friends of the African Union; New Future Foundation; The African Diaspora Directorate, Friends of African Union EDcorp; Friends of Africans Union PBFS, Congress of Black Native Americans; Infinity Building Economics/Black Political Action Committee; Friends of African Union smartWISE; Black Methodist for Church Renewal Chapter of Keys of the Kingdom; United Methodist Church; Congress of Black Native Americans; Infinity Building Economics/Black Political Action Committee; Friends of Africans Union Mighty Forefront; Friends of Africans Union Ghana; Sons and Daughters of Africa; Friends of African Union Zimbabwe; Friends of African Union Ethiopia; The Universal Negro Improvement Association

- and African Communities League; The Town of Forth Coffee; CASH Community Development; Cincinnati (United States of America);
- JS26 **Joint submission 26 submitted by:** Puente Human Rights Movement; Coalición de Derechos Humanos; Poder in Action; South Texas Human Rights Center; The Border Network for Human Rights; The Rio Grande Valley-Equal Voice Network; The University of Dayton Human Rights Center; Trans Queer Pueblo; Phoenix (United States of America);
- JS27 **Joint submission 27 submitted by:** Virgin Islands Youth Advocacy Coalition Inc.; Virgin Islands Rastafari Sacramental Cannabis Council Inc.; Christiansted (United States Virgin Islands);
- JS28 **Joint submission 28 submitted by:** The Advocates for Human Rights; Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Immigrant Law Center of Minnesota; ISAIAH; Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition; Northwest Immigrant Rights Project; Minneapolis (United States of America);
- JS29 **Joint submission 29 submitted by:** National Advocates for Pregnant Women; If/When/How: Lawyering for Reproductive Justice; Movement for Family Power; All-Options; Amnesty International; Birth Rights Bar Association; Black Mamas Matter Alliance; Center for Reproductive Rights; Human Rights and Gender Justice Clinic, City University of New York Law School; Human Rights Watch; National Network of Abortion Funds; Rise; SisterReach; Women and Harm Reduction International Network; Women's Rights and Empowerment Network; The Yellowhammer Fund; New York (United States of America);
- JS30 **Joint submission 30 submitted by:** The Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute at Washington University School of Law; The Institute for Public Health of Washington University in St. Louis; Saint Louis (United States of America);
- JS31 **Joint submission 31 submitted by:** Pittsburgh Human Rights City Alliance; Casa san Jose; Hill District Consensus Group; Just Harvest; Pittsburgh for CEDAW; Pittsburghers for Public Transit; Pittsburgh (United States of America);
- JS32 **Joint submission 32 submitted by:** Justice for Muslims Collective; Muslim Justice League; Washington D.D. (United States of America)
- JS33 **Joint submission 33 submitted by:** The DC Human Rights City Alliance; The United Nations Association of the National Capital Area; George Washington University Law School International Human Rights Clinic; Washington D.C. (United States of America);
- JS34 **Joint submission 34 submitted by:** Women Enabled International; The Lurie Institute for Disability Policy at Brandeis University's Heller School; Washington D.C. (United States of America);
- JS35 **Joint submission 35 submitted by:** Gender Justice Project at the University of the District of Columbia David A. Clarke School of Law; United Nations Association of the National Capital Area; Washington D.C. (United States of America);
- JS36 **Joint submission 36 submitted by:** University of Arizona Indigenous Peoples Law and Policy Program, Water Protector Legal Collective; Tucson (United States of America);
- JS37 **Joint submission 37 submitted by:** Human Rights Clinic, University of Miami School of Law; Environmental Justice Clinic, University of Miami School of Law; The Alliance for GLBTQ Youth; Struggle for Miami's Affordable and Sustainable Housing; Miami Workers Center; National Economic & Social Rights Initiative; Coral Gables (United States of America);

- JS38 **Joint submission 38 submitted by:** Fédération Internationale de l'Action des Chrétiens pour l'Abolition de la Torture; ACAT USA; Paris (France);
- JS39 **Joint submission 39 submitted by:** International Transport Workers' Federation; International Association of Machinists and Aerospace workers; London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
- JS40 **Joint submission 40 submitted by:** The World Organisation against Torture; REDRESS; The International Commission of Jurists; Geneva (Switzerland);
- JS41 **Joint submission 41 submitted by:** The Gwich'in Steering Committee; Cultural Survival; Land is Life; First Peoples Worldwide; American Indian Law Clinic at the University of Colorado; Fairbanks (United States of America);
- JS42 **Joint submission 42 submitted by:** Action on Smoking & Health; The African American Tobacco Control Leadership Council; Corporate Accountability International; Austrian Council on Smoking and Health; Centro de Investigación para la Epidemia del Tabaquismo; Cigarette Butt Pollution Project; Comité National Contre le Tabagisme; European Network for Smoking and Tobacco Prevention; International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease; Jeewaka Foundation; New Vois Association of the Phils Inc.; Public Health Advocacy Institute; Southeast Asia Tobacco Control Alliance; Tanzania Tobacco Control Forum; UBINIG- Policy Research for Development Alternatives; Washington D.C. (United States of America);
- JS43 **Joint submission 43 submitted by:** Red Venezolana de Derechos Humanos; Sures; Genero con Clase; Embajada de Derechos Humanos; Red Ciega; Fundación por el Derecho a la Vivienda; Rompiendo la Norma; Base Lésbica Venezuela; Intersaber; Asociación Venezolana de Juristas; Fundación de Víctimas del Sicariato Campesino; Participación Activa y Social, por los Derechos de la Mujer y la Paz; La Araña Feminista; Caracas (Venezuela);
- JS44 **Joint submission 44 submitted by:** Best Practices Policy Project; Outlaw Project; Black Sex Workers Collective; New Jersey Red Umbrella Alliance; Desiree Alliance; Morristown (United States of America);
- JS45 **Joint submission 45 submitted by:** Institute on Statelessness and Inclusion; United Stateless; Americas Network on Nationality and Statelessness; Eindhoven (The Netherlands);
- JS46 **Joint submission 46 submitted by:** U.S. Human Rights Cities Alliance; US Human Rights Network; All Aboard for Justice; Creative Educators International Network; DC Human Rights City Alliance; Malcolm X Grassroots Movement; Medical Whistleblower Advocacy Network; Pittsburgh Human Rights City Alliance; Protect the Protest Task Force; Ubuntu Institute for Community Development; Turn South; Westside Justice; Pittsburgh (United States of America);
- JS47 **Joint submission 47 submitted by:** Human Rights Clinic, University of Miami School of Law; Why Hunger; FIAN International; Food Studies Program at Syracuse University; Center for Hunger-Free Communities; Coral Gables (United States of America);
- JS48 **Joint submission 48 submitted by:** University of Miami School of Law Human Rights Clinic; Rural Women's Health Project; Florida Legal Services; Florida Council Against Sexual Violence; Coral Gables (United States of America);
- JS49 **Joint submission 49 submitted by:** University of Miami School of Law Human Rights Clinic; Miami Workers Center; WeCount!; Community Justice Project; National Domestic Workers Alliance; Coral Gables (United States of America);

- JS50 **Joint submission 50 submitted by:** Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice; International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education, and Development; Veyrier (Switzerland);
- JS51 **Joint submission 51 submitted by:** Centro de Trabajadores Unidos en la Lucha; The Advocates for Human Rights; Minneapolis (United States of America);
- JS52 **Joint submission 52 submitted by:** Center for Global Nonkilling; Conscience and Peace Tax International; Geneva (Switzerland);
- JS53 **Joint submission 53 submitted by:** Pocasset Pokanoket Land Trust; The Land and Water Sovereignty Campaign Project; Pocasset Wampanoag Tribe of the Pokanoket Nation; Indigenous People's Network; Auburn (United States of America);
- JS54 **Joint submission 54 submitted by:** Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom United States of America; Geneva (Switzerland);
- JS55 **Joint submission 55 submitted by:** The Advocates for Human Rights; World Coalition Against the Death Penalty; Minneapolis (United States of America);
- JS56 **Joint submission 56 submitted by:** International Law Association, American Branch, Task Force on Immigrant Human Rights and Women's Rights; The International Refugee Assistance Project; The National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers Guild; The Interdisciplinary Human Rights Initiative of the College of Arts and Letters at San Diego State University; The Leitner Center for International Law and Justice at Fordham Law School; Iowa City (United States of America);
- JS57 **Joint submission 57 submitted by:** Indigenous Peoples and Nations Coalition; The Koani Foundation; Geneva (Switzerland);
- JS58 **Joint submission 58 submitted by:** National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty; Global Initiative for Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights; Human Rights Clinic, University of Miami School of Law; Washington D.C. (United States of America);
- JS59 **Joint submission 59 submitted by:** The Center for Victims of Torture; Physicians for Human Rights; Washington D.C. (United States of America);
- JS60 **Joint submission 60 submitted by:** International Human Rights Center of Loyola Law School, Los Angeles; Federazione Italiana Diritti Umani; Los Angeles (United States of America);
- JS61 **Joint submission 61 submitted by:** United Nations Association of the United States of America; March for Our Lives; Washington D.C. (United States of America);
- JS62 **Joint submission 62 submitted by:** Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy; Western States Legal Foundation; Swiss Lawyers for Nuclear Disarmament; New York (United States of America);
- JS63 **Joint submission 63 submitted by:** Mama JuN - Mother's Justice Network; Women LEAD Network; Canby (United States of America);
- JS64 **Joint submission 64 submitted by:** Friends of the African Union; Vision Works Inc.; Cincinnati (United States of America);
- JS65 **Joint submission 65 submitted by:** Angry Tias and Abuelas, Refugio Del Rio Grande; Proyecto Libertad; Greenstein and Kolker Law Firm; Law Office of Virginia Raymond; Law Office of Thelma Garcia; Weslaco (United States of America).

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):

IACHR-OAS

Inter-American Commission on Human Rights-Organization of

OSCE/ODIHR American States, Washington D.C. (United States of America); Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Warsaw (Poland).

²The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

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

³ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.1-176.72, 176.105-176.106, 176-109-176.112, and 176.342.

⁴ HRW, para. 4, referring to A/HRC/30/12, paras 176.17 (Mauritius), 176.21 (Kazakhstan), 176.23 (Bulgaria), 176.24 (India), 176.25 (Indonesia), 176.27 (Romania), 176.31 (Botswana), 176.32 (Iceland), 176.34 (Democratic Republic of the Congo), 176.35 (New Zealand), 176.38 (North Macedonia), 176.39 (Czech Republic), 176.40 (Turkey, Iraq, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, France, Canada, China, Trinidad and Tobago, Japan), 176.41 (Lebanon), 176.42 (Latvia), 176.47 (Mali), 176.48 (Sweden, Timor-Leste, Algeria, Maldives, France, Portugal, Slovenia, China, Japan, Canada), 176.49 (Estonia), 176.50 (Libya), 176.56 (Islamic Republic of Iran), 176.58 (Guatemala, Canada, Bosnia Herzegovina, China), 176.60 (Philippines), 176.61 (Sudan), 176.46 (Austria); 176.62 (Trinidad and Tobago), and 176.55 (Burkina Faso).

⁵ HRW, para. 4. See also AI, p. 1 and IAPD, p. 2.

⁶ CS, p. 6, para. 17, FFF, p. 3, HRW, para.6, JAI, p. 7, JS29, para. 54, JS39, para. 20, JS47, p. 12, JS49, p. 13, para. 13, and UCCHRE, p. 8.

⁷ CS, p. 6, para. 17, HRW, para. 6, IAPD, p. 7, JS3, p. 12, para. 8, JS7, para. G3, JS12, para. F5, JS16, p. 9, JS24, p. 4, JS29, para. 54, JS34, para. 45, JS45, para. 36, JS47, p. 12, JS49, p. 13, para. 13, JS63, p. 7, SRI, para. 33, UCCHRE, p. 8, and UNA-USA, para. D5. See also JS35, para. E1.

⁸ CFYJ, para. 21, CS, p. 6, para. 17, FFF, p. 2, HBI, para. 21, HRW, para. 6, JS3, p. 12, para. 8, JS7, para. G3, JS12, para. F5, JS16, p. 9, JS45, para. 36, JS47, p. 12, SRI, para. 33, and UCCHRE, p. 8.

⁹ IAPD, p. 7, JS3, p. 12, para. 8, JS45, para. 36, and UCCHRE, p. 8.

¹⁰ CS, p. 6, para. 17, HRW, para. 6, JS7, para. G3, JS12, para. F5, JS34, para. 45, JS45, para. 36, and UCCHRE, p. 8.

¹¹ CS, p. 6, para. 17, GICJ, para. 30, and HBI, para. 21.

¹² JS38, p. 2, JS52, p. 6, and GICJ, para. 30. See also HBI, para. 21.

¹³ CS, p. 6, para. 17, GICJ, para. 30, Guale-Nation, p. 6, and HBI, para. 21.

¹⁴ JS45, para. 36.

¹⁵ JS39, para. 20.

¹⁶ JS39, para. 20.

¹⁷ Guale-Nation, p. 5 and JS41, para. 44(d). See also JS53, p. 1.

¹⁸ GICJ, para. 30 and JS52, p. 7.

¹⁹ CCR, p. 7, GICJ, para. 30, HRW, para. 6, JAI, p. 7, and JS52, p. 7.

²⁰ JS62, para. 17.

- 21 CEIN, p. 1, ICAN, p. 1, JS52, p. 7, and JS54, p. 10.
- 22 JS52, p. 7 and JS54, p. 13.
- 23 AI, p. 1. See also AccessNow, para. 7, JS5, para. 23, JS23, para. 1, and SRI, para. 3.
- 24 SBCC, para. 2.2.
- 25 HRW, para. 3. See also, AI, p.1.
- 26 JS62, para.17. See also JS54, p. 10.
- 27 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.73–176.74, 176.75–176.90, and 176.107–176.108.
- 28 JS16, p. 9. See also JS24, p. 2, JS46, para. 57, and SIPC, p. 5.
- 29 JS5, para. 26.
- 30 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras.176.91-176.95,176.113, 176.118–176.126, 176.131–176.136, 176.149, 176.160–176.161, and 176.162–176.164.
- 31 JS5, para. 21. See also TTI³ alliance, para. 2.1.
- 32 JS53, p. 7 and PC (USA), p. 1. See also JS26, paras. 2-3.
- 33 JS20, paras. 4-5 and 16, JS26, paras. 2-3, JS53, p. 7, and PC (USA), p. 1.
- 34 CCR, p. 6. See also HRC paras. 1-2, JS44, para. 8, JS56, paras. 5-7, SRI, para. 12, and TTI³ alliance, paras. 1.1a, 2.1, 2.1f.
- 35 HRC, para. 20.
- 36 AI, p. 4. See also JS7, para. C3.
- 37 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, para. 176.101, 176.103–176.104, and 176.341–176.343.
- 38 JS54, para. 21. See also JS15, para. 32.
- 39 JAI, para. 32. See also Guale-Nation, p. 2 and JS17, para. C7.
- 40 JS16, para. 19.
- 41 JS53, para. 1.2. See also HIHR, p. 4.
- 42 Guale-Nation, p. 1.
- 43 JS54, p. 9. See also JS15, p. 13, JS16, p. 8, and JS17, para. D3.
- 44 AISSA, paras. 4-9, CNWN, paras. 2-7, FHA Iran, paras. 4-10, ILIA, paras. 7-13, JS43, paras. 4-23, LSFA, paras. 3-9, MGEC, paras. 6-12, MSAUIP, paras. 5-10, and ODVV, paras. 25-30.
- 45 CNWN, para. 4, FHA Iran, paras. 7-9, ILIA, paras. 9-10 and 13, JS43, paras. 10-17, LSFA, paras. 4-5 and 7, MGEC, paras. 9-10, MSAUIP, paras. 5-10, and ODVV, para. 25.
- 46 JS43, paras.18-9. See also ILIA, para. 13, LSFA, para. 5 referring to A/HRC/19/33, CNWN, para. 4 ODVV, para. 25.
- 47 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.210–176.212, 176.239–176.250, 176.282, 176.286, 176.282, 176.285 and 176.288.
- 48 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.240 (Libya), 176.242 (Maldives), 176.244 (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), 176.246 (Malaysia), and 176.249 (Spain).
- 49 CCR, p. 2, CVT, paras. 4-5, JS40, p. 3, and JS59, paras. 6-7. See also AI, p. 1.
- 50 IACHR-OAS, p. 4. See also JS59, para. 7.
- 51 CCR, p. 2.
- 52 AI, p. 2.
- 53 JS40, p. 3.
- 54 JS59, paras. 11-12.
- 55 CVT, para. 6.
- 56 AI, p. 2. See also CVT, paras. 7-13, JS40, pp. 2-3.
- 57 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.13, 176.139, 176.143-176.145,176.154–176.159, 176.165–176.202, 176.203–209, 176.210–176.212, 176.213-176.214, 176.215–176.228, 176.230–176.233, 176.286, and 176.287.
- 58 AI, p. 2.
- 59 GICJ, para. 5.
- 60 GICJ, paras. 22-28. See also JAI, paras. 7-10.
- 61 JS2, para. I.i. See also JS54, para. 27.
- 62 ADHRB, p. 2.
- 63 ACLU, p. 4. See also DHF para. 3, JS15, para. 16, and JS38, p. 1.
- 64 ACLU, p. 5, AI, p. 3, DHF, para. 5, JS55, para. 26, and JS60 para. 1.
- 65 ACLU, p. 5, AI, p. 3, JS55, para. 25, and JS60 para. 1.
- 66 AI, p. 3. See also JS15, paras. 17-18.
- 67 JS38. p. 1 and JS55, para. 65. See also AI, p. 3.
- 68 JS55, para. 65. See also AI, p. 3 and JS38. p. 1.
- 69 JS38 p. 2. See also ACLU, p. 7, AI, p. 5, JS55, para. 68, and PC (USA), p. 3.
- 70 See JS20, para. 28, referring to A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.139 (Peru), 176.143 (Plurinational State of Bolivia), 176.144 (Malaysia), 176.214 (Azerbaijan), 176.215 (Bulgaria), 176.216 (Canada), 176.219 (Thailand), 176.221 (Argentina), 176.222 (Australia), and 176.287 (Egypt).
- 71 HRW, para. 8. See also JS18, p. 4 and MCCR, para. 5.

- 72 AI, p. 3.
- 73 JS18, p. 4, para D2. See also AFSC, p. 3.
- 74 AI, p. 5.
- 75 MCCR, para. 28.
- 76 HRW, para. 11. See also JS24, p. 4.
- 77 JS20, para. 28, referring to A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.230 (Ecuador), 176.231 (Azerbaijan), 176.232 (Iceland) and 176.233 (Peru).
- 78 JS20, para. 28.
- 79 AmProg, p. 1. See also AI, p. 2, JS20, para. 17, IAPD, pp. 5-6.
- 80 JS20, para. 17. See also JS30, para. 48.
- 81 Gualle-Nation, p. 5. See also AI, p. 2, BRADY, para.10, and JS61, para. F1.
- 82 JS46, para. 29, AI, p. 2, BRADY, para.10 GLC, para. 13. See also JS20 para. 17.
- 83 JS30, para. 31.
- 84 JS30, para. 43. See also IACHR-OAS, p. 10 and JS20 para. 17.
- 85 BRADY, para. 12, JS30, para. 39, and JS46, para. 30.
- 86 JS30, para. 41.
- 87 BRADY, para. 11. See also JS20, para. 18.
- 88 AmProg, p. 4. See also JS30, para. 26.
- 89 BRADY, para. 9.
- 90 JS20, para. 27 and JS30, para. 27. See also GLC, paras. 21-22, and JS46, para. 33.
- 91 BRADY, para. 13, See also AmProg, pp. 3-4, GLC, para. 28, JS20, p. 7, JS30, para. 62, and JS61, p. 4.
- 92 JS20, p. 7. See also AmProg, pp. 2-3, BRADY, para. 13, GLC, para. 28, JS30, para. 62, and JS61, p. 4.
- 93 BRADY, para. 13. See also JS20, p. 7 and JS30, para. 62.
- 94 CGJC, para. 1 referring to A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.258 (Slovenia) and 176.289 (Denmark).
- 95 CGJC, para. 2.
- 96 CGJC, para. 2. See also JS23, para. 13.
- 97 AFSC, p. 3. See also JS6, para. 7, JS23, para. 11, JS28, paras. 40-42, and TTP³ alliance, para. 2.3b.
- 98 JS55, para. 41.
- 99 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.51, 176.127–176.130, 176.137, 176.139–176.153, 176.161, 176.234–176.236, 176.258, 176.274–176.277, 176.289, and 176.291–176.292.
- 100 HRW, para. 7.
- 101 AFSC, p. 2. See also ACLU, p. 1 and JAI, para. 3.
- 102 JS24, p. 2. See also JS18, p. 5, para. E2.
- 103 JAI, para. 24. See also ACLU, p. 1, HRW, para. 28, and JS54, para. 16.
- 104 ACLU, p. 2.
- 105 ACLU, p. 3.
- 106 HRW, para. 10. See also JS6, p. 11. JS8, p. 4, para. D1.
- 107 JS46, para. 21.
- 108 JS24, p. 3. See also JS29, para. 29.
- 109 JS24, p. 3. See also JS29, para.30.
- 110 JS31, para. 33. See also JS18, p. 4, para. D4.
- 111 Justice-Strategies, para. 1.
- 112 ACLU, p. 6. See also JS24, p. 2.
- 113 ACLU, p. 6. See also JS24, p.4.
- 114 JS8, p. 4, para. D3.
- 115 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.223 and 176.281.
- 116 DRAD, pp. 4-5.
- 117 DRAD, p. 5.
- 118 JS36, para. 20.
- 119 JS36, para. 21. See also CS, p. 3 and CCR, p. 5.
- 120 DRAD, p. 5. See also CCR, p. 4.
- 121 FLD, paras. 3 and 6. See also AI, p. 3, IACHR-OAS, pp. 4-5, JS10, p. 5, and AFSC, p. 4.
- 122 IACHR-OAS, page 3.
- 123 JS11, pp. 3-4.
- 124 JS11, pp. 4-5.
- 125 JS11, pp. 5-7. See also JAI, para. 20, JS13, para. E4, and JS24, p. 12.
- 126 AFSC, p. 3. See also JAI, para. 20, and JS13, para. E1.
- 127 JS33, paras. 1-23, NRPTT, paras. 1-14, Students for D.C. Statehood, paras. 1-14. See also UNPO, paras 3-4.
- 128 OSCE/ODIHR, para. 6.
- 129 OSCE/ODIHR, para. 10. See also OSCE/ODIHR, para. 6.

- ¹³⁰ OSCE/ODIHR, paras. 6 and 10.
- ¹³¹ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.262–176.264, 176.268–176.273, and 176.328.
- ¹³² JS51, p. 2.
- ¹³³ JS18, para. F2.
- ¹³⁴ JS12, para. D6.
- ¹³⁵ JS51, p. 9, para. 41.
- ¹³⁶ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.293–176.307.
- ¹³⁷ EPIC, para. 6.
- ¹³⁸ JS32, p. 1. See also AFSC, p. 6.
- ¹³⁹ EPIC, para. 1.
- ¹⁴⁰ AccessNow, para. 22. See also HRW, para. 18.
- ¹⁴¹ JS45, para. 19.
- ¹⁴² For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.112, 176.114–176.117, 176.138, 176.261–176.264, and 176.332–176.333.
- ¹⁴³ JS51, p. 5, para. 16.
- ¹⁴⁴ JS51, p. 6, para. 24.
- ¹⁴⁵ JS51, p. 8, para. 35.
- ¹⁴⁶ JS49, para. 3.
- ¹⁴⁷ JS23, para. 30. See also *The Harvest*, p.1.
- ¹⁴⁸ JS51, p. 9, para. 41.
- ¹⁴⁹ JS54, para. 17.
- ¹⁵⁰ JS28, para. 43 and JS10, p. 3.
- ¹⁵¹ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras.176.309–176.312.
- ¹⁵² JS47, p. 7. See also JS25, para. 10 and JS64, para. 10.
- ¹⁵³ HRC, para. 32.
- ¹⁵⁴ JS53, p. 7, para. 2.1.
- ¹⁵⁵ JS58, para. 3. See also JS23, para. 35.
- ¹⁵⁶ JS23, para. 35, JS58, para. 3.
- ¹⁵⁷ JS23, para. 35, JS58, para 21, and MCLI, para. 10. See also JS37, p. 2 and JS54, para. 7.
- ¹⁵⁸ JS24, p. 9.
- ¹⁵⁹ JS53, pp. 7-8, para. 2.2.
- ¹⁶⁰ AFSC, p. 2.
- ¹⁶¹ JS58, p. 14.
- ¹⁶² JS4, para. 1.
- ¹⁶³ JS4, para. 11.
- ¹⁶⁴ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176. 97–176.100, 176.308, 176.313–176.318, 176.335–176.337.
- ¹⁶⁵ HRW, para. 23 referring to A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.313 (South Africa) and 176.317 (Serbia).
- ¹⁶⁶ HRW, para. 23. See also JS24, p. 7 and TTI³ alliance, para. 2.4.
- ¹⁶⁷ JS1, para. 5. See also JS24, p. 7.
- ¹⁶⁸ JS1, para. 8.
- ¹⁶⁹ JS1, para. 19.
- ¹⁷⁰ JS37, paras. 15 and 17.
- ¹⁷¹ JS1, para. 12.
- ¹⁷² JS42, para. 1.
- ¹⁷³ HRW, para. 26. See also JS1, para. 12.
- ¹⁷⁴ JS12, para. F3 and JS14, para. 36. See also AI, p. 4 and JS24, p. 4.
- ¹⁷⁵ JS14, para. 36, JS12, paras. F3-F4, and PPFA, para. 17. See also JS7, para. F5, JS35, para. C3, and UNA-USA, para. D4.
- ¹⁷⁶ JS14, para. 36.
- ¹⁷⁷ PPFA, para. 17.
- ¹⁷⁸ JS14, para. 38.
- ¹⁷⁹ AI, p. 4. See also JS29, para. 47 and JS23, para. 9.
- ¹⁸⁰ GJC, paras. 1-29, JS14, paras. 47-52, JS56, para. 8, PPFA, paras. 6-13 and 20-26, SCU-IHRC, paras.17-19, and SRI, paras. 18-21.
- ¹⁸¹ C-FAM, paras. 15-17 and Priests for Life, paras. 7-8.
- ¹⁸² HRW, para.20. See also PPFA, paras.14-19.
- ¹⁸³ SRI, para. 24.
- ¹⁸⁴ SRI, para. 27. See also HRW, para. 24.
- ¹⁸⁵ JS14, para. 21. See also HRW, para. 20 and JS14, para. 23.
- ¹⁸⁶ ECLJ, paras. 6 and 9-16, and UST Profile Center, pp. 1-6.
- ¹⁸⁷ JS14, para. 7.
- ¹⁸⁸ JS56, para. 10. See also SCU-IHRC, para. 30.

- 189 AHRC, p. 5 and JS14, para. 30.
190 UFI, paras. 1-40.
191 interACT, para. 3.
192 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.309, 176.319, and 176.320.
193 USHRN-SEWG, p. 2. See also JS50, para. 7.
194 USHRN-SEWG, p. 4. See also IFLA, paras. 10-11.
195 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, para. 176.319 (Armenia).
196 JS50 para. 10(a).
197 UCCHRE, p. 8.
198 HRE-USA, para. 6.1. See also MCCR, para. 28.
199 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.114–176.117, 176.125, 176.228, and 176.255–176.257.
200 UNA-USA, para. D3. See also JS34, para. 9.
201 JS16, p. 9, JS7, para. G3, and CS, p. 5/para. VI (5). See also JS12, para. F5.
202 JS12, para. E2. See also JS50, para. 23.
203 JS24, p. 4. See also JS12, para. E3.
204 JS12, para. E3.
205 JS49, para. 9. See also JS48, p. 1.
206 JS34, para. 25.
207 AI, p. 4. See also JS50, para. 24.
208 CS, p. 5, para. e.
209 TTI³ alliance, para. 2.1d. See also AI, p. 5.
210 JS49, para. 1. See also JS47, pp. 9-10.
211 JS12, p. 7, para. F3. See also UNA UH-Manoa, para. F4.
212 JS50 para. 20.
213 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.265 and 176.291-176.292.
214 GIEACPC, p 2.
215 CFYJ, para. 15. See also HRW, para. 29.
216 HRW, para. 29. See also ACLU, p. 2.
217 HRW, para. 31.
218 JS12, para. D7.
219 JS34, para. 11.
220 JS34, p. 12.
221 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.311,176.321-176.327.
222 Gualé-Nation, p. 1. See also SIPC, p. 4.
223 CS, p. 5, para. VI (1) and JS41, para. 44(c). See also ASHNYM, para. 6 and HIHR, p. 3.
224 CS, p. 1, para. a.
225 JS21, pp. 1-2.
226 HIHR, pp. 2-3.
227 CS, p. 1, para. b.
228 CS, p. 2.
229 JS53, p. 1, para. 1.0 and 5, para. 1.2.
230 JS53, p. 5, para. 1.2.
231 CS, p. 6, para. 10.
232 TKF, pp. 1-7 and HIHR, pp. 2-3.
233 JS57, p. 1.
234 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/30/12, paras. 176.229,176.321, 176.329–176.331, 176.334, 176.335–176.337, and 176.338–176.340.
235 UNA-SNY, para. D1.
236 JS28, p. 3, para. 8. See also AI, p. 2, CCR, p. 3, CVT, para. 29, Haas Institute, para. 3, and JS20, paras. 6-15.
237 AI, p. 2. See also JS28, p. 3, para. 9.
238 JS56, para. 19. See also JS24, p. 5, IACHR-OAS, p. 4, JS28, p. 2, para. 4, JS65, para. 28, TTI³ alliance, para. 2.6, and UNA-SNY, para. E1.
239 HBI, para. 9.
240 JS3, para. 13. See also PHR, paras. 11-14 and SBCC, para. 1.3.
241 JS28, p. 2, para. 4.
242 JS56, para. 19.
243 JS3, para. 12. See also JS28, p. 3, paras. 6-7, and JS26, para. 31.
244 JS56, para. 17. See also HBI, para. 8, HRW, para. 12, JS65, para. 39 and SBCC, para. 1.3.
245 JS3, paras. 7-10, JS28, p. 4, para. 10, UNA-SNY, para. D4, and UNA-USA, para. C3.
246 MWAN, para. 2. See also JS23, para. 18.
247 SBCC, para. 1.6. See also JS19, p.3, paras. 1-3.
248 JS19, pp. 2 and 8.
249 JS28, p. 5, para. 17.

-
- ²⁵⁰ AI, p. 3. See also JS12, para. G2 and HBI, para. 11.
- ²⁵¹ AI, p. 3. See also JS19, p. 2, and JS28, pp. 8-9, paras. 34-36.
- ²⁵² AFSC, pp. 4-5, JS19, p. 2, and JS26, para. 36. See also IACHR-OAS, pp. 9-10, JS28, p. 1, para. 5, JS50, para. 13.
- ²⁵³ JS28, p. 9, para. 39. See also JS12, para. G2, JS19, p. 2, and JS63, p. 3.
- ²⁵⁴ JS9, para. 32.
- ²⁵⁵ JS63, p. 2. See also JS14, para. 33.
- ²⁵⁶ UNA-SYN, p. 5, para. F1.
- ²⁵⁷ PHR, para. 9. See also AFSC, p. 4, CS, p. 4, para. d, JS9, paras. 2 and 22, and JS65, para. 29.
- ²⁵⁸ JS22, paras. 13-14. See also CLS-IRC, paras. 1-21, SCU-IHRC, para. 9 and TTI³ alliance, para. 2.6.
- ²⁵⁹ UNA-SNY, F4. See also HBI, paras. 35-36, HRW, para. 15, JS7, para. E4, JS16, p. 7, JS26, para. 37, JS12, para. G4, JS19, p.2, and PHR, para. 17.
- ²⁶⁰ AI, p.5. See also CS, p. 6, para. 16, HBI, para. 31, HRW, para. 15, JS16, p. 6, JS24, p. 5, SCU-IHRL, para. 13, TTI³ alliance, para. 2.6b, and UNA-USA, p. 2.
- ²⁶¹ JS45, para. 16.
- ²⁶² JS45, paras. 17-18.
- ²⁶³ UNPO, para. 1. See also HGCR, p. 2.
- ²⁶⁴ JS27, p. 2.
- ²⁶⁵ AHRC, pp. 6-7. See also HGCR, pp. 6-7.
- ²⁶⁶ OSCE/ODIHR, para. 6. See also JS27, p. 8.
-