



General Assembly

Distr.: General
24 August 2016
English
Original: English/French

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twenty-sixth session
31 October-11 November 2016

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

Haiti*

The present report is a summary of 25 stakeholders' submissions¹ to the universal periodic review. It follows the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council in its decision 17/119. It does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), nor any judgement or determination in relation to specific claims. The information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes and, to the extent possible, the original texts have not been altered. As provided for in Human Rights Council resolution 16/21, where appropriate, a separate section is provided for contributions by the national human rights institution of the State under review that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles. The full texts of all submissions received are available on the OHCHR website. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the periodicity of the review and developments during that period.

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



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

1. The Office of the Ombudsman (Office de la Protection du Citoyen) noted that the conditions for guaranteeing equality between men and women had not been established. The election results confirmed that women's equal participation in decision-making bodies had not been a priority.²
2. Detention conditions had deteriorated. Pretrial detainees accounted for 72 per cent of the prison population. The high proportion resulted from, inter alia, the judicial apathy. The non-renewal of the mandates of investigating judges and the excessive use of pretrial detention were obstacles to the right to a trial within a reasonable time.³
3. The widespread placement of children in domestic service affected children from poor families in particular. According to the Office, the State's actions were regrettably insufficient to address the exploitation of children in Haiti.⁴
4. The Office welcomed the establishment, in December 2015, of the National Committee to Combat Human Trafficking, but noted that the Committee did not have the means to operate.⁵
5. The independence of the judiciary was not apparent. Public prosecutor's offices faced untimely staff changes, there was ongoing abuse of authority and some defendants were granted illegal pardons.⁶
6. The lack of a standard framework for legal assistance paralysed the courts. The Office encouraged the Ministry of Justice to submit the legal assistance bill to the parliament.⁷
7. The Office noted that proceedings had been brought against perpetrators of human rights violations. However, it objected to the slowness in processing cases. The double murder case of Jean Léopold Dominique and Jean-Claude Louissaint and the case of former president Jean-Claude Duvalier were emblematic and attested to the incompetence of the justice system.⁸
8. The Office reported that distressingly, a number of courts did not have juvenile judges and that some minors were tried in adult courts.⁹
9. The Office considered that the Paternity, Maternity and Filiation Act enshrined the principle of equality among legitimate, natural, adopted and other children. However, all the other discriminatory provisions of the Civil Code still needed to be revised.¹⁰
10. There were no provisions to provide for the care of children whose parents were in prison.¹¹
11. The precariousness of most of the population's living conditions remained a major concern.¹²
12. Thousands of internally displaced persons continued to live in tents. Family resettlement was lacking in sustainability and sanitary conditions were deteriorating.¹³ Various shortcomings could be seen in the Government's housing plans. The publication of the housing policy in October 2013 was an important step forward. However, concerns about the insecurity of land tenure and respect for the right to private property remained fully valid.¹⁴

13. The right to health was far from guaranteed. Access to health care was determined by the ability to pay for it. Women were among the social groups with the least access to health care; access to sexual and reproductive health services was not guaranteed.¹⁵ Priority should be given to public health policy.¹⁶

II. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Background and framework

1. Scope of international obligations

14. The World Coalition against the Death Penalty (WCADP) urged the Government to accede to the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.¹⁷

15. Combite pour la Paix et le Développement (Combite for Peace and Development) found it regrettable that Haiti had not ratified the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.¹⁸ Joint Submission 6 (JS6) recommended that the Government should ratify the Convention and its Optional Protocol.¹⁹

16. JS3 recommended the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict.²⁰

17. Amnesty International (AI) regretted that, during its first UPR review, Haiti rejected recommendations to ratify the Conventions on statelessness²¹ albeit their relevance considering the high number of Haitians lacking identity documents expelled from a third country.²² It recommended that the Government ratify them.²³

18. JS3 recommended the ratification of the Inter-American Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities and the Inter-American Convention against Racism, Racial Discrimination and Related Forms of Intolerance.²⁴ JS17 recommended the ratification of the Arms Trade Treaty.²⁵

2. Constitutional and legislative framework

19. JS3 considered that Haiti was experiencing a profound political and electoral crisis. Since 2009, there had been no municipal elections; the municipalities were run by non-elected officials appointed by those in power. Senate elections had not been held since 2012 and the parliament had been out of commission for almost a year in 2015 and 2016. Under the agreement of February 2016 between the executive branch and the parliament, the General Assembly had elected the President of the Senate as interim President.²⁶ JS15 noted that while the political future of Haiti was uncertain, the human rights obligations of the State were unchanged.²⁷

20. JS6 recommended that the State should complete the electoral process, open a dialogue with civil society on mechanisms to set up a permanent electoral council and implement the recommendations of the Electoral Assessment Commission.²⁸

21. JS10 recommended that the Government should adopt laws enabling the translation of all legislation into Creole.²⁹

3. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures

22. AI considered that while the 2012 reform of the Ombudsman's Office was a step forward, the OPC remained largely under-funded.³⁰

23. JS17 regretted that the Ministry for Human Rights and the fight Against Extreme Poverty was abolished during the 2015 cabinet reshuffle.³¹ JS17 recommended that the Government re-instate it.³²

B. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

24. Bearing in mind the recommendations received during the first universal periodic review,³³ Combite pour la Paix et le Développement, JS3 and JS6 recommended that the Government should extend an invitation to the special procedures, in particular the Special Rapporteur on children's rights.³⁴

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

1. Equality and non-discrimination

25. JS10 noted that, after a long history of patriarchy and discrimination, women continued to be stigmatized.³⁵ JS3 pointed out that stereotypes were to be found in traditions, customs and the education system.³⁶ According to JS10, the Government had acknowledged the need to remove provisions that discriminated against women from the Criminal Code, the Civil Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure. However, the revision of the Codes was still pending. Similarly, the Act on Gender Equality and Gender-based Violence had yet to be discussed in parliament. JS10 recommended that Haiti should update the legal codes in order to protect women.³⁷ JS3 recommended the organization of awareness-raising campaigns and the adoption of a comprehensive policy to meet women's specific needs.³⁸

26. JS7 condemned the fact that lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) persons were subjected to discrimination and stigmatization by the public.³⁹ Despite this, the State had done nothing to protect LGBTI rights.⁴⁰ Negative social attitudes, poverty and the importance of religion in society exacerbated the violence and discrimination faced by LGBTI persons.⁴¹ JS7 found it regrettable that most of the presidential candidates in 2015 had spoken out against homosexuality and equality of marriage rights.⁴²

27. JS1 noted that members of the LGBTI community were forced to live in secrecy and isolation, due to fear of violence and discrimination. LGBTI organizations had documented physical attacks committed on the basis of a victim's gender nonconforming demeanour and reported numerous incidents of police discrimination leading to arbitrary arrests and violence.⁴³

28. AI recommended that Haiti investigate all acts of violence motivated by discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity and bring those responsible to justice; carry out training for State agents on how to handle such cases; and implement human rights education and anti-discrimination awareness-raising programs in collaboration with LGBTI rights organizations.⁴⁴

29. In line with the recommendations made during the first cycle of the universal periodic review,⁴⁵ the Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice recommended that the Government should eliminate all forms of discrimination against children with disabilities, street children and "*restavèk*" children (children in domestic service).⁴⁶

30. JS3 indicated that prejudices against persons with HIV persisted and that the passivity on the part of the State contributed to an atmosphere that encouraged discrimination against them. JS3 recommended that the State should organize campaigns to

raise awareness of the stigmatization of persons with HIV and prohibit the practice whereby an HIV test certificate was required upon hiring.⁴⁷

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

31. Recalling the recommendations received during the first UPR cycle regarding the security situation,⁴⁸ JS17 considered that a major factor of insecurity was the lack of gun control. According to official figures, some 250,000 arms were circulating illegally.⁴⁹ JS17 recommended that the Government adopt a policy for control of firearms.⁵⁰

32. JS6 considered that, while the practice of torture was not systematic, there were sometimes appalling cases.⁵¹ JS16 noted many reports of arbitrariness and force amounting to cruel, inhumane or degrading treatment during arrests.⁵² JS6 recommended that the State should punish police officers implicated in acts of torture.⁵³

33. JS6 considered that the conditions of detention constituted a violation of human dignity. At the end of 2015, the nationwide occupancy rate stood at 804 per cent and the space available for each person was 0.54 square metres.⁵⁴

34. JS17 indicated that, after accepting recommendations on persons in detention during its first UPR review,⁵⁵ the Government had focused on building additional prisons instead of prioritizing policy initiatives addressing the lack of food, water, hygiene, sanitation, and health services in places of detention.⁵⁶

35. JS17 noted that children detainees were placed in the same locations as adults, particularly minor girls. Moreover, 85 per cent of minors in detention had never been seen by a judge. JS17 recommended that Haiti give priority to cases of minors in detention and guarantee their separation from adults.⁵⁷ JS6 recommended the establishment of a reintegration centre for minors in conflict with the law.⁵⁸

36. JS6 noted that, in 2015, the women's prison in Pétion-Ville, which had a capacity of around 100 people, was holding 324 inmates, of whom only 35 had been convicted. In addition, some people had been in pretrial detention for 10 years.⁵⁹

37. JS17 considered that the second UPR review of Haiti should put an emphasis on the need for measures to decrease the prison population and improve detainees' conditions.⁶⁰ JS16 requested recommending States to ask the Government what it was doing to ensure that detainees are informed of charges against them and appear before a judge within 48 hours of arrest, and how the Government was ensuring that those charged with petty offenses be sent to a justice of the peace instead of prison.⁶¹ JS6 recommended that the Government should ensure that conditions of detention conformed to international standards.⁶²

38. JS6 pointed out that on average, the proportion of prison inmates that were pretrial detainees had remained in excess of 70 per cent. The action taken by the Government with regard to extended pretrial detention had not yielded satisfactory results.⁶³ JS17 regretted that the Government did not provide for effective legal assistance as mandated by law.⁶⁴

39. Combite pour la Paix et le Développement recommended that Haiti should combat prison overcrowding by reducing the numbers of pretrial detainees and of convicts who had served their sentences.⁶⁵ JS17 recommended that the Government guarantee that all persons detained enjoy the right to habeas corpus, promote alternatives to detention and make legal assistance available to all detainees.⁶⁶

40. JS16 noted that instability in the aftermath of the 2010 earthquake had exacerbated vulnerabilities of women and LGBT persons and incited further sexual violence.⁶⁷ JS1 stated that the Government had failed to prevent and investigate sexual and gender-based

violence against women and girls and that the failure to bring perpetrators to justice implicitly condoned such violence.⁶⁸

41. JS10 said that the criminal legislation did not sufficiently punish sexual assault. The Criminal Code did not cover harassment, assault other than rape, incest or touching. JS10 welcomed the issuance of a decree in 2005 that punished rape but found it regrettable that the decree did not define the constituent elements of the offence, sexual assault or harassment.⁶⁹

42. JS10 added that victims could not file a complaint of rape because the police required a medical certificate as evidence, even though none was required by law. Moreover, the judicial officials who were in contact with the victims were often men with attitudes that perpetuated the stigmatization of rape.⁷⁰

43. AI recommended that the Government adopt comprehensive legislation on violence against women, including a definition of rape consistent with international standards and the criminalization of marital rape.⁷¹ JS1 recommended that Haiti address negative gender attitudes and discrimination against women among law enforcement and judicial officials; and build police and judicial capacity to ensure that complaints of gender-based violence are investigated.⁷² JS10 recommended that medical services should be established within hospitals to care for rape victims and that a legal aid system should be set up to combat sexual violence.⁷³

44. JS13 considered that women and girls were at greater risk of sexual abuse and exploitation because of the presence of the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH). JS13 said that allegations of sexual exploitation against MINUSTAH staff often involved transactional relationships that developed into sexual abuse. In other cases, victims were assaulted or raped. There was also the problem of the lack of support for the children of MINUSTAH staff.⁷⁴ JS13 considered that the Government had failed both to request contingents to prosecute their military personnel who committed sexual abuse and to support the victims so that proceedings would be brought against those responsible in their countries of origin.⁷⁵

45. JS13 recommended that the Government should recognize that members of MINUSTAH committed sexual abuse and exploitation, conduct investigations into allegations in cooperation with MINUSTAH and clarify the responsibilities of United Nations staff in such cases.⁷⁶

46. The Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice noted that, despite the adoption of a law in 2001 prohibiting the use of corporal punishment against children, such punishment was commonplace in schools and families.⁷⁷ Combite pour la Paix et le Développement recommended that the Government should ensure that the law was implemented and disseminated.⁷⁸

47. According to Lumos, violence against children was endemic. Lumos also noted that evidence showed systematic abuse of children in some institutions and that perpetrators were seldom arrested or prosecuted. Lumos considered that children in institutions, internally displaced children and children in domesticity were at high risk of being victims of violence and trafficking.⁷⁹ JS3 pointed out that children in domestic service were subjected to all kinds of physical and psychological abuse without receiving any assistance from the authorities.⁸⁰

48. Lumos noted the enactment, in 2014, of Law CL/2014-0010, prohibiting all forms of human trafficking. According to independent sources, no convictions had taken place until 2015.⁸¹ Lumos recommended that the Government improve the enforcement of Law CL/2014-0010 and strengthen the National Committee against Trafficking in Persons; finance programmes to address trafficking in children; ensure the prosecution of traffickers;

and develop standard operating procedures for whenever a child within an institution has been victim of abuse.⁸²

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

49. According to AI, the overall lack of independence of the justice system remained a concern and there was a need for comprehensive reform of the Judiciary. Apart from some measures taken by the Government, following recommendations it accepted during its first UPR review,⁸³ key legislation had remained unchanged, with several human rights violations not covered. In 2015, the draft new Penal Code and Criminal Procedure Code would have been submitted to the President. Both of them have yet to be transmitted to Parliament.⁸⁴

50. JS10 found it regrettable that legal proceedings were generally conducted in French, even though 80 per cent of Haitians did not speak that language.⁸⁵ JS16 requested recommending States to ask Haiti what steps the Government could take to discourage acceptance of bribes by court officials; how documents and court proceedings could be made available in Creole; and how support could be provided to the *École de la Magistrature* to train a professional Judiciary.⁸⁶ AI recommended that the Government ensure that the Judiciary is provided with adequate resources and able to operate free from interference; and finalize the reform of the Criminal Code.⁸⁷

51. AI reported that, in February 2014, the Port-au-Prince Court of Appeals re-established the charges of crimes against humanity and serious human rights abuses against former dictator Jean Claude Duvalier and others, reversing a 2012 ruling. The investigations continued after Duvalier's death in 2014. AI considered that further efforts were needed to establish the criminal liability of Duvalier's subordinates, and to conduct a fair trial. AI recommended that Haiti ensure that the judicial authorities have resources to continue the investigation, without interference.⁸⁸

4. Right to marriage and family life

52. The Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice noted that many families remained reluctant to register their children. Several factors were responsible: registration was not always free; the nearest civil registry office was not always nearby; and little importance was attached to registration.⁸⁹ JS17 recommended that the Government ensure that all Civil Status Offices issue birth certificates free of charge; and increase the number of Offices in rural and remote areas.⁹⁰

53. Lumos welcomed the sanction of the 2013 Adoption Act, resulting in a reduction in the number of international adoptions and ensuring a process in accordance with international law.⁹¹

54. Lumos noted that institutionalisation of children was widespread, though 80 per cent of children in orphanages have one or two living parents. Less than 15 per cent of the orphanages in Haiti were registered.⁹² Lumos recommended that the Government work with donors to shift resources to community-based services that strengthen the abilities of families and communities to care adequately for their children; and develop an inspection system so that no one can establish an institution without accreditation.⁹³

5. Freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly, and right to participate in public and political life

55. JS16 indicated that human rights defenders and journalists had received threats, been placed under police surveillance, faced criminal charges, and been assassinated. Also, journalists had been increasingly imprisoned under defamation charges.⁹⁴ AI recommended that Haiti investigate all allegations of attacks and intimidation and bring the perpetrators to

justice; and provide effective protection to lawyers, human rights defenders and journalists.⁹⁵

56. JS11 observed that elections, including those held in 2015, had very low turnouts and were poorly organized and marred by irregularities and fraud.⁹⁶ JS11 noted cases of excessive use of force by police at peaceful protests during the last elections and added that political activists had been arrested arbitrarily.⁹⁷ JS11 recommended that the Government should punish those responsible for violence during protests, including police officers, and provide police with training in how to behave during protests and arrests.⁹⁸

57. JS11 noted that practically no women were candidates in the 2015 legislative elections.⁹⁹ JS10 recommended that the State should increase the participation of women, particularly in positions of responsibility.¹⁰⁰

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

58. According to JS12, more than two thirds of the labour force was not in formal employment. Violations of workers' rights persisted owing to a lack of monitoring and to a failure to implement the legal provisions in force. Trade union activists were subjected to much persecution. Workers feared that they would lose their jobs if they reported ill-treatment and poor working conditions.¹⁰¹

59. JS12 recommended that the Government should strengthen the administrative infrastructure governing the implementation of labour law legislation and conventions and guarantee the right of freedom of association.¹⁰²

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

60. JS17 considered that poverty was a cause and consequence of human rights violations. Much of the population lacked access to potable water. With long periods of drought this situation was worsening and has affected the price of food. Homelessness was a serious problem aggravated by the 2010 earthquake. Stark inequality persisted between rural and urban areas and between men and women.¹⁰³ JS17 recommended that the Government implement a human rights based approach to poverty eradication.¹⁰⁴

61. JS5 reported that, according to official numbers, in early 2016, 3.6 million people were food insecure and 1.5 million severely so. Haiti's ability to feed its own people had been undermined by decades of underinvestment in agriculture, poor infrastructure and natural resource management, political instability and deforestation. Climate change had aggravated environmental degradation.¹⁰⁵

62. JS5 noted that the policies on food security and climate change had been sporadic and uncoordinated, prioritizing import subsidies. Haiti produced less than 40 per cent of what it consumed.¹⁰⁶ Inflation and the 2010 earthquake had resulted in an increase of chronic malnutrition.¹⁰⁷

63. JS5 recommended that the Government create forums for communicating with civil society about food security, disaster risk reduction, preparedness and mitigation policies.¹⁰⁸ Lumos recommended the establishment of an inter-ministerial group to develop a holistic approach to food security.¹⁰⁹ JS3 recommended the adoption of an agrarian reform policy.¹¹⁰

64. JS4 indicated that a majority of Haitians lived in overpopulated urban centres, shantytowns or under-developed villages without minimum standards of habitability. Security of tenure remained a significant problem and building codes were unenforced. JS4 regretted the lack of a ministry for housing and that the Government had not consulted with community groups and displaced persons associations in housing matters.¹¹¹

65. JS4 recommended that Haiti establish a ministry of housing and a housing program for the most marginalized; ensure that eligibility for housing assistance does not discriminate between landowners, renters, and people who informally occupy open land; and enforce building codes protecting against natural disasters.¹¹²

66. JS3 observed that the availability of running water was very uncertain.¹¹³ Lumos recommended that Haiti prioritise the development of infrastructure to ensure access to safe drinking water and sanitation for all.¹¹⁴

8. Right to health

67. JS8 observed that 60 per cent of Haiti's population lacked access to basic healthcare. Haiti's health care system was fragmented, as public and private healthcare providers, NGOs, and private donors, operated in an un-coordinated manner.¹¹⁵

68. JS9 considered that the measures aimed at reducing infant mortality, improving medical services and providing medical assistance produced mixed results because of population growth and the political and economic challenges faced by the country. JS9 added that the need for primary health-care services had grown everywhere.¹¹⁶ JS9 recommended that the State should establish health-care centres in the various *sections communales* (communal sections) and communes and increase the health budget.¹¹⁷

69. Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF) noted that Haiti had a high maternal mortality ratio. ADF recommended that the Government improve the health care system infrastructure, increase midwife training, and devote more resources to maternal health.¹¹⁸

70. JS14 said that sexual and reproductive health services discriminated against women and girls with disabilities.¹¹⁹ JS14 recommended that Haiti should develop an antenatal, delivery and postnatal follow-up programme for women with disabilities and make sexual and reproductive health programmes accessible to them.¹²⁰

71. JS8 indicated that cholera continued to constitute a grave threat to the health of Haitians. Official numbers reported that the epidemic had killed more than 9,200 persons and infected more than 770,000. JS8 noted that the Government's recently reported that interventions were fragmented and appeared to focus on crisis response, rather than in a systematic effort to improve the health system or water and sanitation infrastructure. JS8 regretted that, despite ample evidence, the United Nations had never formally acknowledged responsibility for its role in the cholera epidemic.¹²¹

72. JS8 recommended that the Government ensure that the United Nations establishes a standing claims commission that guarantee fair adjudication of cholera victims' claims; and call on the United Nations and international donors to fund the national plan for the elimination of cholera through investment in water and sanitation.¹²²

9. Right to education

73. Several organizations expressed their concern over the poor situation of the education system.¹²³ JS17 recalled that during its first UPR review, Haiti accepted six recommendations related to education and considered them as already implemented.¹²⁴ Nonetheless, a significant number of children still did not have access to education.¹²⁵

74. JS2 recognized that the Government had adopted policies to improve public education, such as the provision free of charge of the six years of primary education, but found it regrettable that the policies were not implemented in practice.¹²⁶ JS2 added that the number of solely profit-orientated private schools had risen without any oversight, with no framework or regulations and with untrained teachers and inadequate infrastructure. Of the schools in the country, 85 per cent were private and were attended by 75 per cent of students. Around 30 per cent of those schools received government funding.¹²⁷ There was,

however, insufficient monitoring of the use of such funding, which was thus liable to be embezzled.¹²⁸ As a result, it was more difficult for disadvantaged groups to access education.¹²⁹

75. JS2 recommended that the Government should direct resources towards developing a public education system, increase education funding, adopt a comprehensive law on education and secure the approval of the parliament for the National Pact for Quality Education.¹³⁰

76. JS6 found it regrettable that, six years after the 2010 earthquake, the State University of Haiti had still not been rebuilt.¹³¹ JS9 objected to the fact that the only State university was being weakened by a huge increase in the number of private universities that did not conform to any standards.¹³²

77. JS10 pointed out that at least 52 per cent of women were illiterate.¹³³ The Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice recommended that the State should guarantee the right of girls to education by conducting campaigns to raise awareness of the importance of attending school.¹³⁴

78. JS14 reported that persons with disabilities were excluded from the education system. Special education was prioritized over inclusive education.¹³⁵ JS14 recommended that the Government should include a requirement of accessibility for persons with disabilities in the accreditation process for schools, vocational training centres and universities and guarantee the right of children with disabilities to inclusive education.¹³⁶

10. Persons with disabilities

79. JS14 noted that, despite some progress, persons with disabilities were subjected to violence and exclusion. Accessibility and communication were lacking in public services, thus hindering the participation of persons with disabilities in the life of the country.¹³⁷

80. JS14 recommended that the State should provide training on disabilities to judges, police officers and others involved in work with persons with disabilities, establish a legal assistance service for persons with disabilities and guarantee for all the right to accessible information on risk and disaster management.¹³⁸

11. Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers

81. AI reported that a 2013 ruling in a neighbour country deprived thousands of persons of Haitian descent from the nationality of the third country. AI was concerned that Haitian authorities had made statements indicating that they considered those affected by the ruling to be stateless. As a consequence, high numbers of people started returning to Haiti since June 2015. In this context, Haitian authorities had failed to identify stateless people.¹³⁹ AI recommended that the Haitian Government register people who are at risk of statelessness; facilitate settlement to stateless people who wish to remain in Haiti; and provide returnees with immediate assistance and protection.¹⁴⁰

82. JS4 noted that recent controversial immigration policies in a third country had led to the formation of six large camps in Haiti populated by nearly 3,000 repatriated persons that lived in very difficult conditions.¹⁴¹

12. Internally displaced persons

83. JS4 reported that the 2010 earthquake displaced 1.5 million people to camps marked by conditions that fell short of minimum humanitarian standards. Human rights abuses, including forced evictions and sexual violence were endemic in the camps. Deficient drainage and sanitation facilities also helped spread cholera. Six years after the earthquake, around 60,000 persons continued to live in displacement camps. Conditions remained

precarious as funding had shifted over to camp closures. Only 20 per cent of people who had left the camps had benefitted from a durable solution to their displacement.¹⁴²

84. JS4 recommended that Haiti prioritize the return, resettlement or restitution of internally displaced and repatriated persons who were still living in camps.¹⁴³ AI recommended that the Government end all forced evictions; and ensure that programmes aimed at transforming camps into neighbourhoods do not result in forced evictions and provide security of tenure to all beneficiaries.¹⁴⁴

13. Right to development and environmental issues

85. JS15 considered that information on mining activities should be made available to obtain the prior and informed consent of concerned communities. However, the mining sector was governed by two 2005 mining conventions requiring that the Government treat as confidential information provided by mining companies. A project of Mining Law, drafted without public oversight, also imposed a confidentiality requirement.¹⁴⁵

86. JS15 called for a moratorium on mining activities until the necessary transparency and engagement of concerned communities had been established. JS15 also recommended that the Government make available information, including in Creole, about proposed changes to the mining legal framework; disclose information regarding mining activities; and reject any project lacking the free, prior, and informed consent of the communities affected.¹⁴⁶

87. JS15 stated that mining may have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the rights to food, water, and health.¹⁴⁷ Additionally, considering the complex and insecure patterns of land use, mining could pose an additional risk of forced evictions for concerned communities.¹⁴⁸ JS15 indicated that new mining regulations should strengthen requirements regarding protection of water and forest resources; and require mining companies to compensate affected parties by their actions.¹⁴⁹

88. JS5 observed that the Global Climate Change Vulnerability Index characterized Haiti's vulnerability to climate change as extreme because of rising sea levels, higher sea temperatures, soil erosion, more intensive and frequent hurricanes, drought and even poorer access to fresh water.¹⁵⁰ JS5 recommended that the Government promote disaster risk reduction and preparedness as well as integrate climate change adaptation into all components of national planning.¹⁵¹ JS9 recommended that the Government should undertake studies on climate change with a view to establishing policies to address the issue.¹⁵²

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:

ADF	Alliance Defending Freedom International, Geneva, Switzerland;
AI	Amnesty International, London, United Kingdom;
C.P.D.	Combite pour la Paix et le Développement, Port-au-Prince, Haïti;
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London, United Kingdom;
IIMA	Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice, Geneva, Switzerland;
Lumos	Lumos, London, United Kingdom;
WCADP	World Coalition Against the Death Penalty, Montreuil, France.

Joint submissions:

- JS1 Joint Submission 1 submitted by: FASCDIS, Port au Prince, Haiti; Human Rights and Gender Justice (HRGJ) Clinic at CUNY Law School, New York, USA; MADRE, New York, USA; OutRight Action International, New York, USA; SEROVie Port au Prince, Haiti;
- JS2 Joint Submission 2 submitted by: Campagne Latino-Américaine Pour le Droit à l'Éducation; CEMEA-Haïti, Haiti; Centre de Recherche et d'Action pour le Développement (CRAD), Haiti; Fédération Nationale des Travailleurs en Education et en Culture (FENATEC), Haiti; Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (GI-ESCR), Geneva, Switzerland; Plateforme Haïtienne de Plaidoyer pour un Développement Alternatif (PAPDA), Haiti; Programme Collectif pour le Développement de l'Education et du Dialogue Social en Haïti (PROCEDH), Haiti; Regroupement Education pour Tous et Toutes (EPT), Haiti; Solidarité Laïque, France; Union Nationale des Normaliens/Normalienne et Educateurs/Educatrices d'Haïti (UNNOEH), Haiti;
- JS3 Joint Submission 3 submitted by: Collectif « Défenseurs Plus »; Combite pour la Paix et le Développement (CPD); les Défenseurs des Droits Humains Sans Frontières Haïti (DESAFRODH); Fondation « Zanmi Timoun »; le Groupe d'Intervention en Droits Humains (GIDH); l'Initiative Citoyenne Artibonitienne pour la Promotion et la Défense des Droits Humains (INICAPRODH); l'Institut Mobile d'Education Démocratique (IMED); le Mouvement Sociaux des Haïtiens pour le Développement Humains et aux Droits de la Femme (MOUSHADH); l'Observatoire sur la traite de Personnes (OBSERVAR La Traite); l'Organisation des Citoyens pour une Nouvelle Haïti (OCNH); la Solidarité Haïtienne de Défense des Droits Humains (SOHDDH), Haiti;
- JS4 Joint Submission 4 submitted by: Institute for Technology and Animation and Mennonite Central Committee Haiti, Port-au-Prince, Haiti; endorsed by: American Jewish World Service, Christian Aid, Church World Service, Environmental Justice Initiative for Haiti, Institute for Justice and Democracy in Haiti, Servicio Social de Iglesias Dominicanas;
- JS5 Joint Submission 5 submitted by: Church World Service and Christian Aid, Port-au-Prince, Haiti; endorsed by: Alternative Chance, American Jewish World Service, Association pour le Développement Rural d'Haïti (ADRUH), Environmental Justice Initiative for Haiti, Finn Church Aid, Global Justice Clinic, NYU School of Law, Institute for Justice and Democracy in Haiti, Li, Li, Li! Read, Presbyterian Church, USA, Sant Kreyen pou Devlopman Entegre (SKDE), Women Thrive Worldwide (WTW);
- JS6 Joint Submission 6 submitted by: Action concertée pour la promotion et la défense des droits humains (ACROPDDH), Centre d'analyse de recherche en droits humains (CARDH), Combite pour la paix et le développement (C.P.D.), Fonds réseaux d'aide pour le développement social (FRADES), KOURAJ, and Vision haïtienne des droits humains (VHDH), Port-au-Prince, Haiti;
- JS7 Joint Submission 7 submitted by: Association Pour la Lutte Contre l'Homophobie (APLCH), Gran Lakou, Kouraj, Port-au-Prince, Haiti; endorsed by: Bureau des Avocats Internationaux (BAI), Institute for Justice and Democracy in Haiti (IJDH), Mouvement de Liberté, d'Égalité des Haïtiens pour la Fraternité (MOLEGHAF);
- JS8 Joint Submission 8 submitted by: AIDS-Free World, New York, USA, Environmental Justice Initiative for Haiti (EJIH), New York, USA,

Haitian-American Leadership Council (HALEC), New York, USA, Haitian Diaspora for Democracy and Development (HD3), Orlando, USA, Institute for Justice and Democracy in Haiti (IJDH), Boston, USA; endorsed by: 1199 SEIU United Healthcare Workers East, Alternative Chance, American Association of Jurists (Asociación Americana de Juristas), Association of Haitian Professionals (AHP), Ayiti Demain, Bureau des Avocats Internationaux (BAI), Center for Constitutional Rights (CCR), Center for Self-Sufficiency, Centre International de Documentation & d'Information Haitienne, Caraïbéenne & Afrocanadienne (CIDIHCA), Diaspora in Action, European Center for Constitutional and Human Rights (ECCHR), Fanm Viktim Leve Kanpe (FAVILEK), Fédération des Association Régionales Haïtiennes de la Diaspora (FAREHD), Fédération de la Diaspora haïtienne en Europe (FEDHE), Femmes Combattant Avisées pour le Développement d'Haiti (FEMCADH), Global Haitian Diaspora Federation, Global Justice Clinic, NYU School of Law, Haitian Artists Assembly of Massachusetts (HAAM), Haitian American Association for Political Action PAC, Haitian Americans United, Inc (H.A.U), Haitian-American Grassroots Coalition (HAGC), Haitian Congress to Fortify Haiti, Haitian Diaspora Foundation (HDF), Haiti-Jamaica Society (Kingston, Jamaica), Haiti Justice Alliance, Haitian League, Haiti Support Group, Health and Human Rights Clinic, Indiana University McKinney School of Law, International Human Rights Clinic, Western New England University School of Law, Irish International Immigrant Center, KOURAJ, Li, Li, Li! Read, MADRE, Mennonite Central Committee — Haiti, Mouvement de Liberté, d'Egalité des Haïtiens pour la fraternité (MOLEGHAF), National Alliance for the Advancement of Haitian Professionals (NAAHP), National Haitian American Elected Officials Network (NHAEON), National Organization for the Advancement of Haitians (NOAH), Organization des Femmes Actives de Riviere Canot (OFARC), Other Worlds, Plan D'action Citoyenne (PAC), Programme d'Engagement Civique Boucan Kare, Programme d'engagement Civique du Commune Lachapelle, Programme d'Engagement Civique Mirebalais, Programme d'Engagement Civique du Commune Saut D'Eau, SOA Watch, SEIU Florida State Council;

- JS9 Joint Submission 9 submitted by: Groupe des Techniciens pour le Développement de Mirebalais (GTDMi), Programme d'engagement civique de Mirebalais (PEC Mirebalais), Programme d'engagement civique de la Commune de Lachapelle (PEC Lachapelle), Programme d'engagement civique de Saut d'Eau (PEC Saut d'Eau), Réalité de Femmes Fort-National en Action (RFFA); Haiti; endorsed by: Bureau des Avocats Internationaux (BAI), Femmes Combattants Avisées pour le Développement d'Haiti (FEMCADH), Komisyon Fanm Viktim pou Viktim (KOFIV), Kòdinasyon Nasyonal Ansyen Mawon Viktim Dirèk (KONAMAVID), Kouraj, Mouvement des Etudiants pour Libérer Haiti (MELA), Mouvement de Liberté, d'Egalité des Haïtiens pour la Fraternité (MOLEGHAF);
- JS10 Joint Submission 10 submitted by: Gender Action, Femmes Combattante Avisées Pour le Développement d'Haiti (FEMCADH), Komisyon Fanm Viktim pou Viktim (KOFIV), Mouvman Òrganizasyon Fanm Aktiv Sodo (MOFAS), Port-au-Prince/Washington, Haiti/USA; endorsed by: Bureau des Avocats Internationaux (BAI), Fanm Viktim Leve Kanpe (FAVILEK), Institute for Justice and Democracy in Haiti (IJDH), Kòdinasyon

- Nasyonal Ansyen Mawon Viktim Dirèk (KONAMAVID), Kouraj, Mouvement des Étudiants pour Libérer Haïti (MELA), Organisation des Femmes Actives de Rivière Canot (OFARC), Réalité de Femmes Pour Fort-National en Action (RFFA);
- JS11 Joint Submission 11 submitted by: Mouvement des Étudiants pour Libérer Haïti (MELA) and Mouvement de Liberté, d'Égalité des Haïtiens pour la Fraternité (MOLEGHAF), Haiti; endorsed by: Bureau des Avocats Internationaux (BAI), Fanm Viktim Leve Kanpe (FAVILEK), Femmes Combattante Avisées Pour le Développement d'Haïti (FEMCADH), Institute for Justice and Democracy in Haiti (IJDH), Komisyon Fanm Viktim pou Viktim (KOFIVIV), Kouraj, Programme d'engagement civique du Boucan Carre, Programme d'engagement civique du Commune Lachapelle, Programme d'engagement civique du Saut d'Eau, Realité Femmes Fort-National en Action (RFFA);
- JS12 Joint Submission 12 submitted by: Bureau des Avocats Internationaux (BAI) and Fann Viktim Leve Kenpe (FAVILEK), Port-au-Prince, Haiti; endorsed by: Batay Ouvriye, Institute for Justice and Democracy in Haiti (IJDH), KOURAJ, Mouvement des Étudiants pour Libérer Haïti (MELA), Programme d'Engagement Civique (Boucan Carré) (PEC), Programme d'Engagement Civique (La Chapelle) (PEC), Programme d'Engagement Civique (Saut d'Eau) (PEC), Réalité Femme Fort-National en Action (RFFA);
- JS13 Joint Submission 13 submitted by: Kòdinasyon Nasyonal Ansyen Mawon Viktim Dirèk (KONAMAVID), Organization des Femmes Actives de Rivière Canot (OFARC), Port-au-Prince, Haiti; endorsed by: Bureau des Avocats Internationaux (BAI), Fanm Viktim Leve Kanpe (FAVILEK), Institute for Justice & Democracy in Haiti (IJDH), Kouraj, Mouvement des Étudiants pour Libérer Haïti (MELA), Programme d'engagement civique de Boucan Carré, Programme d'engagement civique de commune Lachapelle, Programme d'engagement civique de Saut d'Eau, Réalité Femme Fort-National en Action (RFFA);
- JS14 Joint Submission 14 submitted by: Association Filles au Soleil (AFAS), Association des Sourds de Lévéque d'Haïti (ASLH), Coalition du Réseau Associatif National pour l'Intégration des Personnes Handicapées Sud (RANIPH), Union des Femmes à Mobilité Réduite d'Haïti (UFORMH), Haiti; endorsed by: Bureau des Avocats Internationaux (BAI) and Institute for Justice and Democracy in Haiti (IJDH);
- JS15 Joint Submission 15 submitted by: American Jewish World Service (AJWS), New York, USA, Concertation pour Haïti, Montreal, Canada, Environmental Justice Initiative for Haiti, New York, USA, Global Justice Clinic, NYU School of Law, New York, USA, Kolektif Jistis Min (Justice in Mining Collective), Haiti, Mennonite Central Committee, Haiti;
- JS16 Joint Submission 16 submitted by: Alternative Chance/Chans Alternatif, New York, USA, and Center for Human Rights and International Justice, Boston College, Boston, USA; endorsed by: Institute for Justice & Democracy in Haiti, Boston, United States;
- JS17 Joint Submission 17 submitted by: Congregation of the Mission, Congregation of the Sisters of Saint Joseph, Daughters of Charity, Franciscans International, International Public Policy Institute, National Bishop's Conference of Haiti — Justice and Peace Commission, Pax Christi International, Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, UNANIMA, VIVAT International.

National Human Rights Institution

OPC

Office de la Protection du Citoyen*, Port-au-Prince, Haiti.

- 2 OPC, para. 1.
3 OPC, paras. 3-4.
4 OPC, para. 12.
5 OPC, para. 11.
6 OPC, paras. 5 and 14.
7 OPC, para. 5.
8 OPC, para. 15.
9 OPC, para. 10.
10 OPC, paras. 17-18.
11 OPC, para. 18.
12 OPC, para. 22.
13 OPC, para. 20.
14 OPC, para. 21.
15 OPC, para. 1.
16 OPC, para. 23.
17 WCADP, para. 5.
18 C.P.D., pages 3 and 4.
19 JS6, para. 25. See also C.P.D., page 5 and JS16, page 10.
20 JS3, para. 41. See also OPC, para. 13.
21 For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/19/19, recommendations 88.18 (Norway) and 88.19 (France).
22 AI, page 1.
23 AI, page 5.
24 JS3, para. 22.
25 JS17, para. 31 (h).
26 JS3, paras. 6-8. See also AI, page 2, JS5, para. 4, JS6, para. 52 and JS11, para. 3.
27 JS15, para. 6.
28 JS6, paras. 53-55.
29 JS10, page 8.
30 AI, page 2.
31 JS17, paras. 5-10.
32 JS17, para. 14.
33 For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/19/19, recommendations 88.52 (Paraguay), 88.53 (Spain), 88.54 (Portugal), 88.55 (Latvia), 88.56 (Peru).
34 C.P.D., page 2, JS3, para. 41 and JS6, para. 33.
35 JS10, page 1.
36 JS3, para. 46.
37 JS10, pages 3 and 7.
38 JS3, para. 45.
39 JS7, paras 1-2.
40 JS7, para. 10.
41 JS7, paras. 13-16. See also AI, page 4 and JS6, para. 5.
42 JS7, para. 29.
43 JS1, paras. 10-12 and 26.
44 AI, page 6. See also JS1, para. 27, JS6, paras. 6-7 and JS7, page 8.
45 For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/19/19, recommendations 88.36 (Colombia), 88.38 (Thailand), 88.42 (United States), 88.97 (Sweden).
46 IIMA, paras. 4-9. See also C.P.D. page 2 and JS3, para. 37.
47 JS3, paras. 21-22. See also JS1, paras. 23-24.
48 For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/19/19, recommendations 88.47 (Colombia) and 88.108 (Mexico).
49 JS17, paras. 23-26. See also C.P.D., page 4.
50 JS17, para. 31. See also JS6, paras. 10-11.
51 JS6, para. 22.

- ⁵² JS16, para. 37.
- ⁵³ JS6, paras. 22-24. See also C.P.D., pages 3 and 4.
- ⁵⁴ JS6, paras. 12-13. See also C.P.D., page 4, JS3, para. 15, JS16, para. 39 and JS17, para. 41.
- ⁵⁵ For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/19/19, recommendations 88.63 (Canada), 88.64 (Slovenia), 88.65 (Spain), 88.66 (Canada), 88.67 (United States), 88.68 (Belgium), 88.69 (Switzerland), 88.70 (Sweden), 88.71 (Switzerland), 88.72 (Slovakia) and 88.73 (Belgium).
- ⁵⁶ JS17, para. 32.
- ⁵⁷ JS17, paras. 42 and 44 (e). See also JS3, paras. 16 and 42 and JS6, para. 14.
- ⁵⁸ JS6, para. 21.
- ⁵⁹ JS6, para. 15.
- ⁶⁰ JS17, para. 35.
- ⁶¹ JS16, page 9.
- ⁶² JS6, para. 19. See also JS16, page 9 and JS17 para. 44.
- ⁶³ JS6, paras. 16-17.
- ⁶⁴ JS17, paras. 39-40. See also AI, page 4 and JS16, para. 5 (e).
- ⁶⁵ C.P.D., page 5.
- ⁶⁶ JS17, para. 44 (a-b). See also AI, page 5 and C.P.D., page 5, JS6, para. 18 and JS16, page 9.
- ⁶⁷ JS16, para. 10. See also IIMA, para. 26.
- ⁶⁸ JS1, para. 13.
- ⁶⁹ JS10, pages 1-3. See also AI, page 2, JS1, para. 21 and JS16, paras. 13-16.
- ⁷⁰ JS10, pages 3-5. See also AI, page 4 and JS1, paras. 5-7.
- ⁷¹ AI, page 6. See also JS1, para. 27 (a), JS10, page 7 and JS16, pages 7 and 8.
- ⁷² JS1, para. 27 (b-c). See also AI, page 6, IIMA, para. 28 (b-c), JS10, pages 8-9 and JS16, page 8.
- ⁷³ JS10, pages 8-9.
- ⁷⁴ JS13, paras. 1-5.
- ⁷⁵ JS13, para. 26.
- ⁷⁶ JS13, pages 7-8.
- ⁷⁷ IIMA, para. 24. See also C.P.D., page 4, GIEACPC, page 1, JS3, para. 37 and JS6, para. 26.
- ⁷⁸ C.P.D., page 5. See also GIEACPC, para. 1.3, IIMA, para. 25 (f), JS3, para. 38 and JS6, paras. 27-28.
- ⁷⁹ Lumos, pages 3-4. See also JS3, paras. 39-40, JS6, paras. 30-31 and JS17, para. 30.
- ⁸⁰ JS3, para. 37.
- ⁸¹ Lumos, pages 3-4. See also JS17, para. 30.
- ⁸² Lumos, page 6. See also JS6, paras. 34-35 and JS17, para. 31 (a).
- ⁸³ For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/19/19, recommendations 88.97 (Sweden), 88.98 (Spain), 88.99 (United Kingdom), 88.100 (United States), 88.101 (Norway), 88.102 (Slovakia), 88.103 (Barbados), 88.104 (Turkey), 88.105 (Belgium), 88.106 (United States), 88.107 (Slovenia), 88.108 (Mexico), 88.109 (Belgium), 88.110 (Switzerland), 88.111 (Canada) and 88.112 (France).
- ⁸⁴ AI, pages 1-4. See also JS3, paras. 10-14, JS6, paras. 49-50 and JS16, paras. 1-21.
- ⁸⁵ JS10, page 4.
- ⁸⁶ JS16, page 9.
- ⁸⁷ AI, page 5. See also JS3, para. 14 and JS6, para. 51.
- ⁸⁸ AI, pages 4-5. See also JS16, paras. 24-26 and page 9.
- ⁸⁹ IIMA, para. 10. See also JS10, page 7 and JS17, paras. 55-61.
- ⁹⁰ JS17, para. 62 (a-d). See also IIMA, para. 11 (a-b), Lumos, page 6 and OPC, para. 9.
- ⁹¹ Lumos, page 2. See also JS3, paras. 33-34.
- ⁹² Lumos, page 3.
- ⁹³ Lumos, page 6.
- ⁹⁴ JS16, paras. 28-34. AI, page 4.
- ⁹⁵ AI, page 6. See also JS16, page 8.
- ⁹⁶ JS11, paras. 10-11.
- ⁹⁷ JS11, paras. 38 and 42.
- ⁹⁸ JS11, page 9.
- ⁹⁹ JS11, paras. 21-22.
- ¹⁰⁰ JS10, pages 7-8. See also JS3, para. 44, JS11, page 9 and JS16, para. 12 and page 8.
- ¹⁰¹ JS12, pages 1, 2 and 5. See also JS17, para. 6.
- ¹⁰² JS12, page 7.

- ¹⁰³ JS17, paras. 5-10.
¹⁰⁴ JS17, para. 14.
¹⁰⁵ JS5, paras. 1-2. See also JS3, para. 23, JS6, para. 40 and JS9, paras. 19-20 and 21-28.
¹⁰⁶ JS5, paras. 3 and 9.
¹⁰⁷ JS5, para. 26.
¹⁰⁸ JS5, pages 8-9.
¹⁰⁹ Lumos, page 7.
¹¹⁰ JS3, para. 24. See also JS5, page 8 and JS9, page 9.
¹¹¹ JS4, paras. 1, 18, 19 and 22. See also JS3, para. 25.
¹¹² JS4, pages 6-7. See also AI, page 5, JS3, para. 26, JS8, paras. 29-30 and JS15, para. 2.
¹¹³ JS3, para. 27.
¹¹⁴ Lumos, page 7.
¹¹⁵ JS8, paras. 32-34.
¹¹⁶ JS9, paras. 8-13.
¹¹⁷ JS9, page 9.
¹¹⁸ ADF, paras. 23 and 31.
¹¹⁹ JS14, para. 26.
¹²⁰ JS14, paras. 63-64.
¹²¹ JS8, paras. 15, 17, 33 and 37.
¹²² JS8, page 10.
¹²³ C.P.D. page 3, IIMA, paras. 15-22, JS3, paras. 30-32, JS6, paras. 43-46 and JS9, paras. 30-43. See also OPC, para. 19.
¹²⁴ For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/19/19, recommendations 88.122 (Cuba), 88.125 (Ghana), 88.126 (Thailand), 88.127 (Slovakia) and 88.128 (Uruguay).
¹²⁵ JS17, paras. 46-48.
¹²⁶ JS2, page 17.
¹²⁷ JS2, pages 3-5.
¹²⁸ JS2, page 23.
¹²⁹ JS2, page 11.
¹³⁰ JS2, page 27. See also C.P.D. page 3, IIMA, para. 25, JS6, para. 48, JS9, page 10 and JS17, para. 54.
¹³¹ JS6, para. 45.
¹³² JS9, para. 46.
¹³³ JS10, page 6. See also IIMA, paras. 17-18.
¹³⁴ IIMA, para. 25 (c).
¹³⁵ JS14, paras. 33-35. See also IIMA, para. 19.
¹³⁶ JS14, paras. 57-59.
¹³⁷ JS14, paras. 2-3.
¹³⁸ JS14, paras. 50-53.
¹³⁹ AI, page 3. See also JS3, paras. 48-49 and JS12, pages 6-7.
¹⁴⁰ AI, page 5.
¹⁴¹ JS4, paras. 2, 9 and 23. See also AI, page 3 and JS5, paras. 33-34.
¹⁴² JS4, paras. 6-8. AI, pages 1-3.
¹⁴³ JS4, pages 6-7. See also JS3, para. 26.
¹⁴⁴ AI, page 5.
¹⁴⁵ JS15, paras. 9-14. See also JS17, paras. 15-21.
¹⁴⁶ JS15, paras. 10, 16 and 21.
¹⁴⁷ JS15, paras. 24-29.
¹⁴⁸ JS15, para. 32.
¹⁴⁹ JS15, para. 33. See also JS17, para. 22.
¹⁵⁰ JS5, paras. 12-15. See also JS9, paras. 9-10 and JS17, para. 8.
¹⁵¹ JS5, page 8.
¹⁵² JS9, page 9.