



Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirty-seventh session
18–29 January 2021

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Mauritania*

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 29 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 obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies²

2. The Center for Global Non-killing (CGNK) recommended to Mauritania the urgent ratification of the Convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide and the ratification of the Second Protocol of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.³

3. The Association mauritanienne pour la santé de la mère et de l'enfant (AMSME) noted that Mauritania had not yet ratified the following international instruments: (i) the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict; (ii) the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure; (iii) the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court; and (iv) the Convention against Discrimination in Education.⁴

4. JS8 recommended that Mauritania accede to the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons and to the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.⁵

5. The Association Mauritanienne de la Promotion des Droits de l'Homme (AMPDH) recommended that Mauritania ratify the International Labour Organization (ILO) Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189).⁶

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



6. The European Centre for Law and Justice (ECLJ) noted that Mauritania has ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights with a reservation to Article 18, which establishes freedom of religion and thought, stating that “the Mauritanian Government, while accepting the provisions set out in article 18 concerning freedom of thought, conscience, and religion, declares that their application shall be without prejudice to Islamic Sharia”.⁷

7. AMSME recommended that the drafting of reports be made more participatory by involving all relevant stakeholders and that the reports produced under the follow-up mechanism for the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the concluding observations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child be widely disseminated.⁸

8. JS9 recommended that a standing invitation be issued to all special procedures, that all restrictions on human rights defenders who wished to cooperate with United Nations human rights mechanisms be lifted and that no reprisals be taken against them.⁹

9. Planète Réfugiés-Droits de l’Homme (PRDH) recommended that an official invitation to carry out a country visit be issued to the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities.¹⁰

B. National human rights framework¹¹

10. JS4 noted that laws were not always harmonized with the international treaties ratified by Mauritania. For example, the 2002 discrimination law regarding women’s rights had still not been harmonized with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women or the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The same was true of the Personal Status Code.¹²

11. The National Human Rights Commission of Mauritania (CNDH-M) recommended that conditions be improved for its members and staff to allow it to monitor the human rights situation even during times of crisis. It recommended that its scope of action be expanded through partnerships with primary, secondary and higher education establishments.¹³

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

1. Cross-cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination¹⁴

12. JS4 noted that Haratin and black African communities faced discrimination on a daily basis, particularly in respect of their access to education, employment, housing, health care, social services, land and natural resources. Mauritania had adopted a law criminalizing discrimination, but it did not provide sufficient legal protection. The definition of discrimination was not in line with international standards, there was no effective remedy for victims and several provisions of the law lacked legal clarity. Many provisions of the law contradicted the principles of freedom of expression, opinion and religion and posed a threat to human rights defenders.¹⁵

13. JS13 noted that, despite advances in the law, the Haratin remained marginalized and under-represented in public and political institutions such as the High Constitutional Council, the High Islamic Council, the High Judicial Council and the National Chamber of Commerce. The Haratin are excluded from the places of power in Mauritanian society. Indeed, only 5 seats out of 95 are occupied by Haratin in the National Assembly and out of 56 senators, only one is Haratin. Moreover, of the 13 regional governors, only two are Haratin and of the 53 prefects, only three are Haratin.¹⁶

14. PRDH noted that Mauritanian Ordinance No. 2006-043 did not contain a definition of disability-based discrimination, although that was essential to ensuring effective access to justice for persons with disabilities who were victims of discrimination. In the absence of a definition in the Ordinance, persons with disabilities and their counsel could not use the legal avenue of disability-based discrimination to assert their rights. Moreover, the

Ordinance did not reaffirm the principle of equality before the law or the right to equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination. The Ordinance also remained silent on the requirement for legal protection against all discrimination.¹⁷

15. Front Line Defenders (FDL) noted that there are no laws protecting lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex (LGBTI) persons from discrimination. Under sharia law, as applied in the country, consensual same-sex sexual activity between men is punishable by death if witnessed by four individuals, and such activity between women is punishable by three months to two years in prison and a fine, according to articles 306 and 308 of the criminal code.¹⁸

*Development, the environment, and business and human rights*¹⁹

16. The African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights (AU-ACHPR) recommended that Mauritania: (i) indicate the number of companies engaged in the extractive industries and their areas of activity; (ii) follow up and support small-scale mining operations in the country through programmes or policies intended to monitor or regulate the practice; (iii) establish a government policy to raise awareness about safety standards, given the threats to the environment and to the health of small-scale miners; and (iv) put in place measures to address any violations of environmental standards or incidents of environmental harm caused by the activities of the extractive industries.²⁰

17. Just Atonement Inc. (JAI) stressed that Mauritania was vulnerable to climate change with its substantial population growth and recurring challenges related to environmental degradation, poverty and political instability. Its readiness to improve resilience is very low. JAI recommended that Mauritania work together with other countries in its region to strengthen climate resilience and to fight climate change effectively. While addressing this issue, Mauritania must aim to protect minorities that are disproportionately affected by climate change, such as women and children.²¹

*Human rights and counter-terrorism*²²

18. JS4 noted that persons suspected of terrorist and related offences faced a high risk of torture or ill-treatment. In addition, judges prioritized the law on terrorism over the law against torture. The definition of "terrorist acts" in the Criminal Code was broad and vague. Furthermore, there were reliable reports that terrorism suspects could be arrested and held incommunicado in illegal clandestine places of detention and subjected to torture to compel them to confess.²³

19. JAI noted that Mauritania was a part of the Sahel region, which had porous borders and terrorists operated across borders easily. Terrorist groups are the main threats to the safety of people, especially tourists, humanitarian aid workers, and journalists. Even though Mauritanian authorities have taken some security measures, they have not been enough to mitigate the threat and protect the population from terrorism. It recommended that Mauritania implement more effective counter-terrorism measures at the national level and increase international cooperation for the fight against terrorism.²⁴

2. Civil and political rights

*Right to life, liberty and security of person*²⁵

20. CGNK recommended that Mauritania amend their Constitution to value life and strongly called for the immediate abolition of the death penalty.²⁶

21. JS6 noted that, although Mauritania had observed a de facto moratorium since 1987, its criminal chambers continued to hand down death sentences on a regular basis. In Mauritania, numerous offences that did not come under the category of "most serious crimes" carried the death penalty. Conditions of detention and the treatment of prisoners, especially those facing a death sentence, were not compatible with international standards. Moreover, the de facto moratorium left persons sentenced to death in a state of uncertainty, which constituted cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment.²⁷

22. JS11 noted that Mauritania had expressed willingness in recent years to move forward on torture prevention by signing the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, amending the

Constitution, strengthening the powers of the National Human Rights Commission, submitting its initial report to the Committee against Torture and adopting Act 033/2015 on Combating Torture and Act 034/2015 on the Establishment of the National Mechanism for the Prevention of Torture. JS11 recommended raising public awareness to encourage a national dialogue on the prohibition of torture.²⁸

23. JS4 expressed concern about the ill-treatment of persons deprived of their liberty, including the imposition of solitary confinement 23 hours a day for 15 or 60 days in a row and the use of restrictions on access to water or family visits as a collective disciplinary measure. There had been allegations of suspicious deaths, such as that of Mohamed Ould Brahim Maatalla, who had died of a heart attack following his arrest by the police, and allegations that autopsies were not performed in the event of deaths in custody owing to a lack of forensic doctors in the State.²⁹

24. The National Mechanism for the Prevention of Torture (MNP) noted that, since its establishment in 2016, it had been able to organize visits in accordance with its preventive mandate to all prisons, all national reception and reintegration centres for children in conflict with the law and most police and gendarmerie stations at the national level, to obtain information about the detention conditions for prisoners and persons in police custody and prepare a report on the various prisons and other places of deprivation of liberty.

25. MNP recommended that the maximum duration of police custody should not exceed 48 hours, including weekends and public holidays, and be renewable once only, and that MNP be provided with sufficient resources to fully discharge its mandate.³⁰

*Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law*³¹

26. JS6 noted that respect for only minimal legal safeguards in criminal proceedings called into question the independence of the judiciary, including respect for the principle of adversarial proceedings and the real discretion of judges in judicial decisions.³²

27. JS13 stated that slavery or slave-like practices persisted throughout the country, and yet the culprits were rarely detained. The judicial system is highly partial and prevents an adequate response to reported cases of exploitation. The Néma court, for example, has been criticized both for long delays in adjudicating cases and for inappropriate application of the law; in one case handing down a sentence of 5 years' imprisonment, although under the 2015 Act the sentence was to be at least 10 years imprisonment for the crime committed.³³

28. JS13 noted that the judiciary was faced with practical difficulties in the implementation of the law on slavery. These include: a lack of resources granted to the courts, a lack of reception facilities for minor victims, no method of calculation for the evaluation of compensation for victims of slavery, the absence of a provision on legal assistance to victims, and difficult conditions for the transmission of files within the territory. JS13 stated that reform of the judicial system was needed to improve the judicial response to continued use of slavery.³⁴

29. JS4 noted that, according to statements made by four prisoners, the women's prison was guarded by men. In order to receive certain services, the women were forced to accept solitary confinement and rape, which they could not report for fear of reprisals. The women's prison currently had 29 inmates, including 20 young women and 2 teenagers. As the Committee against Torture had recommended, the authorities should find an alternative to whipping so that women could serve out their sentences and not have to rely on the uncertain possibility of a pardon.³⁵

*Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life*³⁶

30. ECLJ noted that in 2018, the National Assembly voted to amend the penal code to mandate the death penalty in cases of apostasy and blasphemy. It was deeply concerned that the death penalty had the great potential to be misused to target innocent people who were merely exercising their fundamental human right of religious freedom. The mandatory death sentence for apostasy and blasphemy is extremely concerning and greatly inhibits the ability of minority religions, including Christians, to freely exercise their religious beliefs.

31. ECLJ recommended that Mauritania show its commitment to protecting freedom of religion by not only removing the mandatory death sentence for apostasy and blasphemy, but by removing apostasy and blasphemy altogether from its criminal code.³⁷

32. Jubilee Campaign noted that Courts convicted a Mauritanian blogger to death penalty for apostasy in late 2014 for blogging about religious discrimination and spent five years in prison before being acquitted of his charges in 2019. Christian converts are forced to maintain their religious affiliation in secrecy, because if they are caught, they can be arrested and detained indefinitely. They also risk being denied or revoked citizenship by the government. It recommended that Mauritania cease the practice of rescinding citizenship from Christian converts and ensure the freedom of expression of all religious groups, especially those who choose to leave Islam.³⁸

33. JS5 noted that Article 10 of the 1991 Constitution guaranteed the right to the freedom of association. Moreover, article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which Mauritania is a State party, also guarantees the freedom of association. However, despite these commitments, the government has continued to restrict civil society organizations' ability to form and operate freely, especially those that promote human rights and work on sensitive issues, by refusing to authorise them and interfering in their operations. Several organisations, especially those working to end slavery, speaking out against ethnic and racial discrimination, and seeking justice for past human rights abuses have never received authorisation to operate, despite applying for legal status.³⁹

34. JS 5 recommended to amend Law No. 73-008 of 1973 in order to guarantee fully the right to the freedom of peaceful assembly and unconditionally and immediately release all protesters, human rights defenders and journalists detained for exercising their right to the freedom of peaceful assembly.⁴⁰

35. JS10 has received reports and documented many cases of excessive use of force by law enforcement officials, including during the repression of demonstrations. Persons who publicly challenge the authorities or who demand the effective enjoyment of their civil, political, economic or social rights are particularly targeted by this excessive use of force on the part of the national law enforcement agencies during demonstrations, arrests, transfer to police stations and the custody period. These targets include human rights defenders, members of youth and student movements and foreign nationals, both asylum seekers and other migrants.⁴¹

36. JS13 noted that repression of Haratin and antislavery activists was widespread. Arbitrary arrests and detentions are increasing and torture and ill-treatment of the detained is repeated and regular. Public protests are regularly curtailed and those who engage in speech that is critical of the government are harassed and intimidated (if they aren't arrested and detained). Antislavery NGOs, including IRA-Mauritania continue to be summarily denied the ability to form and register officially in Mauritania.⁴²

37. *FLD noted with concern that human rights defenders regularly faced online and offline surveillance, travel bans, blacklisting for job opportunities, verbal assaults, defamation, smear campaigns, death threats, social exclusion, discrimination, and pressure on family members. It was deeply concerned by the pattern of reprisals against those denouncing ongoing racial discrimination and slavery practices, despite the 2015 adoption of a law criminalising slavery and slavery practices in Mauritania. Human rights defenders working on slavery were subjected to arbitrary detentions and charged with incitement to violence, racial hatred or blasphemy for doing their job.*⁴³

38. *FLD recommended to adopt a human rights defenders protection law aiming at effectively protecting human rights defenders in Mauritania; ensure that this law includes special provisions for women human rights defenders; any future human rights defenders protection law should have an implementation mechanism led by a national and independent institution.*⁴⁴

*Prohibition of all forms of slavery*⁴⁵

39. JS2 noted that, in the absence of official figures, anti-slavery organizations working in Mauritania estimated there to be approximately 100,000 persons living in slavery. The Haratin community (former slaves of the Moors), who accounted for more than 40 per cent

of the country's population, were the main victims of slavery. They continued to suffer from economic dependence and political exclusion with respect to the Moors.⁴⁶

40. JS2 recognized that Mauritania had made significant progress in respect of legislation to combat slavery, in particular with a law adopted in 2015 that criminalized slavery and provided for the establishment of special courts to try slavery cases. However, it regretted that the law had not yet been fully implemented and that the courts were still not truly operational. The legal instruments established pursuant to the law were still rarely used, which constituted an obstacle to its implementation. Several cases of slavery reported to the authorities had been reclassified as cases of labour disputes or exploitation of minors or had been resolved through out-of-court settlements.⁴⁷

41. JS2 recommended that the anti-slavery law be strictly enforced to ensure that the perpetrators of slavery were investigated, prosecuted, convicted and sentenced to penalties commensurate with the gravity of the offence. It also recommended that cases in which the police, prosecutors or judges had not upheld the law or imposed the applicable criminal penalty be investigated and, if necessary, that the special slavery courts be provided with the financial and human resources they needed to operate effectively.⁴⁸

42. CNDH-M recommended monitoring the implementation of the laws to suppress slavery-like practices, improving the capacity of the courts specialized in combating slavery-like practices and strengthening its cooperation with the justice sector to ensure better monitoring of slavery. It also recommended raising awareness of the 2015 law criminalizing slavery and granting the special courts resources and powers to enable them to deal with cases of slavery and punish the perpetrators.⁴⁹

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

*Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work*⁵⁰

43. Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights recommended that Mauritania implement the Tripartite Consultation Convention on International Labor Standards and the Migrant Workers Convention (Supplementary Provisions), which it ratified in 2019. The Government should also issue the updated edition of the national survey on employment and the unrated sector, with an extensive participation of civil society organizations.⁵¹

*Right to an adequate standard of living*⁵²

44. JS3 noted that the promotion of economic, social and cultural rights was supported by an appropriate poverty reduction framework and actions targeting vulnerable groups. The Government had improved food security and access to drinking water and health and education services for the population. JS3 noted that the social measures taken in response to the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic had been and remained insufficient. The Government had issued an appeal to businesses, independent organizations, civil society and technical and financial partners for more consolidated efforts and support for groups affected by the lockdown, particularly those working in the informal sector, which was a pillar of the national economy.⁵³

*Right to health*⁵⁴

45. JS3 noted that Mauritania had put in place a COVID-19 response system in the face of the pandemic. As soon as the first cases had been declared in neighbouring countries, the Government had closed the air, land and sea borders. It had also shut down schools and markets and put in place a package of prevention measures along with a social response policy to limit the harm and consequences of lockdown, particularly among persons working in the informal sector.⁵⁵

46. AU-ACHPR noted with concern that the report of Mauritania did not include information on the steps taken to allow access to safe abortion for women in the country.⁵⁶ JS4 noted that a law on reproductive health had been adopted, but was not effective because it had been set aside. Services were not free. Abortion was only permitted in cases of rape and the law contained many restrictions. Abortion was not permitted if the fetus was not viable and was not permitted after three months.⁵⁷

47. AMPF noted that Mauritania had made progress in the promotion of reproductive health, but that some aspects required improvement to ensure the right to sexual and reproductive health for all. Specifically, it recommended reinforcement of the supply chain for reproductive health products and financial and technical support to establish an efficient national distribution network and prevent real or artificial shortages and disparities between urban, peri-urban and rural areas.⁵⁸

*Right to education*⁵⁹

48. JS2 stated that children born into slavery started working for their masters at a very young age and so did not have access to even the most basic education. Persons of slave descent who were no longer under the control of their masters generally had limited access to education owing to the consequences of poverty and marginalization. Since enslaved persons did not have access to education, they could not acquire the skills they would need to do work other than domestic service or tasks related to livestock rearing or farming.⁶⁰

49. AU-ACHPR was concerned about the continuing low levels of literacy among women and girls in general, which stood at 46.3 per cent for women between the ages of 15 and 19 years and 69.3 per cent for women between the ages of 45 and 49 years. It recommended that Mauritania take steps to improve literacy rates among women and girls through literacy programmes for adult women and support programmes for girls to prevent school dropout.⁶¹

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

*Women*⁶²

50. AMSME expressed concern about the upsurge during the COVID-19 pandemic of sexual violence against women and children and about the lack of a clear strategy on the part of the Government to protect women and children against these serious violations. It noted that victims of sexual violence had complained that no prosecutions of offenders had been undertaken during the pandemic and condemned the release of perpetrators of rape to prevent prison overcrowding. It recommended the adoption of a specific law on sexual assault, setting out an unambiguous and precise definition of rape, the elements of the offence and the penalties for its commission.⁶³

51. AU-ACHPR was concerned about: (i) the persistence of genital mutilation despite the efforts made by the State to eradicate the practice; and (ii) the continuation of the practice of force-feeding girls. It recommended that Mauritania step up the action taken to address the persistence of clandestine female genital mutilation by, inter alia, imposing harsh penalties on all persons involved, including parents and family members.⁶⁴

52. AU-ACHPR was also concerned about the low numbers of women on electoral lists and in decision-making positions, despite the existence of quotas. It recommended that the State pursue its efforts to increase the representation of women in politics and in decision-making entities, including by increasing the quota for female representation to 30 per cent.⁶⁵

53. AMPF recommended that measures be taken to address the root causes of child marriage, including by encouraging dialogue with traditional and religious leaders, changing attitudes and reinforcing the responsibility of parents, guardians and communities to protect vulnerable young girls, combating poverty and incorporating human rights education into school curricula to prevent harmful practices such as child marriage.⁶⁶

54. ECPAT International⁶⁷ recommended to amend the provisions of the Personal Status Code relating to marriage to ensure children cannot be married without their consent by avoiding mis-interpretation of the concept of incapability and to remove from the Code that the silence of the girl is consent.

*Children*⁶⁸

55. The Association de lutte contre la dépendance stated that Mauritania had undertaken major reforms to improve the compatibility of national law with the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The Directorate for Children of the Ministry of Social Affairs, Children and the Family had produced a national child protection strategy aimed at the protection and advancement of children.⁶⁹

56. JS1 noted that children in Mauritania continue to be victims of poverty, disease and exploitation. Thousands of children were subjected to forced labour; they included *talibe*, brickmakers, apprentice mechanics, water carriers with and without donkeys, domestic servants and scavengers who searched through dumps to find leftovers (referred to as “*hach*”) to feed domestic livestock. JS1 noted that child labour was an attack on children’s most fundamental rights.⁷⁰

57. ECPAT International recommended to amend the 2005 Order on the Penal Protection of the Child to include a comprehensive definition of “pornographic materials featuring children” and pornographic “messages”, in accordance with Articles 2 and 3 of the Optional Protocol on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography. It recommended to criminalise all forms of sexual exploitation of children, including in the context of travel, tourism and online.⁷¹

58. The Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) noted with concern the legality of corporal punishment of children in Mauritania. It expressed hope that states will raise this issue during the review and make a specific recommendation that Mauritania draft and enact legislation as a matter of priority to explicitly prohibit corporal punishment of children in all settings, including the home and as a sentence for a crime.⁷²

Persons with disabilities

59. PRDH recommended the adoption of a new law on the promotion and protection of the rights of person with disabilities, with a definition of disability and a specific definition of disability-based discrimination in line with the international definition contained in the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The law should also set out as fundamental principles the dignity of persons with disabilities, gender equality and the inclusion of persons with disabilities in all aspects of society. PRDH also recommended that the new law be disseminated as widely as possible, taking into account the diversity of disabilities, so that it was accessible and understood by all.⁷³

*Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers*⁷⁴

60. JS12 noted that Mauritania hosted many migrants from sub-Saharan Africa and other regions. It was also facing a large influx of more than 40,000 refugees in the border region of Hodh ech-Chargui.⁷⁵

61. JS7 has identified the following on-going issues that may merited attention: (i) that the detention of persons on the grounds that they plan to depart the country irregularly lacked any legal basis; (ii) with no screening in place, victims of trafficking were vulnerable to detention and deportation; and (iii) the lack of clarity concerning the operating status of the Nouadhibou detention facility.

62. JS7 recommended to cease detention of refugees and, instead, ensure their protection by adopting asylum legislation, to ensure that no refugees are expelled in violation of the non-refoulement principle, to cease forced expulsions, and to provide non-nationals with the opportunity to appeal expulsion orders and to clarify the conditions and facilities in which non-nationals are held.⁷⁶

Stateless persons

63. JS8 noted that Mauritania was still in the process of repatriating ‘Black Mauritians’ who were rendered stateless following an inter-communal conflict in Mauritania in 1989. At the time, the government arbitrarily denationalised over 60,000 ‘Black Mauritians’, leaving them stateless, and simultaneously expelled them from the country.⁷⁷

64. JS8 also said that Mauritania’s nationality law denied Mauritanian women equal rights with men to confer nationality on children and spouses, which could lead to statelessness and also formed part of a much wider and pervasive discrimination against women in the country.⁷⁸ It recommended to amend nationality laws to ensure every child’s right to a nationality, including by introducing a comprehensive safeguard against statelessness, where the parents may themselves be stateless or unable to pass on their nationality to the child.⁷⁹

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:*

AMPDH	Association Mauritanienne Pour la Promotion des Droits de l'Homme, Nouakchott, Mauritanie;
ALCD	Association de lutte contre la dépendance, Nouakchott, Mauritanie;
AMPF	Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion de la famille, Nouakchott, Mauritanie;
AMSME	Association Mauritanienne pour la Santé de la Mère et de l'Enfant, Nouakchott, Mauritanie;
CGNK	Center for Global Non-killing, Grand-Saconnex, Switzerland;
ECLJ	European Centre for Law and Justice, Strasbourg, France;
ECPAT International	ECPAT International, Bangkok, Thailand;
FLD	Front Line Defenders - The International Foundation for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders, Dublin, Ireland;
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
JAI	Just Atonement Inc, New York, United States of America;
JUBILEE	Jubilee Campaign, Surrey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
MAAT	Maat Foundation for Peace, Development and Human Rights, Cairo, Egypt;
PRDH	Planète Réfugiés-Droits de l'Homme, Port-Vendres, France.

Joint submissions:

JS1	Joint submission 1 submitted by: Association Mauritanienne pour la Promotion du Droit, ONG Stratégies et développement, ONG Un monde sans guerre sans violence, Observatoire national de lutte contre la gabegie et la corruption, Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, Nouakchott, Mauritanie;
JS2	Joint submission 2 submitted by: l'Association des Femmes Chefs de Familles (AFCF) Anti-Slavery International (ASI) International Service for Human rights (ISHR) Minority Rights Group International (MRGI) SOS-Esclaves (SOS), London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
JS3	Joint submission 3 submitted by: Alliance et Solidarité des Organisations Nationales des Droits de l'Homme contre la Haïne et l'Exclusion en Mauritanie, Arafatt, Mauritanie;
JS4	Joint submission 4 submitted by: Centre for Civil and Political Rights, Coordination des Organisations des Victimes de la Répression; Cadre de Concertation des Rescapés Mauritaniens; Organisation pour le Développement International, Social, Solidaire et Intégré; Association des Femmes Cheffes de Famille; Association Mauritanienne d'Aide aux Nécessiteux; Forum des Organisations Nationales des Droits Humains en Mauritanie; Comité de Solidarité avec les Victimes de Violations des Droits de l'Homme; SOS-Esclaves, Geneva, Switzerland;
JS5	Joint submission 5 submitted by: CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, le Réseau Ouest Africain des Défenseurs des Droits Humains (ROADDH, West African Human Right Defenders Network), Johannesburg, South Africa;
JS6	Joint submission 6 submitted by: Association mauritanienne des droits de l'homme (AMDH), Coalition mondiale Composée de plus de 160 ONG, barreaux d'avocats et

- d'avocates, collectivités locales et syndicats, la Coalition mondiale contre la peine de mort est née à Rome le 13 mai 2002, Ensemble contre la peine de mort (ECPM), Planète Réfugiés-Droits de l'Homme (PRDH), Paris, France;
- JS7 **Joint submission 7 submitted by:** Global Detention Project, Association for Juridical Studies on Immigration (ASGI), Geneva, Switzerland;
- JS8 **Joint submission 8 submitted by:** Institute on Statelessness and Inclusion Association des femmes chefs de Famille SOS-Esclaves Anti-slavery International Minority Rights Group International Global Campaign for Equal Nationality Rights, Eindhoven, Netherlands;
- JS9 **Joint submission 9 submitted by:** MENA Rights Group, Cadre de Concertation des Rescapés de Mauritanie (CCR-M), Chatelaine, Switzerland;
- JS10 **Joint submission 10 submitted by:** Planète Réfugiés-Droits de l'Homme (PRDH) ACAT-France SOS Esclaves Association Mauritanienne pour les Droits de l'Homme (AMDH) Association des Femmes Cheffes de Famille (AFCF) Comité de Solidarité avec les Victimes des Violations des Droits Humains (CSVVDH) Forum des Organisations Nationales des Droits de l'Homme (FONADH), Port-Vendres, France;
- JS11 **Joint submission 11 submitted by:** Réseau Ensemble Contre la Torture en Mauritanie, Association " Paix " pour la lutte contre la contrainte et l'injustice, Nouakchott, Mauritanie;
- JS12 **Joint submission 12 submitted by:** Tewassoul pour la Santé, la Femme et l'Enfant (TPSFE), Association Mauritanienne pour la Promotion des Droits de l'Homme (AMPDH), Assistance Communautaire et Développement (ASCOM), Association pour l'Education et la Santé de la Femme et de l'Enfant (AESFE), Initiative d'Opposition contre le Discours Extrémiste (IODE), Association du Développement et de la Promotion de Droits de l'Homme (ADPDH), Nouakchott, Mauritanie;
- JS13 **Joint submission 13 submitted by:** Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization, The Initiative for the Resurgence of the Abolitionist Movement (IRA) in Mauritania, The Hague, Netherlands.

National human rights institution:

- CNDH-M National Human Rights Institution of Mauritania, Nouakchott, Mauritanie;
- MNP Mécanisme National de Prévention de la Torture, Nouakchott, Mauritanie.

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):

- AU-ACHPR African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, Banjul, Gambia.

² For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/6, paras. 127.1, 128.1–2, 128.4, 128.6, and 129.1–23.

³ The Center for Global Nonkilling, pp. 6–7.

⁴ L'association Mauritanienne pour la Santé de la Mère et de l'Enfant, p. 2.

⁵ JS8, p. 11.

⁶ L'Association Mauritanienne de la Promotion des Droits de l'Homme, p. 5.

⁷ The European Centre for Law and Justice, para. 5.

⁸ L'association Mauritanienne pour la Santé de la Mère et de l'Enfant, p. 8.

⁹ JS9, p. 5.

¹⁰ Planète Réfugiés-Droits de l'Homme, para. 4.

¹¹ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/6, paras 126.1–4, and 126.7–21.

¹² JS4, para. 3.

¹³ Commission nationale des droits de l'homme, p. 7.

¹⁴ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/6, paras. 129.37, 129.53–54, 129.37, 127.30, 126.16–17, and 129.51. 128.6.

¹⁵ JS4, para. 12.

¹⁶ Ibid., para. 30.

- 17 Planète Réfugiés-Droits de l'Homme, paras. 9–10.
- 18 *Front Line Defenders*, p5.
- 19 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/6, paras. 126.73, 127.60, and 127.57.
- 20 CADHP, Observations Finales et Recommandations relatives au Rapport périodique et cumulé de la République Islamique de Mauritanie sur la mise en œuvre de la Charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples (2006–2014) et Rapport Initial sur le Protocole de Maputo, para. 53.
- 21 Just Atonement Inc., para. 45.
- 22 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/6, paras. 126.73, 127.60, and 127.57.
- 23 JS4, para. 10.
- 24 Just Atonement Inc, paras. 13, 14 and 40.
- 25 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/6, paras. 126.36, 129.38–46, and 129.36.
- 26 The Center for Global Nonkilling, p. 7.
- 27 JS6, paras. 2–7.
- 28 JS11, p. 8.
- 29 JS4, para. 20.
- 30 Le Mécanisme National de Prévention de la Torture, p. 3.
- 31 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/6, paras. 127.6, 127.39, 129.48, 127.36, 126.21–23, 126.31, and 127.15.
- 32 JS6, para. 2.
- 33 JS13, paras. 11–12.
- 34 *Ibid.*, para. 13.
- 35 JS4, para. 21.
- 36 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/6, paras. 127.11, 127.55, 129.27, 129.28–29, 129.35, and 129.52.
- 37 The European Centre for Law and Justice, paras. 6–11.
- 38 Jubilee Campaign, paras. 11, 12 and 25.
- 39 JS5, paras. 2.1–5.
- 40 JS5, paras. 5.2, 5.4 and 6.4.
- 41 JS10 paras. 5–10.
- 42 JS13, para. 6.
- 43 *Front Line Defenders*, p3.
- 44 *Ibid.*, p6.
- 45 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/6, paras. 127.40, 127.51, 127.30, 127.29, 127.31, 127.49, 127.34, 127.36, 126.53, 129.51, 126.21, 126.55–57, 126.59, 127.7, 127.24–25, 127.27–28, 127.32–33, 127.35, 127.38, 127.42, 127.44, 127.45–49, 127.39, 127.62, 127.43, and 126.54.
- 46 JS2, para. 6.
- 47 *Ibid.*, paras. 8 and 13.
- 48 *Ibid.*, p. 15.
- 49 CNDH, p. 9.
- 50 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/6, paras. 127.57, 126.64, and 127.59.
- 51 Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights, paras. 9–10.
- 52 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/6, para. 126.61.
- 53 JS3, pp. 10–11.
- 54 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/6, paras. 126.65–70.
- 55 *Ibid.*, paras. 10–11.
- 56 CADHP, para. 77.
- 57 JS4, para. 17.
- 58 L'Association Mauritanienne pour la Promotion de la Famille, para. 8.
- 59 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/6, paras. 126.26–27, 126.71–72, 127.61, and 127.63.
- 60 JS2, paras. 30–31.
- 61 CADHP, paras. 79 and 86.
- 62 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/6, paras. 126.14, 126.33–34, 126.38, 126.60, 127.16–17, 126.41, 126.44, 126.47, 127.21, and 127.22.
- 63 L'Association Mauritanienne pour la Santé de la Mère et de l'Enfant, pp. 3–6.
- 64 CADHP, paras. 78 and 85.
- 65 CADHP, paras. 76 and 83.
- 66 L'Association Mauritanienne pour la Promotion de la Famille, p. 5.
- 67 ECPAT International, p. 5.
- 68 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/6, paras. 126.46, 126.18, 127.19, 127.52, 126.49, 127.15, and 127.53.
- 69 L'Association de Lutte Contre la Dépendance, pp. 4–5.
- 70 JS1, p. 1.
- 71 ECPAT International, p. 5.

⁷² The Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, p. 1.

⁷³ Planète Réfugiés-Droits de l'Homme, paras. 6 and 12.

⁷⁴ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/31/6, para. 129.55.

⁷⁵ JS12, p. 3.

⁷⁶ JS7, para. 3.6.

⁷⁷ JS8, paras. 45–47.

⁷⁸ JS8, paras. 45–47.

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 11.
