



General Assembly

Distr.: General
30 July 2013

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review

Seventeenth session

Geneva, 21 October – 1 November 2013

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

Belize*

The present report is a summary of six 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 Resolution 16/21 of the Human Rights Council, 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 being sent to United Nations translations services.

Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Background and framework

1. Scope of international obligations

1. Joint Submission 1 (JS1) recommended that Belize adhere to recommendations made by the UPR in 2009.²
2. JS1 recommended that Belize ratify the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR); sign optional protocols to both the International Covenant on Civil Political Rights (OP-ICCPR) and ICESCR (OP-ICESCR); and withdraw the reservation to article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD).³
3. International Human Rights Clinic of University of Oklahoma (IHRC-OU) noted that the 2009 UPR report had recommended that Belize ratify the ICESCR and consider ratifying the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). IHRC-OU indicated that Belize still had not ratified the ICESCR, but had signed and ratified the CRPD in 2011.⁴
4. Joint Submission 2 (JS2) indicated that, in 2000, Belize had signed, but not ratified ICESCR, and it had not signed the Optional Protocol to ICESCR. The Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OP-CAT) had not been acceded to and the Belize's report to the Committee against Torture remained overdue. The International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance had not been signed or ratified despite Belize accepting to consider the UPR recommendation for ratification.⁵
5. JS1 recommended that Belize sign and ratify the International Labour Organization's Convention concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries (ILO Convention no. 169).⁶

2. Constitutional and legislative framework

6. JS2 stated that national legislation to implement the substantive rights set out in international human rights law had not been formulated.⁷ JS2 recommended that Belize develop and amend national legislation in order to ensure it was harmonized with regional and international treaties ratified by Belize.⁸
7. JS1 recommended that Belize implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) through national legislation.⁹

3. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures

8. JS2 indicated that there was no functioning national human rights institution (NHRI) in Belize.¹⁰ JS2 recommended that Belize set timelines and commitment to take specific actions with regard to the development of an NHRI as recommended in the first UPR¹¹

B. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

1. Cooperation with treaty bodies

9. JS1 recommended that Belize submit all reports to relevant treaty bodies in a timely manner.¹² IHRC-OU recommended that Belize submit all overdue reports to the United Nations human rights treaty bodies.¹³

10. JS2 stated Belize had recognized its tardiness in reporting to the treaty bodies, but had not mapped out a plan of action to address it in order to implement the recommendations formulated by several countries during the UPR of 2009 and accepted by Belize.¹⁴

2. Cooperation with special procedures

11. JS1 recommended that Belize extend an open invitation to all thematic special procedures, including the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous peoples.¹⁵

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations

1. Equality and non-discrimination

12. Joint Submission 3 (JS3) stated that, under its international obligations, Belize was required to ensure the right to equality before the law, equal protection of the law, and non-discrimination. By failing to recognize the collective rights of the Maya, while continuing to recognize and grant individual rights over land, both in general and over the Maya traditional lands, Belize was acting in clear violation of the principle of equal treatment. This particularly affected those communities that viewed land as a communal good. Consequently, the failure to recognize collective land rights disproportionately affected the Maya villages in southern Belize. This discriminatory treatment, as the 2007 and 2010 Supreme Court judgments affirmed, “*stems largely from the fact that the[y] are Maya and practice the customary land tenure system of their people*” (*Aurelio Cal and Others v Attorney General of Belize and Others, 18 October 2007*).¹⁶

13. JS3 noted that the discriminatory treatment of the Maya communities had a particularly negative impact on Maya children. In 2005, the Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC) had raised concerns at the inadequate resources allocated to meeting the needs of children and the non-implementation of equality laws, particularly with respect to vulnerable children, including those from minorities and indigenous groups. CRC had recommended that Belize prioritise “effective measures to reduce poverty” among them, in order to enable such children to enjoy their equal rights. Such concerns remained in 2013.¹⁷ JS3 recommended that Belize take immediate and effective steps to implement existing anti-discrimination laws, including through the adoption of a detailed strategy to eliminate discrimination against children from minority and indigenous groups.¹⁸

14. JS2 indicated that Belize had accepted the UPR recommendation directed at strengthening activities directed to HIV prevention, as well as against stigma and discrimination of people living with HIV/AIDS.¹⁹ However, no specific legislative measures or amendments had been introduced to address stigma and discrimination against people living with HIV/AIDS, in particular, men who have sex with men.²⁰ IHRC-OU stated that stigmatization of and discrimination against those infected remained a major obstacle to treating and combating the spread of HIV/AIDS.²¹ JS2 recommended that Belize implement all necessary measures to address the serious problem of stigma and

discrimination against people living with HIV/AIDS, including through the enactment of legislation to eradicate this phenomenon.²²

2 Right to life, liberty and security of the person

15. Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) stated that corporal punishment of children was lawful in Belize, despite the Government's acceptance of recommendations on the issue made during the UPR in 2009 and repeated recommendations by CRC.²³

16. GIEACPC noted that, when accepting the UPR recommendations, Belize had stated: "Government has instituted strict limitations to the use of corporal punishment. Corporal punishment has been abolished from all child care institutions, and the relevant authorities are actively exploring measures to effect the complete abolition of corporal punishment."²⁴

17. GIEACPC acknowledged that some progress had been made towards prohibiting all corporal punishment since the first review in 2009, with the prohibition of corporal punishment in schools included in the Education and Training Act 2010. However, further reform was necessary, as today, as in 2009, corporal punishment was lawful in the home and in some alternative care settings and penal institutions.²⁵ GIEACPC expressed the hope that a recommendation would be made to Belize by the UPR Working Group to enact legislation to explicitly prohibit corporal punishment of children in all settings, including in the home as a matter of priority.²⁶

3. Administration of justice and the rule of law

18. JS1 indicated that the 2009 UPR had recommended that Belize improve accountability for allegations of misconduct, abuse and violence by public agents. Belize had supported this recommendation. However, JS1 noted there had been numerous examples of misconduct by public agents in response to Maya assertions of communal property rights.²⁷ In a number of Maya villages throughout 2011 and 2012, police and government officials had provided no support to *Alcaldes* who had attempted to enforce Maya customary norms against loggers cutting rosewood timber on their lands.²⁸ JS4 indicated that Belize was not a party to the United Nations Convention against Corruption and reported alleged threats of intimidation aimed at people who challenged the Government regarding environmental issues.²⁹

4. Right to privacy, marriage and family life

19. IHRC-OU noted that, although Belize had accepted the UPR recommendation to implement the recommendations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), the State had not raised the minimum age of marriage from 16 to 18 years.³⁰

20. JS2 indicated that Belize Criminal Code Chapter 101 stated in section 53: "Every person who has carnal intercourse against the order of nature with any person or animal shall be liable to imprisonment for 10 years", and a constitutional challenge had been launched directed to repeal or amendment of the provision, and a related case was before the Supreme Court. In the first UPR, Belize received recommendations to take appropriate legislative measures in order to ensure that no person could be subject to criminal sanctions for same-sex activity between consenting adults.³¹ JS2 recommended that Belize conduct a legal review to define how enacted national legislation reflected substantive rights set out in international human rights obligations ratified by Belize and carry out the necessary actions to address gaps.³²

21. JS2 stated that Belize had retained its discriminatory immigration law that affected homosexuals. The Immigration Act, Chapter 156, Revised Edition 2000, under categories

of prohibited immigrants - Section 5 (1) (2) (3) - included the following “(e) any prostitute or homosexual or any person who may be living on or receiving or may have been living on or receiving the proceeds of prostitution or homosexual behaviour”.³³

22. JS2 also indicated that, in the first UPR, Belize had accepted the recommendation to provide human rights training for the protection of vulnerable groups, including persons of minority sexual orientation or gender identity, to law enforcement officials, judicial officials, and all state officials. However, over the past two years, human rights violations against LGBT people had taken place involving use of violence, threats, humiliation, and discrimination in villages, cities and towns and at police stations by police agents.³⁴ According to JS2, most of these cases remained unreported, due to lack of trust in the police and judicial agents by the LGBT population. Failure of officials to carry out their duties had a penalty under the police act. However, victims of police abuse were influenced by fear of negative repercussions and therefore, there was no accountability for abuse by law enforcement officials.³⁵

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

23. Joint Submission 4 (JS4) indicated that Belize had international obligations to provide access to clean water and basic sanitation services, as per commitments adhered to through its ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and signature of ICESCR. In addition, Belize’s national legislation provided for the right to access proper sanitation and clean and safe drinking water. Lack of Government oversight, limitations on access, and inadequate water quality were the primary areas of concern raised.³⁶

24. JS4 reported that the central government lacked coordinated, comprehensive policies and institutions to deliver water and provide sanitation services and that the system often left too much control in the hands of local water board members who might lack the education and formal training necessary to run a water delivery system. Access to clean drinking water was limited by high prices and lack of adequate infrastructure. These two factors were significant in preventing community members from accessing enough water to meet their basic household needs. Most communities had a basic water delivery system, which pumped water from groundwater sources into a central holding tank, however, these systems were often underfunded and overused, resulting in reduced access. Water quality was adversely affected by inadequacies in water treatment and the presence of various contaminants, including industrial pollutants, solid and human waste. There were also issues of transparency and corruption. The Government was opaque when it provided information regarding its expenditures and practices.³⁷

25. JS4 recommended that Belize enforce water-related regulations, such as clear parameters for dumping and removing waste; and increase investment in water infrastructure, government accountability and transparency, and community involvement and access to information. At the local level, residents needed to know where they could obtain information about their community’s water system and how they could file complaints relating to water quality or access. JS4 stated that Belize needed to ensure that local water boards were free of corruption and staffed by well-trained elected or appointed members of the community. Increased community involvement could be accomplished through translation of documents into local languages and broadcasting important information over the radio. Increased information could be disseminated through schools and community health clinics in instructional lectures and in written materials.³⁸

6. Right to health

26. IHRC-OU stated that indigenous peoples faced long, costly treks to clinics and continued lack of access to affordable treatment. Increased funding from the Government had been focused on urban centres, while rural satellite clinics remained understaffed and underfunded. The Government had failed to engage in adequate communication and consultation with the Maya that would enable Belize to serve the medical needs of the rural communities.³⁹ IHRC-OU recommended that Belize allocate resources to the health sector in order to improve access to quality health care in rural areas; and implement measures to regularly compile health statistics for indigenous communities in order to identify their healthcare needs.⁴⁰ JS3 recommended that Belize give proper consideration to indigenous medical knowledge and traditional healthcare structures; and put in place mechanisms to ensure that the Government would consult and cooperate in good faith with indigenous peoples in order to obtain their free, prior and informed consent.⁴¹

27. IHRC-OU noted that both the maternal and infant mortality rates had decreased slightly since 2009. The number of births attended by skilled personnel had increased steadily. Typically, Mayan women gave birth at home with a midwife attending. They reported discrimination when giving birth at the regional hospitals due to language barriers and negative stereotypes about Maya culture being backward.⁴² IHRC-OU recommended that Belize initiate cultural sensitivity training for medical personnel in order to diminish discrimination in the provision of healthcare services.⁴³

28. IHRC-OU indicated that Mayan women reported use of contraceptives at half the rate of the general population. Additionally, cultural barriers related to women's perceived proper place in society prevented some Mayan women from making family planning decisions.⁴⁴ IHRC-OU recommended that Belize consider identifying persons in the villages, with whom Mayan women would be comfortable, to train them in various health areas, including reproductive health care.⁴⁵

29. IHRC-OU reported that, although the first UPR recommended that Belize consider eliminating the required parental consent for HIV testing for minors under the age of 16, the law had not been amended in line with this recommendation.⁴⁶

30. IHRC-OU noted that, in 2007, CEDAW had recommended that Belize remove a statutory provision punishing women who had abortions⁴⁷ and although Belize had accepted the UPR recommendation to implement CEDAW recommendations, the State had not removed the punitive provision from its abortion law.⁴⁸

7. Right to education

31. IHRC-OU stated that primary education was not completely free because of associated fees, including required uniforms, computers, and registration. These fees often caused financial difficulties for many families, particularly in rural areas where incomes tended to be lower. IHRC-OU recommended that, consistent with the United Nations Millennium Development Goal no.2, Belize ensure that, by 2015, all children would be able to complete a full course of primary schooling without fees keeping them from completing their courses.⁴⁹

32. JS2 indicated that LGBT children and young adults could not fully enjoy the right to education because of violence and discrimination. LGBT students (or those perceived as such) had encountered homophobic and trans-phobic bullying in schools and lacked support from school officials and teachers.⁵⁰ JS2 recommended that Belize: elaborate and implement a national plan to invest in stigma and discrimination reduction strategies in the education system, including the elimination of homophobic bullying; document and punish discriminatory behaviour on the part of educators towards LGBT children; and ensure that

LGBT students and parents had access to legal advocate/counsellor to support them in addressing discriminatory experiences in the education system.⁵¹

33. JS2 reported that Catholic and Evangelical schools had a problematic relationship with sexuality issues that damaged the government investment in comprehensive sexual education. There was a history of denominational school management, expelling girls for being pregnant and firing female teachers for having a baby out of wedlock, while the former Catholic Bishop had strongly spoken against condom use. General managers of denominational schools considered that their teachers were uncomfortable with sexual education. JS2 indicated that the Catholic Church ran an estimated 60 per cent of the country's schools.⁵²

8. Cultural rights

34. IHRC-OU stated that Belize did not have a language policy to integrate indigenous languages in the national curriculum. While less than one in twenty-five Belizeans spoke English as a first language, English was the official language and the primary language of instruction throughout the education system. Three intercultural bilingual schools existed with limited support from the Government, but more schools of this type needed to be created in additional locations around the country. The Government also needed to increase resources provided to existing schools. In addition, although there was teacher training at the universities, there was no teacher training for indigenous languages and culture and no major research was being done in these areas.⁵³

35. IHRC-OU recommended that Belize consult with the indigenous peoples to work toward the creation of a plan for integrating indigenous languages into the national curriculum, in accordance with article 14 of UNDRIP; invest in research into indigenous languages and cultures at the national university; and ensure that the training of teachers, particularly in the areas of indigenous languages and culture, were in accordance with international standards on indigenous peoples, such as those found in the UNDRIP.⁵⁴

36. JS3 stated that Belize had failed to abide by the recommendation of the CRC in 2005 that it allocate sufficient resources and pay special attention to the needs of indigenous and minority children in order to safeguard their right to education at all levels. Any real movement towards reform had been led by the Maya themselves.⁵⁵ JS3 recommended that Belize establish, in consultation with the affected indigenous communities, a system of bilingual and intercultural education utilising culturally-appropriate learning methods and curricula and prioritise resource allocations to protect the rights of children from minority and indigenous groups.⁵⁶

37. JS3 reported that there was a general need for the input of indigenous communities in the process of recognition of the diverse cultural histories of Belize, and a willingness on the part of the Government to adopt a culturally-sensitive cultural policy following proper consultation. While there were on-going consultations, there was a concern that these were directed more at the links between the economy, arts/culture and tourism. JS3 recommended that Belize take immediate and effective steps to develop and implement a policy which was sensitive to the cultural history of Belize's indigenous and minority groups, following consultation and cooperation with such groups.⁵⁷

9. Persons with disabilities

38. JS2 indicated that the immigration law discriminated against mentally challenged people (described as "any idiot or any person who is insane or mentally deficient...") and physically disabled persons (described as "deaf and dumb or deaf and blind, or dumb and blind...") even though, Belize had signed and ratified CRPD in 2011.⁵⁸

10. Minorities and indigenous peoples

39. JS1 and IHRC-OU noted that the 2009 UPR had recommended that Belize redouble its efforts to recognize and respect the rights of its indigenous peoples in accordance with the UNDRIP. Belize had made a commitment to engage the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the rights of Indigenous Peoples, stating: “The situation of the Maya of Belize is a matter of national importance. Belize intends to engage the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous people.” However, there was no indication that Belize had implemented any measures in order to protect the rights of indigenous peoples in line with the UNDRIP provisions.⁵⁹

40. JS1, JS3, and IHRC-OU underscored that, after its 2007 decision that recognized Maya customary property rights for the communities of Conejo and Santa Cruz under the Belize Constitution and ordered the Government to delimit, demarcate and document Maya title to their lands, the Supreme Court had reaffirmed, on 28 June 2010, customary land rights of all Maya villages in the Toledo Districts (*The Maya Leaders Alliance, the Toledo Alcaldes Association and Others v. Attorney General of Belize and Others*). The 2010 judgment included an injunction against the Government interfering or allowing interference by third parties in the use and occupation by Mayan people in all the Maya villages in the Toledo District, unless the affected village expressly consented to such activities. Issuing logging or oil extraction permits was explicitly enjoined.⁶⁰

41. JS1, JS3 and IHRC-OU indicated that the Government had appealed the 2010 judgement, and the appeal was heard in March and June 2011, but the decision was still pending as of March 2013. The Government made clear that it would appeal to the highest court.⁶¹ It continued to assert in Court and publicly that Maya land rights did not exist or did not merit legal protection.⁶²

42. JS1 stated that, since the first UPR in 2009, Belize had granted an oil company drilling rights in protected Maya lands inside the Sarstoon-Temash National Park in the Toledo District, in defiance of the 2007 and 2010 Supreme Court decisions, the 2004 recommendations of the Inter-American Commission of Human Rights (IACHR), and those of the UPR Working Group.⁶³ The affected Maya villages were not informed of the oil exploration activities, or asked for their consent. The presence of the company and its equipment was a direct violation of existing domestic court injunctions and Belize’s Petroleum Act, which required the company to obtain the consent of the Maya landowners before entering their lands.⁶⁴

43. JS3 indicated that, by granting leases and resource concessions to third parties without an adequate framework to protect the Maya members against the consequential destruction of their traditional lands and water sources, the Government threatened the very existence and survival of the Maya people. This represented a severe violation of the right to life of the Maya, and their right to be secure in the enjoyment of their own means of subsistence and development.⁶⁵ There was a manifest failure by the State to ensure the provision of an effective remedy in response to these violations. The State’s violation of this obligation was further reinforced by its failure to protect the rights of the Maya communities against abuses by business enterprises and to implement effective remedies to redress violations of indigenous rights by such entities, pursuant to the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.⁶⁶

44. JS3 stated that the granting of the concessions over their lands continued to severely violate their rights to property, and enjoy their culture and spiritual practices in community with each other. It also severely violated the individual and collective rights of the Maya to participate in, contribute to, and enjoy economic, social and cultural development.⁶⁷ Furthermore, the State’s failure to consult represented a manifest breach of its obligation to protect the rights of the members of the Maya communities, in particular, to ensure the

effective participation of members of minority communities in decisions which affect them. This obligation was further informed by Article 19 of UNDRIP, which required States to consult and cooperate in good faith with indigenous peoples to obtain their free, prior and informed consent before adopting and implementing legislative measures that may affect them, which the Government is also failing to fulfill.⁶⁸

45. JS1 indicated that Belize had committed itself to uphold the human rights standards contained in UNDRIP, including the right to free, prior and informed consent (articles 10, 11, 19, 29, 32). These rights were also set out in the International Labour Organization's *Convention concerning Indigenous Peoples in Independent Countries* (ILO Convention no. 169). Belize, however, had not signed nor ratified this convention that protected the rights of a large portion of its population.⁶⁹

46. JS1 stated that the UPR recommendations related to Maya land rights and respecting the rights articulated in the UNDRIP had been largely ignored. Three main examples of this were oil exploration/extraction, logging, and road construction.⁷⁰ JS1 and JS3 requested the UPR Working Group to recommend that Belize respect and implement the Supreme Court judgments and the recommendations of the IACHR with respect to Maya land and resource rights, including the injunctions against interference by state agents or third parties with the use, value and enjoyment of lands used and occupied by the Maya; and cease its efforts to overturn domestic judicial recognition of Maya rights of land and resources.⁷¹

47. Additionally, JS3 urged the UPR Working Group to recommend to Belize to, among others: design and implement a regulatory framework that fully recognized and protected indigenous peoples' collective rights affected by extractive operations; re-open good faith dialogue with the Toledo Maya communities to ensure their full participation in all decision-making processes concerning their lands; commit, in future dealings with the Maya villages of Toledo, to operate through a principle of consultation with a view to obtaining free, prior and informed consent.⁷² IHRC-OU made similar recommendations.⁷³

48. JS3 noted that, in 2005, the CRC had expressed particular concern regarding the difficulties for indigenous girls to be heard in society and highlighted that their right to participate and to be heard in proceedings affecting them was often limited. The CRC recommended that Belize take measures "to promote respect for the views of children, especially girls, belonging to minorities and indigenous peoples and facilitate their participation in all matters affecting them." However, the State had failed to take adequate steps to secure the participation of Maya girls.⁷⁴ JS3 recommended that Belize take immediate and effective steps to promote respect for the views of children, especially girls, belonging to minorities and indigenous peoples, and to facilitate their participation in all matters affecting them.⁷⁵

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

GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
JS1	Joint submission No. 1 by Maya Leaders Alliance, Toledo District, Belize, and Cultural Survival, Cambridge, Massachusetts, United States of America;
JS2	Joint submission No. 2 by United Belize Advocacy Movement (UNIBAM), Belize City, Belize, and Sexual Rights Initiative

- (Akahata – Latin American team on sexualities and genders; Action Canada for Population and Development; Creating Resources for Empowerment and Action-India; Polish Federation for Women and Family Planning, and others);
- JS3 Joint submission No. 3 by Minority Rights Group, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Sarstoon Temash Institute for Indigenous Management (SATIM), Punta Gorda Town, Toledo District, Belize;
- JS4 Joint submission No. 4 by International Human Rights Clinic at Willamette University, Oregon, United States of America, and Water Mission International-Belize, Belize City, Belize.
- Academic institution*
IHRC-OU International Human Rights Clinic, University of Oklahoma College of Law, Norman, Oklahoma, United States of America.
- ² JS 1, para. 40. ix.
³ JS 1, para. 40. vi.
⁴ IHRC-OU, p. 2.
⁵ JS2, para. 6.
⁶ JS 1, para. 40. iii.
⁷ JS2, para. 7.
⁸ JS2, para. 10.
⁹ JS 1, para. 40. iv.
¹⁰ JS2, para. 8.
¹¹ JS2, para. 11.
¹² JS 1, para. 40. vii.
¹³ IHRC-OU, p. 4.
¹⁴ JS2, para. 5.
¹⁵ JS 1, para. 40. vii.
¹⁶ JS 3, para. 2.2.
¹⁷ JS 3, para. 7.2.
¹⁸ JS 3, para. 7.4.
¹⁹ JS2, para. 26.
²⁰ JS2, para. 28.
²¹ IHRC-OU, p. 4.
²² JS2, para. 30.
²³ GIEACPC, p. 1.
²⁴ GIEACPC, para. 1.2.
²⁵ GIEACPC, p. 2.
²⁶ GIEACPC, p. 1.
²⁷ JS1, para. 29.
²⁸ JS1, para. 33.
²⁹ JS4, para. 23.
³⁰ IHRC-OU, p. 3.
³¹ JS2, para. 13.
³² JS2, para. 9.
³³ JS2, para. 14.
³⁴ JS2, para. 15.
³⁵ JS2, para. 16.
³⁶ JS4, para. 3.
³⁷ JS4, pp. 3-8.
³⁸ JS4, para. 9.
³⁹ IHRC-OU, p. 3.
⁴⁰ IHRC-OU, p. 4.
⁴¹ JS3, paras. 6.5.1. and 6.5.2.

- 42 IHRC-OU, p. 3.
43 IHRC-OU, p. 4.
44 IHRC-OU, p. 3.
45 IHRC-OU, p. 4.
46 IHRC-OU, p. 2.
47 HRC-OU, p. 2.
48 IHRC-OU, p. 3.
49 IHRC-OU, p. 2.
50 JS2, paras. 17-18.
51 JS2, paras. 21-22.
52 JS2, para. 20.
53 IHRC-OU, pp. 1-2.
54 IHRC-OU, p. 2.
55 JS 3, para. 7.1.
56 JS 3, para. 7.4.
57 JS 3, paras. 6.4. and 6.5.3.
58 JS2, para. 14.
59 JS 1, paras. 2-3/IHRC-OU, p. 4.
60 IHRC-OU, p. 4. / JS 1, para. 12. / JS3, paras. 1.4 – 1.6.
61 IHRC-OU, p. 4. / JS 1, para. 13. / JS3, para. 1.7.
62 JS 1, para. 13.
63 JS 1, para. 4.
64 JS 1, para. 5.
65 JS 3, para. 3.2.
66 JS 3, para. 4.1.
67 JS 3, para. 5.1.
68 JS 3, para. 6.1.
69 JS 1, para. 6.
70 JS 1, para. 15.
71 JS 1, paras. 40. i. and ii. / JS3, paras. 2.3 and 5.19.
72 JS3, para. 5.19.
73 IHRC-OU, p. 5.
74 JS 3, para. 7.3.
75 JS 3, para. 7.4.
-