

Saint Lucia

Mid-term

Implementation

Assessment



*Promoting and strengthening
the Universal Periodic Review*
<http://www.upr-info.org>



Introduction

1. Purpose of the follow-up programme

The second and subsequent cycles of the review should focus on, inter alia, the implementation of the accepted recommendations and the development of the human rights situation in the State under review.

A/HRC/RES/16/21, 12 April 2011 (Annex I C § 6)

The Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process takes place every four and half years; however, some recommendations can be implemented immediately. In order to reduce this interval, we have created an update process to evaluate the human rights situation two years after the examination at the UPR.

Broadly speaking, *UPR Info* seeks to ensure the respect of commitments made in the UPR, but also, more specifically, to give stakeholders the opportunity to share their opinion on the commitments. To this end, about two years after the review, *UPR Info* invites States, NGOs, and National Institutions for Human Rights (NHRI) to share their comments on the implementation (or lack thereof) of recommendations adopted at the Human Rights Council (HRC) plenary session.

For this purpose, *UPR Info* publishes a Mid-term Implementation Assessment (MIA) including responses from each stakeholder. The MIA is meant to show how all stakeholders are disposed to follow through on, and implement their commitments. States should implement the recommendations that they have accepted, and civil society should monitor that implementation.

While the follow-up's importance has been highlighted by the HRC, no precise directives regarding the follow-up procedure have been set until now. Therefore, *UPR Info* is willing to share good practices as soon as possible, and to strengthen the collaboration pattern between States and stakeholders. Unless the UPR's follow-up is seriously considered, the UPR mechanism as a whole could be adversely affected.

The methodology used by UPR Info to collect data and to calculate index is described at the end of this document.

Geneva, 31 October 2013



Follow-up Outcomes

1. Sources and results

All data are available at the following address:

http://followup.upr-info.org/index/country/saint_lucia

We invite the reader to consult that webpage since all recommendations, all stakeholders' reports, as well as the unedited comments can be found at the same internet address.

3 stakeholders' reports were submitted for the UPR. 3 NGOs were contacted. 1 UN agency was contacted. The Permanent Mission to the UN was contacted. No National Human Rights Institution (NHRI) was found.

2 NGOs responded to our enquiry. The UN agency did not respond. The State under Review did not respond to our enquiry either.

The following stakeholders took part in the report:

1. **NGOs:** (1) Edmund Rice International (ERI) (2) Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC)

IRI: 4 recommendations are not implemented, 0 recommendation is partially implemented, and 3 recommendations are fully implemented. No answer was received for 133 out of 140 recommendations and voluntary pledges.

2. Feedbacks on recommendations

ESC Rights

Recommendation n°67: *Look to develop and support programmes directed towards the training and education of marginalized youth in Saint Lucia* (Recommended by Maldives)

IRI: *fully implemented*

+

Recommendation n°68: *Strengthen its efforts to develop and support educational programmes and technical training for marginalized youth in the country* (Recommended by Canada)

IRI: *fully implemented*

+

Recommendation n°69: *Develop and support programmes directed towards the training and education of marginalized youth* (Recommended by Slovenia)

IRI: *fully implemented*

Edmund Rice International (ERI) response:

[This recommendation was] accepted by St Lucia.

Our people on the ground in St Lucia are very positive about the support they have since received from the government of St Lucia. Funding was provided for the CARE program which is an educational program directed towards marginalised youth which is conducted by members of our network. In the budget following the UPR session funding was provided for the CARE program and subsequently even when budgets were cut across the board, including that of the Ministry of Education, funding for CARE remained untouched.

It was further reported that relevant government ministries include CARE in workshops, consultations and advisory sessions.

Women & Children

Recommendation n°54: *Review its existing legislation to fully reflect the principles and provisions of CRC, especially in relation to non-discrimination, corporal punishment and juvenile justice* (Recommended by Guatemala)

IRI: *not implemented*

Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) response:

There appears to have been no comprehensive review of legislation relating to corporal punishment of children.



Recommendation n°105: *Take all necessary steps to eliminate corporal punishment* (Recommended by *Germany*)

IRI: *not implemented*

+

Recommendation n°108: *Amend the legislation to explicitly prohibit corporal punishment in families, schools and institutions, to conduct awareness-raising campaigns on this issue and to ensure that the existing legislation related to children fully reflects the principles and provisions contained in CRC* (Recommended by *Italy*)

IRI: *not implemented*

GIEACPC response:

In rejecting this recommendation, the Government stated that law reform is a "formidable challenge" but that efforts will continue to promote positive, non-violent forms of discipline. The near universal deep-rooted acceptance of corporal punishment in childrearing means that it is typically not perceived as "violent": amending the law to explicitly prohibit corporal punishment sends a clear message that it is no longer acceptable or lawful and supports, not hinders, efforts to promote non-violent discipline. On the contrary, laws which allow, regulate or provide a defence for the use of corporal punishment - as in St Lucia's Education Act 1999 and the right "to administer reasonable punishment" in the Children and Young Persons Act 1972 - undermine such efforts.

Recommendation n°106: *Increase efforts to ban corporal punishment from schools* (Recommended by *Costa Rica*)

IRI: *not implemented*

GIEACPC response:

Corporal punishment remains lawful in schools. In rejecting this recommendation, the Government stated that law reform is a "formidable challenge" but that efforts will continue to promote positive, non-violent forms of discipline. The near universal deep-rooted acceptance of corporal punishment in childrearing means that it is typically not perceived as "violent": amending the law to explicitly prohibit corporal punishment sends a clear message that it is no longer acceptable or lawful and supports, not hinders, efforts to promote non-violent discipline. On the contrary, laws which allow, regulate or provide a defence for the use of corporal punishment - as in St Lucia's Education Act 1999 and the right "to administer reasonable punishment" in the Children and Young Persons Act 1972 - undermine such efforts.

Recommendation n°107: *Prohibit all forms of corporal punishment of children in all settings* (Recommended by *Slovenia*)

IRI: *not implemented*

GIEACPC response:

There has been no change in the legality of corporal punishment of children since the review of St Lucia in 2011: it is lawful in the home, alternative care settings, day care, schools and penal institutions. In rejecting this recommendation, the Government stated that law reform is a "formidable challenge" but that efforts will continue to promote positive, non-violent forms of discipline. The near universal deep-rooted acceptance of corporal punishment in childrearing means that it is typically not perceived as "violent": amending the law to explicitly prohibit corporal punishment



sends a clear message that it is no longer acceptable or lawful and supports, not hinders, efforts to promote non-violent discipline. The majority of states which have achieved prohibition of corporal punishment have done so ahead of public opinion, and public opinion on the issue has then changed following law reform.

Methodology

A. First contact

Although the methodology has to consider the specificities of each country, we applied the same procedure for data collection about all States:

1. We contacted the Permanent Mission to the UN either in Geneva (when it does exist) or New York;
2. We contacted all NGOs which took part in the process. Whenever NGOs were part of coalitions, each NGO was individually contacted;
3. The National Institution for Human Rights was contacted whenever one existed.
4. UN Agencies which sent information for the UPR were contacted.

We posted our requests to the States and NHRI, and sent emails to NGOs and UN Agencies.

The purpose of the UPR is to discuss issues and share concrete suggestions to improve human rights on the ground. Therefore, stakeholders whose objective is not to improve the human rights situation were not contacted, and those stakeholders' submissions were not taken into account.

However, since the UPR is meant to be a process which aims at sharing best practices among States and stakeholders, we take into account positive feedbacks from the latter.

B. Processing recommendations and voluntary pledges

Stakeholders we contact are encouraged to use an Excel sheet we provide which includes all recommendations received and voluntary pledges taken by the State reviewed.

Each submission is processed, whether the stakeholder has or has not used the Excel sheet. In the latter case, the submission is split up among recommendations we think it belongs to. Since such a task is more prone to misinterpretation, we strongly encourage stakeholders to use the Excel sheet.

If the stakeholder does not clearly mention neither that the recommendation was “fully implemented” nor that it was “not implemented”, UPR Info usually considers the recommendation as “partially implemented”, unless the implementation level is obvious.



UPR Info retains the right to edit comments that are considered not to directly address the recommendation in question, when comments are too lengthy or when comments are defamatory or inappropriate. While we do not mention the recommendations which were not addressed, they can be accessed unedited on the follow-up webpage.

C. Implementation Recommendation Index (IRI)

UPR Info developed an index showing the implementation level achieved by the State for both recommendations received and voluntary pledges taken at the UPR.

The **Implementation Recommendation Index (IRI)** is an individual recommendation index. Its purpose is to show an average of stakeholders' responses.

The *IRI* is meant to take into account stakeholders disputing the implementation of a recommendation. Whenever a stakeholder claims nothing has been implemented at all, the index score is 0. At the opposite, whenever a stakeholder claims a recommendation has been fully implemented, the *IRI* score is 1.

An average is calculated to fully reflect the many sources of information. If the State under Review claims that the recommendation has been fully implemented, and a stakeholder says it has been partially implemented, the score is 0.75.

Then the score is transformed into an implementation level, according to the table below:

Percentage:	Implementation level:
0 – 0.32	Not implemented
0.33 – 0.65	Partially implemented
0.66 – 1	Fully implemented

Example: On one side, a stakeholder comments on a recommendation requesting the establishment of a National Human Rights Institute (NHRI). On the other side, the State under review claims having partially set up the NHRI. As a result of this, the recommendation will be given an *IRI* score of 0.25, and thus the recommendation is considered as “not implemented”.

Disclaimer

The comments made by the authors (stakeholders) are theirs alone, and do not necessarily reflect the views, and opinions at UPR Info. Every attempt has been made to ensure that information provided on this page is accurate and not abusive. UPR Info cannot be held responsible for information provided in this document.

Contact

UPR Info

Rue de Varembé 3
CH - 1202 Geneva
Switzerland

Website:

<http://www.upr-info.org>



Phone:

+ 41 (0) 22 321 77 70

General enquiries

info@upr-info.org



<http://twitter.com/UPRInfo>



<http://www.facebook.com/UPRInfo>