



General Assembly

Distr.: General
27 February 2017

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twenty-seventh session
1–12 May 2017

Summary of stakeholders' submissions - the Philippines*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights¹

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 53 stakeholders' submissions² to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Information provided by the accredited national human rights institution in full compliance with the Paris Principles

2. CHRP stated that the Philippines had not ratified ICPPED, OP-CRPD, OP-ICESCR, OP-CRC-IC, and the ILO Convention 169 on the Indigenous and Tribal People's Convention, as well as the ASEAN Convention against Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children.³

3. CHRP referred to relevant supported recommendations,⁴ and stated that the charter to strengthen the Commission and to enable it to fully perform its constitutional task of protecting and promoting human rights had been "languishing in the legislative mill", which had put into question the Government's commitment to nurture the independence and fiscal autonomy of CHRP.⁵

4. CHRP stated that President Rodrigo Duterte as well as the Speaker of the House of Representatives had announced the inclusion of the restoration of the death penalty on the

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



legislative agenda of the 17th Congress, which was contrary to the obligations of the Philippines as a state party to ICCPR-OP2.⁶

5. CHRP expressed concern about statements that had been made by President Rodrigo Duterte and seconded by the Chief of the Philippine National Police that may have emboldened some members of the security sector and vigilantes to kill with impunity.⁷ CHRP stated that right to life may have been severely compromised by the Government's war against drugs;⁸ and that extrajudicial killings have recently exacerbated.⁹

6. CHRP stated that torture was still being perpetrated by the police.¹⁰ The bill creating a national preventative mechanism for torture remained pending before Congress.¹¹

7. CHRP stated that the law on reproductive health had not being uniformly implemented and expressed alarm at the withdrawal of contraceptives in the City of Sirosogon.¹² Furthermore, there had been challenges in the delivery of reproductive health services due to religious and cultural resistance.¹³

8. CHRP expressed concern about the plight of internally displaced persons and urged the authorities to adopt a rights-based approach to development and permanent resettlement.¹⁴

9. CHRP stated that there the Government had appeared to have reversed its position on the Paris Agreement.¹⁵

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies¹⁶

10. JS1 recommended the ratification of ICPPED.¹⁷ It recalled that at the Universal Periodic Review of the Philippines in 2012 (2012 Review),¹⁸ eight states (Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Japan, France, Chile, Spain, and Iraq) had made recommendations to that effect and also similar recommendations had been made by Slovenia and Mexico at the earlier review in 2008,¹⁹ all of which had not been supported. This was a departure from the official statement that had been delivered by the Philippines during its candidature to the Human Rights Council in 2007 in which a voluntary pledge had been made to strengthen domestic support for the ratification of ICPPED and CRPD.²⁰

11. JS2 recommended ratification of ILO Convention No. 169.²¹

12. CMA called for the ratification of ILO Conventions 181 and 29.²²

13. CTUHR called for the ratification of OP-ICESCR as recommended by Portugal, Germany and Palestine.²³

14. Referring to a relevant noted recommendation from the 2012 Review,²⁴ JS14 called for the full cooperation with the Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council.²⁵

15. JS2 recommended that the Philippines issue a standing invitation to the Special Procedures and working groups of the Human Rights Council.²⁶

16. JS1 referred to a request by the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances to visit the Philippines and recommended that the Government grant this request.²⁷

B. National human rights framework²⁸

17. Karapatan stated that there was a lack of effective and substantive implementation of the international and domestic human rights framework adopted by the Government.²⁹

18. NCCP referred to relevant supported recommendations and stated that the national human rights action plan had never been publicized and had not been fully observed by the state security forces.³⁰

19. AI stated that CHRP faced difficulties in fulfilling its mandate due to capacity and operational challenges, including insufficient budget.³¹

20. JS4 recommended strengthening the role of CHRP to include investigating human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity.³²

21. JS8 stated that the sovereignty of the Philippines was compromised with the “Enhanced Defence Cooperation Agreement” which allowed a third country to maintain military bases in the Philippines.³³

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

1. Cross-cutting issues

*Equality and non-discrimination*³⁴

22. JS4 stated that the 1987 Constitution did not explicitly mention sexual orientation and gender identity as grounds for protection, making subsequent policies and programmes non-responsive to the various forms of discrimination against LGBTIQ persons.³⁵

23. JS13 stated that transgender persons will continue to suffer discrimination as long as there was no law or policy enabling them to change their name and civil status.³⁶

24. JS4 stated that the Reproductive Health Law and its corresponding programmes did not cater for the reproductive health needs of lesbian, transgender and intersex persons,³⁷ who experienced discrimination due to the non-recognition of same-sex partnerships.³⁸

25. JS11 stated that there had been a rise in the on-line abuse of the LGBTIQ community which had taken the form of hate speech, harassment and bullying.³⁹ JS4 stated that hate crimes had been treated as “ordinary” crimes and recommended the adoption of legislation specifically criminalizing hate crimes based on sexual orientation and gender identity.⁴⁰ JS6 stated that bullying of children were on the rise.⁴¹

26. JS13 called for the prosecution of alleged violations of the rights of LGBT persons, which were fueled by conservative religious beliefs.⁴²

Development⁴³ and environment

27. IBON stated that despite years of rapid economic growth in the Philippines, the wealth and profits of a few have increased while the largest part of the population did not have a decent livelihood, with poverty remaining deep and widespread.⁴⁴

28. JS2 stated that mining-related human rights violations have dramatically increased since the 2012 Review. Mining projects often caused widespread damage to the environment. Pursuant to the Mining Act of 1995, mining companies had extensive rights to cut timber and on the use of water, which compromised the social and economic rights of the indigenous communities.⁴⁵

Human rights and counter-terrorism

29. CRCN-P called for an end to the counter-insurgency programme referred to as “Operation Plan Bayanihan” which had claimed the lives of many children.⁴⁶ Karapatan stated that the military operations conducted under this programme resulted in the massive displacement of communities in rural areas.⁴⁷

2. Civil and political rights

*Right to life, liberty and security of person*⁴⁸

30. JS19 noted that the death penalty had been abolished in 2006 and stated that on 1 July 2016 a bill had been introduced before the 17th Congress to restore the death penalty.⁴⁹

31. AHCR noted the restrictive definition of extrajudicial killings in the Administrative Order No. 35 issued in 2013, and recommended the enactment of legislation defining extrajudicial killings in line with internationally recognized standards.⁵⁰

32. NCCP referred to supported recommendations on extrajudicial killings and enforced disappearances and stated that the massive law and order campaign targeting those allegedly involved in illegal drug related activities had resulted in an alarming numbers of deaths by the police and by unknown individuals. Those deaths had not been adequately investigated, the appropriateness of the police conduct had not been determined, and unknown assailants had not been apprehended.⁵¹

33. JS10 referred to the relevant supported recommendations from the 2008 Review and 2012 Review,⁵² and expressed concerns over the Government’s failure to implement those recommendations.⁵³ AI also referred to relevant supported recommendations and stated that it continued to receive reports of unlawful killings by both state and non-state actors.⁵⁴

34. AHRC stated that progress in resolving cases of extrajudicial killings had been slow due to impunity and lack of accountability of the authorities allegedly responsible for such killings.⁵⁵

35. JS2 stated that President Rodrigo Duterte had issued the police with an explicit shoot-to-kill order in relation to persons allegedly involved in the drug trade and recommended retracting that order.⁵⁶

36. TCC stated that President Rodrigo Duterte had publically condoned and encouraged extrajudicial killings of alleged criminals by promising pardons for any law enforcement officials convicted of killing anyone resisting arrest.⁵⁷ JS12 stated that such statements constituted incitement to kill.⁵⁸

37. JS1 stated that President Rodrigo Duterte’s programme to curb drug-related crimes was reminiscent of the methods of the Davao Death Squads that operated in Davao City where he had served as Mayor.⁵⁹

38. PCPR stated that the almost three-thousand people killed under this so-called “war on drugs” was a manifestation of the State’s disregard for the right to life.⁶⁰ HRW stated that President Rodrigo Duterte had ignored calls for an official probe into those killings and had instead praised the killings as proof of the success of his anti-drug campaign and had urged the police to seize the momentum. The Chief of the Philippine National Police, Director-General Ronald dela Rosa, had rejected calls for an investigation saying that it was “legal harassment,” and that it “dampens the morale” of police officers. The Solicitor-General Jose Calida, had also defended the legality of the killings.⁶¹

39. JS1 stated that at the 2012 Review, the Philippines had supported all recommendations relating to “broad actions” towards ending enforced disappearance⁶² while recommendations relating to concrete actions had been noted.⁶³

40. AI referred to relevant supported recommendations,⁶⁴ and noted the enactment of the Anti-Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances Act in 2012, but stated that there had not been any convictions under the Act.⁶⁵ JS1 commended the enactment of the Act, but stated that it had not been effectively implemented.⁶⁶

41. JS1 stated that the majority of the cases of enforced disappearance had been politically motivated. It recommended including enforced disappearance on the agenda of the peace process involving the Government and the National Democratic Front of the Philippines.⁶⁷

42. JS17 stated that torture had remained pervasive and the continued use of secret detention had remained a key obstacle to exposing this crime. The alleged perpetrators had been police officers, the security forces, prison officials, local executive officers, paramilitary groups and local peace keepers.⁶⁸ While the supported recommendations provided a roadmap for combating torture, there was limited action towards their implementation and the efforts undertaken were insufficient to have a positive impact.⁶⁹

43. JS17 stated that the Anti-Torture Act had not been diligently implemented.⁷⁰

44. AI stated that a national preventive mechanism, as required under OP-CAT, had not been established in accordance with a commitment made during the 2012 Review.⁷¹

45. JS17 stated that most torture victims had not received rehabilitation due to the lack of political willingness to take responsibility for and adequately fund the Comprehensive Program for the Rehabilitation of Torture Victims and their Families.⁷²

46. The NCCP stated that the prison system had been subjected to unacceptable overcrowding, which has been further aggravated by the ‘war on drugs’. Prisons were no longer able to ensure the health and safety of prisoners or meet minimal standards under international law.⁷³

47. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation,⁷⁴ JS2 stated that even though the number of private armed groups had fallen from 107 in 2010 to 81 in 2013, this number has since risen to 85 leading up to the May 2016 elections, which did not include armed groups legitimized as Civilian Volunteer Organizations, Special CAFGU Active Auxiliary units, or “force multipliers”⁷⁵

*Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law*⁷⁶

48. NCCP referred to relevant supported recommendations on reforming the judicial system and stated that the judicial system remained open to manipulation, and was exceedingly slow in delivering justice.⁷⁷

49. JS3 stated that the long court process exacerbated by the postponement of hearings, and the absence of judges, prosecutors and attorneys had often lead to pro-longed trauma for child victims of sexual abuse.⁷⁸ The child-friendly procedures including the rules on the examination of child witnesses had not being implemented and only a few courts had used the video conferencing technology that allowed for the testimony of children to be taken outside the court room.⁷⁹ Many prosecutors and judges had not received the training prescribed by the Family Courts Acts of 1997.⁸⁰

50. JS6 stated that bills seeking to lower the minimum age of criminal responsibility from fifteen to nine years had been filed during the 17th Congress. It opposed the lowering of the minimum age of criminal responsibility.⁸¹

51. JS12 stated that local town, village and law enforcement officials had compiled lists of alleged drug users and suppliers and those persons had been made to confess to either being a drug user or a drug supplier, which had violated their right to due process.⁸²

52. Salinlahi stated that the Government had failed to implement the Juvenile Justice and Welfare Act by not providing rehabilitation to youth offenders by a multi-disciplinary team.⁸³

53. JS2 stated that impunity for severe human rights violations had continued even though at the 2012 Review, the Philippines had supported several recommendations to address that issue.⁸⁴ HRW also referred to those recommendations and stated that widespread impunity had continued for members of the security forces allegedly responsible for serious human rights violations.⁸⁵

54. IFI-RPRD stated that the already entrenched culture of impunity had been reinforced by sloppy investigations into alleged abuses committed during police operations and the apparent tolerance of vigilante groups in the war on illegal drugs.⁸⁶

55. NUPL referred to the supported recommendation to inter alia bring to justice perpetrators of human rights violations, including Major General Jovito Palparan Jr. and Joel Reyes,⁸⁷ and stated that the Government had openly shown its acquiescence to the alleged actions of Palparan and had flaunted its refusal to comply with its commitments made during the 2012 Review.⁸⁸

56. AI stated that although the Witness Protection, Security and Benefit Act provided for extensive protection, its implementation had been weak, and had not meet the urgent requirements of witnesses.⁸⁹

*Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life*⁹⁰

57. ADF stated that despite constitutional protection, the persecution of by “Islamic extremists” had continued.⁹¹

58. JC stated that there had been concerns over the proposed Bangsamoro Basic Law, which would expand sharia jurisdiction to cover civil, commercial, and criminal law, in addition to the family law. Although sharia law only applied to Muslims, the Christian community within the autonomous region was concerned that its members could be forced to adhere to Sharia law.⁹²

59. UCCP stated that the UCCP Northeast Southern Tagalog Conference had reported persistent surveillance,⁹³ and cited specific cases of surveillance and intimidation.⁹⁴

60. JS11 stated that the definition of cybersex in the Cybercrime Prevention Act is “overly broad and vague” and empowered law enforcement personnel to use their own standards of morality.⁹⁵

61. JS5 stated that the revised Penal Code (articles 353-355), which criminalizes libel and slander and the 2012 Cybercrime Prevention Act which criminalises online libel, had been repeatedly used to stifle freedom of expression and to harass independent journalists.⁹⁶

62. NCCP stated that the rhetoric especially by President Duterte, which painted the press as unpatriotic and against the national interest, made journalists vulnerable to human rights violations.⁹⁷

63. JS14 stated that despite the acceptance of two recommendations relating to the protection of journalists and human rights defenders,⁹⁸ extrajudicial killing remained the gravest threat facing human rights defenders.⁹⁹ JS2 stated that since the 2012 Review, at least 147 human rights defenders and 23 journalists had been killed.¹⁰⁰ FLD stated that there were real fears that targeted attacks against human rights defenders will increase under the current administration.¹⁰¹

64. FLD stated that fabricated charge of libel had been repeatedly used against human rights defenders, particularly since the amendment of the relevant law which shifted the burden of proof on the accused.¹⁰² JS2 stated that some human rights defenders had faced “trumped-up” charges based on falsified evidence.¹⁰³ Karapatan stated that leaders of

people's organizations in Negros, Cagayan Valley, Davao City, and Sarangani had been falsely charged with criminal offenses such as kidnapping and trafficking.¹⁰⁴

65. JS5 stated that progressive legislation proposed in 2013 – the Human Rights Defenders Bill or House Bill 1472, was yet to be adopted.¹⁰⁵

66. JS5 stated that the registration process to form associations remained unduly onerous and subjected to overly strict bureaucratic controls.¹⁰⁶

67. JS5 stated that there have been several reported cases of excessive use of force by law enforcement agencies when dispersing peaceful assemblies.¹⁰⁷

68. TCC stated that violence was prevalent during the election period and on election-day;¹⁰⁸ and that “vote-buying” was widespread.¹⁰⁹ Practical barriers¹¹⁰ restricted Indigenous Peoples from registering to vote and from voting.¹¹¹

*Prohibition of all forms of slavery*¹¹²

69. JS6 stated that the facilities and services to address the needs of victims of human trafficking remained inadequate.¹¹³ It made recommendations including that the Philippines implement the commitments it had made at the 2012 Review,¹¹⁴ and increase the budget for the shelters.¹¹⁵

70. CMA called for criminal justice reforms to ensure expeditious investigations and trials for alleged perpetrators of human trafficking,¹¹⁶ and for a broadened public information campaign on the rehabilitation programme for women victims.¹¹⁷

71. JS21 stated there remained a lack of political will to fully implement the Anti-Trafficking in Person Act, which had also been hindered by corruption.¹¹⁸

72. JS11 stated that the use of children in cybersex had continued unabated despite the passage of the Anti-Child Pornography Act in 2009, the conducting of police raids and the arrests of alleged perpetrators.¹¹⁹

Right to privacy and family life

73. JS22 stated that interception of communication through wiretapping is permitted when authorised by a court order. The Grievance Committee as envisaged by the Human Security Act with a mandate to investigate complaints had not been established. Also, reports by the Joint Oversight Committee, which had the power to question law enforcement authorities on the interception of communication, had not been published.¹²⁰

74. JS22 stated that in the 2014 case of *Disini v. The Secretary of Justice* the court had ruled that Section 12 of the Cybercrime Prevention Act had threatened the constitutional rights to privacy and struck-down the provision. However the Implementing Rules and Regulations of the law, which had been promulgated in August 2015, had effectively reinstated the struck down provision.¹²¹

3. Economic, social and cultural rights¹²²

*Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work*¹²³

75. DJP stated that the Herrera Law (RA 6715) made provision for workers to be hired by man-power agencies or third parties who were then sent to companies requiring their labour. The workers were not considered as employees of those companies and were poorly paid, received no benefits and had no union rights.¹²⁴

76. COURAGE stated that the majority of the 1.3 million government employees had received a salary less than the Constitutionally-mandated “family living wage”.¹²⁵

77. CTUHR stated that one out of every 3 employees held flexible employment, which violated the right to security and tenure.¹²⁶

78. CTUHR stated that in the manufacturing sector a “quota system” existed which drove workers to work beyond their physical capacity in order to meet the quota and earn the minimum wage.¹²⁷ In 2012, the Government issued the DOLE Department Order 118-12 that implemented a two-tiered wage system, which reduced the wage.¹²⁸

79. CTUHR stated that corporations were exploiting Republic Act 7686, Dual Training Act of 1994 by employing students and youth workers as trainees to do the jobs of regular workers and paying them 75 percent of prescribed minimum wage and not providing insurance.¹²⁹

80. JS8 stated that many big companies had offered work on a contractual basis were employees had been employed for five months per year had not received social protection, health insurance and other benefits.¹³⁰ Employers had rarely complied with labour safety standards.¹³¹

81. JS8 stated that the thousands of women who had worked as farm workers on big plantations had received wages much lower than their male counter-parts.¹³²

82. CTUHR stated that unsafe and unhealthful conditions characterized workplaces as companies’ compliance to occupational safety and health standards were made voluntary.¹³³

83. CMA stated that the Philippines had deployed more than a million workers abroad.¹³⁴ Staff working in the Philippine missions abroad must know how to respond to the needs of those workers.¹³⁵

84. MIGRANTE stated that the concerned embassies did little or nothing to secure the rights of 35 overseas Filipinos workers who had either been convicted or were on trial for crimes in third countries.¹³⁶

85. CTUHR stated that a climate of violence and intimidation against trade unions had persisted.¹³⁷

*Right to social security*¹³⁸

86. JS1 called for adequate and effective support for the families of disappeared persons, which included livelihood assistance.¹³⁹

*Right to an adequate standard of living*¹⁴⁰

87. JS8 referred to relevant supported recommendations¹⁴¹ and stated that the Conditional Cash Transfer Programme, the Government’s flagship anti-poverty programme had failed to make a dent on the poverty crisis.¹⁴² JS8 stated that poverty aggravated the low social and economic status of women.¹⁴³

88. KMP stated that the country was subservient to the policies of the World Trade Organisation which had resulted in an increased dependence on food importation, an abandonment of state subsidies for food production and an allocation of vast tracts of land for production of crops for export.¹⁴⁴

89. JS6 stated that the malnutrition among children remained a great concern. Referring to relevant recommendations from the 2012 Review,¹⁴⁵ JS6 recommended that the Philippines enact of the “First 1000 Days Bill” to ensure effective nutrition programmes.¹⁴⁶

90. DJP cited cases of forced eviction¹⁴⁷ and called on the Government to refrain from such practices and to focus on developing the existing urban communities.¹⁴⁸

91. JS8 stated that seven out of ten farmers remained landless.¹⁴⁹ It recommended providing land to all qualified tenant farmers with attention to households headed by women.¹⁵⁰

92. KMP stated that the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program and its Reforms which ended in 2014 had been a failure leaving farming and fishing the poorest sectors in the country.¹⁵¹ KMP called for a new redistributive land reform programme based on social justice.¹⁵²

*Right to health*¹⁵³

93. AI referred to relevant supported recommendations,¹⁵⁴ and stated that the Philippines had taken positive steps, including adopting the Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act, the Domestic Workers Act and the Expanded Anti-Trafficking in Persons Act. However, the Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act had suffered from inconsistent implementation across the country, and there was no mechanism to monitor the implementation of the Act.¹⁵⁵

94. AI stated that repealing the provisions of the the Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act which the Supreme Court had ruled to be unconstitutional, would be inconsistent with the international obligations of the Philippines, including Article 12 of CEDAW and Article 12 of ICESCR.¹⁵⁶ JS20 stated that the Act required the consent of male spouses in order for women to access reproductive health procedures and prohibited minors from availing of modern methods of family planning without parental consent, both of which defeated the purpose of addressing teenage pregnancy and empowering women to uphold their sexual and reproductive health rights.¹⁵⁷

95. JS6 stated that the high incidence of teenage pregnancy was attributed to the lack of access to age-appropriate and comprehensive sexual education, as well as to a lack of adolescent-friendly reproductive health services.¹⁵⁸ JS6 stated that at the 2012 Review, the Philippines had committed to ensuring access to sexual and reproductive health, education and counselling¹⁵⁹ and recommended removing the legal barriers to full access to sexual and reproductive health services for girls and boys.¹⁶⁰

96. JS7 stated that despite legislative guarantees of contraceptive information and services, there were two executive orders in Manila which banned modern contraceptives in all public health care facilities.¹⁶¹

97. AI stated that due to the ban on abortion, clandestine abortions remained widespread, resulting in maternal mortality and morbidity and disability of women.¹⁶² JS7 recommended decriminalizing abortion and ensuring that women and girls have access to humane, non-judgmental and quality post-abortion care.¹⁶³

98. ADF stated that the right to life of the unborn was constitutionally protected and abortion was illegal.¹⁶⁴ It called for continued protection for the unborn and assistance for pregnant women.¹⁶⁵

99. JS8 stated that health and medical services had remained inaccessible for many poor women. Public hospitals had continued to be ill-equipped and understaffed.¹⁶⁶ JS13 called for emergency obstetric facilities for all women including rural, indigenous and Muslim women.¹⁶⁷

100. HRW stated that there had been a sharp rise in HIV infections as a consequence of government policies, compounded by the resistance of the Catholic Church and other entities to sexual health education and the use of condoms.¹⁶⁸ JS13 attributed the increase of HIV infections to a “lack of access to sexuality education”.¹⁶⁹ There was also a lack of post-exposure prophylaxis and there were no protocols in relation to rape victims.¹⁷⁰

*Right to education*¹⁷¹

101. IBON stated that although tuition-free education was provided at the primary and secondary levels in public schools, the high non-tuition expenses denied millions of children their right to a decent education.¹⁷²

102. JS6 stated that children in marginalized communities, such as those in informal urban settlements and relocation sites, hazard-prone areas and indigenous communities experienced many barriers to education. The relocation sites had no schools and children had to walk long distances to the nearest school. Class rooms were heavily congested. The education system was not culturally sensitive resulting in the marginalization of indigenous persons.¹⁷³

103. ERI expressed concern at the high rates of children who had not gone to school and who had dropped out of school.¹⁷⁴

104. ERI stated that although there are some schools located in indigenous communities, most of the facilities were improvised compared to other Government public schools.¹⁷⁵

105. GG called for the creation of a national action plan for human rights education.¹⁷⁶

4 Rights of specific persons or groups

*Women*¹⁷⁷

106. JS20 stated that women were kept systematically and historically disadvantaged.¹⁷⁸ Sexist and patriarchal views, values, and practices were deeply entrenched in the culture of the society, which were reinforced by different influential institutions.¹⁷⁹

107. JS20 stated that women had always been at the bottom of development priorities. From 2006 to 2012, poverty incidence among women had been pegged at 26 percent, clearly indicating absence of economic progress among most women.¹⁸⁰

108. GABRIELA stated that the counter-insurgency programme, “Oplan Bayanihan”, resulted in massive human rights violations and heinous cases of violence against women, particularly in indigenous, rural and urban poor communities.¹⁸¹

109. JS11 stated that the internet had become a tool for violence against women in the form of pornography, amongst others.¹⁸²

*Children*¹⁸³

110. JS6 referred to supported recommendations on corporal punishment from the 2012 Review,¹⁸⁴ and recommended the passage of the the “Anti-Corporal Punishment/Positive Discipline Act” in the 17th Congress and the promotion of positive forms of discipline for children.¹⁸⁵

111. JS3 stated that the Philippines had not acted on supported recommendations in relation to child abuse, particularly sexual abuse.¹⁸⁶

112. JS3 referred to the Anti-Rape Law of 1997 (RA8353) and recommended removing a subsequent marriage to extinguish any criminal action and more serious penalties for perpetrators who were persons of trust or authority over the children.¹⁸⁷

113. Salinlahi stated that an increasing number of children had been forced into child pornography and other related commercial sexual activities.¹⁸⁸ JS3 recommended including topics on the prevention of child abuse in the school curriculum.¹⁸⁹

114. JS6 stated that the high level of engagement of children in cyberspace, along with weak regulation of cyberspace use and content, had made them highly vulnerable to online violence. The Philippines had been considered a major global source for the child cybersex industry.¹⁹⁰

115. JS6 stated that the conflict in Mindanao had caused frequent displacement and evacuation creating the fear among children of being separated from their families.¹⁹¹ JS6 recommended enacting the law on the rights of children in armed conflict, as a follow up to the commitments that had been made in the 2012 Review.¹⁹²

116. CRCN-P stated that 18 children had been falsely identified as child soldiers and illegally detained and subjected to torture, harassment and intimidation.¹⁹³

*Persons with disabilities*¹⁹⁴

117. JS20 stated that women and girls with disability were more vulnerable to all forms of human rights violations. Gender-based violence had been perpetrated more often against women and girls with disabilities than those without. One in every three deaf women had been sexually harassed or raped.¹⁹⁵

*Minorities and indigenous peoples*¹⁹⁶

118. RMP-NMR stated that legislation including the Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act had allowed the legal displacement of the Lumad¹⁹⁷ from their territories. This Act had several loop-holes that have been used against the indigenous peoples.¹⁹⁸

119. TCC stated that the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act provided for mandatory representation for Indigenous Peoples in policy-making bodies and local legislative councils. Although national guidelines had been enacted in 2009 to create mechanisms to give effect to this representation, no such mechanisms had been created.¹⁹⁹

120. JS10 stated that the Mining Act of 1995 which provided inter alia for the eviction of indigenous communities violated the collective rights of indigenous people.²⁰⁰

121. JS2 stated that free, prior, and informed consent as required by the Indigenous People's Rights Act was frequently not obtained by the mining companies.²⁰¹ Indigenous human rights defenders who lead community processes demanding mining companies seek such consent had faced harassment, threats, and attacks.²⁰²

122. While noting the politically motivated killings of the Indigenous Peoples, particularly the Lumads of Mindanao and the Igorots of the Cordillera,²⁰³ JS10 stated that the killings of Indigenous Peoples and the continuing threats to their leaders have resulted in conflicts, fear and mistrust among the indigenous communities which weakened the Indigenous Peoples' movement for respect and recognition of their collective rights.²⁰⁴

23. JS10 stated that the individual and collective rights of the Indigenous Peoples were violated by the "militarization of their territories". The military were permanently based within those territories and conducted operations including unwarranted searches of homes, imposition of food blockages and curfews.²⁰⁵

124. NCCP stated that the activities of the military and the para-military groups have brought immense suffering to the Lumad communities of eastern Mindanao, which included the raiding of schools and villages, extrajudicial killings, and the displacement of thousands of Indigenous People.²⁰⁶

125. JS2 stated that attacks against independent indigenous schools in Mindanao perpetrated by the military and paramilitary groups intensified in 2015.²⁰⁷

126. ERI stated that Indigenous children lacked equal access to education.²⁰⁸ The school curriculum was not culturally responsive and appropriate for indigenous children.²⁰⁹

127. JS18 stated that there was a lack of support for indigenous education schools and a lack of teacher training courses on indigenous education at the universities.²¹⁰

128. JS16 stated that the lack of land had remained a problem for the Bangsamoro, with the majority of the population still landless.²¹¹ It also stated that in the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao about 70 percent of the people lived below the poverty line, and had been denied basic services, such as health and education.²¹²

129. JS20 stated that the indigenous women's lack of economic power in a patriarchal society had contributed to their subjugation by their spouses.²¹³

130. JS20 stated that indigenous women had been adversely affected by the “No Home Birthing Policy” as they had no access to birthing facilities.²¹⁴

*Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons*²¹⁵

131. JS9 stated that the conditions at the Bagong Diwa Immigration Detention Centre in Bicutan were appalling, particularly as the living space was insufficient, the food was of a poor quality and insufficient quantity and there was no medical assistance.²¹⁶

5. Specific regions or territories

132. PCPR commended the Government for pursuing formal peace talks with the National Democratic Front of the Philippines and for opening the door for informal talks both with Moro National Liberation Front and Moro Islamic Liberation Front.²¹⁷

133. JS16 stated that despite the signing of the Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro in October 2012 and the Comprehensive Agreement on the Bangsamoro in March 2014, the Moro communities continued to be repeatedly attacked and displaced by military operations.²¹⁸

Notes

¹ The following abbreviations have been used in the present document:

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

² 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

Joint submissions

JS1	Asian Federation against Involuntary Disappearances (AFAD) and families of Victims of Involuntary Disappearance (FIND) (Joint Submission 1);
JS2	Aktionsbündnis Menschenrechte – Philippinen (AMP) comprising of Amnesty International Germany, Bread for the World – Protestant

- Development Service, International Peace Observers Network (IPON), MISEREOR, Missio Munich, philippinenbüro e.V. im Asienhaus, and the United Evangelical Mission, Cologne, Germany, (Joint Submission 2);
- JS3 Apprentis d’Auteuil Foundation, CAMELEON Association Inc., Center for the Prevention and Treatment of Child Sexual Abuse, and Action Against Violence and Exploitation, Inc. , Paris, France (Joint Submission 3);
- JS4 ASEAN Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Expression (SOGIE) Caucus, Association of Transgender People of the Philippines, Babaylanes, Inc, GALANG Philippines, LGBTS Christian Church Inc, Metropolitan Community Church of Marikina City, Metro Manila Pride, MUJER-LGBT Organization, PDRC/ Deaf Resources Philippines, SHINE SOCCSKSARGEN Inc., Side B Philippines, The Philippine LGBT Chamber of Commerce, TLF Share, Quezon City, the Philippines (Joint Submission 4);
- JS5 CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation and Karapatan – Alliance for the Advancement of People’s Rights, Johannesburg, South Africa (Joint Submission 5);
- JS6 The Civil Society Coalition on the Convention on the Rights of the Child composed of Child Hope Asia, Fundacion Educacion Y Cooperacion, Good Neighbors International Philippines, John J. Carroll Institute on Church and Social Issues), Kindernothilfe Ev. Philippines, Open Heart Foundation, Philippines Against Child Trafficking, Plan Philippines, Unang Hakbang Foundation, VIDES Philippines Volunteers Foundation Inc., and World Vision Development Foundation, Inc. (Joint Submission 6);
- JS7 Catholics for Reproductive Health, Center for Reproductive Rights, EnGendeRights Inc., Filipino Freethinkers, Population Services Pilipinas Inc., Woman Health Philippines Inc., Women’s Global Network for Reproductive Rights (Joint Submission 7);
- JS8 Center for Women's Resources and General Assembly Binding Women for Reforms, Integrity, Equality, Leadership, and Action (Joint Submission 8);
- JS9 Human Rights Without Frontiers and Forum for Religious Freedom , Soignies, Belgium (Joint submission 9);
- JS10 Franciscans International, Edmund Rice International, Franciscans Solidarity Movement for Justice, Peace and Integrity of Creation, Geneva, Switzerland (Joint Submission 10);
- JS11 Foundation for Media Alternatives, Association for Progressive Communications and Women’s Legal and human Rights Bureau, Quezon City, Philippines (Joint Submission 11);
- JS12 Philippine Alliance of Human Rights Advocates, No Box Transitions Foundation, Inc., International Drug Policy Consortium , APCASO, Asian Network of People who Use Drugs London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Joint Submission 12);
- JS13 Sexual Rights Network comprising of Family Planning Organization of the Philippines and EnGendeRights, Inc., London United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Joint Submission 13);
- JS14 International Service for Human Rights, Medical Action Group and the Philippines Alliance of Huma Rights Advocates, Geneva, Switzerland (Joint Submission 14);
- JS15 Katribu Kalipunan ng Katutubong Mamamayan ng Pilipinas, Cordillera Peoples Alliance for the Defense of Ancestral Land and for Self-determination, Kusog sa Katawhang Lumad sa Mindanao, Stop the Killings of Indigenous Peoples Network and Tumanduk nga

	Magunguma Nagapangapin sa Duta kag Kabuhi , Quezon City, the Philippines (Joint Submission 15);
JS16	Moro-Christian Peoples Alliance and KAWAGIB Alliance for the Advancement of Moro Human Rights, Quezon City, the Philippines (Joint Submission 16);
JS17	Balay Rehabilitation Centre, Medical Action Group and the International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims, Copenhagen, Denmark (Joint Submission 17);
	JS18 Network and partners of the Franciscan Solidarity Movement on Justice and Peace and Integrity of Creation, composed of : Alyansa Tigil Mina, BALAY Rehabilitation Centre, Franciscan Apostolic Sisters IP Ministry, Philippine Misereor Partnership, Inc., Save Sierra Madre Movement, Task Force Detainees of the Philippines, Workers Assistance Centre, Urban Poor Associates, Quezon City, the Philippines (Joint Submission 18);
JS19	Philippine Alliance of Human Rights Advocates, Children’s Legal Research and Development, Medical Action Group, Inc., Philippine Human Rights Information Centre, Task Force Detainees of the Philippines and United Against Torture Coalition, Quezon City, the Philippines (Joint Submission 19);
JS20	Women’s legal and Human Rights Bureau, Inc. and Philwomen on ASEAN, Quezon City, the Philippines (Joint Submission 20);
JS21	Dominicans for Justice and Peace (Order of Preachers) and the Dominican Family in the Philippines, Geneva, Switzerland;
JS22	Foundation for Media Alternatives and Privacy International, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Joint Submission 22);
Individual submissions:	
ADF	ADF International, Geneva, Switzerland;
AI	Amnesty International, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
AHRC	Ateno Human Rights Center, Makati City, Philippines;
BAYAN	Bagong Alyansang Makabayan (New Patriotic Alliance or BAYAN), Quezon City, the Philippines;
CMA	Center for Migrant Advocacy- Philippines, Quezon City, the Philippines;
COURAGE	Confederation for Unity Recognition and Advancement of Government Employees, Quezon City, the Philippines;
CRCN-P	Children’s Rehabilitation Center - Philippines, Quezon City, the Philippines;
CTUHR	Center for Trade Union and Human Rights, Quezon City, the Philippines;
DJP	Defend Job Philippines, Manila, Philippines;
ERI	Edmund Rice International, Geneva, Switzerland;
FFF	Four Freedoms Forum, Kaneohe, United States of America;
FLD	Front Line Defenders – The International Foundation for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders, Dublin, Ireland;
GABRIELA	GABRIELA National Alliance of Filipino Women, Quezon City, the Philippines;
GG	The Good Group, Honolulu, the United States of America;
HRW	Human Rights Watch, Geneva, Switzerland;
IBON	IBON Foundation, Quezon City, the Philippines;
INDI1893	Indigenous 1893, Kaneohe, United States of America;
IFI-RPRD	Iglesia Filipina Independiente – Ramento Project for Defenders, Manila, Philippines;
JC	Jubilee Campaign, Fairfax, United States of America;

KARAPATAN	KARAPATAN Alliance for the Advancement of People's Rights, Quezon City, the Philippines;
KMP	The Kilusang Magbubukid ng Pilipinas (Peasant Movement of the Philippines), Quezon City, Philippines;
MIGRANTE	Migrante International, Quezon City, the Philippines;
NCCP	National Council of Churches in the Philippines, Quezon City, the Philippines;
NUPL	National Union of Peoples' Lawyers, Quezon City, the Philippines;
OHR	Oceania Human Rights Hawaii, Kailua, United States of America;
PCPR	Promotion of Church People's Response, Quezon City, the Philippines;
RMP-NMR	The Rural Missionaries of the Philippines – Northern Mindanao Sub-Region, Iligan City, the Philippines;
Salinlahi	Salinlahi Alliance for Children's Concern, Quezon City, the Philippines;
TCC	The Carter Center, Atlanta, United States of America;
UCCP	United Church of Christ in the Philippines, Quezon City, the Philippines;
National human rights institution:	
CHRP	Commission on Human Rights of The Philippines, Quezon City, the Philippines.

³ CHRP, para. 33 and endnote 38.

⁴ CHRP, para. 10 and endnote 14 referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.1 (Egypt, Australia, Russian Federation and Viet Nam) and 131.13 (Iraq).

⁵ CHRP, paras. 10 and 11.

⁶ CHRP, para. 30. See also JS12, paras. 5.1 and 5.2.

⁷ CHRP, para. 4.

⁸ CHRP, para. 6.

⁹ CHRP, paras. 13-17.

¹⁰ CHRP, para. 26.

¹¹ CHRP, para. 25.

¹² CHRP, para. 12.

¹³ CHRP, para. 34.

¹⁴ CHRP, para. 36.

¹⁵ CHRP, para. 29.

¹⁶ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.5, 129.6, 129.23, 130.1, 131.1-131.4, 131.6-131.8 and 131.11, 131.14, 131.15, 131.23.

¹⁷ JS1, para. 30. See also JS2, para. 37.

¹⁸ See A/HRC/21/12.

¹⁹ See A/HRC/8/28, para. 58 (4).

²⁰ JS1, para. 25 referring to the Note verbal dated 18 April 2007 from the Permanent Mission of the Philippines to the United Nations addressed to the President of the General Assembly, A/61/882, (26 April 2007).

²¹ JS2, para. 56.

²² CMA, para. 4.2.1.3.

²³ CTUHR, para. 33 and referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 131.6. The recommendations have been noted (A/HRC/21/12 Add.1, para.4(c)).

²⁴ JS14 p. 1, referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 131.32 (Ireland).

²⁵ JS14, p. 3.

²⁶ JS2, paras. 57 and 58. See also JS5, para. 6.5.

²⁷ JS1, paras. 31-36.

²⁸ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.1, 129.2, 129.3, 129.4, 129.10, 129.19, 129.21, 130.2, 130.5, 131.9, 131.10, 131.12, 131.13, 131.16, 131.17, 131.27, 131.30, 131.33 - 131.35.

²⁹ Karapatan, para. 4.

³⁰ NCCP, paras. 10 and 11, referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.3 (Palestine and Qatar).

³¹ AI, pp. 2-3 and fn. 18 referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 131.13 (Iraq).

³² JS4, para.12.6.

- ³³ JS8, para. 37. JS8 made a recommendation (para. 47.10).
- ³⁴ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.7 and 129.8.
- ³⁵ JS4, para. 3.1. JS4 made a recommendation (para. 12.1).
- ³⁶ JS13, para. 60. JS13 made a recommendation (para. 71.).
- ³⁷ JS4, para. 6.2. It made a recommendation (para. 12.9). See also JS13, para. 55.
- ³⁸ JS4, para. 9.1.
- ³⁹ JS11, para. 40.
- ⁴⁰ JS4, paras. 5.2 and 12.2. See also JS13 para. 56.
- ⁴¹ JS6, para.11. JS6 made recommendations (para. 13).
- ⁴² JS13, paras. 7 and 8.
- ⁴³ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.45 (Myanmar) and 130.8 (Nicaragua).
- ⁴⁴ IBON, para. 1.
- ⁴⁵ JS2, para. 50. See also OHR, p. 2.
- ⁴⁶ CRCN-P, paras. 3 and 29.
- ⁴⁷ Karapatan, paras. 5, 17 and 21. Karapatan made a recommendation (para. 23).
- ⁴⁸ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.12, 129.13, 129.14-129.18, 129.20, 129.22, 129.24, 129.25, 129.35, 130.3, 130.4, 131.18, 131.16, 131.24, 131.25, 131.26.
- ⁴⁹ JS19, para. 26. JS19 made recommendations (paras. 46 and 47); See also JC, paras. D. 1, D.3 and D.4; JS2, paras. 24 and 27.
- ⁵⁰ AHCR, paras. 10 and 37.
- ⁵¹ NCCP, paras. 3 and 4, referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.12 (Republic of Korea, Singapore, and Holy See), 129.13 (Germany, France, Trinidad and Tobago.), 129.14 (Germany), 129.15 (Spain, United States of America), 129.16 (Sweden and Timor-Leste) 131.22 (Switzerland) and A/HRC/21/12/Add.1, para. (3) (f). See also PCPR, para. 5.
- ⁵² For recommendations from the 2008 review see A/HRC/8/28, 23 May 2008, para. 58 (6) (Holy See and Switzerland), read together with A/HRC/8/28/Add.1, 25 August 2008, p. 2, paras. 2 (e) and (f). For recommendations from the 2012 review see A/HRC/21/12, 9 July 2012, paras. 129.13 (France and Trinidad and Tobago), 129.14 (Germany), 129.15 (Spain and the United States of America), 129.16 (Sweden, Timor-Leste and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), 129.17 (Republic of Korea and Egypt), 129.28 (Indonesia), 129.29 (Republic of Korea, Austria and the Netherlands), and 129.32 (Canada).
- ⁵³ JS10, para. 5.
- ⁵⁴ AI, p. 1 and fn. 1 referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.14 (Germany) and 129.15 (Spain and United States of America). AI made recommendations (p. 6).
- ⁵⁵ AHRC, para. 29. AHRC made recommendations (paras. 38-40).
- ⁵⁶ JS2, paras. 21 and 25. See also JS12, para. 2.10. JS12 made recommendations (para. 6.19.); JS19, para.15. JS19 made recommendations (paras. 28-36); JC, para. C. 3. JC made a recommendation (para. E.3); Karapatan, para. 22; TCC p. 1.
- ⁵⁷ TCC, pp.1-2.
- ⁵⁸ JS12, para. 2.9. See also JS19, para. 14; JC, para. C.1.
- ⁵⁹ JS1, para. 19. See also JC, para. C. 2.
- ⁶⁰ PCPR, para. 30. PCPR made a recommendation (para. 30 (1)).
- ⁶¹ HRW, p. 3.
- ⁶² For recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.12 (Republic of Korea, Singapore and Holy See), 129.13(Germany, France and Trinidad and Tobago), 129.15, (Spain and United States of America), 129.16 (Sweden, Timor-Leste and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), 129.28 (Indonesia), 129.29 (Republic of Korea, Austria and Netherlands) and 129.35 (France).
- ⁶³ For recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 131.1 (Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Japan, France and Chile), 131.12 (Canada), and 131.15 (Norway, Mexico and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland). For positions on the recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12/Add.1.
- ⁶⁴ AI, p. 1, referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.15 (Spain and United States of America) and 129.16 (Sweden and Timor Leste).
- ⁶⁵ AI, p. 1
- ⁶⁶ JS1, paras. 12 and 21-24.
- ⁶⁷ JS1, para. 20.
- ⁶⁸ JS17, para. 6. See also JS19, paras. 5-9. JS19 made recommendations (paras. 37-40), Karapatan, para. 8; HRW, pp. 3-4.

- ⁶⁹ JS17, para. 5. See also JS15, para. 66.
- ⁷⁰ JS17, paras. 13-15. JS17 made recommendations (paras 16 and 17).
- ⁷¹ AI, p. 1 and fn. 7 referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.21 (France, New Zealand and Denmark. See also NCCP, paras. 12 and 13).
- ⁷² JS17, para. 28. JS17 made recommendations (paras. 34-37).
- ⁷³ NCCP, para. 17. NCCP made a recommendation (para. 20 (v)). See also JS17, para. 45.
- ⁷⁴ For recommendation see A/HRC/21/12, paras 129.25 (Chile).
- ⁷⁵ JS2, paras. 42 and 43. JS2 made recommendations (paras. 46-49); See also NCCP, paras. 14 and 15; Karapatan, para. 7. Karapatan made a recommendation (para. 24).
- ⁷⁶ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.26-129.34, 131.20-131.22, 131.31,
- ⁷⁷ NCCP, para. 17, referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.29 (Spain, Republic of Korea and the Netherlands). NCCP made a recommendation (para. 20 (iv)),
- ⁷⁸ JS3, para. 16.
- ⁷⁹ JS3, para. 27. JS3 made recommendations (paras. 33.4 and 33.7).
- ⁸⁰ JS3, para. 29. JS3 made recommendations (paras. 33.5 and 36.6).
- ⁸¹ JS6, paras. 33 and 34. JS6 made recommendations (para. 35.). See also Salinlahi, para. 32.
- ⁸² JS12, paras. C, 3.1 - 3.4. See also JS19, para. 23.
- ⁸³ Salinlahi, para. 33.
- ⁸⁴ JS2, para. 28, referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras 129.15 (United States of America), 129.26 (Spain), 129.29 (Republic of Korea, Austria, Netherlands), 129.30 (Australia). JS2 made recommendations (paras. 36-41).
- ⁸⁵ HRW, p. 5, referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.31 (United States of America) and 129.32 (Canada).
- ⁸⁶ IFI-RPRD, para. 18.
- ⁸⁷ NUPL, p. 1, referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.30 (Australia).
- ⁸⁸ NUPL, para. 1. NUPL cited cases of impunity (2-7).
- ⁸⁹ AI, p. 2.
- ⁹⁰ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, para. 131.32.
- ⁹¹ ADF, paras. 18-23. ADF made recommendations (para. 24).
- ⁹² JC, paras. A. 2 and 3. JC made a recommendation (para. E.1).
- ⁹³ UCCP, para. 5.
- ⁹⁴ UCCP, paras. 5-9. UCCP made recommendations (para. 17).
- ⁹⁵ JS11, paras. 14-16. JS11 made recommendations (para. 40).
- ⁹⁶ JS5, paras. 4.2-4.4. JS5 made recommendations (para. 6.3). See also JS11, para. 12; JS2, para. 12. JS2 made a recommendation (17).
- ⁹⁷ NCCP, para. 6., referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.35(France).
- ⁹⁸ JS14, p.1 referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.35 (France) and 131.32 (Ireland). For the position taken by the Philippines on the recommendations see A/HRC/21/12/Add.1. See also FLD, para. 5.
- ⁹⁹ JS14, p. 2.
- ¹⁰⁰ JS2, para. 4. JS2 made recommendations (paras. 8-10), See also JS5, para. 3.1, and Annex referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129. 35, 131.15, 131.31, and 131.32.
- ¹⁰¹ FLD, paras. 5 and 6.
- ¹⁰² FLD, para. 19.
- ¹⁰³ JS2, para. 14. JS2 made recommendations (paras. 18 and 19). See also JS15, paras. 49-51; IFI-RPRD, para. 5; Karapatan, para. 9; NCCP, para. 7.
- ¹⁰⁴ Karapatan, para. 10. Karapatan made a recommendation (para. 30).
- ¹⁰⁵ JS5, paras. 3.3 and 6.2. For recommendations see para. 6.2.
- ¹⁰⁶ JS5, para. 2.2.
- ¹⁰⁷ JS5, paras. 5.2-5.4. JS5 made recommendations (para. 6.4).
- ¹⁰⁸ The presidential and general elections were held on 9 May 2016 (TCC, p. 1).
- ¹⁰⁹ TCC, p. 3.
- ¹¹⁰ Those barriers included the remoteness of the locations where they live and the considerable distances they must travel to register or to vote; the high levels of illiteracy which render the voting process highly inaccessible; and the lack of legal documentation to facilitate voter registration (TCC, p. 2).
- ¹¹¹ TCC, p. 2. TCC made a recommendation (p. 3).
- ¹¹² For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.23, 130.3 and 130.4.
- ¹¹³ JS6, para. 20.

- ¹¹⁴ JS6, para. 22(a) referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.22 (Norway) and 130.3 (Spain, Belarus, Holy See, Netherlands, Uruguay, Latvia).
- ¹¹⁵ JS6, para. 22. For other recommendations see para. 22. See also JS21, para. 7.
- ¹¹⁶ CMA, para. 8.6.
- ¹¹⁷ CMA, para. 8.8.
- ¹¹⁸ JS21, para. 10. JS21 made recommendations (para. 11).
- ¹¹⁹ JS11, para. 22. JS11 made recommendations (para. 40).
- ¹²⁰ JS22, paras. 13-18. JS22 made recommendations para. 43. See also JS11, paras. 31 and 31.
- ¹²¹ JS22, paras. 24 and 25. JS22 made recommendations (para. 43).
- ¹²² For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.11, 129.38 and 129.39.
- ¹²³ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.36.
- ¹²⁴ DJP, paras. 10-12. DJP made recommendations (paras. 30 and 31).
- ¹²⁵ COURAGE, paras. 1-4. COURAGE made recommendations (p. 7).
- ¹²⁶ CTUHR, paras. 4, 5 and 7. CTUHR made recommendations (para. 33 (ii)). See also JS20, para. 4.
- ¹²⁷ CTUHR, para. 13.
- ¹²⁸ CTUHR, para. 15.
- ¹²⁹ CTUHR, para. 16.
- ¹³⁰ JS8, paras. 18-20.
- ¹³¹ JS8, para. 23. JS8 made a recommendation (para. 47.5).
- ¹³² JS8, para. 24. See also CTUHR, para. 17; GABRIELA, para. 8.
- ¹³³ CTUHR, para. 20, referring to the DOLE Department Order 131-13, (2013) Rules on Labor Law Compliance System.
- ¹³⁴ CMA, para. 1.1.
- ¹³⁵ CMA, para. 6.1. CMA made proposals (paras. 6.2-6.9).
- ¹³⁶ MIGRANTE, pp. 3-4. MIGRANT made recommendations (pp. 5-6.).
- ¹³⁷ CTUHR, paras. 23 and 25.
- ¹³⁸ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.36 and 129.37.
- ¹³⁹ JS1, para. 14.
- ¹⁴⁰ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.36 and 129.37.
- ¹⁴¹ For recommendations see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.36 (Bangladesh, Cuba, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), and Russian Federation) and 129.37 (Bahrain, Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia and United Arab Emirates).
- ¹⁴² JS8, para. 12. JS8 made a recommendation (para. 47.8). See also GABRIELA, para. 5; and Salinilahi, para. 41.
- ¹⁴³ JS8, p. 1. See also GABRIELA, para. 7.
- ¹⁴⁴ KMP, p. 1.
- ¹⁴⁵ For recommendations see A/HRC/21/12 referring to paras. 129.38 (Qatar and Viet Nam) and 129.39 (Cuba and Pakistan).
- ¹⁴⁶ JS6, paras 41-43. JS6 also made other recommendations (para. 43).
- ¹⁴⁷ See DJP, paras. 27 – 29.
- ¹⁴⁸ DJP, para. 6. DJP made recommendations (paras. 35 and 36).
- ¹⁴⁹ JS8, para. 14.
- ¹⁵⁰ JS8, para. 47.8.
- ¹⁵¹ KMP, p. 1.
- ¹⁵² KMP, para. 3.
- ¹⁵³ For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.40 and 129.41.
- ¹⁵⁴ AI, p. 2 and fn. 12 referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.7 (Spain), 129.40 (Switzerland and Sweden) and 129.41 (Slovakia and New Zealand).
- ¹⁵⁵ AI, p. 2. AI made recommendations (p. 6).
- ¹⁵⁶ AI, p. 5.
- ¹⁵⁷ JS20, para. 36.
- ¹⁵⁸ JS6, para. 45.
- ¹⁵⁹ JS6 referred to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.40 (Sweden) and 129.41 (New Zealand).
- ¹⁶⁰ JS6, para. 47. For other recommendations made see para. 47.
- ¹⁶¹ JS7, para. 9. JS7 made recommendations (para. 28).
- ¹⁶² AI, p. 5.
- ¹⁶³ JS7, p. 3. See also JS13, para. 43.

164 ADF, paras. 3-6.
165 ADF, para. 17. ADF made recommendations (para. 24).
166 JS8, paras. 28-30.
167 JS13, para. 18.
168 HRW, p. 8.
169 JS13, para. 13.
170 JS13, para. 16. JS13 made a recommendation (para. 16).
171 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.42 and 129.43.
172 IBON, para. 34.
173 JS6, paras. 36-39. JS6 made recommendations and that context referred to A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.42 (Saudi Arabia and Holy See).
174 ERI, paras. 12-13.
175 ERI, para. 10.
176 GG, p. 2.
177 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.7 and 129.8.
178 JS20, p. 2.
179 JS20, para. 4. JS20 made recommendations (para. 41).
180 JS20, para. 3.
181 GABRIELA, paras. 11 and (i). GABRIELA made recommendations (para. ii).
182 (JS11, para. 17. JS 11 made recommendations (para. 40).
183 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, para. 131.5.
184 For recommendations see A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.24 (Portugal, France, Uruguay and Liechtenstein).
185 JS6, para.19.
186 JS3, para. 5, referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.10 (Brunei Darussalam), 129. 24 (France and Uruguay), 129.29 (Republic of Korea and the Netherlands).
187 JS3, paras. 33.2 and 33.3.
188 Salinlahi, para. 29.
189 JS3, paras. 36 and 38.13.
190 JS6, paras. 23 and 24. JS6 made recommendations (para. 28).
191 JS6, para. 30.
192 JS6, para. 32 referring to A/HRC/21/12, para.129.25 (Chile). For other recommendations see para. 32.
193 CRCN-P, para. 7.
194 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, para. 130.6.
195 JS20, para. 14.
196 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.44.
197 The collective term used for the indigenous peoples of Mindanao (RMP-NMR, fn.1).
198 RMP-NMR, para. 5. RMP-NMR made a recommendation (para. 33).
199 TCC, p. 2. TCC made a recommendation (p. 3). See also RMP-NMR, para. 31. RMP-NMR made a recommendation (para. 38).
200 JS10, para. 11.
201 See also JS18, p. 3.
202 JS2, para. 50. JS2 made recommendations (paras. 53 and 54).
203 JS10, paras. 14-19.
204 JS10, para. 20. JS10 made recommendations (p. 7, paras. 2-5); See also IFI-RPRD, para. 6.
205 JS10, para. 21. See also JS15, paras. 54-62.
206 NCCP, para. 19.
207 JS2, para. 51, referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.11(Thailand). JS2 made a recommendation (para. 55).
208 ERI, para. 19.
209 ERI, para. 20. ERI made recommendations (para. 24 (h) and (i).
210 JS18, p. 4. See also CRCN-P, para. 17. CRCN-P made recommendations (para. 29).
211 JS16, p. 1.
212 JS16, p. 1.
213 JS20, para. 17.
214 JS20, para. 18. JS20 made recommendations (para. 42).
215 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, para. 130.7.
216 JS9, p. 7.

²¹⁷ PCPR, paras. 28 and 29. PCPR made a recommendation para 30 (2). See also JS8, para. 47.1 and 47.3. See also Karapatan, para. 28; KMP, para. 3.

²¹⁸ JS16, p. 1. JS16 made recommendations (pp. 2 and 8).
