



Human Rights Council
Working Group Report on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirty-third session
6-17 May 2019

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Norway*

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

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 10 stakeholders' submissions¹ to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints. A separate section is provided for the contribution by the national human rights institution that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles.

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

A. Scope of international obligations² and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies³

2. The Norwegian National Human Rights Institution (NIM) recommended that Norway consider withdrawing reservations to article 10 of the ICCPR, as it was recommended during the second universal periodic review (the 2014 UPR) of Norway.^{4,5}

B. National human rights framework

3. NIM recommended putting in place a coordination mechanism to follow up recommendations from international human rights mechanisms.⁶

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



C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law⁷

4. While noting a new strategy against hate speech (2016-2020), NIM recommended that Norway take further measures to combat hate speech and hate crimes, including by strengthening the investigation capacity of police and by ensuring the collection of comprehensive and reliable data.⁸

5. NIM noted the adoption of the first National Action Plan for implementing the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. A key goal of the Action Plan was to ensure that Norwegian companies were provided with a coherent guidance on their human rights responsibilities, and to establish a national centre for such guidance. NIM recommended that Norway implement the aforementioned goal.⁹

6. NIM referred to reports indicating that the use of coercion in mental health care remained high. The use of non-consensual electroconvulsive was of particular concern. The Health and Care Services Act allowed for the use of coercion and force against persons with intellectual disabilities to protect against serious harm to themselves or others. NIM recommended that Norway reduce the use of coercion in mental health care and against persons with intellectual disabilities, strengthen legislation and refrain from any undue use of coercion.¹⁰

7. NIM recommended that Norway implement effective measures to ensure protection, prevention and redress to children, the Sami people and older persons exposed to violence and sexual abuse, including developing a specific action plan for Sami victims of such violence.¹¹

8. While noting existing challenges in investigation of cases of domestic violence and rape by police, NIM recommended strengthening investigation capacity of police related to domestic and sexual violence.¹²

9. The instances of individuals being held in police custody for more than 48 hours had been significantly reduced. However, the number of cases of prolonged police custody had appeared relatively high.¹³

10. In many cases, detainees had been placed in isolation without such measures deemed necessary for reasons relating to the investigation. NIM considered that the regulatory framework must be revised and implemented in order to reduce unjustified isolation in police custody.¹⁴ Furthermore, NIM recommended ensuring that solitary confinement in prisons is used only in exceptional circumstances.¹⁵

11. NIM recommended that Norway ensure that inmates receive adequate mental health care and improve detention conditions of women in prisons.¹⁶

12. NIM recommended that the authorities ensure that surveillance systems aimed at preventing serious criminal offences and terrorism do not unduly infringe on the right to privacy.¹⁷

13. In view of ongoing education reform, NIM recommended strengthening human rights education both in school programs and higher education.¹⁸

14. NIM referred to information indicating that average pay of women was 88 percent of men, which was reportedly due to gender-segregated market and an impact of family life on women. NIM recommended that Norway implement further measures to encourage more equal participation of both parents in family life.¹⁹

15. While noting five officially recognised national minorities in Norway, NIM recommended that Norway intensify its efforts to further support the use of language and culture of national minorities.²⁰

16. While noting the establishment of two commissions of inquiry to examine consequences of past assimilation policies, NIM recommended that Norway ensure the follow up of recommendations from the commission related to Tater/Romani minority and adequate support to the commission of enquiry on Kven and Sami peoples.²¹

17. NIM noted a number of challenges in ensuring the rights of Sami people as indigenous people, including enjoyment of their rights outside the Finnmark county and the recognition of Sami historical and cultural fishing rights in the coastal sea areas.²²

18. Women and children belonging to Sami people were reportedly more exposed to domestic violence than the rest of the population. NIM recommended that Norway strengthen the protection of the rights of indigenous Sami people.²³

19. NIM recommended that Norway intensify its efforts to ensure non-discrimination of persons with immigrant backgrounds in housing and employment sectors.²⁴

20. There was reportedly a relatively high level of use of security cells in the Trandum centre for persons awaiting deportation. Minors had also been placed in security cells. NIM recommended that Norway prevent the use of restrictive and coercive measures and increase psychological support to detainees at Trandum.²⁵

21. While noting a new law that strengthened the protection of the rights of children in forced return processes, NIM stated that there was no mechanism in place to provide an overall assessment of the cumulative effects of all possible coercive measures in a forced return process in each individual case. NIM recommended that the authorities continue their efforts to strengthen the rights of children in forced return processes.²⁶

22. NIM noted that there were reportedly significant differences in the accommodation and care given to unaccompanied asylum-seeking children 16-18 years of age compared to those under the age of 15. Younger asylum seekers were under the care of the Child Welfare Services whereas the older children were under the responsibility of the immigration authorities. The reception centres for those children 16-18 years of age, had a lower standard.²⁷

23. NIM reported that a large number of unaccompanied asylum-seeking children had disappeared from the reception centres and their whereabouts remained unknown.²⁸

24. Children born in Norway were not ensured Norwegian citizenship unless at least one parent had Norwegian citizenship. NIM recommended that Norway ensure that the Act on Nationality provide stateless children with citizenship in accordance with international obligations of Norway.²⁹

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies³⁰

25. ECPAT Norway noted the ratification of the Council of Europe Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse and the Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence in accordance with two recommendations³¹ from the 2014 UPR.³²

26. The Norwegian Human Rights NGO-Forum (NGO-Forum) recommended that Norway ratify optional protocols to the ICESCR, CRC and CRPD related to individual complaints.³³

27. NGO-Forum recommended that Norway consider withdrawing reservations to Article 10 of the ICCPR and an interpretative declaration made to Article 12 of the CRPD.³⁴

28. The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) recommended that Norway sign and ratify the United Nations Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.³⁵

B. National human rights framework

29. The Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe (CoE-Commissioner) noted that a new chapter on human rights was added to the Constitution in

2014. Civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights had become part of the Constitution. The human rights chapter included a provision on the rights of the child.³⁶

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

1. Cross-cutting issues

*Equality and non-discrimination*³⁷

30. The Organisation for Defending Victims of Violence (ODVV) encouraged Norway to adopt more substantive measures against all forms of discrimination, in particular Islamophobia and xenophobia.³⁸ The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (CoE-ECRI) recommended ensuring that legislation provide for the dissolution of racist organisations and the suppression of their public financing and criminalise the creation and leadership of a group which promotes racism and participation in its activities.³⁹

31. CoE-ECRI noted that victims of discrimination did not receive enough assistance from independent bodies to secure their rights before authorities and the courts.⁴⁰ In 2015, CoE-ECRI recommended that Norway gave the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombudsman and the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Tribunal the power to recommend cases to court free of charge, so that victims did not have to pay court fees and get their legal representation for free.⁴¹ In 2017, CoE-ECRI regretted that the new Equality and Anti-Discrimination Act did not contain an explicit competence for the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombudsman to bring cases to the courts free of charge for victims, even though its explanatory memorandum extensively dealt with this issue. The Ombudsman was not provided with dedicated human and financial resources to represent victims before the courts, the tribunal and other authorities. CoE-ECRI reported that the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Tribunal had not been also provided with the power to recommend cases to court free of charge.⁴² The Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (CoE-ACFC) and the Committee of Ministers (CoE-CM) recommended that Norway strengthen and fund adequately the complaint mechanism resulting from the reform of the Equality and Non-Discrimination Ombudsman.⁴³

32. CoE-ACFC noted an increase in hate speech and xenophobic discourse by politicians, the media and society at large, in particular on the Internet/social media, directed against immigrants, minorities, and indigenous people.⁴⁴

33. CoE-ACFC stated that shortcomings in the way the police recorded and investigated alleged hate crimes, coupled with under-reporting and a narrow interpretation of the legislation in force had led to a low number of prosecutions. Policy measures had been taken to monitor hate speech on the Internet and to emphasise investigation and prosecution of hate crimes. CoE-ACFC noted that while efforts to combat hate speech had intensified there was little evidence of any comprehensive strategy for the implementation of various action plans.⁴⁵

34. In 2015, CoE-ECRI recommended that Norway set up an IT-based system for recording and monitoring racist and homo/transphobic incidents and their processing through the judicial system.⁴⁶ In 2017, CoE-ECRI welcomed the fact that the Police Directorate published a national hate crime report in 2017. However, it noted that the report of the Police Directorate did not contain data about the outcomes of the registered hate crime cases, as for example numbers of indictments, sentences and suspensions of criminal proceedings.⁴⁷

35. CoE-ACFC urged Norway to ensure implementation of the initiatives in place to counter hate speech and to promote tolerance and intercultural dialogue, in particular the strategy to prevent and combat hate speech.⁴⁸ CoE-Commissioner urged Norway to condemn all instances of racist and xenophobic speech. He called on the police and prosecution service to reinforce their efforts to investigate and monitor racist hate speech, including on the Internet, and to encourage and facilitate the reporting of such incidents.⁴⁹

36. NGO-Forum stated that new legislations had strengthened the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) persons. However, LGBTI people still experienced discrimination.⁵⁰ CoE-ECRI stated that transgender persons faced intolerance and transphobia. Gender identity was not mentioned in the hate-crime provisions.⁵¹ CoE-ECRI recommended that Norway include gender identity in the Criminal Code concerning hate motivated offences.⁵² Joint Submission (JS) 1 and NGO-Forum made a similar recommendation.⁵³

37. JS1 stated that there was a centralized health care service for transgender people located in Oslo. Some patients had to travel very far to receive treatment and to wait long for receiving services as the centralised service had a long waiting list.⁵⁴ CoE-ECRI recommended ensuring that gender reassignment and other specific treatment for transgender persons is made available to them in several medical facilities and that their cost is reimbursed by public health-insurance schemes. It recommended developing legislation on gender recognition and gender reassignment in accordance with international standards.⁵⁵

38. Furthermore, NGO-Forum recommended ensuring that intersex children, when it is not medically necessary, are not treated hormonally or surgically until they are old enough to decide for themselves if any such treatment is desired and secure access to desired gender confirming treatment for transgender people.⁵⁶ JS1 recommended that Norway establish better scientific evidence and guidelines for treatment of intersex people, which protect their physical integrity and autonomy and ensure that intersex children, youth and their families receive adequate counselling and support.⁵⁷

Development, the environment, and business and human rights

39. While noting the adoption of a Declaration on the Rights to Peace by the United Nations General Assembly in 2016, the Conscience and Peace Tax International (CPTI) recommended that Norway set up a special fund to allow individuals and corporations to dedicate funds to the promotion and achievement of peace locally and worldwide.⁵⁸

2. Civil and political rights

Right to life, liberty and security of person⁵⁹

40. NGO-Forum noted the criticism expressed by the national preventive mechanism over the use of involuntary forms of treatment in mental health care institutions. The use of coercive measures were insufficiently registered and there was a large variation in the use of coercive measures in mental healthcare throughout the country.⁶⁰

41. NGO-Forum noted concern on the use of electroconvulsive therapy without informed consent. The law on mental healthcare did not grant patients, who were given electroconvulsive therapy without consent, the same legal safeguards as those who were subject to other forms of coercion.⁶¹ The CoE-Commissioner was not convinced that the documented involuntary use of electroconvulsive therapy was in line with human rights standards. He pointed out that particular care should be taken to ensure that information given by health professionals about electroconvulsive therapy was correct and complete, including information on secondary effects and related risks so that patients are able to express their free and informed consent to the procedure.⁶²

42. CoE-Commissioner called on Norway to reform existing legislation on involuntary placements in a way that it applies objective and non-discriminatory criteria which are not specifically aimed at people with psycho-social disabilities. He pointed out that precise data on the use of involuntary medical treatment and restraints should be made available with a view to drastically reducing the recourse to such practices. Medical treatment should be based on free and fully informed consent with the exception of life-threatening emergencies.⁶³

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law⁶⁴

43. NGO-Forum stated that legal aid scheme did not provide effective protection of civil and political rights and that means-tested legal aid failed to consider the actual financial circumstances of the applicants and the actual cost of the legal services sought.⁶⁵ It recommended that Norway provide for free legal aid in cases where the interests of justice

so require and that the assessment of a person's ability to pay for legal aid should be based on the actual financial ability of the individual.⁶⁶

44. NGO-Forum reported that persons detained by police were routinely kept in solitary confinement, that pre-trial solitary confinement were extensively used under the pretext of protecting evidence and that de facto isolation in prisons continued to exist. It noted that a national preventive mechanism at the Parliamentary Ombudsman had criticized the widespread use of solitary confinement/isolation in police cells, prisons, mental health care institutions and in the police immigration detention center (Trandum).⁶⁷

45. NGO-Forum recommended that Norway inter alia introduce individual assessment of the need for solitary confinement as an absolute requirement in all cases, amend legal framework to effectively regulate discretion of judges on the use of solitary confinement and give clear indications that solitary confinement should only be used when it is strictly necessary and only in exceptional circumstances and when it is absolutely essential for the administration of justice and put in place further measures to reduce the use of solitary confinement in prisons.⁶⁸

*Fundamental freedoms*⁶⁹

46. NGO-Forum noted with concern that articles 2, 4 and 16 of the Constitution put an emphasis on Christian values and placed the Evangelical-Lutheran Church in a privileged position compared to other belief communities. NGO-Forum recommended that the right to freedom of religion or belief be included in the Constitution and articles 2, 4 and 16 of the Constitution be amended to ensure non-discrimination and equality.⁷⁰

47. ODVV encouraged Norway to respect religious diversity.⁷¹ The ADF International recommended that Norway ensure that the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion is duly recognised and respected in accordance with international and regional human rights standards and consider introducing legal provisions regulating and protecting the right to conscientious objection.⁷²

*Prohibition of all forms of slavery*⁷³

48. In 2017, the Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (CoE-GRETA) noted that Norway was a country of destination for victims of trafficking in persons.⁷⁴ Norway amended the definition of trafficking in human beings and increased the maximum penalty for this offence, set up specialised anti-trafficking units in the five largest police districts and adopted a new comprehensive national action plan against trafficking in human beings in 2016.⁷⁵ Additionally, CoE-GRETA commended Norway for funding projects in countries of origin and for its cooperation with law enforcement agencies of other countries.⁷⁶

49. CoE-GRETA and the Committee of the Parties to the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (CoE-CP) urged Norway to include slavery, practices similar to slavery and servitude as types of exploitation in the legal definition of trafficking in persons.⁷⁷

50. Furthermore, CoE-GRETA considered that Norway should intensify its efforts to prevent human trafficking for the purpose of labour exploitation, including by working closely with the private sector to raise awareness of trafficking for the purpose of labour exploitation, prevent trafficking in supply chains and strengthen corporate social responsibility.⁷⁸ It invited Norway to consider establishing as a criminal offence the use of services which are the object of labour exploitation, with the knowledge that the person is a victim of trafficking in human beings.⁷⁹

51. CoE-GRETA and CoE-CP considered that Norway should intensify its efforts to prevent trafficking in children, including by increasing efforts to prevent such children from disappearing from child welfare centres and asylum reception centres.⁸⁰ They urged Norway to ensure that child victims of human trafficking benefit from the assistance measures and that all child victims of trafficking aged 15 to 17 be placed under the care of child welfare services.⁸¹

52. CoE-GRETA and CoE-CP urged Norway to further improve the identification of victims of trafficking including by setting up a formalised National Referral Mechanism and improving the identification of victims of trafficking among asylum seekers, migrants

and persons placed in detention centres.⁸² They also recommended adopting a National Referral Mechanism for child victims of trafficking taking into account the special circumstances and needs of child victims and involving child specialists.⁸³

53. CoE-GRETA invited Norway to secure long-term funding for victim assistance Projects and considered that Norway should strengthen its efforts to provide assistance to victims of trafficking.⁸⁴

54. CoE-GRETA considered that Norway should ensure that crimes related to human trafficking for all types of exploitation are investigated, prosecuted and adjudicated promptly and effectively.⁸⁵ It considered that Norway should make further efforts to discourage demand fostering all forms of exploitation of persons in partnership with the private sector, civil society and trade unions.⁸⁶

Right to privacy and family life

55. While referring to concerns expressed about cases of separation of children from their families by the Norwegian child welfare system, the ADF International recommended that Norway ensure that parental rights are not unjustly deprived by child welfare services and that right to private and family life is duly recognised and respected in accordance with international and regional human rights standards.⁸⁷

3. Rights of specific persons or groups

*Women*⁸⁸

56. ODVV stated that gender-based violence, including rape and sexual violence remained a serious concern and that violence against women was underreported.⁸⁹ NGO-Forum noted a low rate of prosecutions in rape cases owing to weakness in police investigations.⁹⁰

57. NGO-Forum recommended that Norway include a gender-sensitive approach in legislation, programs and policies concerning domestic violence, develop comprehensive measures of support to women who break out of violent relationships and provide sufficient funding for shelters for victims of domestic violence and ensure sufficient number of shelters in municipalities.⁹¹

58. NGO-Forum recommended adopting a legal definition of rape in the Criminal Code, which places the absence of consent at its centre, train judges, prosecutors and lawyers about gender-based violence, including rape and other sexual violence and strengthen the investigative capacity of police and prosecutors in all forms of gender-based violence.⁹²

59. La Manif Pour Tous (LMPT) expressed concerns about the use of surrogacy.⁹³

*Children*⁹⁴

60. ECPAT Norway stated that the risk of children becoming victims of sexual exploitation had been increasing with the use of the Internet and mobile technologies. Unaccompanied minors, LGBTQ children and children belonging to minorities and indigenous groups had faced higher risk of becoming a victim of sexual exploitation than other children.⁹⁵ ECPAT Norway noted an increase in reported cases of sexual abuse against children, particularly cases of rape against children aged 14 and younger. The number of incidents of sexual extortion online and grooming had also increased.⁹⁶

61. ECPAT Norway noted that the legislation lacked an explicit prohibition of the sale of children and sexual exploitation of children in travel and tourism, and that very few cases of such exploitation of children had been prosecuted and led to conviction.⁹⁷

62. ECPAT Norway recommended that Norway adopt a comprehensive national plan of action to address sexual exploitation of children in all its forms and provide the adequate human, technical and financial resources for its implementation. It recommended that Norway implement measures to prevent sexual abuse of children within the travel and tourism industry and include an explicit prohibition of sale of children and sexual exploitation of travel and tourism.⁹⁸

63. ECPAT Norway noted that child victims of violence and abuse had an access to the eleven Children's Houses that provided legal assistance and support services. It

recommended that Norway establish Children's Houses across the country, including in rural areas.⁹⁹

*Persons with disabilities*¹⁰⁰

64. CoE-Commissioner noted that Norway had for a long time promoted community living and set up a strong legal framework against the discrimination of people with disabilities.¹⁰¹ He pointed out that the implementation of the CRPD fell short of some of its key objectives in promoting the self-determination, legal capacity and effective equality of people with psycho-social and intellectual disabilities.¹⁰²

65. CoE-Commissioner stated that the 2013 Guardianship Act, continued to enable substituted decision-making and plenary guardianship with reference to psychosocial and intellectual disabilities and that the guardianship system hindered the development of supported decision-making alternatives for those who simply wanted assistance in making decisions or communicating them to others.¹⁰³ Guardians continued to make decisions on behalf of people with disabilities even though they had a duty to listen to the views of the persons concerned. A guardian could decide against the will of persons who had not even been deprived of their legal capacity if they were deemed not to understand the issues at hand.¹⁰⁴

66. CoE-Commissioner urged Norway to develop new systems for supported decision-making, based on individual consent. Robust safeguards were needed to ensure that any support provided respected the will and preferences of the person requesting it and was free of conflict of interests. Plenary guardianship and full incapacitation regimes should be revoked.¹⁰⁵ CoE-Commissioner expressed view that the withdrawal of Norway's interpretative declarations concerning the CRPD would signal a new approach.¹⁰⁶

*Minorities and indigenous peoples*¹⁰⁷

67. NGO-Forum stated that the recognised national minorities – Jews, Forest Finns, Kven, Roma and Romani/Tater – and the Sami indigenous people suffered from assimilation policies in the past.¹⁰⁸ NGO-Forum recommended that the Government and local authorities engage in enhanced dialogue and consultation with members of national minorities and Sami communities in order to overcome distrust due to past assimilation policies.¹⁰⁹

68. CoE-ACFC stated that progress had been accomplished through the publication of reports shedding light on past assimilation practices vis-à-vis the Tater/Romani and the Roma minorities and the ensuing apologies by the authorities. Compensation schemes and other reparation measures were being adopted, but discriminatory attitudes towards the two national minorities persisted.¹¹⁰ CoE-ECRI stated that the Romani people/Taters and the Roma continued suffering from negative media reporting, hate speech and discrimination. Moreover, they had problems accessing education, housing and employment.¹¹¹

69. CoE-ACFC noted concerns expressed regarding the disproportionate number of Roma children placed with the child welfare services, in particular in foster-care families and that the child welfare services did not make sufficient efforts to put in place alternative measures before taking children into care. When foster care was the retained option, placement only exceptionally occurred in Roma families. Placement of children in non-Roma families had adversely affected the development of their cultural identities and language acquisition and use.¹¹²

70. CoE-ACFC noted that for those among the Romani/Taters and the Roma who traditionally travelled during the summer, access to education for children in that period continued to be difficult.¹¹³

71. CoE-ACFC and CoE-CM recommended that Norway step up efforts to preserve and develop Tater/Romani and Roma cultural identities by combating discriminatory attitudes towards their travelling lifestyle and by facilitating access to education. They recommended ensuring that alternative measures to placing children in child welfare services are put in place whenever possible and that placement remains a measure of last resort and intensifying efforts to preserve family ties and the cultural identities of the children when placement in families occurs, including through the recruitment of foster families belonging to the respective minority and the promotion of a broad understanding of Roma culture among child welfare services.¹¹⁴ CoE-Commissioner made similar recommendations and

called on Norway to provide Roma parents with the necessary support to enable them to exercise their parental role and duties in the upbringing and education of their children.¹¹⁵

72. CoE-ACFC called on Norway to show flexibility and put in place best practices, such as distance education, to allow children belonging to Tater/Romani and Roma minorities to continue to have access to quality education while travelling.¹¹⁶

73. Additionally, CoE-ACFC and CoE-CM recommended that Norway step up its efforts to facilitate access of persons belonging to the Tater/Romani and Roma minorities to employment and apprenticeship and reduce inequalities that Roma in particular experience in access to housing, including by conducting research to assess the situation.¹¹⁷

74. CoE-ACFC stated that, while some initiatives had been in place as regards the learning and teaching of the Kven language, multilingual topographical signs, and to a lesser extent, the presence of Kven in the media, a comprehensive and adequately funded plan for the revitalisation of the Kven language had not yet been adopted.¹¹⁸ CoE-ACFC noted that during compulsory schooling, the number of students learning Kven dropped due to the lack of qualified teachers and the absence of financial incentive for students in the form of scholarships.¹¹⁹

75. CoE-ACFC and CoE-CM recommended that Norway develop a comprehensive and adequately resourced plan to revitalise and promote the Kven language including through developing language teaching in education, teacher training, language centres and an increased presence in the media so as to ensure that persons belonging to the Kven minority can maintain and develop their cultural identities and actively use their language in the public sphere.¹²⁰

76. CoE-ACFC noted that Radio programming in the Kven language remained very limited (12 minutes weekly) and had not increased for the last two to three decades, while television programming was still lacking. It reported that broadcasting programmes or printed or online media in the languages of other national minorities did not appear to be available.¹²¹

77. CoE-ACFC urged Norway to enhance significantly the presence of TV and radio broadcasting in Kven and to secure support for all minorities to increase their media presence in broadcasting, printed and online media. The authorities should ensure that national minority programmes are mainstreamed to expand knowledge and awareness of national minorities among the general public.¹²²

78. CoE-ACFC encouraged Norway to continue ensuring the effective implementation of the existing legal framework on multilingual signs of place names and to consult with national minorities when deciding on street names in areas inhabited by persons belonging to national minorities.¹²³

79. CoE-ACFC and CoE-CM recommended that Norway step up efforts in co-operation with national minorities to ensure that curricula, textbooks and other teaching materials appropriately reflect the history and diversity of society in Norway and teachers are adequately trained in order to improve knowledge and teaching on national minorities.¹²⁴

80. CoE-ACFC reiterated its call on the authorities to increase opportunities and enhance mechanism for persons belonging to national minorities to participate in decision-making processes.¹²⁵

81. CoE-ECRI stated that State help for the approximately 40 000 Norwegian Sami took the form of measures to preserve their traditional way of life.¹²⁶ CoE-ECRI noted, however, that the Sami people reportedly continued to suffer from stereotypes: e.g. jokes implying that they are primitive persons, not able to speak proper Norwegian.¹²⁷ It encouraged Norway to continue promoting equality for and combat discrimination against national minorities and indigenous people.¹²⁸

*Migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers*¹²⁹

82. CoE-ECRI referred to studies indicating that many migrants had experienced discrimination in areas such as recruitment, housing and health care. Adult migrants had limited access to free education. Migrants with a low level of education continued having problems in accessing the labour market. The gap in unemployment rates between migrants and those born in Norway had increased.¹³⁰

83. CoE-ECRI noted the adoption of an action plan on increasing employment among immigrants (2013 to 2016) and the National Strategy for immigrants' health (2013-2017). It recommended that Norway adopt a new comprehensive action plan on integration including the promotion of equality and the prevention of discrimination and introduce measurable objectives into their integration policies and determine integration indicators to monitor progress.¹³¹

84. ODVV reported on the rise of anti-immigration politics and initiatives to restrict the rights of asylum-seekers and refugees.¹³² NGO-Forum referred to some documented cases of asylum seekers who were declined protection by Norway and had been tortured or ill-treated upon return to their country of origin. It recommended that Norway put in place stronger safeguards to ensure that asylum seekers are not returned to countries where they might be at risk of torture or other ill-treatment.¹³³ ODVV made a similar recommendation.¹³⁴

85. NGO-Forum stated that the Trandum immigration detention centre was designed for short-term detention before deportation. While most detainees stayed in the center less than 24 hours, a few of them, however, were kept for long period because of a lack of identity documents. The center was not designed to accommodate detainees for more than two days. NGO-Forum recommended that Norway, inter alia, take measure to avoid keeping in Trandum immigration detention centre for prolonged periods and using vulnerable persons and minors in security cells and ensure that health services at the centre are not run by the police.¹³⁵

86. CoE-ECRI noted problems hindering the access of asylum seekers to the labour market. Asylum seekers have to apply for a temporary work permit which was only granted to those having valid travel documents. Since many of them did not possess such documents, and as it was often impossible to obtain them from their country of origin, they were not able to work for years. CoE-ECRI recommended that Norway abolish the rules requiring asylum seekers to present valid travel documents in order to obtain work permits.¹³⁶

87. CoE-ECRI recommended that Norway guarantee a legal right to preschool education including kindergarten for asylum seeking children. They also should improve the access of adult migrants to education. It also recommended that the authorities design projects to promote the involvement of parents of children with migration backgrounds into school life and the education of their children.¹³⁷

Stateless persons

88. NGO-Forum recommended that Norway put in place legislations ensuring that applications for citizenship from stateless persons, who were born in Norway, are processed in accordance with binding international law.¹³⁸

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. (One asterisk denotes a national human rights institution with "A" status).

Civil society

Individual submissions:

ADF International	Alliance Defending Freedom, Geneva, Switzerland;
CPTI	Conscience and Peace Tax International, London, United Kingdom;
ECPAT Norway	End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Trafficking of Children for Sexual Purposes, Oslo, Norway;
LMPT	La Manif Pour Tous, Paris, France;
ICAN	International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Geneva, Switzerland;
ODVV	Organisation for Defending Victims of Violence, Tehran, Islamic Republic of Iran.

Joint submissions:

JS1	Joint submission 1 submitted by: The Norwegian Children
-----	--

NGO-Forum/JS2 and Youth Council and Queer Youth, Oslo Norway;
Joint submission 2 submitted by: The Norwegian NGO-Forum of Human Rights, which is a network of 41 non-governmental organisations, Oslo, Norway.

National human rights institution:

NIM Norwegian National Human Rights Institution*, Oslo, Norway.

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):

CoE The Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France);

Attachments:

(CoE-Commissioner) Report by Mr. Nils Muižnieks, Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe, following his visit to Norway from 19 to 23 January 2015, Strasbourg, CommDH (2015) 9;
 (CoE-ECRI) European Commission against Racism and Intolerance report on Norway, adopted on 10 December, 2014, CRI (2015) 2;
 (CoE-ECRI Conclusions) European Commission against Racism and Intolerance's conclusions on the implementation of the recommendations in respect of Norway subject to interim follow-up, adopted on 5 December 2017, CRI (2018) 5;
 (CoE-GRETA) - Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, Report concerning the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings by Norway, Second Evaluation Round, Strasbourg, adopted on 31 March 2017; GRETA (2017) 18;
 (CoE-CP) Committee of the Parties to the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, Recommendation CP (2017) 30 on the Implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings by Norway, adopted on 13 October 2017;
 (CoE-ACFC) Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection Of National Minorities, Strasbourg, Fourth Opinion on Norway adopted on 13 October, 2016 ACFC/OP/II (2016) 008;
 (CoE-CM) Committee of Ministers, Resolution CM/ResCMN (2018) 6 on the implementation of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities by Norway, adopted on 2 May 2018.

² The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

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;
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child;
OP-CRC-IC	Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure;
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities;
OP-CRPD	Optional Protocol to CRPD.

³ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/3, para. 131.16 and 131.21.

⁴ For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/27/3, paras. 131.16 (South Africa) and 131.21 (Austria).

⁵ NIM, para. 1.

⁶ NIM, para. 2.

⁷ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/3, paras. 131.29-131.31, 131.35, 131.136, 131.41, 131.42, 131.68, 131.84, 131.72 -131.75, 131.91, 131.97, 131.102, 131. 109, 131.129, 131. 130-131.144, 131. 146, 131. 149, 131.152-131.157, 131. 165-131.167, 131.-172, 131. 176-131.178, 131.180-131.182, 131.184-131.188, 131. 192-131.203.

⁸ NIM, para. 17.

⁹ NIM, para. 20.

- 10 NIM, paras. 23 and 24.
- 11 NIM, para. 16.
- 12 NIM, para. 15.
- 13 NIM, para. 4.
- 14 NIM, para. 5. See also para. 6.
- 15 NIM, para. 7.
- 16 NIM, paras. 8-9.
- 17 NIM, para. 18.
- 18 NIM, para. 3.
- 19 NIM, para. 21.
- 20 NIM, para. 26.
- 21 NIM, para. 27.
- 22 NIM, para. 28.
- 23 NIM, para. 28.
- 24 NIM, para. 25.
- 25 NIM, para. 12.
- 26 NIM, para. 13.
- 27 NIM, para. 29.
- 28 NIM, para. 29.
- 29 NIM, para. 30.
- 30 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/3, paras. 131.2, 131.9, 131.12-131.16, 131.18, 131.20-131.23.
- 31 For the full texts of the recommendations see A/HRC/27/3, paras. 131.2 (Italy) and 131.22 (France).
- 32 ECPAT Norway, paras. 17 and 18.
- 33 NGO-Forum, para. 5. See also CoE-Commissioner, para. 37.
- 34 NGO-Forum, para. 3.
- 35 ICAN, p.1.
- 36 CoE-Commissioner, para. 83 and p. 5. See also CoE-ECRI, p. 9.
- 37 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/3, paras. 131.26-131.28, 131.36, 131.39, 131.65, 131.66, 131.69, 131.97, 131.98, 131.101-131.110, 131.113, 131.127.
- 38 ODVV, para. 13.
- 39 CoE-ECRI, paras. 8 and 13, See also p. 9.
- 40 CoE-ECRI, p. 9.
- 41 CoE-ECRI, para. 19 and p. 33. See also CoE-ACFC, para. 22.
- 42 CoE-ECRI conclusions, para. 1.
- 43 CoE-ACFC, p. 35 and CoE-CM Resolution, p. 2. See also CoE-Commissioner, para. 102 and CoE-ECRI, para. 20.
- 44 CoE-ACFC, para. 5 and para. 48. See also CoE-ECRI, paras. 22 and 27 and ODVV, para. 7.
- 45 CoE-ACFC, para. 5. See also paras. 54-56.
- 46 CoE-ECRI, para. 44 and p. 33.
- 47 CoE-ECRI conclusions, para. 2.
- 48 CoE-ACFC, para. 53. See also ODVV, para. 13.
- 49 CoE-Commissioner, para. 81 and p. 5. See also NGO-Forum, para. 40, CoE-ACFC, para. 57 and CoE-ECRI, para. 31.
- 50 NGO-Forum, para. 32.
- 51 CoE-ECRI, p. 10. See also JS1, paras. 7 and 8.
- 52 CoE-ECRI, para. 83.
- 53 JS1, para. 11 and NGO-Forum, para. 40.
- 54 JS1, para. 1. See also CoE-ECRI, p. 10.
- 55 CoE-ECRI, paras. 92-94. See also JS1, para. 3.
- 56 NGO-Forum, para. 32.
- 57 JS1, para. 6.
- 58 CPTI, pp. 2-3.
- 59 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/3, paras. 131.164-131.167.
- 60 NGO-Forum, para. 15.
- 61 NGO-Forum, para. 16.
- 62 CoE-Commissioner, para. 43 and p. 4.
- 63 CoE-Commissioner, paras. 41-42 and p. 4.
- 64 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/3, paras. 131.140-131.144.
- 65 NGO-Forum, para. 17.
- 66 NGO-Forum, para. 19.
- 67 NGO-Forum, paras. 9, 10 and 11.

- 68 NGO-Forum, paras. 9, 10 and 11.
- 69 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/3, para. 131.33.
- 70 NGO-FORUM, para. 6.
- 71 ODVV, para. 14.
- 72 ADF International, para. 24.
- 73 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/3, paras 131.120-131.126.
- 74 CoE-GRETA, para. 12.
- 75 CoE-GRETA, para. 198. See also CoE-CP, para. 1.
- 76 CoE-GRETA, para. 206.
- 77 CoE-GRETA, para. 153 and p. 44 and CoE-CP, para. 2. See also ECPAT Norway, para. 23.
- 78 CoE-GRETA, para. 51 and pp. 44-45.
- 79 CoE-GRETA, para. 159 and p. 46.
- 80 CoE-GRETA, para. 56 and p. 45 and CoE-CP, para. 2.
- 81 CoE-GRETA, para. 116 and p. 43 and CoE-CP, para. 2.
- 82 CoE-GRETA, para. 81 and p. 43 and CoE-CP, para. 2.
- 83 CoE-GRETA, para. 116 and p. 43 and CoE-CP, para. 2.
- 84 CoE-GRETA, para. 96 and p. 45.
- 85 CoE-GRETA, para. 181 and p. 47.
- 86 CoE-GRETA, para. 68 and p. 45.
- 87 ADF International, para. 24. See also paras. 7-15.
- 88 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/3, paras. 131.29, 131.30, 131.41, 131.35, 131.113, 131.125 and 131.131-131.138.
- 89 ODVV, para. 9.
- 90 NGO-Forum, para. 20.
- 91 NGO-Forum, para. 24. See also ODVV, para. 15.
- 92 NGO-Forum, para. 22.
- 93 LMPT, paras. 8-21.
- 94 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/3, paras. 131.147, 131.151, 131.158 and 131.159.
- 95 ECPAT Norway, para. 5.
- 96 ECPAT Norway, paras. 7 and 10; See also para. 11.
- 97 ECPAT Norway, paras.14, 22 and 24.
- 98 ECPAT Norway, p. 6, recommendations nos. 1 and 3 and p. 8, para. 1.
- 99 ECPAT, para. 31 and recommendation no. 3 in p. 9.
- 100 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/3, para. 131.36 and 131.179.
- 101 CoE-Commissioner, para. 6.
- 102 CoE-Commissioner, paras. 36 and p. 4.
- 103 CoE-Commissioner, para. 38 and p. 4.
- 104 CoE-Commissioner, para. 15.
- 105 CoE-Commissioner, paras. 39 and p. 4.
- 106 CoE-Commissioner, para. 37.
- 107 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/3, paras. 131.69, 131.76, 131. 87, 131.88, 131.93, 131.94, 131.96, 131.97, 131.159, 131.180-131.185 and 131.187-131.192.
- 108 NGO-Forum, para. 29.
- 109 NGO-Forum, para. 30. See also CoE-ACFC, p. 35 and CoE-CM Resolution, p. 1.
- 110 CoE-ACFC, para. 4. See also CoE-ACFC, paras. 37-42 and 55, CoE-Commissioner, para. 75 and p. 4 and NGO-Forum, para. 31.
- 111 CoE-ECRI, para. 71. See also CoE-Commissioner, paras. 46, 49 and 81.
- 112 CoE-ACFC, para. 45. See also paras. 4, 7 and 44 and CoE-Commissioner, p. 5 and paras. 52-55.
- 113 CoE-ACFC, para. 72. CoE-Commissioner, para. 50.
- 114 CoE-ACFC, p. 35 and CoE-CM Resolution, p. 1. See also CoE-ACFC, para. 47.
- 115 CoE-Commissioner, para. 78 and p. 5.
- 116 CoE-ACFC, para. 74. CoE-Commissioner, paras. 74 and 77.
- 117 CoE-ACFC, para. 94 and p. 37, and CoE-CM, p. 2. See also CoE-Commissioner, para. 75.
- 118 CoE-ACFC, para. 4.
- 119 CoE-ACFC, para. 8. See also para. 34.
- 120 CoE-ACFC, p. 35, and CoE-CM Resolution, p. 1. See also CoE-ACFC, paras. 68, 86 and 87.
- 121 CoE-ACFC, para. 10. See also paras. 59-60.
- 122 CoE-ACFC, para. 63. See also CoE-CM Resolution, p. 2.
- 123 CoE-ACFC, para. 71. See also CoE-CM Resolution, p. 2.
- 124 CoE-ACFC, para. 80 and p. 36, and CoE-CM Resolution, p. 2.
- 125 CoE-ACFC, para. 92.
- 126 CoE-ECRI, para. 72.

¹²⁷ CoE-ECRI, para. 72.

¹²⁸ CoE-ECRI, para. 73.

¹²⁹ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/3, paras. 131.69, 131.76, 131.77, 131.88-131.95, 131.99, 131.100, 131.158, 131.160, 131.161, 131.174, 131.192-131.203.

¹³⁰ CoE-ECRI, p. 9. See also para. 65 and NGO-Forum, para. 41.

¹³¹ CoE-ECRI, paras. 49, 50 and 55.

¹³² ODVV, para. 5.

¹³³ NGO-Forum, para. 8. See also ODVV, paras. 5 and 6.

¹³⁴ ODVV, para. 11.

¹³⁵ NGO-Forum, para. 43 and 45.

¹³⁶ CoE-ECRI, paras. 66-67.

¹³⁷ CoE-ECRI, paras. 62-64.

¹³⁸ NGO-Forum, para. 51.
