



Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirty-ninth session
1–12 November 2021

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Suriname*

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.

II. Information provided by stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies²

2. The Organization of Indigenous Peoples in Suriname (OIS) stated that Suriname should ratify the International Labour Organisation (ILO) Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No.169) no later than December 2021.³

3. The Center for Global Nonkilling (CGNK) strongly recommended that the Government urgently ratify the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.⁴

4. The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) recommended that Suriname sign and ratify the United Nations Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons as a matter of international urgency.⁵

5. The International Human Rights Clinic of the University of Oklahoma College of Law (IHRC-OU) stated that in September 2012, the Special Rapporteur on the right of indigenous peoples had sent a communication to Suriname asking, among other issues, about the measures taken by Suriname to address the health and environmental situation affecting the Wayana communities of Peluowine (Apetina) and Kawemhakan (Anapike) by mercury contamination resulting from gold-mining activities on or near their traditional lands. IHRC-OU noted that Suriname regrettably after 9 years still had not replied to the communication.⁶

* The present document is being issued without formal editing.



6. JS2 recommended that the Government invite the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples to make an official visit to Suriname.⁷

B. National human rights framework⁸

7. Stichting Projekta (Projekta) recommended that the Government establish and operationalize the national human rights institute in accordance with the Paris Principles, based on a broad dialogue and in partnership with civil society, in particular human rights and human rights based organizations.⁹

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

1. Cross-cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination¹⁰

8. Projekta noted the huge discrepancy in the quality and availability of services and in the policy attention between urban areas and populations and the hinterland, where mostly indigenous and tribal people resided. This had resulted in the continued exacerbation of human rights infringements in areas such as education, health, environment, access to water and sanitation.¹¹

9. JS2 stated that indigenous peoples faced increasing and intensifying negative outcomes as a result of disproportionate inequities in their access to education, clean water, food, and a safe environment.¹²

10. JS1 stated that still little progress could be reported towards the enactment and adoption of necessary robust and comprehensive legislation and policies to effectively prevent and punish all forms of rights violations based on sexual orientation or gender identity in all settings.¹³

11. JS1 recommended that the Government enact and adopt comprehensive legislation and policies that prevent all forms of discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity and provide appropriate civil and criminal legal remedies to victims of these forms of discrimination.¹⁴

12. JS1 recommended that the Government continue to reform the legal framework on the right to family life, utilizing the ongoing Civil Code reform process, as well as the applicable policy framework to eliminate all direct and indirect forms of discrimination against LGBTQI persons.¹⁵

13. JS1 recommended that the Government review and where necessary revise existing policies and measures on gender, gender re-assignment and on supplementing the civil status registers in accordance with a re-assigned gender and sex to make them compatible with the Constitution and related binding legal provisions of human rights treaties.¹⁶

Development, the environment, and business and human rights¹⁷

14. JS2 stated that massive negative environmental impacts continued to affect indigenous peoples' territories and that the Government had not taken any concrete action to ban the use of mercury in gold mining, despite evidence that contamination far exceeded World Health Organization limits.¹⁸

15. OIS stated that a constant violation of the rights of indigenous peoples was the unbridled mercury use in and near the lands of indigenous peoples. Whole villages and tribes were at risk of or already experienced mercury poisoning. OIS stated that none of the steps Suriname claimed to have taken had yielded any results. It was also concerned about the introduction of a new substance for goldmining, the effects of which on the health of the villagers was not known. Not much information was available, other than that it allegedly contained cyanide. No effective action had been taken by the Government to prevent its use.¹⁹

16. JS2 recommended that the Government implement a ban on the use of mercury in gold mining, and, with the effective participation of affected indigenous peoples, provide immediate environmental remediation for existing mercury contamination in indigenous territories.²⁰

17. IHRC-OU recommended that the Government adopt legislation to ensure that no mercury is used or dispersed on territories occupied by indigenous and tribal peoples.²¹

18. IHRC-OU encouraged the Government to avail itself of technical assistance of the United Nations to assess the health and environmental situation in Apetina and Anapaike communities affected by mercury contamination from artisanal and small-scale gold mining.²²

19. Projekta recommended that the Government prevent the exposure to pollution and toxic chemicals and guarantee an effective remedy for exposure and environmental contamination. It recommended that the Government compensate victims of mercury pollution, and provide a budget for research in the communities to diagnose mercury-related health issues.²³

2. Civil and political rights

*Right to life, liberty and security of person*²⁴

20. The Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children (GPEVAC) stated that in Suriname, corporal punishment of children was still lawful despite repeated recommendations to prohibit it by the Committee on the Rights of the Child, other treaty bodies, and during the second cycle UPR of Suriname in 2016.²⁵

21. GPEVAC stated that corporal punishment of children in Suriname was lawful in the home, alternative care settings, day care, schools and penal institutions. There was no defence for the use of corporal punishment by parents and others enshrined in law, but legal provisions against violence and abuse were not interpreted as prohibiting all corporal punishment in childrearing.²⁶

22. GPEVAC stated that prohibition should be enacted of all corporal punishment in all settings, including the family home and all settings where adults have authority over children.²⁷

*Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law*²⁸

23. IHRC-OU recommended that the Government pass legislation, such as the previously recommended 2004 draft Mining Act, providing that where there are free, prior and informed consent or health and environmental violations, indigenous peoples have recourse to courts for appropriate remedies and adequate compensation.²⁹

*Fundamental freedoms*³⁰

24. Projekta stated that Suriname still had no Freedom of Information Law. This was especially challenging for journalists, as their access to senior government officials had been significantly reduced in the past five years. Government communication had become more centralized, under a central communication office. On various occasions, journalists had indicated that they do not get information that they requested from the central communications office, or that Ministries referred to the central communication office when asked questions about sector-specific issues.³¹

25. Projekta stated that various news outlets had reported being boycotted from Government press conferences due to perceived misreporting. Also, in the press conferences themselves, questions by journalists often remained unanswered, and journalists did not receive an opportunity for follow-up questions.³²

26. Projekta recommended that the Government discuss and adopt a Freedom of Information Act as soon as possible.³³

27. Projekta recommended that the Government halt the continued centralization of Government information and the prevention of journalists from reporting public events. It also recommended that the Government cease the intimidation of journalists.³⁴

28. Projekta recommended that the Government decriminalize defamation and place it within the civil code in accordance with international standards.³⁵

29. The Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF International) recommended that the Government fully guarantee the right to freedom of opinion and expression, including by repealing Article 196 of the Penal Code on blasphemy.³⁶

30. ADF International recommended that the Government fully align Articles 175 and 175bis of the Penal Code with international human rights obligations on freedom of expression.³⁷

*Prohibition of all forms of slavery*³⁸

31. The European Centre for Law and Justice (ECLJ) stated that the remote nature of Suriname's interior made it easy for human traffickers to work with impunity. It also posed difficulties in data tracing incidents of human trafficking, and limited the amount and type of stories available to highlight the issue.³⁹

32. ECLJ stated that within Suriname, human traffickers targeted women and children for sexual exploitation as well as low-skilled labor jobs in the country's interior mining regions. Women and girls were sexually exploited in the mining camps and were forced to work in brothels, bars, and strip clubs.⁴⁰

33. ECLJ stated that while it was known that human trafficking occurred in Suriname, the Government's lack of resources and training in the remote interior regions posed a challenge for the police. It stated that unfortunately, the full scope of human trafficking was unknown, and as a result, most cases went unreported and un-investigated.⁴¹

34. ECLJ was pleased that Suriname had recognized and taken steps toward addressing human trafficking within its borders, but stated that it was critical that Suriname took further steps to provide aid and assistance to victims of human trafficking, as well as provide regular and accurate data regarding the full scope of human trafficking within the country.⁴²

Right to family life

35. JS1 stated that the right to family life through marriage was exclusively guaranteed for couples of opposite sexes by Article 80 in conjunction with Article 138 of the Civil Code. It noted that the Civil Code was under review, but that so far no attention had been given to the aspect of discrimination on sexual orientation and gender identity of Article 80.⁴³

36. JS1 stated that the fact that LGBTQI married couples were ineligible to adopt a child, due to the opposite-sex element of the marriage requirement, constituted a discriminatory and unfair treatment based on sexual orientation.⁴⁴

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

*Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work*⁴⁵

37. Projekta recommended that the Government add to the draft Act on Equal Treatment a statutory quota for employers to hire persons with disabilities.⁴⁶

Right to social security

38. Projekta recommended that the Government adjust the social welfare payments to a living wage standard, and delete the rule that aid stops at marriage.⁴⁷

*Right to an adequate standard of living*⁴⁸

39. JS2 stated that deforestation, destruction of cultural and natural heritage sites, and the pollution of freshwater sources through the exploitation of natural resources had had a substantial and, in some cases, debilitating negative impact on the quality of life of indigenous peoples.⁴⁹

40. JS2 stated that the exploitation of indigenous territories, in particular for gold mining and logging, had had a strong detrimental effect on the access to food of indigenous communities. For most indigenous peoples, for whom hunting and fishing had been a primary source of livelihood, access to food was increasingly limited.⁵⁰

41. The IHRC-OU stated that the second cycle UPR recommendations by Honduras (A/HRC/33/4, para. 133.86; “Adopt legislative and political measures, including allocation of financial resources to improve coverage of health services in rural areas”), and Colombia (A/HRC/33/4, para. 133.98; “Strengthen measures to ensure equality of rights for indigenous peoples, including the right to health, education and adequate housing.”) had yet to be implemented.⁵¹

42. JS2 stated that the increasing presence and activity of illegal gold miners in and around indigenous territories had caused fresh water sources in those areas to become polluted up to a point where it was no longer safely consumable. Particularly the use of mercury in the extraction process created a situation in which consumption was no longer possible. It stated that only limited governmental initiatives had been undertaken over the past years, and often purification systems were poorly maintained. Purchasing bottled water was often not economically attainable, forcing the consumption of polluted water on indigenous peoples.⁵²

43. JS2 recommended that the Government improve access to safe and potable water of indigenous communities, particularly in the remote interior of the country.⁵³

44. OIS recommended that the Government actively work on improving the situation of the indigenous peoples and provide the basic services including clean water and electricity.⁵⁴

*Right to health*⁵⁵

45. JS2 stated that most of Suriname’s indigenous communities were located at a substantial distance from the capital Paramaribo. For most members the only facilities near enough were health posts managed by Medical Mission Suriname, an independent health care organization, staffed only by health care assistants and only infrequently visited by general practitioners. The facilities often lacked specialized knowledge and medication to properly treat all patients.⁵⁶

46. JS2 stated that the health care facilities in or near the indigenous communities were often unable to treat more serious diseases, and transportation to a better-equipped hospital had to take place by boat or airplane in most cases, which was often too costly.⁵⁷

47. JS2 stated that extremely little effort had been made to improve access to healthcare facilities in indigenous territories. During the COVID-19 pandemic, healthcare facilities in the capital were limitedly accessible to members of the indigenous population living in remote communities. Travel to the health care facilities of the capital was made impossible due to restrictions on travel by road, water, and air. Only an NGO, Medical Mission Suriname, had continued to provide care in the interior of the country during the lockdown.⁵⁸

48. JS2 recommended that the Government improve access to health care of indigenous peoples in Suriname, particularly by improving the quality of existing healthcare facilities in or in the vicinity of indigenous communities, and by implementing and executing legal measures that ensure non-discriminatory access to healthcare.⁵⁹

49. IHRC-OU recommended that the Government adopt legislative and political measures to improve health services in rural areas and to ensure equality rights.⁶⁰

50. JS1 stated that Suriname was one of the top five countries with the highest maternal mortality ratio, and that the rural interior had the highest ratio. The highest percentage of deaths was among Maroon women and women in poverty. It noted substandard care in health facilities and a lack of postnatal care.⁶¹

51. JS1 recommended that the Government develop and implement, in partnership with relevant stakeholders, maternal healthcare policies and measures that ensure accessible, sufficient and timely obstetric care for all women, a national budgeted postnatal care program, national protocols and guidelines addressing the main causes of maternal mortality during pregnancy, childbirth and the post-partum period, a national maternal mortality surveillance system, and a national monitoring mechanism that closely observes the trends in maternal deaths.⁶²

52. ADF International stated that it was crucial that the Government undertake urgent efforts to accurately record maternal health data and ultimately to improve the health of its mothers.⁶³

53. ADF International recommended that the Government take measures to improve the health care infrastructure, access to emergency obstetric care, midwife training, and resources devoted to maternal health.⁶⁴

54. ADF International recommended that the Government advance efforts to safely get mothers and babies through pregnancy and childbirth, with special attention paid to improving health-care access for women from poor and/or rural backgrounds.⁶⁵

55. JS1 stated that the Government did not guarantee universal access to sexual and reproductive health and rights services and education.⁶⁶

56. JS1 recommended that the Government initiate and facilitate with reasonable time-bound targets, the abortion decriminalization process as part of a national debate on the development and implementation of comprehensive sexual and reproductive health and rights-policies, based on evidence-based data and adequate research on (un)safe abortions and their impact on women's health.⁶⁷

57. JS1 noted the urgent need for a structural policy to ensure that adolescents are empowered and strengthened in making informed choices whilst exercising their sexual and reproductive health and rights. It stated that the policies must include in and out of school comprehensive sexuality education to contribute to the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values of adolescents enabling them to protect and/or enhance their health, well-being and dignity by making free, responsible and informed healthy lifestyle choices.⁶⁸

58. JS1 recommended that the Government develop and implement a comprehensive national policy to integrate comprehensive sexuality education in the national education curriculum at the different school levels, as well as in programmes targeting out of school adolescents.⁶⁹

59. JS1 stated that Suriname had no national comprehensive cervical cancer screening program that included a budgeted national cervical cancer control policy. It stated that this denied women the full enjoyment of the right to health and access to adequate sexual and reproductive health and rights services that met the availability, accessibility, acceptability and quality standards as set out by the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.⁷⁰

*Right to education*⁷¹

60. OIS stated that no effective steps had been implemented to improve the level of education for indigenous peoples, mainly those living in the southern part of the country. Primary education maintained the most accessible level. Higher education was concentrated in and around the capital and the additional costs for higher education could not be carried by the parents.⁷²

61. JS2 stated that there had been little to no action to improve the access to education of indigenous groups, especially in remote territories.⁷³

62. OIS stated that the COVID-19 pandemic had had an immense impact on education in the whole country, but that the effects were exacerbated in the interior.⁷⁴

63. JS2 recommended that the Government improve access to education of indigenous children, both through implementing governmental projects as well as by supporting non-governmental projects oriented towards providing indigenous children with better, more culturally appropriate, and relevant education.⁷⁵

64. OIS recommended that the Secondary and Technical Education Support project include a quota system to ensure that children of indigenous villages have equal opportunities and that measures are in place to financially assist the families.⁷⁶

65. JS2 stated that schools were often not present in indigenous communities, or understaffed, and that many children were forced to go to school many kilometres away. In many cases, this was economically unattainable for parents.⁷⁷

66. JS2 stated that in the absence of local schools, members of several communities located on the border with French-Guiana, such as in the Wayana community of Kawemhakan (Anapaike), were forced to send their children to primary and secondary schools across the border, at great expense.⁷⁸

67. JS2 stated that in communities in which the Government had made the effort to provide primary education, students were generally not educated to the level of the national standard. Often this was attributable to logistical problems regarding the deployment of teaching staff to the schools in indigenous territories. Inadequate housing and unwillingness of the teachers to live under the local circumstances with inadequate water, electricity and communication facilities, were other factors.⁷⁹

68. JS2 stated that most teachers employed by the Government were residents of the capital, and that special transportation to the indigenous territories by air or boat was often necessary. A recurring problem was a lack of Government funds to ensure the transportation.⁸⁰

69. JS2 stated that often teachers assigned to schools in indigenous territories were unlicensed and their stationing in indigenous communities was merely part of their training. Accordingly, their assignment lasted only for a few months, after which a new trainee would take over. It stated that this caused little continuity in terms of teaching. Furthermore, as most teachers were not familiar with indigenous practices and culture, they were unable to provide culturally appropriate and relevant education.⁸¹

70. OIS stated that a draft Primary Education Act had been submitted to parliament in December 2019. According to the draft Act, Surinamese Dutch remained the main language for primary education. No provisions had been made to consider using a multilingual approach.⁸²

71. OIS stated that no action had been taken to introduce studies of native languages at university level.⁸³

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

*Women*⁸⁴

72. JS1 stated that women, girls, lesbian, bisexual and trans women, women living with HIV, sex workers and migrant women and girls in vulnerable situations experienced sexual and gender-based violence, discrimination and stigmatization in the private and the public domain. It stated that risk factors included young age, low educational level, pregnancy and early cohabitation with a male partner. In addition, social and cultural attitudes contributed significantly to maintaining entrenched gender roles within society.⁸⁵

73. JS1 stated that sexual harassment was recognized as a serious problem by both employees and employers, and that it was linked to structural and cultural factors such as unequal gender relations, hierarchical organization structures, a sexualized context and a macho culture.⁸⁶

74. JS1 recommended that the Government guarantee and facilitate an in-depth public debate including with women's organizations and labor unions as input for the current draft legislation around sexual harassment at the workplace, while simultaneously investing in awareness-raising around sexual rights, for specific target groups in culturally appropriate language.⁸⁷

*Children*⁸⁸

75. Projekta stated that violence against children remained a huge human right issue in Suriname, including the incidence of violent child discipline. It noted that the Violence against Children study had shown that the Government child protection programmes were inadequate, due to a lack of a coordinated approach and a tracking system in the support process, a lack of case management and monitoring systems, and a lack of defined processes and protocols for professional groups working with children. There was a shortage of social workers in public service and at a non-governmental level, as well as of adequate childcare and guidance of traumatized children.⁸⁹

76. Projekta stated that based on the recommendations of the Violence against Children Study, in 2018 the Government had initiated the setting up of a coordinated mechanism for the child protection services through the IKBen network of service providers both at public and non-governmental level. The IkBen network was still not fully implemented among all child protection service providers. It recommended that the Government strengthen the IKBen network, providing it with adequate resources and assistance to further a coordinated approach in child protection.⁹⁰

77. Projekta stated that there were about 44 children's homes in Suriname, which were mostly managed by private organizations or individuals, including religious organizations. Children were put into their care by families who could not adequately care for them anymore, or by the authorities, in cases of abuse or other deprived circumstances. It stated that most organizations were able to keep the homes running thanks to the donations from the private sector and other donors, but that in the financial crisis in Suriname, exacerbated by the Covid-19 crisis, these donations had dried up. It stated that the Government had a financial aid system in place through which it supported the children's homes, but noted that there had been discussions about the efficiency and the reach of this system.⁹¹

78. Projekta recommended that the Government make the processes and procedures of the subsidy policy for the children's homes practical and transparent. It also recommended that the Government ensure that children's homes are authorized to receive the monthly child benefit for the children under their care, which was currently still received by the parents.⁹²

*Persons with disabilities*⁹³

79. Projekta stated that costs for medical services and basic supplies for persons with a physical disability were not included in basic medical aid packages provided by the Government.⁹⁴

80. Projekta stated that most of the school buildings were not accessible for children with a physical disability.⁹⁵

81. Projekta stated that the National Policy Advisory Board for the Disabled was no longer active.⁹⁶

*Indigenous peoples*⁹⁷

82. IHRC-OU stated that the Constitution of Suriname did not recognize the right to communal property, and that therefore the indigenous people of the interior of Suriname had no means to own, occupy, or enjoy their ancestral lands collectively nor individually.⁹⁸

83. JS2 stated that indigenous peoples continued to lack any form of legal recognition for their land rights or any form of tenure security.⁹⁹

84. JS2 recommended that the Government urgently enact and/or implement legal measures, such as the draft law on Collective Rights for Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in

Suriname, oriented towards providing indigenous peoples some measure of protection for their rights, including as ordered by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACHR). It stated that this must include, among others, the official recognition of the traditional authority of indigenous peoples in Suriname, and the right of indigenous peoples to own and control the lands, territories and resources which they have traditionally owned.¹⁰⁰

85. OIS stated that Parliament had unanimously passed the Act on Protection of Residential and Living Areas of Indigenous and other Tribal Surinamese on 22 December 2017, but that it had no legal force as it had not been promulgated by the President. It recommended that the Act be reviewed and meaningfully consulted with indigenous peoples, no later than December 2021.¹⁰¹

86. OIS recommended that the Government revise the Mining Act of 1986 to include the rights of indigenous peoples to their lands, territories and resources, and hold adequate consultations on the draft Mining Act and take the emerging issues into consideration before submitting it to Parliament.¹⁰²

87. IHRC-OU stated that the judgment of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACHR) in the case of *Saramaka People v. Suriname* (2007, Series C, No. 172) and relevant provisions of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, adopted by the General Assembly on September 13, 2007, worked in favor of the Suriname indigenous people to allow occupation and rights to their ancestral lands.¹⁰³

88. OIS stated that the Government had affirmed its commitment to the implementation of the IACHR judgment in the case of *Kaliña and Lokono Peoples v. Suriname*, IACTHR (2015) Series C, No. 309 and the judgment in the case of *Saramaka People v. Suriname*, IACTHR (2007) Series C, No. 172) of the IACHR, but that it had not implemented them.¹⁰⁴

89. JS2 stated that Suriname had failed to adequately comply with the decision of the IACHR regarding indigenous collective titles to property, such as in the cases of the *Moiwana Community* (2005), *Saramaka People v. Suriname* (2007), and *Kaliña and Lokono Peoples v. Suriname* (2015). It stated that Suriname had yet to recognize the legal personality and land rights of all Indigenous and Tribal peoples and their communities.¹⁰⁵

90. OIS recommended that the Government implement the judgements of the IACHR to their full extent before December 2022.¹⁰⁶

91. IHRC-OU recommended that the Government acknowledge, protect, and properly demarcate the ancestral land of indigenous peoples, and adopt and implement legislation that allows for indigenous people to own land collectively.¹⁰⁷

92. OIS stated that there was a continued lack of legal protection against the issuance of mining, logging, and tenure rights in the territories of indigenous peoples. Work had been ongoing on a new Mining Act since 2004 to replace the Mining Act of 1986. In 2016 and 2019, two Committees had been established, but the outcome of both committees was unknown. It stated that in addition, there had not been any active and meaningful engagement with indigenous peoples on the content of the Act.¹⁰⁸

93. JS2 stated that the right of indigenous peoples to effective participation in decision making was violated at the local level in addition to the national level.¹⁰⁹

94. OIS stated that even after establishing two new departments within the Ministry of Regional Development, there was still limited to no participation of members of indigenous peoples in public life and governmental bodies, and in the development and approval of public standards and policies, including those directly affecting their rights.¹¹⁰

95. OIS recommended that the Government improve the national participation of indigenous peoples in public life and government bodies.¹¹¹

96. IHRC-OU recommended that the Government guarantee the right of indigenous and tribal people to effectively participate in decisions that affect them directly, including the mandatory free, prior and informed consent before any decisions of projects are commissioned on their land or on resources that will directly affect them.¹¹²

97. IHRC-OU recommended that the Government create a consultative body for indigenous and maroon groups to settle boundary disputes.¹¹³

98. JS2 recommended that the Government adopt and implement laws that ensure the requirement of obtaining free, prior, and informed consent, as ordered by the IACHR, and, with the effective participation of indigenous peoples' freely chosen representatives, develop a means for remediation in case this principle is not adhered to.¹¹⁴

99. JS2 stated that indigenous peoples and their communities remained highly vulnerable to violations of their rights by the Government or third parties, including in relation to the plethora of, inter alia, extractive and agricultural concessions, nature reserves and individual third party interests previously granted and that continued to cause substantial violations of their rights. It stated that the new Government that had come to power after the parliamentary elections in 2020 had made promises to speedily enact and implement the draft law on Collective Rights for Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Suriname, but that little to no action had been taken in this regard.¹¹⁵

100. OIS stated that the COVID-19 pandemic had affected indigenous peoples more severely than other groups in the country. It had unveiled the structural vulnerable situation that indigenous peoples were experiencing in Suriname. Due to the national mitigation measures, such as lockdowns and curfews, indigenous peoples had to largely rely on sustenance provided by the forest or from own cultivation. Hunters travelled days from the village to hunt and returned with insufficient game to feed the whole village.¹¹⁶

Notes

¹ The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org.

Civil society

Individual submissions:

ADF International	Alliance Defending Freedom, Geneva (Switzerland);
CGNK	Center for Global Nonkilling, Geneva (Switzerland);
ECLJ	The European Center for Law and Justice, Strasbourg (France);
GPEVAC	The Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children, London (United Kingdom);
ICAN	The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Geneva (Switzerland);
IHRC-OU	The International Human Rights Clinic of the University of Oklahoma College of Law, Norman (United States of America);
OIS	The Organization of Indigenous Peoples in Suriname, Paramaribo (Suriname);
Projekta	Stichting Projekta, Paramaribo (Suriname).

Joint submissions:

JS1	Joint submission 1 submitted by: Professional Associates for Representation, Equality and Acceptance, Paramaribo (Suriname); Stichting Lobi Health Center, Paramaribo (Suriname); Women's Rights Centre, Paramaribo (Suriname);
JS2	Joint submission 2 submitted by: The Mulokot Foundation, Village Kawemhakan (Suriname); the Association of Village Leaders Suriname, Paramaribo (Suriname); Cultural Survival, Cambridge (United States of America).

² For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/44, paras. 133.1–133.22, 133.39–133.41, 134.1, 135.1–21, 135.23 and 135.26–135.31.

³ OIS, para. 2.1.2.

⁴ CGNK, p. 6.

⁵ ICAN, p. 1.

⁶ IHRC-OU, p. 3.

⁷ JS2, p. 12.

⁸ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/44, paras. 133.23–133.24, 133.27–133.37, 135.22 and 135.24–135.25.

⁹ Projekta, para. 7.

¹⁰ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/44, paras. 133.38, 133.55–133.61 and 135.32–135.33.

¹¹ Projekta, para. 1.

- ¹² JS2, p. 2.
¹³ JS1, para. 43.
¹⁴ Ibid., p. 10.
¹⁵ Ibid., p. 10.
¹⁶ Ibid., p. 10.
¹⁷ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/44, paras. 133.102 and 135.43.
¹⁸ JS2, para. 3.
¹⁹ OIS, para. 1.3.4.
²⁰ JS2, pp. 11-12.
²¹ IHRC-OU, p. 3.
²² Ibid., p. 3.
²³ Projekta, para. 25 (a), (e) and (f).
²⁴ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/44, paras. 133.62–133.66 and 135.34.
²⁵ GPEVAC, p. 1.
²⁶ Ibid., p. 2.
²⁷ Ibid., p. 2.
²⁸ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/44, paras. 133.69, 133.81–133.83 and 134.2–134.3.
²⁹ IHRC-OU, p. 3.
³⁰ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/44, para. 135.40.
³¹ Projekta, paras. 9–10.
³² Ibid., para. 10.
³³ Ibid., para. 13 (a).
³⁴ Ibid., paras. 13 (b) and 19 (b).
³⁵ Ibid. para. 19 (a).
³⁶ ADF International, para. 27 (a).
³⁷ Ibid., para. 27 (b).
³⁸ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/44, paras. 133.75–133.80.
³⁹ ECLJ, para. 10.
⁴⁰ Ibid., para. 11.
⁴¹ Ibid., para. 11.
⁴² Ibid., para. 14.
⁴³ JS1, paras. 44 and 48.
⁴⁴ Ibid., para. 51.
⁴⁵ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/44, para. 133.26.
⁴⁶ Projekta, para. 42 (b).
⁴⁷ Ibid., para. 42 (a).
⁴⁸ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/44, paras. 133.25 and 133.85.
⁴⁹ JS2, para. 13.
⁵⁰ Ibid., para. 25.
⁵¹ IHRC-OU, p. 2.
⁵² JS2, paras. 18 and 21–22.
⁵³ Ibid., p. 12.
⁵⁴ OIS, para. 2.4.2.
⁵⁵ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/44, paras. 133.86–133.89.
⁵⁶ JS2, para. 27.
⁵⁷ Ibid., para. 28.
⁵⁸ Ibid., para. 5.
⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 12.
⁶⁰ IHRC-OU, p. 3.
⁶¹ JS1, paras. 21–22 and 24.
⁶² Ibid., pp. 9–10.
⁶³ ADF International, para. 17.
⁶⁴ Ibid., para. 27 (d).
⁶⁵ Ibid., para. 27 (e).
⁶⁶ JS1, para. 4.
⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 9.
⁶⁸ Ibid., para. 8.
⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 9.
⁷⁰ Ibid., para. 14.
⁷¹ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/44, paras. 133.90–133.95 and 135.41.
⁷² OIS, para. 1.4.6.
⁷³ JS2, para. 6.

- ⁷⁴ OIS, para. 1.4.6.
⁷⁵ JS2, p. 12.
⁷⁶ OIS, para. 2.4.3.
⁷⁷ JS2, para. 31.
⁷⁸ Ibid., para. 32.
⁷⁹ Ibid., para. 33.
⁸⁰ Ibid. para. 34.
⁸¹ Ibid., para. 35.
⁸² OIS, para. 1.4.7.
⁸³ Ibid., para. 1.4.8.
⁸⁴ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/44, paras. 133.42–133.54 and 133.67–133.68.
⁸⁵ JS1, paras. 28–29.
⁸⁶ Ibid., para. 34.
⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 10.
⁸⁸ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/44, paras. 133.70–133.74, 133.84 and 135.35–135.39.
⁸⁹ Projekta, paras. 27–29.
⁹⁰ Ibid., paras. 30–31.
⁹¹ Ibid., paras. 33 and 35.
⁹² Ibid., para. 36 (a) and (c).
⁹³ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/44, para. 135.42.
⁹⁴ Projekta, para. 39.
⁹⁵ Ibid., para. 40.
⁹⁶ Ibid., para. 41.
⁹⁷ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/44, paras. 133.96–133.101.
⁹⁸ IHRC-OU, p. 4.
⁹⁹ JS2, p. 2.
¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 11.
¹⁰¹ OIS, para. 2.2.2.
¹⁰² Ibid., para. 2.3.2.
¹⁰³ IHRC-OU, p. 4.
¹⁰⁴ OIS, paras. 1.1.2 and 2.1.1. See also IHRC-OU, p. 4.
¹⁰⁵ JS2, para. 1.
¹⁰⁶ OIS, para. 2.1.1.
¹⁰⁷ IHCR-OU, p. 4.
¹⁰⁸ OIS, paras. 1.3.2.
¹⁰⁹ JS2, para. 10.
¹¹⁰ OIS, para. 1.2.1.
¹¹¹ Ibid., para. 2.2.1.
¹¹² IHRC-OU, p. 4.
¹¹³ Ibid., p. 4.
¹¹⁴ JS2, p. 12.
¹¹⁵ Ibid., para. 12.
¹¹⁶ OIS, para. 1.4.3.
-