



AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL'S ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION BY STATES OF UPR RECOMMENDATIONS ACCEPTED IN THE PREVIOUS REVIEW

24th session of the UPR Working Group,
18-29 January 2016

AI index number: IOR 40/3024/2015

INTRODUCTION

A key test of the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) is the extent to which it leads to positive changes to the situation of human rights in the countries reviewed. For the UPR to meet its objective of strengthening the protection of human rights on the ground, the recommendations previously supported by the State under Review must be implemented.

This implementation imperative must be at the forefront of States' preparation for the reviews of countries coming up in the 24th session of the UPR Working Group. It is essential to the continued value of the UPR as a human rights mechanism and the improvement of the human rights situation in the countries under review, that reviewing States include in their interventions in the UPR Working Group observations on the state of implementation of recommendations and that they make recommendations, where warranted, for renewed efforts to implement recommendations accepted in the previous reviews that are still pertinent.

In this document, prepared for UPR24, Amnesty International provides an overview of the state of implementation of key recommendations among those accepted in the 2011 reviews in the following eight States: Belgium, Denmark, Mozambique, Niger, Paraguay, Sierra Leone, Singapore and Somalia. In each of the country chapters, the specific recommendations being assessed are identified in the footnotes by document and paragraph reference, and by the State(s) that made the recommendation(s). A simple word search across the document will immediately identify the recommendations originally made by a particular State. For a list of the reviewing States and the recommendations considered in this document, please see the annex.

While Amnesty International welcomes efforts by States to give effect to accepted recommendations, many of the recommendations considered in this document remain unimplemented or only partially implemented. Amnesty International takes this opportunity to call on all States – States under review as well as reviewing States – to make every effort to ensure the implementation of accepted recommendations and

voluntary commitments. Where relevant, reviewed and reviewing States should work bilaterally to cooperate, share good practice, and offer assistance to foster the full implementation of UPR recommendations.

BELGIUM

Of the 121 recommendations made by Member States during Belgium's first UPR in 2011, Belgium accepted 88 recommendations and rejected 33.¹

Amnesty International is pleased to note that Belgium has consulted with civil society on several occasions throughout the UPR process and that it published an interim report in 2013 with updates on efforts to implement accepted recommendations from the 2011 review.²

Ratification of international human rights treaties and establishment of a National Human Rights Institution

Belgium has taken a number of positive steps since its previous review, including the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights,³ the Arms Trade Treaty,⁴ and the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance,⁵ although in relation to the latter the necessary changes to the legislative framework have yet to be made.⁶

Amnesty International regrets, however, that on two key areas progress has been limited. A number of States recommended to Belgium to establish a National Human Rights Institution fully compliant with the Paris Principles.⁷ However, despite commitments by successive governments, there has been little progress on this.⁸ Likewise, no progress appears to have been made to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against

¹ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review - Belgium*, A/HRC/18/3, 11 July 2011, paras 100-103 and *Report of the Human Rights Council on its eighteenth session*, A/HRC/18/2, 22 October 2012.

² Examen Périodique Universel de la Belgique au Conseil des Droits de l'Homme (2011) – Suivi à mi-parcours des recommandations acceptées (septembre 2013).

³ A/HRC/18/3, recommendations 100.2 (Palestine), 100.3 (Spain, Brazil, South Africa) and 100.6 (Ecuador). Belgium ratified the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in May 2014.

⁴ Belgium ratified the Arms Trade Treaty on 3 June 2014.

⁵ A/HRC/18/3, recommendations 100.6 (Ecuador), 101.1 (Spain, Brazil, Argentina, Japan) and 101.2 (France), ratification was already nearing completion at the time of the Working Group session, the instrument was deposited on 2 June 2011.

⁶ See Committee on Enforced Disappearances, *Concluding Observations on the report submitted by Belgium under article 29, para. 1, of the Convention*, CED/C/BEL/CO/1, 15 October 2014, paras 12, 16 and 18.

⁷ A/HRC/18/3, recommendations 100.9 (India, United Kingdom, Poland, Egypt, Afghanistan, Portugal, Australia, Norway, Spain, Democratic Republic of Congo, Palestine, Ecuador, Djibouti, Russian Federation, Indonesia, Chile, Burkina Faso, Malaysia) and 102.6 (partly accepted – Djibouti).

⁸ For example, on 11 October 2014, the Federal Government agreed to create a 'human rights mechanism' (*Accord de gouvernement - "Un engagement économique, un projet social,"* p. 227 and Committee on Enforced Disappearances, *List of issues in relation to the report submitted by Belgium under article 29, para. 1, of the Convention, Addendum, Replies by Belgium to the list of issues*, CED/C/BEL/Q/1/Add.1, 6 August 2014, paras 2-6).

Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment⁹ or to establish a National Preventative Mechanism, as required by the Protocol.

Prison conditions

Belgium also accepted a number of recommendations aimed at improving its prison system, including by reducing overcrowding.¹⁰ However, despite some efforts, prison conditions remain problematic.

Refugees and asylum-seekers

Moreover, despite accepting a recommendation to strictly adhere to the principle of *non-refoulement*,¹¹ there are reports that the authorities have disregarded or attempted to disregard Belgium's obligations under this principle.

DENMARK

During the first UPR of Denmark in May 2011, reviewing States made recommendations relating to counter-terrorism;¹² asylum-seekers, refugees and migrants;¹³ and violence against women.¹⁴ Amnesty International welcomes the government's acceptance of most of the recommendations, as well as its decision, in June 2014, to accept a further 20 recommendations which it had previously rejected.

Ratification of international human rights treaties

Denmark has implemented many of the recommendations, including raising the age of criminal responsibility from 14 to 15 years,¹⁵ and acceding to both the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities¹⁶ and the Third Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. It is disappointing, however, that the government did not ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, as agreed to during the 2011 review.¹⁷

⁹ A/HRC/18/3, recommendations 100.1. (Czech Republic, United Kingdom, Norway, Spain, Brazil, Ecuador), 100.2 (Palestine), 100.6 (Ecuador).

¹⁰ A/HRC/18/3, recommendations 100.35 (Czech Republic), 100.36 (Australia), 100.37 (Djibouti), 100.38 (Chile), 100.39 (Ecuador), 100.40 (Algeria), 100.41 (United States), 100.42 (United States), 100.44 (Sweden), 100.45 (Netherlands) and 100.47 (Slovakia).

¹¹ A/HRC/18/3, recommendation 100.57 (Indonesia).

¹² *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review – Denmark*, A/HRC/18/4, 11 July 2011 and its addendum, A/HRC/18/4/Add.1, 13 September 2011 (A/HRC/18/4), recommendations 106.118 (Switzerland), 106.132 (Switzerland), 106.120 (Mexico) and 106.133 (Netherlands).

¹³ A/HRC/18/4 and A/HRC/18/4/Add.1, recommendations 106.102 (Turkey), 106.103 (France), 106.116 (Greece), 106.117 (Switzerland), 106.125 (Netherlands), 106.126 (Republic of Korea), 106.127 (United Kingdom), 106.128 (Brazil), 106.129 (Sweden), and 106.131 (Slovakia).

¹⁴ A/HRC/18/4 and A/HRC/18/4/Add.1, recommendations 106.34 (Norway), 106.35 (Switzerland) and 106.36 (Belgium).

¹⁵ *Mid-term Progress Report 2014 - Update by Denmark on follow-up of the recommendations of UNHRC under the Universal Periodic Review mechanism (Mid-term Progress Report 2014)*, recommendation 106.99 (Kyrgyzstan).

¹⁶ See Minister of children, gender equality, integration and social affairs, *Denmark has acceded to the Optional Protocol for the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*, <http://english.sm.dk/en/international-priorities/bilateral-agreements/denmark-has-acceded-to-the-optional-protocol-for-the-un-convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities> and *Mid-term Progress Report 2014 - Update by Denmark on follow-up of the recommendations of UNHRC under the Universal Periodic Review mechanism (UPR)*, recommendations 106.3 (Spain), 106.6 (Austria), 106.7 (France), 106.8 (Australia), 106.9 (United Kingdom), and 106.10 (Burkina Faso).

¹⁷ *Mid-term Progress Report 2014*, recommendations 106.4 (Spain), 106.11 (France), 106.17 (Brazil), and 106.21 (Ecuador).

CIA rendition programme

However, Amnesty International does not consider that all the accepted recommendations have been adequately fulfilled and several of the human rights concerns raised during the 2011 review remain relevant. For example, Denmark has stated that the recommendation to assess the United States Central Intelligence Agency's (CIA) alleged use of Danish territory in the context of the CIA's rendition program has been fulfilled through the investigation carried out by the Danish Institute for International Studies.¹⁸ Amnesty International considers this investigation to be inadequate: it focused exclusively on the territory of Greenland, relied entirely on written documents and did not collect any new information or use data dating back later than 2008.¹⁹

MOZAMBIQUE

Of the 169 recommendations made to Mozambique by other Member States during its 2011 UPR, it accepted 161 recommendations and rejected eight.²⁰

Ratification of international human rights treaties

While Mozambique has taken some steps to strengthen its human rights framework, such as ratifying the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and enacting the new Penal Code and the Access to Information Bill, many of the issues raised in the previous review have yet to be addressed.

Amnesty International welcomes the ratification by Mozambique of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment on 1 July 2014, as committed to during its 2011 review.²¹ Mozambique also agreed to ratify the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and its Optional Protocol, and the First Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.²² Amnesty International is disappointed to note, however, that Mozambique has still not signed these treaties, let alone ratified and implemented them.

Cooperation with the Special Procedures

Mozambique also accepted recommendations to issue a standing invitation to the Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council;²³ these recommendations are also yet to be implemented.

¹⁸ *Mid-term Progress Report 2014*, recommendation 106.132 (Switzerland).

¹⁹ Amnesty International press release, *Denmark: Review of US rendition flights over Greenland "toothless"*, 8 November 2011, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2011/11/denmark-review-us-rendition-flights-over-greenland-ectoothlessed/>

²⁰ *Report of the Human Rights Council on its seventeenth session*, 24 May 2012, A/HRC/17/2.

²¹ A/HRC/17/16, recommendations 90.1 (France), 90.3 (United Kingdom), 90.4 (Argentina), 90.5 (Portugal) and 90.7 (Ecuador).

²² A/HRC/17/16, recommendations 88.1 (Algeria), 88.2 (Nigeria), 88.3 (Spain), 88.4 (Argentina), 88.5 (Portugal), 88.6 (Austria), 88.7 (Slovakia) and 88.8 (Australia), 90.2 (Spain), 90.5 (Portugal) and 90.6 (Slovakia).

²³ A/HRC/17/16, recommendations 90.11 (Brazil), 90.12 (Latvia), 90.13 (Portugal), 90.14 (Spain), 90.15 (Ecuador), 90.16 (United Kingdom), 90.17 (Denmark) and 90.18 (Hungary).

In addition, although Mozambique accepted several recommendations to respond positively to the 2008 request by the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions to visit Mozambique,²⁴ the government has yet to reply to this request.

²⁴ A/HRC/17/16, recommendations 88.16 (Brazil), 88.17 (Norway), 88.18 (Germany), 88.19 (Italy), 88.20 (Netherlands) and 88.21 (Spain).

Investigation of human rights violations

Mozambique accepted recommendations to ensure prompt, thorough and impartial investigations into cases of arbitrary detention, excessive use of force, extrajudicial executions, torture and other ill-treatment by the police, and to bring to justice those responsible.²⁵ Despite this, however, there have been reports of killings, torture and other ill-treatment by police, and in the majority of cases the government has failed to bring the perpetrators to justice.

NIGER

Of the 112 recommendations made by Member States during its 2011 UPR, Niger accepted 106 recommendations and rejected six.²⁶

Ratification of international human rights treaties

In October 2014, Niger approved a bill authorizing accession to the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.²⁷ One month later, Niger took another positive step and voted in favour of the UN General Assembly resolution to establish a moratorium on executions with a view to abolishing the death penalty globally. However, the death penalty continues to exist in the Nigerien Penal Code, although it has not been applied since 1976.

Niger also acceded to the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment in November 2014, in line with recommendations that enjoyed its support during the 2011 UPR.²⁸

PARAGUAY

Paraguay accepted all of the 124 recommendations made to it by Member States during its first UPR in 2011, stating that some of these had already been implemented or were in the process of being implemented.²⁹

Ratification of international human rights treaties and establishment of a national preventative mechanism

Although Paraguay supported recommendations to ratify the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, to date there has been no discussion of this matter in Congress.³⁰ Furthermore, a bill on the ratification of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court is still pending before the Congress.³¹

²⁵ *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review – Mozambique*, 28 March 2011, A/HRC/17/16, recommendations 89.53 (Canada), 89. 54 (Austria), 89.55 (Netherlands), 89.56 (Slovakia), 89.57 (Ecuador), 89.58 (Germany), 89.59 (Hungary), 89.60 (Sweden), 89.62 (Switzerland), 89.63 (Slovakia), 89.64 (Italia) and 90.20 (Switzerland).

²⁶ *Report of the Human Rights Council on its seventeenth session*, 24 May 2012, A/HRC/17/2.

²⁷ *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review – Niger*, 25 March 2011, A/HRC/17/15, recommendations 78.2 (Argentina), 78.3 (Ecuador), 78.5 (Australia), 78.6 (Sweden), 78.12 (Slovenia), 78.21 (Switzerland), 78.22 (Belgium), 78.23 (Belgium), 78.24 (France), 78.25 (Spain) and 78.26 (United Kingdom).

²⁸ A/HRC/17/15, recommendations 76.1 (Denmark), 78.1 (France), 78.2 (Argentina), 78.3 (Ecuador), 78.4 (Spain), 78.12 (Slovenia) and 78.29 (Spain).

²⁹ *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review of Paraguay*, A/HRC/17/18, 28 March 2011, paragraphs 84-86, and its Addendum, A/HRC/17/18/Add.1, 31 May 2011.

³⁰ A/HRC/17/18, recommendations 85.1 (Republic of Moldova) and 85.2 (Spain).

³¹ A/HRC/17/18, recommendation 85.4 (Australia). Bill S-213991 to implement the Rome Statute for the International Criminal Court is pending before the Legislation, Codification, Justice and Work Commission in the Paraguay Senate [*Proyecto S-213991 de Ley de Implementación del Estatuto de*

Some progress has been made with respect to implementing the recommendations. For example, Paraguay has established a national mechanism for the prevention of torture, as required under the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment,³² and has also established an online platform to monitor compliance with UPR recommendations.³³

Discrimination

However, with regards to most of the other recommendations, the level of progress has been disappointing. There has either been no substantial progress, as is the case with the recommendations relating to discrimination³⁴ and violence against women,³⁵ or the recommendations have only been partially implemented, as is the case with those relating to Indigenous Peoples' rights³⁶ and the ratification of human rights treaties.³⁷

Despite some progress, not all the recommendations relating to Indigenous Peoples' rights have been fully implemented.³⁸ Some progress has been made in the restitution of land belonging to the Sawhoyamaxa and Yakye Axa communities; however, further steps are needed to legally transfer ownership of the land.³⁹ In both cases, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights ordered Paraguay to return their traditional land to the communities.⁴⁰

Amnesty International welcomes the prohibition of discrimination in the 1992 Constitution,⁴¹ including the requirement that the state remove all factors that contribute to discrimination. However, recommendations calling for the adoption of a law against all forms of discrimination have not been implemented.⁴² In May 2007, a draft anti-discrimination law was tabled in the Senate. The draft law, which had been prepared in collaboration with a number of civil society organizations, defined discrimination in line with international human rights standards; however, in November 2014 it was rejected.⁴³

Roma de la Corte Penal Internacional, Comisión de Legislación, Codificación, Justicia y Trabajo, Cámara de Senadores].

³² A/HRC/17/18, recommendation 85.8 (Mexico).

³³ See *Sistema de Monitoreo de Recomendaciones SIMORE* <http://www.mre.gov.py/mdhpy/Buscador>

³⁴ A/HRC/17/18, recommendations 84.2 (Australia), 84.24 (Plurinational State of Bolivia), 85.3 (Uruguay) and 85.25 (Sweden).

³⁵ A/HRC/17/18, recommendations 85.12 (Brazil), 85.44 (Argentina), 85.45 (United States of America) and 85.46 (Uruguay).

³⁶ A/HRC/17/18, recommendations 85.68 (Canada), 85.69 (Norway) and 85.70 (France).

³⁷ A/HRC/17/18, recommendations 85.1 (Republic of Moldova), 85.2 (Spain) and 85.4 (Australia).

³⁸ A/HRC/17/18, recommendations 84.44 (Republic of Korea), 84.45 (Switzerland), 84.46 (Hungary), 85.62 (Holy See), 85.63 (Spain), 85.64 (Plurinational State of Bolivia), 85.65 (United Kingdom), 85.66 (Norway), 85.67 (Germany), 85.68 (Canada), 85.69 (Norway), 85.70 (France) and 85.71 (Mexico).

³⁹ A/HRC/17/18 recommendations 85.68 (Canada), 85.69 (Norway), 85.70 (France).

⁴⁰ Case Sawhoyamaxa Indigenous Community vs. Paraguay, judgment of 29 March 2006 and 40 Case Yakye Axa indigenous Community vs. Paraguay, judgment of 17 June 2005.

⁴¹ Articles 46-48.

⁴² A/HRC/17/18, recommendations 84.2 (Australia), 84.24 (Plurinational State of Bolivia), 85.3 (Uruguay) and 85.25 (Sweden).

⁴³ Draft law 74805, see <http://sil2py.senado.gov.py/formulario/VerDetalleTramitacion.pmf?q=VerDetalleTramitacion%2F1163>

Women and girls' rights

Although the recommendations to uphold the rights of women and girls and to protect them from violence were all accepted,⁴⁴ legislation to prevent and punish violence against women has yet to be passed in the Deputy Chamber.⁴⁵ In addition, recommendations to reduce maternal mortality rates and to introduce measures to safeguard women's right to life and health, including through the provision of safe and legal abortion, have yet to be implemented.⁴⁶

Prevention of torture and other ill-treatment and enforced disappearances

A national mechanism to prevent torture was established in April 2011,⁴⁷ as recommended during the previous UPR.⁴⁸ However, Amnesty International is concerned that legal reforms have yet to be undertaken to ensure that the definitions of torture and enforced disappearance in national law comply with international human rights law. In addition, allegations of torture and other ill-treatment have not been thoroughly investigated, allowing impunity to prevail.⁴⁹

SIERRA LEONE

Of the 129 recommendations made by Member States during its first UPR in 2011, Sierra Leone accepted 126 recommendations.⁵⁰ It rejected three recommendations to repeal provisions that criminalize sexual activity between consenting adults.⁵¹

Amnesty International welcomes the steps taken by the government to implement the UPR recommendations, including the enactment of several new laws. Sierra Leone has also taken steps to submit its outstanding reports to the treaty bodies.⁵²

⁴⁴ A/HRC/17/18, recommendations 85.12 (Brazil), 85.44 (Argentina), 85.45 (United States of America) and 85.46 (Uruguay).

⁴⁵ Bill D-1533287, submitted to Deputy Chamber on 4 March 2015, Law of integral protection against all form of violence (*Ley de protección integral a las mujeres, contra toda forma de violencia*). On 9 June, there was a public audience in which civil society organizations commented on the project.

⁴⁶ A/HRC/17/18, recommendations 85.58 (Slovenia) and 86.4 (Norway).

⁴⁷ Law N° 4288, which established a national mechanism on the prevention of torture and other inhuman, cruel and degrading treatments (*Del mecanismo nacional de prevencion contra la tortura y otros tratos o penas crueles e inhumanas o degradantes*), was published on 27 April 2011.

⁴⁸ A/HRC/17/18, recommendation 85.8 (Mexico).

⁴⁹ A/HRC/17/18, recommendations 85.5 (Peru), 85.28 (Slovakia), 85.29 (United States of America), 85.30 (Republic of Korea), 85.31 (Switzerland), 85.32 (Japan), and 85.33 (Costa Rica).

⁵⁰ *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Period Review - Sierra Leone*, Addendum, A/HRC/18/10/Add.1, 13 September 2011.

⁵¹ *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review – Sierra Leone*, A/HRC/18/10, 11 July 2011 and A/HRC/18/10/Add.1, recommendations 82.7 (Canada), 82.8 (Norway) and 82.9 (Netherlands).

⁵² A/HRC/18/10, recommendations 80.11 (Japan), 80.12 (Algeria) and 80.13 (Ukraine). For example, Sierra Leone was reviewed for the first time by the Human Rights Committee on 11-12 March 2014. It has also submitted its first report to the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, *Sierra Leone Periodic Report on the Implementation of the African Charter for Human and Peoples' Rights*, 2013, p. 10 available at <http://www.achpr.org/states/sierra-leone/reports/1st-1983-2013/>

The death penalty

Amnesty International notes that despite the government's acceptance of recommendations to abolish the death penalty,⁵³ it has yet to do so.

Freedom of expression

Moreover, laws which restrict freedom of expression, such as criminal libel laws, are still in place despite the government's earlier commitment to repeal such laws.⁵⁴ Reports of excessive use of force by the police are still commonplace and there has been limited investigation into alleged killings of civilians by the police despite Sierra Leone's acceptance of such recommendations.⁵⁵

Girls' access to education

Amnesty International is particularly concerned that, despite accepting recommendations to guarantee equal access to education,⁵⁶ particularly for girls, the Minister of Education has banned visibly pregnant girls from sitting exams and attending mainstream school.⁵⁷

International human rights treaties

Sierra Leone accepted recommendations to ratify a number of international treaties,⁵⁸ however, many are still outstanding, including the Optional Protocols to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

SINGAPORE

The death penalty

Amnesty International welcomes the initial progress Singapore has made on the 2011 UPR recommendations to impose a moratorium on executions⁵⁹ while reviewing the Misuse of Drugs Act 2012 and the Penal Code Act 2012. However, its progress on the recommendation to remove mandatory death sentencing has been limited.⁶⁰

While the courts now allow judges to exercise some discretion in deciding whether or not to impose the death penalty in particular circumstances, Amnesty International regrets that the amended legislation still does not conform with international human rights law and standards. Moreover, Singapore's decision to resume executions in July 2014 after the two-year moratorium on executions and to uphold the mandatory death penalty for

⁵³ A/HRC/18/10, recommendation 82.14 (France), 82.15 (Ireland), 82.16 (Spain), 82.17 (Austria), 82.18 (Germany), 82.19 (Argentina), 82.20 (Brazil), 82.22 (Switzerland), 82.23 (Portugal), 82.24 (United Kingdom) and 82.25 (Ecuador)

⁵⁴ A/HRC/18/10, recommendations 81.45 (Netherlands) and 82.10 (United States).

⁵⁵ A/HRC/18/10, recommendations 81.40 (Switzerland) and 81.57 (Mexico).

⁵⁶ A/HRC/18/10, recommendations 80.37 (Chile) and 81.52 (Turkey).

⁵⁷ Ministry of Education, Science and Technology Press Release, *Government Position on Pregnant School Girls*, 2 April 2015. Amnesty International, *Sierra Leone: Let pregnant girls take exams*, 27 March 2015, available at <https://www.amnesty.org/en/articles/news/2015/03/let-pregnant-girls-take-exams/>

⁵⁸ A/HRC/18/10, recommendations 80.1 (Spain), 80.2 (Argentina), 80.3 (Costa Rica), 80.4 (France), 80.5 (United Kingdom), 80.6 (Belgium), 80.7 (Nigeria) and 80.8 (Hungary).

⁵⁹ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review – Singapore*, 11 July 2011, A/HRC/18/11, recommendations 97.1 (Finland, France), 97.3 (Czech Republic) and 97.4 (Canada).

⁶⁰ A/HRC/18/11, recommendations 97.3 (Czech Republic), 97.4 (Canada), 97.5 (United Kingdom) and 97.6 (France, Slovenia).

certain types of offences or if circumstances of the case do not meet certain criteria, is contrary to global trends towards abolition and prior UPR recommendations to abolish the death penalty.⁶¹

Singapore is yet to ratify the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its Optional Protocols, or the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and its Optional Protocol, as recommended in the previous UPR.⁶²

SOMALIA

Somalia accepted fully or in part all 155 recommendations made during its 2011 review. However, while some positive steps have been taken, such as the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the inclusion of provisions guaranteeing fundamental rights and freedoms in the provisional Constitution adopted in 2012, little overall progress has been made towards the implementation of the UPR recommendations.⁶³

⁶¹ A/HRC/18/11, recommendations 97.1 (Finland, France), 97.3 (Czech Republic), 97.4 (Canada) and 97.5 (United Kingdom).

⁶² A/HRC/18/11, recommendations 96.8 (Slovenia), 96.9 (Egypt), 96.10 (Czech Republic), 96.11 (Poland), 96.13 (United Kingdom), 96.14 (Japan), 96.15 (Ghana), 96.16 (France) and 96.17 (Kazakhstan).

⁶³ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review - Somalia*, 11 July 2011, A/HRC/18/6, recommendations 98.3 (France), 98.4 (Spain), 98.5 (Japan), 98.6 (Indonesia), 98.7 (Germany), 98.8 (Australia), 98.9 (Costa Rica), 98.10 (Philippines), 98.11 (Portugal), 98.12 (Norway), 98.13 (Chile), 98.14 (Uruguay); 98.18 (Islamic Republic of Iran), 98.19 (Canada) and 98.20 (Switzerland).

Overview of 2011 UPR recommendations reviewed in this document, listed by the States making the recommendations

Recommending State	States to whom recommendations were made	Recommending State	States to whom recommendations were made
Afghanistan	Belgium,	Germany	Mozambique, Paraguay, Sierra Leone, Somalia
Algeria	Belgium, Mozambique, Sierra Leone,	Ghana	Singapore,
Argentina	Belgium, Mozambique, Niger, Paraguay, Sierra Leone,	Greece	Denmark,
Australia	Belgium, Mozambique, Niger, Paraguay, Somalia	Hungary	Mozambique, Paraguay, Sierra Leone,
Austria	Mozambique, Sierra Leone,	India	Belgium,
Belgium	Denmark, Niger, Sierra Leone,	Indonesia	Belgium, Somalia
Bolivia	Paraguay,	Iran	Somalia
brazil	Belgium, Denmark, Mozambique, Paraguay, Sierra Leone,	Ireland	Sierra Leone,
Burkina Faso	Belgium,	Italy	Mozambique,
Canada	Mozambique, Paraguay, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia	japan	Belgium, Paraguay, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia
Costa Rica	Paraguay, Sierra Leone, Somalia	Kazakhstan	Singapore,
Czech Republic	Belgium, Singapore,	Latvia	Mozambique,
Chile	Belgium, Sierra Leone, Somalia	Malaysia	Belgium,
Denmark	Mozambique, Niger,	Mexico	Denmark, Paraguay, Sierra Leone,
Djibouti	Belgium,	Moldova	Paraguay,
DRC	Belgium,	Netherlands	Belgium, Denmark, Mozambique, Sierra Leone,
Egypt	Belgium, Singapore,	Nigeria	Mozambique, Sierra Leone,
Ecuador	Belgium, Denmark, Mozambique, Niger, Sierra Leone,	Norway	Belgium, Denmark, Mozambique, Paraguay, Sierra Leone, Somalia
Finland	Singapore,	Palestine	Belgium
France	Belgium, Denmark, Mozambique, Niger, Paraguay, Sierra	Peru	Paraguay,

Recommending State	States to whom recommendations were made	Recommending State	States to whom recommendations were made
	Leone, Singapore, Somalia		
Philippines	Somalia	South Africa	Belgium,
Poland	Belgium, Singapore,	Sweden	Belgium, Denmark, Mozambique, Niger, Paraguay,
Portugal	Belgium, Mozambique, Sierra Leone, Somalia	Switzerland	Denmark, Mozambique, Niger, Paraguay, Sierra Leone, Somalia
Rep of Korea	Denmark, Paraguay	Turkey	Denmark, Sierra Leone,
Russian Federation	Belgium,	Ukraine	Sierra Leone,
Slovakia	Belgium, Denmark, Mozambique, Paraguay	Uruguay	Paraguay, Somalia
Slovenia	Niger, Paraguay, Singapore,	UK	Belgium, Denmark, Mozambique, Niger, Paraguay, Sierra Leone, Singapore,
Spain	Belgium, Denmark, Mozambique, Niger, Paraguay, Sierra Leone, Somalia	USA	Belgium, Paraguay, Sierra Leone,