



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

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on United Republic of Tanzania*

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

I. Background

1. This 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 summarises 36 stakeholders' submissions,¹ in compliance with the word-limit for this report. 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

2. CHRAGG stated that the United Republic of Tanzania (State under Review) had not complied with its reporting obligations in relation to ICESCR, CEDAW and CRPD and had yet to submit its overdue reports.²

3. Referring to the previous national human rights action plan, which ended in 2017, CHRAGG stated that there had been deficiencies in mainstreaming the activities provided in the plan into the Medium Term Expenditure Framework. The second national human rights action plan for 2018-2022 had yet to be adopted.³

4. CHRAGG stated that there had been a decrease in attacks on persons with albinism, but they had continued to face stigma due to a lack of knowledge of albinism in some communities.⁴

5. CHRAGG noted the enactment of the Elder Person Affairs Act of 2020 in Zanzibar and stated that similar legislation had yet to be enacted in mainland Tanzania.⁵

6. CHRAGG stated that the main challenges in prisons had been overcrowding and the poor quality of food given to prisoners.⁶

* The present document is being issued without formal editing.



7. While noting achievements including the establishment of the Corruption and Economic Crimes Division of the High Court of Tanzania, CHRAGG stated, *inter alia*, that there had been a delay in finalizing corruption-related cases and that the capacities of the integrity committees and oversight institutions had been inadequate.⁷

8. Noting relevant commendable initiatives such as the Judiciary Strategic Plan and the Legal Aid Act of 2017, CHRAGG stated that there had been a shortage of judicial personnel, causing a delay in the finalization of cases.⁸

9. Referring to several pieces of legislation, CHRAGG stated that media practitioners had complained that the legislation had limited their constitutional freedoms and had exposed them to censorship and server punishment.⁹

10. CHRAGG stated that requests from some political parties to exercise their freedom of assembly had been declined by the police due to a confusion in the application of relevant Constitutional provisions, the Police Force and Auxiliary Services Act and Political Parties Act of 1992.¹⁰

11. Noting the National Land Use Management Plan Policy (2013-2033) and the legislative framework in place to reduce land disputes, CHRAGG stated, *inter alia*, that there were no plans for most of the towns and villages. There had also been a lack of adequate engagement of the communities in decision-making on land matters, and persistent boundary disputes around reserved land, as well as disputes between pastoralists and farmers.¹¹

12. Noting the enactment of the Water and Sanitation Act of 2019 amongst others, CHRAGG stated that there was a disparity in accessing water services in urban and rural areas.¹²

13. CHRAGG stated that challenges had remained in accessibility to health services, which arose from insufficient number of health centres, dispensaries, personnel, medicines and medical equipment.¹³

14. CHRAGG stated that despite the improvements in ensuring access to education, there remained a shortage of qualified personnel and limited regular in-service teacher training.¹⁴

15. CHRAGG stated that despite positive developments, including the National Plan of Action on Violence against Women and Children, gender-based violence had continued to exist.¹⁵

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations¹⁶ and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies¹⁷

16. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, AI stated that the State under Review had yet to ratify CAT and ICPPED.¹⁸ PLAJC stated that relevant recommendations from the previous review on the ratification of CAT had not been implemented and that implementation of these recommendations would contribute to the eradication of torture.¹⁹

17. JS3 stated that ICCPR-OP2 had not been ratified.²⁰ JS8 stated that the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169) had yet to be ratified.²¹ ICAN called for the ratification of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.²²

18. JS10 stated that the supported recommendation from the previous review on the coordination and monitoring of the implementation of recommendations had been partially implemented. Although some steps had been taken, including the designation of a specific human rights directorate within the Ministry of Constitutional and Legal Affairs, there had been insufficient monitoring mechanisms in place.²³

19. AI stated that the State under Review had not submitted its overdue reports to the Human Rights Committee and the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, despite supporting a recommendation to do so at the previous review.²⁴

B. National human rights framework²⁵

20. JS10 stated that the supported recommendations from the previous review on the constitutional review process had not been implemented.²⁶ JS17 stated that since the enactment of the Constitutional Review Act in 2011, the State under Review had been on course to draft a new Constitution. The draft Constitution had set out important provisions that address some of the shortcomings in the national laws, including those relating to the acquisition of citizenship. However, the referendum to adopt the draft Constitution had been postponed.²⁷

21. JS10 stated that legislation on the protection of older persons had yet to be enacted and considered the relevant supported recommendations from the previous review to have not been implemented.²⁸

22. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, which it considered to have been partially implemented, JS10 stated that the national human rights action plan for 2013 to 2017 had ended without being adequately implemented. The new action plan for 2018 to 2022 had yet to be implemented.²⁹

23. JS10 stated that despite the introduction of relevant plans and policies, there had been financial and technological challenges in the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals.³⁰

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

1. Cross-cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination³¹

24. SMPF stated that the State under Review had a secular legal and judicial system for both criminal and civil cases. However, certain civil cases, such as those relating to marriage, divorce, and inheritance, could be referred to the Islamic courts (Kadhi's courts), which could lead to a discriminatory outcome for women.³²

25. JS12 stated that in an advisory opinion, the African Court of Human and Peoples' Rights had considered the vagrancy law, in particular Section 177 of the Penal Code, and noted that the law effectively punished the poor, including sex workers, and had a discriminatory effect on marginalized persons, violating their right to development.³³

26. COC-Nederland stated that despite the efforts made by the State under Review, sexual minorities had continued to experience stigma, discrimination and violence in the form of verbal and physical abuse, mob justice and corrective rapes.³⁴

27. JS4 stated that there had been a crackdown on the LGBTIQ+ community and the organisations working with this community, including those tackling HIV/AIDS.³⁵

Development, the environment, and business and human rights³⁶

28. PLAJC stated that the State under Review had implemented part of the National Development Vision 2025 and national strategies for growth and poverty reduction, as well as policies for the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals. Consequently, relevant supported recommendations from the previous review had only been partially implemented, allowing for human rights violations.³⁷

29. Noting relevant positive gestures including the signing of the Paris Agreement, JS10 stated that the effects of climate change had posed a threat to small-scale producers like farmers and pastoralists.³⁸ JS6 stated that indigenous communities were threatened by

climate change because of their reliance on nature for their livelihoods, coupled with their poor political representation and high poverty rates.³⁹ JS13 stated that efforts to implement a supported recommendation from the previous review on climate change mitigation and adaptation had been insufficient.⁴⁰

30. JS13 stated that the State under Review had focused on industrialization without giving due consideration to the precautions that needed to be taken in compliance with the Environmental Management Act of 2004. Government officials had been quoted as saying that projects could go ahead while, inter alia, the environmental and social impact assessments were being undertaken.⁴¹

31. JS13 stated that effluents of mercury, used in small-scale mining, had been discharged into Lake Victoria, contrary to the Water Resource Management Act No. 11 of 2009.⁴²

32. JS13 stated that the State under Review was in the process of concluding an agreement to host the East African Crude Oil Pipeline. This pipeline would pose a threat to the environment.⁴³ JS6 stated that the free, prior and informed consent of the Indigenous communities for this pipeline had not been obtained.⁴⁴ JS19 noted that more than 400 villages would be affected by the pipeline and 14,000 families would be deprived of their land.⁴⁵

2. Civil and political rights

*Right to life, liberty and security of person*⁴⁶

33. JS3 stated that while a de facto moratorium on executions had been observed since 1994, courts had continued to sentence people to death, as the death penalty was a mandatory sentence for murder and treason. It added that the State under Review had abstained from all eight resolutions in the United Nations General Assembly calling for a moratorium on the use of the death penalty, including the most recent resolution adopted on 16 December 2020.⁴⁷

34. JS10 stated that relevant recommendations from the previous review relating to persons with albinism had been partially implemented.⁴⁸ Noting initiatives including returning persons with albinism who had been accommodated in temporary shelters to their homes, JS10 stated that some of these people had faced economic hardship, lack of access to basic needs especially food and an unwillingness of some of their relatives to receive them.⁴⁹ ECLJ stated that the belief that body parts of persons with albinism brought about mystical powers and that possession of these body parts would bring success should be eradicated through education.⁵⁰

35. Noting the criminalization of female genital mutilation of girls under the age of 18 years, JS16 stated that the enforcement of the relevant legislation had been variable and cases had rarely reached court. The practice of female genital mutilation had remained due to patriarchal attempts to control wives and daughters.⁵¹

36. JS3 stated that prison conditions had reportedly been harsh and life threatening, with prison staff reporting food and water shortages, a lack of electricity, inadequate lighting, and insufficient medical supplies.⁵²

*Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law*⁵³

37. SALC stated that the Judiciary had suffered from underfunding and corruption. Judges were political appointees and the Judiciary did not have an independent budget, which made it vulnerable to political pressure, the consequence of which had been particularly evident in cases involving opposition figures and critics of the government.⁵⁴ ABA-CHR stated that the law that denied bail for specified offences had been misused to subject government critics and other individuals to prolonged pre-trial detention.⁵⁵

38. JS18 stated that rather than custody being warranted due to the seriousness of the allegedly offence, children who did not have a fixed address were often remanded in custody because they did not have parents or guardians to whom they may be entrusted.

Budget constraints made it difficult for police and the justice system to ensure that rights of those children held custody.⁵⁶

39. JS10 stated that supported recommendations from the previous review on access to justice had been partially implemented.⁵⁷ Noting, inter alia, the enactment of the Legal Aid Act of 2017, JS10 stated that legal aid was restricted to capital offences only.⁵⁸ JS3 stated that people in rural areas faced barriers in obtaining legal aid and adequate representation.⁵⁹

40. L4L stated that confidentiality between lawyers and their clients had not always been guaranteed. Lawyers consulting with their detained clients did not have meeting rooms and prison guards were required to be present within hearing distance.⁶⁰ In addition, lawyers are obliged to report their clients' electronic transfers and financial transactions that exceed prescribed monetary values, in compliance with the Anti-Money Laundering (Electronic Funds Transfer and Cash Transactions Reporting) Regulations of 2019.⁶¹

41. JS3 stated that the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights had upheld a challenge to the mandatory death penalty as a sentence. The Court stated that the mandatory death penalty did not permit consideration of mitigating factors, was applicable to convicted persons without any distinction and took away the discretion inherent in the exercise of the judicial function, did not observe proportionality between the facts and the penalty, and therefore did not uphold fairness and due process.⁶²

42. ABA-CHR stated that law enforcement officers had repeatedly arrested individuals without a warrant of arrest, sometimes in a manner amounting to an abduction or enforced disappearance.⁶³

43. ABA-CHR noted concerns about political interference in the independence of the legal profession.⁶⁴ L4L stated that the necessary guarantees for the proper functioning of the legal profession, as set out in the Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers, were not upheld.⁶⁵

44. AI stated that the State under Review had withdrawn its declaration accepting the competence of the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights to receive cases from individuals and non-governmental organizations.⁶⁶

45. AU-ACHPR expressed concern about the amendment of the Basic Rights and Duties (Enforcement) Act (Cap. 3 of the Revised Laws of Tanzania), which restricted the filing of cases in the interest of the public and went against the right of every person to take legal action to ensure the protection of the Constitution and the laws of the land. It stated that the removal of public interest litigation represented a major regression that reversed the implementation of an important means of protecting constitutional democracy and a key avenue for securing the rights of vulnerable groups lacking the capacity and financial resources to bring their own cases.⁶⁷

*Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life*⁶⁸

46. ADF stated that religious freedom was restricted, including by the passage of legislation in 2019 that amended The Societies Act.⁶⁹ The Authorities had threatened to revoke the registration of religious organizations that mixed religion and politics.⁷⁰

47. ADF stated that for several years, attacks on Christians in Zanzibar had been on the rise with little or no accountability.⁷¹ SMPF expressed concern about the harassment of Christians and "ex-Muslims" by local religious leaders and the police, citing specific cases in that regard.⁷²

48. JS4 expressed concern over the persistent onslaught on media freedom and freedom of expression.⁷³ JS13 noted that the 2020 World Press Freedom Index had showed that the State under Review had dropped 49 places in ranking from 75th place in 2015 to 124th place in 2020.⁷⁴

49. JS1 stated that at the previous review, the State under review had supported three recommendations that broadly addressed freedom of expression,⁷⁵ but had noted eight other recommendations on strengthening the legislative framework and eliminating all provisions that undermined freedom of expression.⁷⁶ Despite constitutional guarantees, many repressive laws had undermined the freedom of expression. In 2018, the East African Court

of Justice had found that multiple sections of the Media Services Act of 2016 had restricted press freedom and freedom of expression.⁷⁷ In addition, the Cybercrimes Act of 2015 violated international human rights standards on freedom of expression and contradicted democratic values, *inter alia*, by not making it mandatory for the police to seek judicial oversight when engaging in surveillance and preventing an affected person from challenging interference with his or her privacy.⁷⁸

50. JS9 stated that section 6 of the Access to information Act of 2016 provided wide sweeping exceptions denying access to information.⁷⁹ ELIZKA stated, *inter alia*, that the Act imposed strong penalties on information owners who incorrectly released information, thus encouraging self-censorship and the withholding of information.⁸⁰

51. ABA-CHR stated that the Political Parties (Amendment) Act No. 1 of 2019 had increased the powers of the authorities to deregister political parties, demand information from them and suspend their members.⁸¹

52. JS9 stated that freedom of expression online had declined since the previous review.⁸² JS2 stated that the Electronic and Postal Communications (Online Content) Regulations of 2018 and had been replaced with the Electronic and Postal Communications (Online Content) Regulations of 2020, which had strengthened the power of the authorities to implement internet censorship.⁸³ JS9 stated that the Regulations of 2020 had aggravated the crackdown on the freedom of expressions and required the registration of bloggers, online discussion forums, and radio and television webcasters.⁸⁴ JS1 stated that the Regulations of 2020 lacked compliance with international human rights standards and the Constitution.⁸⁵

53. JS9 stated that fixed and mobile broadband internet services remained out of reach for many people due to limited telecommunications infrastructure and the high cost of internet services.⁸⁶

54. AI stated that although the State under Review had supported recommendations at the previous review to investigate attacks against journalists and address claims of interference with the freedom of expression, state-backed violations against journalists and media outlets had persisted.⁸⁷ JS1 stated that since the previous review, there had been a deterioration in press freedom, primarily characterised by self-censorship and the shutting down of media outlets, citing specific cases in that regard.⁸⁸ Noting a relevant supported recommendation from the previous review, JS1 stated that journalists had continued to report concerning levels of harassment, intimidation, assaults, arbitrary detention and enforced disappearances, citing specific cases in that regard.⁸⁹

55. JS4 stated that harassment of human rights defenders had continued despite the State under Review stating at the previous review that a conducive environment for them had already existed in the country.⁹⁰ AI stated that human rights defenders had been subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention, prosecution, intimidation, harassment and threats.⁹¹ JS4 stated that those working with, or belonging to, the LGBTIQ+ community had been targeted for harassment and physical abuse.⁹² AU-ACHPR urged the State under Review to ensure that all human rights activists were able to operate in an environment without fear of any acts of violence, threats, reprisals, discrimination, pressure and any arbitrary acts by state and non-state actors.⁹³

56. JS1 stated that since the previous review, space for civil society had continued to deteriorate.⁹⁴ JS4 stated that civil society organizations had been targeted through stifling laws, regulations and public notices. Raids had been conducted on events organized by civil society organizations and their bank accounts had been frozen.⁹⁵ AU-ACHPR urged the State under review to repeal all restrictive legislation that limited the ability of associations to function without fear of reprisals, persecution and interference with their governance structures.⁹⁶

57. JS2 stated that in the lead-up to the presidential elections in 2020, digital rights had been restricted. On 24 October 2020, the Tanzania Communication Regulatory Authority had ordered telecom service providers to suspend access to bulk short messaging services and bulk voice services. In addition, equipment had been installed to enable the authorities to censor content and throttle the internet.⁹⁷

58. AI stated that although the State under Review had supported a recommendation at the previous review to respect freedom of association and assembly and to maintain a safe and enabling environment for political parties, it had ramped up repression of political opposition parties and had interfered with many opposition party assemblies.⁹⁸ Opposition politicians had been intimidated, harassed, arbitrarily arrested and detained.⁹⁹

59. AU-ACHPR expressed concern about reports of threats and intimidation of opposition politicians, including in the context of the electoral process. It called on the State under Review to allow democratically elected leaders in opposition parties to fulfil their democratic functions free from undue restrictions and to ensure that all the necessary safeguards were in place for conducting the elections. In addition, it called on the State under Review to ensure that the elections are conducted in a free environment in which the electorate could express its will freely and all candidates were guaranteed an even playing field to freely campaign for and seek the vote of the electorate.¹⁰⁰

60. SALC stated that the 2020 elections were the first election since 1995 that had been conducted without the assistance of UNDP, as UNDP had not been requested to provide such assistance. Few international observers had been permitted to observe the election and local civil society organizations had been prohibited from monitoring the election. The election had been marred by allegations of arrests of candidates and protesters and restrictions on access to polling stations for agents to political parties, amongst others.¹⁰¹

*Prohibition of all forms of slavery*¹⁰²

61. HKC stated that despite the Anti-Trafficking in Persons Act of 2008, the State under Review has continued to be a source, transit and destination country for human trafficking.¹⁰³

62. JS16 stated that guidelines for supporting victims of trafficking had been adopted and an anti-trafficking secretariat had been established.¹⁰⁴

Right to privacy and family life

63. JS9 stated that the State under Review lacked a comprehensive legal framework to protect data privacy of citizens offline and online. Although the Data Protection and Privacy bill that had been tabled in 2014 had not been passed, mass data collection exercises, including biometrics, had been rolled out by the National Identification Authority, the National Electoral Commission and by telecommunications companies.¹⁰⁵

64. JS19 stated that the lack of a substantive policy protecting the family constituted a failure to recognise the role of the family in attaining human development.¹⁰⁶

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

*Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work*¹⁰⁷

65. JS12 stated that the criminalization and regulation of activities relating to sex work was a profound violation of the rights of sex workers.¹⁰⁸

*Right to an adequate standard of living*¹⁰⁹

66. JS10 stated that relevant supported recommendations from the previous review on, inter alia, land rights had been partially implemented.¹¹⁰ Despite a number of positive changes, pastoralists and other villagers continued to face various forms of violations of their rights, including unlawful evictions.¹¹¹

67. JS8 stated that there had been forced evictions of indigenous peoples, pastoralists, hunters and gatherers to give way to economic activities such as tourism, hunting, farming, and mining in pastoral and hunter-gatherers land without these people being adequately compensated or given alternative settlements.¹¹²

68. JS6 stated that the lack of water had been a major issue in the country and indigenous communities had been particularly vulnerable.¹¹³

*Right to health*¹¹⁴

69. JS11 stated that for the period 2019-2020, only 7.8 percent of the total budget had been allocated to the health sector, well short of the 15 percent pledge made in the Abuja Declaration.¹¹⁵

70. Noting the high maternal mortality rate, ADF stated that almost all maternal deaths were preventable, particularly when skilled birth attendants were present to manage complications and the necessary medication was available.¹¹⁶ JS16 stated that one of the preventable causes of maternal deaths was obstetric fistula, which affected women and girls of all ages, both at first and later pregnancies.¹¹⁷

71. JS16 stated that due to fear of COVID-19 infection, some pregnant women had chosen to avoid pre-natal care in clinics and deliver their babies at home, risking complications during their pregnancies and childbirth.¹¹⁸

72. JS11 stated that the lack of access to safe abortion and post abortion care was attributable to laws and policies that were inconsistent, unclear and widely misunderstood, and a lack of comprehensive guidelines to aid health care practitioners on their implementation.¹¹⁹

73. JS11 stated that there was low contraception usage due to the limited availability and accessibility of contraceptives and quality services.¹²⁰

74. JS11 stated that the lack of access to sexuality and reproductive health services for adolescents fuelled unwanted and unplanned pregnancies.¹²¹ JS12 stated that sex workers had not had easy access to sexual and reproductive health care, services and information.¹²²

75. HRW stated that the State under Review had prevented LGBT persons from accessing health care, including by banning community-based organizations from providing HIV and public health services.¹²³ COC-Nederland stated that there was inadequate HIV and STI related protective gear and some protective gear had been banned for distribution to key populations.¹²⁴

76. JS15 stated that cancer was a leading cause of death among persons with albinism, yet the provision of skin cancer prevention and treatment services continued to be a challenge. There was a lack of knowledge of skin cancer prevention in households with children with albinism.¹²⁵

77. J1 stated that with the advent of COVID-19, the State under Review had refused to publicise information and data regarding the impact of the pandemic. After initially publicising a few cases, there was a subsequent ban on reporting about infections and death rates.¹²⁶ JS5 stated that by withholding information and limiting the expression of differing points of view, the State under Review had politicised the pandemic.¹²⁷ JS9 stated legislation predating the pandemic had been used to arrest, and detain persons, including whistle-blowers.¹²⁸

*Right to education*¹²⁹

78. JS10 stated that supported recommendations from the previous review relating inter alia to equitable access to quality education and inclusive education for children with disabilities had only been partially implemented.¹³⁰ Noting the various steps taken to ensure equitable access to education, JS10 stated that resources, including teachers, classrooms, desks and textbooks, had been insufficient to accommodate the increase in school enrolment.¹³¹

79. JS16 stated that the education sector budget had experienced a declining share in the national budget, despite the adoption of the policy to provide free and compulsory education.¹³² JS5 stated that the policy had led to an increase in enrolment and consequently compromised the quality of education, with schools experiencing a shortage of teachers and instruction guides. The policy had failed to provide inclusive education for all children especially those with disabilities, indigenous children, children living in remote and rural areas, and displaced children.¹³³

80. JS7 stated that children did not have equal access to quality education because of the persistent disparities between the urban and rural districts. There was a need to build more schools, improve the infrastructure and facilities, increase the number of teachers, and provide textbooks and other educational material.¹³⁴

81. JS15 stated that students with albinism faced challenges in school including bullying, and inadequate reasonable accommodation for their low vision, vulnerability to skin cancer, and safety concerns.¹³⁵

82. JS5 stated that the lack of trained teachers in science and technology, together with the limited access and poor internet connectivity had restricted the availability of teaching and learning resources.¹³⁶

83. JS7 stated that although human rights education had been included in the school curriculum and teachers had attended workshops on the rights of the child, human rights awareness remained low.¹³⁷

84. JS11 stated that pregnant girls were expelled from school and that the mandatory pregnancy test was physically invasive and did not require prior consent.¹³⁸ Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, AI stated that pregnant girls and young mothers experienced discrimination, as they were not permitted to return to school.¹³⁹

85. JS16 stated that the COVID-19 pandemic had disrupted the education calendar, affecting the learning of 15.4 million students, especially those preparing for their national examinations. With the closing of schools, there had been limited learning due to poor access to digital spaces.¹⁴⁰

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

*Women*¹⁴¹

86. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation from the previous review, and noting the steps taken by the State under Review to address gender issues, JS13 stated that despite these efforts, national plans had not captured gender equality issues and gender policies and strategies had lacked appropriate budgetary allocations.¹⁴²

87. HKC stated that marital rape was not considered a crime and there was also no law explicitly prohibiting domestic violence.¹⁴³ JS16 stated that despite the high prevalence of gender-based violence, there was a lack of a “survivor-centred approach”, as survivors faced difficulties in accessing essential services, such as psychosocial and legal support. Gender discrimination and a culture of impunity had allowed perpetrators to escape accountability.¹⁴⁴ JS16 stated that the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic had resulted in a reduction of prevention and protection efforts, social services and care for women and girls.¹⁴⁵

*Children*¹⁴⁶

88. JS10 stated that supported recommendations from the previous review relating to the protection of children had only been partially implemented.¹⁴⁷ Despite initiatives taken, including the formulation of the National Plan of Action to end Violence against Women and Children 2017/18-2021/22, there were concerns, including the increase in the incidents of violence against children.¹⁴⁸

89. JS16 stated that in 2019, the Court of Appeal upheld a ruling by the High Court, which deemed sections 13 and 17 of Law of Marriage Act, which allowed girls to marry at the age of 15 years with parental permission and at the age of 14 years with the permission of the Court, to be unconstitutional. However, the law was yet to be amended. Early marriage was more common in rural areas and among the poor. It had significant impact on girls’ health, well-being and personal development, and reduced their access to employment and economic opportunities.¹⁴⁹

90. JS16 stated that despite initiatives by the State under Review, the worst forms of child labour had not been addressed and gaps existed in the legal framework. Children continued to be engaged in the worst forms of child-labour.¹⁵⁰

91. GIEACPC stated that corporal punishment of children was lawful in the home, alternative care settings, day care, schools, in some penal institutions and as a sentence for crime.¹⁵¹

92. JS18 expressed concern about the high levels of sexual violence experienced by children in street situations.¹⁵² These children experienced discriminated from health care professionals and faced multiple barriers in attending school.¹⁵³ The police did not follow the applicable law or any formal procedure when removing the children from public spaces.¹⁵⁴ Begging, which was often essential for the survival of children in street situations, was a crime for children over the age of 10 years.¹⁵⁵

*Persons with disabilities*¹⁵⁶

93. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, HRW stated that the State under Review had committed to protecting the rights of persons with disabilities. However, inhumane practices of confining persons with intellectual and psychological disabilities had continued to exist due to inadequate support and mental health services, as well as widespread beliefs that stigmatized such persons.¹⁵⁷

*Minorities and indigenous peoples*¹⁵⁸

94. JS14 stated that pastoralists and hunter-gatherers were marginalized through the implementation of laws, policies and directives. The Wildlife Conservation Act, no 5 of 2009, which considered hunter-gatherers to be poachers while engaging in sustainable traditional livelihood on their ancestral land, was evidence of this discrimination sanctioned by law. In addition, the National Livestock Policy of 2006 did not recognise pastoralism as a mode of livelihood.¹⁵⁹

*Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons*¹⁶⁰

95. AU-ACHPR denounced the increasing pressure on Burundian refugees by the authorities to provoke forced departures and called on the authorities to put an end to such practices. It also called for cooperation with UNHCR on the care and voluntary return of these refugees.¹⁶¹

*Stateless persons*¹⁶²

96. JS17 stated that there was a lack of statistics on stateless persons, or those at risk of statelessness. Those at risk of statelessness included people in long-term migration situations, foundlings, the Kamba community in Kilimanjaro, the Makonde and Comorian communities in Zanzibar, Burundian refugees and Somali Bantu. The issuance of national identification cards was likely to expose more people to the risk of being stateless, as the strict vetting processes had made it difficult for people to obtain national identification cards.¹⁶³

97. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation from the previous review, JS7 stated that there remained a need to sensitize the people on the importance of birth registration.¹⁶⁴ Noting the initiatives that had been taken to ensure universal birth registration, JS17 stated that fees continued to present barriers to accessing birth registration, particularly for those in rural areas who could not access free handwritten birth certificates.¹⁶⁵

Notes

¹ The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this report. The full texts of their submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org.
Civil society

Individual submissions:

ABA-CHR	American Bar Association Center for Human Rights, Washington (United States of America);
ADF	ADF International, Geneva (Switzerland);
AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
COC-Nederland	Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, Amsterdam (Netherlands);
CPJ	Committee to Protect Journalists, New York (United States of America);
ECLJ	European Centre for law and Justice, Strasbourg (France);
ELIZKA	Elizka Relief Foundation (Ghana);
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
HKC	Helena Kennedy Centre for International Justice, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
HRW	Human Rights Watch, Geneva, (Switzerland);
ICAN	The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Geneva, (Switzerland);
L4L	Lawyers for Lawyers, Amsterdam, (Netherlands);
PLAJC	Tanzania, Peace, Legal Aid and Justice Centre, Dodoma City, (United Republic of Tanzania);
SALC	Southern African Litigation Centre, (South Africa);
SMPF	Set My People Free, Gnosjö (Sweden).

Joint submissions:

JS1	Article 19, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and The Tanzania Human Rights Defenders Coalition, Dar es Salaam (United Republic of Tanzania) (Joint Submission 1);
JS2	Assess Now, New York (United States of America) and Zaina Foundation, Dar es Salaam (Tanzania) (Joint submission 2);
JS3	The Advocates for Human Rights, Minneapolis (United States of America), The World Coalition Against the Death Penalty, Montreuil (France), Legal and Human Rights Centre, Dar es Salaam (United Republic of Tanzania), The Children Education Society, Dar es Salaam (United Republic of Tanzania) and Reprieve, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (Joint Submission 3);
JS4	CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Johannesburg (South Africa) and East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Kampala (Uganda) (Joint Submission 4);
JS5	Edmund Rice International, Geneva (Switzerland), Edmund Rice Network Arusha, Arusha (United Republic of Tanzania), Teach for Tanzania, Mara (United Republic of Tanzania), Haki Elimu (Right to Education) and chama cha waandishi wa habari vijana (CWVT), Dar es Salaam (United Republic of Tanzania);
JS6	Cultural Survival, Cambridge, Massachusetts (United States of America) and The American Indian Law Clinic of the University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado (United States of America) (Joint Submission 6);
JS7	IIMA - Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, and VIDES International – International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development Geneva (Switzerland) (Joint Submission 7);
JS8	Pastoralists Indigenous NGOs Forum, Arusha (United Republic of Tanzania) (Joint Submission 8);

- JS9 Small Media, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Collaboration on International ICT Policy in East and Southern Africa, Kampala (Uganda), Haki Maendeleo, Dar es Salaam (United Republic of Tanzania) (Joint Submission 9);
- JS10 Legal and Human Rights Centre, Dar es Salaam (United Republic of Tanzania), Tanzania Human Rights Defenders Coalition, Dar es Salaam (United Republic of Tanzania), Save the Children, Dar es Salaam (United Republic of Tanzania) (Joint Submission 10);
- JS11 Center for Reproductive Rights, Nairobi, Kenya and Legal and Human Rights Centre, Dar es Salaam (United Republic of Tanzania) (Joint Submission 11);
- JS12 South African Litigation Centre, Johannesburg (South Africa) and The Sexual Rights Initiative, Geneva (Switzerland) (Joint Submission 12);
- JS13 Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future, Kent (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and Stand up for Your Rights, Doorn, (The Netherlands) (Joint Submission 13);
- JS14 Tanzania Pastoralist Community Forum, Arusha (United Republic of Tanzania) (Joint Submission 14);
- JS15 Under the Same Sun, Surry, (Canada) and Tanzania Albinism Society, Dar es Salaam (United Republic of Tanzania) (Joint Submission 15);
- JS16 World Council of Churches, the Christian Council of Tanzania, the Lutheran World Federation and Geneva for Human Rights, Geneva (Switzerland) (Joint Submission 16);
- JS17 Dignity Kwaza, Dar es Salaam (United Republic of Tanzania), Global Campaign for Equal Nationality Rights, New York (United States of America) and the Institute on Statelessness and Inclusion, Eindhoven (Netherlands) (Joint Submission 17); The Consortium for Street Children, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
- JS18 The Consortium for Street Children, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Railway Children Africa, Amani Centre for Street Children, Caritas Mbeya, Kigwe Social Economic Development and Training, Baba Watoto Organization, Cheka Sana Tanzania and Iringa Development of Youth, Disabled and Children Care (Joint Submission 18);
- JS19 Life Runners Organization, Human Life International – Anglophone Africa, Dar es Salaam (United Republic of Tanzania), Prolife Tanzania, Dar es Salaam (United Republic of Tanzania), Uimarishaji WaFamilia Tanzania, Lawyers Environmental Action Team, Dar es Salaam (United Republic of Tanzania) (Joint Submission 19).

National human rights institution:

NHRC

Commission for Human Rights and Good Governance, Dodoma (United Republic of Tanzania).

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):

AU-ACHPR

The Special Rapporteur on Refugees, Asylum Seekers, Internally Displaced Persons and Migrants in Africa of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights.

² CHRAGG, para. 8. CHRAGG made recommendations (para. 9).

³ Ibid, para. 22. CHRAGG made recommendations (para. 23).

⁴ Ibid, para. 22. CHRAGG made recommendations (para. 23).

⁵ Ibid, para. 24. CHRAGG made recommendations (para. 25).

⁶ Ibid, para. 6. CHRAGG made recommendations (para. 7).

⁷ Ibid, para. 10. CHRAGG made recommendations (para. 11).

⁸ Ibid, paras. 3 and 4. CHRAGG made recommendations (para. 4).

⁹ Ibid, paras. 35 and 36. CHRAGG made recommendations (para. 37).

- ¹⁰ Ibid, paras. 38 and 39. CHRAGG made recommendations (para. 40).
- ¹¹ Ibid, paras. 14–15. CHRAGG made recommendations (para. 16).
- ¹² Ibid, para. 20. CHRAGG made a recommendation (para. 21).
- ¹³ Ibid, paras. 17–18. CHRAGG made recommendations (para. 19).
- ¹⁴ Ibid, paras. 31–33. CHRAGG made recommendations (para. 34).
- ¹⁵ Ibid, para. 26. CHRAGG made recommendations (para. 27).
- ¹⁶ The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:
- | | |
|------------|--|
| ICERD | International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; |
| ICESCR | International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; |
| OP-ICESCR | Optional Protocol to ICESCR; |
| ICCPR | International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; |
| ICCPR-OP 1 | Optional Protocol to ICCPR; |
| ICCPR-OP 2 | Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty; |
| CEDAW | Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women; |
| OP-CEDAW | Optional Protocol to CEDAW; |
| CAT | Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment; |
| OP-CAT | Optional Protocol to CAT; |
| CRC | Convention on the Rights of the Child; |
| OP-CRC-AC | Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict; |
| OP-CRC-SC | Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography; |
| OP-CRC-IC | Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure; |
| ICRMW | International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families; |
| CRPD | Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities; |
| OP-CRPD | Optional Protocol to CRPD; |
| ICPPED | International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. |
- ¹⁷ For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/12, paras. 134.1, 134.2–9, 134.11–15, 134.37, 134.39, 134.40, 134.41, 135.1, 137.1–24, 137.25–31, 137.47–53, 137.60, and 137.61.
- ¹⁸ AI, para. 4 and footnote 4, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.1 (Chile), para. 134.2 (Philippines), para. 134.3 (Mozambique) and para. 134.4 (Ukraine), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1 See also SMPF, para. 3 and JS3, para. 10. JS3 made a recommendation (p. 8).
- ¹⁹ PLAJC, paras. 10 and 13, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.1 (Chile), para.134.3 (Mozambique) and para. 134.4 (Ukraine), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1.
- ²⁰ JS3, para. 10. JS3 made a recommendation (p. 8).
- ²¹ JS8, para. 14. JS8 made a recommendation (para. 44).
- ²² ICAN, p. 1.
- ²³ JS10, paras. 4–4.2, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.37 (Switzerland), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1. JS10 made recommendations (para. 4.3).
- ²⁴ AI, para. 5 and footnote 5, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.39 (Sierra Leone), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1. See also JS10, paras. 9–9.2. JS10 made recommendations (para. 9.3).
- ²⁵ For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/12, paras. 134.16, 134.18–25, 134.27–33, 134.35, 134.56, 134.123, 134.126–129, 137.44 and 137.45.
- ²⁶ JS10, paras. 5, 5.1 and 5.2, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.6 (Togo), para. 134.7 (Kuwait), para. 134.8 (Austria), para. 134.9 (Burkina Faso), and para. 134.10 (Spain), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1. JS10 made recommendations (para. 5.3).
- ²⁷ JS17, para. 31.
- ²⁸ JS10, para. 10, referring to referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.15 (Burkina Faso) and para. 134.36 (Pakistan), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1. JS10 made recommendations (para. 12.3).
- ²⁹ Ibid, para. 3 and paras. 3.1–3.3, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.22 (Sudan), para. 134.23 (Bhutan), 134.24 (Uganda), 1334.25 (State of Palestine), para. 134.26 (Equatorial Guinea), para. 134.27 (Libya), and para. 134.28 (Mauritius), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1 JS10 made recommendations (para. 3.3).
- ³⁰ Ibid, para. 14. JS10 made recommendations (para. 14.1).
- ³¹ For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/12, paras. 134.47, 137.33, 137.42 and 137.43.

- ³² SMPF, para. 10.
- ³³ JS12, paras. 6-8 and fn. 2, referring to the Request for an Advisory Opinion by the Pan African Lawyers Union (PALU) on the compatibility of vagrancy laws with the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights and other human rights instruments applicable in Africa, No 001/2018, Advisory Opinion, African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights, 4 December 2020.
- ³⁴ COC-Nederland, p. 7. COC-Nederland made recommendations (p. 7).
- ³⁵ JS4, para. 2.10.
- ³⁶ For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/33/12, paras. 134.25, 134.101, 134.121 and 134.125.
- ³⁷ PLAJC, paras. 1–7, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.35 (Pakistan), para. 134.101 (Haiti), para. 134.121 (Oman) and para. 134.124 (Cuba), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1. PLAJC made recommendations (paras. 8.1–8.11).
- ³⁸ JS10, para. 15.2. JS10 made recommendations (para. 15.3).
- ³⁹ JS6, p. 4.
- ⁴⁰ JS13, p. 16, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para.134.125 (Haiti), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1. JS13 made recommendations (p. 20).
- ⁴¹ Ibid, p. 9. JS13 made recommendations (pp. 18-19).
- ⁴² Ibid, pp. 9–10.
- ⁴³ Ibid, p. 10.
- ⁴⁴ JS6, p.6. JS6 made a recommendation. (p. 8).
- ⁴⁵ JS19, p. 7. JS19 made recommendations (p. 8).
- ⁴⁶ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/12, paras. 134.43, 134.57, 134.58, 134.89, 134.90, 134.94, 137.32, 137.54–59 and 137.62.
- ⁴⁷ JS3, paras. 1.12 and 18. JS3 made recommendations (p. 8). See also JS19, pp. 1–3. JS19 made recommendations (p. 3).
- ⁴⁸ JS10, para. 10, referring to referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.75 (Gabon), para. 134.77 (Haiti), para. 134.79 (Maldives), para. 134.80 (Slovenia), para. 134.81 (Czech Republic), para. 134.82 (South Africa), para. 134.83 (Uganda), para. 134.84 (United States of America), para. 134.85 (Uruguay), 134.86 (Argentina), and para. 134.87 (Botswana), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid, para. 10.2. JS10 made recommendations (para. 10.3).
- ⁵⁰ ECLJ, paras. 7–10.
- ⁵¹ JS16, paras 9-11. JS16 made recommendations (p. 4). See also HKC, para. 20.
- ⁵² JS3, para. 24. JS3 made a recommendation (p. 9).
- ⁵³ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/12, paras. 134.92, 137.66, 134.91 and 134.93.
- ⁵⁴ SALC, p. 7.
- ⁵⁵ ABA-CHR, para. 14. ABA-CHR made recommendations (p. 6).
- ⁵⁶ JS18, para. 10(a). JS18 made recommendations (para. 10.1).
- ⁵⁷ JS10, paras. 6–6.1, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.92(Spain), para. 134.93 (Algeria), para. 134.94 (Algeria) read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid, para. 6.2, JS10 made a recommendations (para. 6.3.1).
- ⁵⁹ JS3, para. 31.
- ⁶⁰ L4L, para. 24. L4L made a recommendation (p. 6).
- ⁶¹ Ibid, para. 25.
- ⁶² JS3, paras. 1 and 14, and endnote 25, referring to Ally Rajabu and Others v. United Republic of Tanzania, Application No. 007-2015, Judgment on Merits and Reparations. JS3 made recommendations (p. 8).
- ⁶³ ABA-CHR, para. 14. ABA-CHR made recommendations (p. 6).
- ⁶⁴ Ibid, para. 20. ABA-CHR made recommendations (p. 7).
- ⁶⁵ L4L, para. 12. L4L made a recommendation (p. 5).
- ⁶⁶ AI, para. 16. See also JS3, paras. 1 and 11. JS3 made a recommendation (pg. 8).
- ⁶⁷ AU-ACHPR, p. 2. See also ABA-CHR, para. 19. ABA-CHR made recommendations (p. 7); and SALC, p. 7. SALC made recommendations (p. 8).
- ⁶⁸ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/12, paras. 134.17, 134.94, 134.95, 134.97–134.100, 136.1, 136.2, 136.4, 136.5, 136.6–136.8, 136.24, 136.25, 137.67 and 137.68.
- ⁶⁹ ADF, para. 6, citing The Written Laws (Miscellaneous Amendments) (No.3) Act, 2019, Part VI Amendments of the Societies Act, Section 38(a)(2).
- ⁷⁰ Ibid, paras. 7 and 17. ADF made recommendations (para. 29).
- ⁷¹ Ibid, paras. 9 and 17. ADF made recommendations (para. 29).
- ⁷² SMPF, paras. 5–8. SMPF made recommendations (paras. 11-14).
- ⁷³ JS4, para. 1.5.
- ⁷⁴ JS13, p. 12.
- ⁷⁵ JS1, para. 5 and footnote 1, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.96 (Australia), para. 134.97 (Switzerland) and para. 134.98 (Ireland), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1.

- ⁷⁶ Ibid, para. 5 and footnote 1, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 136.1 (Czech Republic), para. 136.2 (Denmark), para. 136.4 (Germany), para. 136.5 (Belgium), para. 136.6 (Sweden), and para. 136.7 (United States of America), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1.
- ⁷⁷ Ibid, paras. 6-17. JS1 made recommendations (p. 6). See also JS4, paras. 4.7 and 4.8. JS4 made a recommendation (pg. 14); CPJ, para. 22. CPJ made a recommendation (paras. 49 and 50); ELIZKA, pg. 3. ELIZKA made a recommendation (pg. 9); JS5, paras. 22 and 23. JS5 made recommendations (para. 29); JS9 para. 14. JS9 made a recommendation (pg. 10); HRW, p. 2. HRW made a recommendation (pg. 3); SALC, p. 4. SALC made recommendations (p. 5); and JS13, p. 12.
- ⁷⁸ Ibid, paras. 18–23. JS1 made recommendations (p. 6). See also JS4, paras. 4.3 and 4.4. JS4 made a recommendation (pg. 14); CPJ, para. 18. CPJ made a recommendation (para. 50); ELIZKA, pg. 1. ELIZKA made a recommendation (pg. 9); JS5, para. 28; ABA-CHR, para. 6; and SALC, p. 4. SALC made recommendations (p. 5).
- ⁷⁹ JS9, para. 4. JS9 made a recommendation (pg. 10).
- ⁸⁰ ELIZKA, pg. 3. ELIZKA made a recommendation (pg. 9).
- ⁸¹ ABA-CHR, para. 11. ABA-CHR made a recommendation (p. 4). See also SALC, p. 3. SALC made recommendations (p. 3); and JS13, p. 13.
- ⁸² JS9, para. 5.
- ⁸³ JS2, paras. 17- 19. JS2 made recommendation (para. 24).
- ⁸⁴ JS9, para. 5. JS9 made a recommendation (p. 10).
- ⁸⁵ JS1, paras. 24–29. JS1 made recommendations (p. 6). See also JS2, para. 18. JS2 made recommendation (para. 24); AI, para. 14. AI made recommendations (pg. 6); JS4, para. 4.5. JS4 made a recommendation (pg. 14); JS5, paras 25 and 26; JS9, para. 10. JS9 made a recommendation (pg. 10); ABA-CHR, paras. 7–9. ABA-CHR made a recommendation (p. 4); and HRW, pg. 2.
- ⁸⁶ JS9, para. 39.
- ⁸⁷ AI, para. 6 and endnote 6, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.95 (Latvia) and para. 134.96 (Australia). AI made recommendations (p. 6).
- ⁸⁸ JS1, paras. 30–35. JS1 made a recommendation (p. 8).
- ⁸⁹ Ibid, paras. 36–43. JS1 made a recommendation (p. 9). See also CPJ, paras. 12-16. CPJ made a recommendation (para. 43); and JS9, paras. 18-26. JS9 made a recommendation (pg. 10).
- ⁹⁰ JS4, para. 33.
- ⁹¹ AI, para. 25. AI made a recommendation (pg. 6).
- ⁹² JS4, para. 36. See also COC-Nederland, pg. 8.
- ⁹³ AU-ACHPR, p. 4.
- ⁹⁴ JS1, paras. 44–48. JS1 made a recommendation (p. 10).
- ⁹⁵ JS4, paras. 2.2–2.9. JS4 made recommendations (pg. 13). See also HRW, pg. 3.
- ⁹⁶ AU-ACHPR, p. 4
- ⁹⁷ JS2, paras. 9 and 10. JS2 made recommendations (paras. 21 and 22). See also CPJ, para. 42; JS9, para. 41; and HRW, pg. 3.
- ⁹⁸ AI, para. 7 and endnote 7, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.98 (Ireland), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1. AI made recommendations (p. 5). See also JS10, paras. 2–2.2. JS10 made recommendations (para. 2.3).
- ⁹⁹ Ibid, para. 27.
- ¹⁰⁰ AU-ACHPR, p. 4.
- ¹⁰¹ SALC, p. 3. SALC made recommendations (p. 3).
- ¹⁰² For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/2, paras. 134.57 and 134.58.
- ¹⁰³ HKS, paras. 8 and 9.
- ¹⁰⁴ JS16, para. 7. JS16 made recommendations (p. 3).
- ¹⁰⁵ JS9, para. 43. JS9 made a recommendation (pg. 11).
- ¹⁰⁶ JS19, p. 6. JS19 made recommendations (p. 6).
- ¹⁰⁷ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.65.
- ¹⁰⁸ JS12, para. 3. JS12 made a recommendation (p. 7).
- ¹⁰⁹ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/12, paras. 134.102–105, 134.124, 137.69 and 137.70.
- ¹¹⁰ JS10, paras 13, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.102 (Finland), para. 134.103 (Haiti), para. 134.9 (Burkina Faso), para. 134.47 (Honduras), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1.
- ¹¹¹ Ibid, para. 13.2. JS10 made recommendations (para. 13.3).
- ¹¹² JS8, paras. 15-27. JS8 made recommendations (paras. 47–49). See also JS14, para. 8 and para. 11; JS6, p. 4. JS6 made a recommendation (p. 8); and JS19, p. 8.
- ¹¹³ Ibid, p. 7. JS6 made a recommendation (p. 9).
- ¹¹⁴ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/12, paras. 134.107, 134.108, 134.118 and 136.3.
- ¹¹⁵ JS11, para. 6.
- ¹¹⁶ ADF, paras. 25-27. ADF made recommendations (para. 29).
- ¹¹⁷ JS16, paras. 26 and 26. JS16 made recommendations (p. 7).

- 118 Ibid, para. 38. JS16 made recommendations (p. 10).
- 119 JS11, para. 10. JS11 made a recommendation (para. 27).
- 120 Ibid, paras. 15(a)–(e). JS11 made recommendations (para. 30).
- 121 Ibid paras. 16–21. JS11 made recommendations (para. 30).
- 122 JS12, para. 26. JS11 made recommendations (p. 8).
- 123 HRW, p. 5.
- 124 COC-Nederland, pp. 9–10. COC-Nederland made recommendations (p. 10).
- 125 JS15, paras. 13 and 14. JS15 made recommendations (p. 8).
- 126 JS1, para. 4. See also AI, para. 18.
- 127 JS5, para. 30. JS5 made a recommendation (para. 32).
- 128 JS9, para. 30.
- 129 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.38, 134.109–117.
- 130 JS10, paras. 8 and 8.1, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.109 (Equatorial Guinea), para. 134.110 (Portugal), para. 134.112 (Sudan), para. 134.113 (Tajikistan), para. 134.114 (Algeria), para. 134.116 (China), para. 134.118 (Congo), and para. 134.120 (Singapore), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1.
- 131 Ibid, para. 8.2. JS10 made recommendations (para. 8.3).
- 132 JS16, para. 29. JS16 made recommendations (p. 8).
- 133 JS5, paras. 1–9. JS5 made recommendations (para. 13). See also JS16, para. 33. JS16 made recommendations (p. 8).
- 134 JS7, paras. 11 and 12. JS7 made recommendations (paras. 14 (a) and (b)).
- 135 JS15, paras. 15 and 16. JS15 made recommendations (p. 8).
- 136 JS5, para. 11. JS5 made recommendations (para. 13).
- 137 JS7, para. 13. JS7 made a recommendation (para. 14 (g)).
- 138 JS11, paras. 22 and 23. JS11 made recommendations (para. 31). See also HRW, p. 6.
- 139 AI, paras. 9 and 20. See also JS7, para. 11. JS7 made a recommendation (para. 14(d); and JS19, p. 3.
- 140 JS16, paras. 35 and 36. JS16 made recommendations (p. 10).
- 141 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/12, paras. 134.36, 134.45, 134.48, 134.49, 134.50, 134.51, 134.52, 134.53, 134.61–64, 134.70, 134.71, 134.122, 136.10, 136.11, 136.12, 136.13, 136.16–20, 137.34, 137.36–39, 137.40, 137.41, 137.63, 137.64.
- 142 JS13, p. 17, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.42 (Namibia), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1. JS13 made recommendations (p. 20).
- 143 HKC, paras. 22–24.
- 144 JS16, para. 4. JS16 made recommendations (p. 3).
- 145 Ibid, para. 34. JS16 made recommendations (p. 10).
- 146 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/12, paras. 134.55, 134.59, 134.66–68, 134.106 and 136.21, read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1.
- 147 JS10, paras. 7 and 7.1, referring to referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.43 (Ukraine), para. 134.45 (Republic of Korea), para. 134.50 (Norway), para. 134.54 (Costa Rica), para. 134.55 (Cabo Verde), para. 134.57 (Malaysia), para. 134.58 (Mexico), para. 134.59 (Mexico), para. 134.60 (Turkey), and para. 134.106 (Bangladesh), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1.
- 148 Ibid, para. 7.2. JS10 made recommendations (para. 7.3).
- 149 JS16, paras. 13–15. JS16 made recommendations (p. 5).
- 150 Ibid, paras. 17–20. JS16 made recommendations (p. 6).
- 151 GIEACPC, p. 2. See also JS7, para. 15. JS7 made recommendations (para. 17); and HRW, p. 6.
- 152 JS18, para. 7(a). JS18 made recommendations (para. 7.1).
- 153 Ibid, para. 8(a) and 9(a). JS18 made recommendations (paras. 8.1 and 9.1).
- 154 Ibid, para. 3(a). JS18 made recommendations (para. 3.1.).
- 155 Ibid, para. 4(b). JS18 made recommendations (para. 4.1).
- 156 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/12, paras. 134.119, 134.20 and 134.54.
- 157 HRW, p. 8, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 134.119 (Equatorial Guinea) and para. 134.120 (Singapore), read together with A/HRC/33/12/Add.1.
- 158 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/12, paras. 134.72–134.88, 136.9, 136.22, 136.23, 137.71 and 137.65.
- 159 JS14, paras. 7 and 8. JS14 made recommendations (paras. 20–22 and 34). See also JS13, p. 7; and JS19, p. 8.
- 160 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/12, paras. 72.
- 161 AU-ACHPR, p. 1. See also AI, para. 36. AI made recommendations (p. 6).
- 162 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/33/12, paras. 136.14 and 136.15.
- 163 JS17, paras. 16–24 and 51–52. JS17 made recommendations (para. 53).
- 164 JS7, para. 15, referring to A/HRC/33/12, para. 136.14 (Poland). JS7 made recommendations (para. 16).

¹⁶⁵ JS17, paras. 48-50. See also JS18, para. 6. JS18 made recommendations (para. 6.1).
