



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
21 August 2015

Original: English

---

**Human Rights Council**  
**Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review**  
**Twenty-third session 5401**  
2-13 November 2015

**Compilation prepared by the Office of the United Nations  
High Commissioner for Human Rights in accordance with  
paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Human Rights Council  
resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council  
resolution 16/21**

## **Nauru**

The present report is a compilation of the information contained in reports of the treaty bodies and special procedures, including observations and comments by the State concerned, in reports of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, and in other relevant official United Nations documents. It is presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints. For the full texts, please refer to the documents referenced. The report does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights other than those contained in public reports and statements issued by the Office. It follows the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council in its decision 17/119. Information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the periodicity of the review, and developments during that period.



## I. Background and framework

### A. Scope of international obligations<sup>1</sup>

#### 1. International human rights treaties<sup>2</sup>

	<i>Status during previous cycle</i>	<i>Action after review</i>	<i>Not ratified/not accepted</i>
<i>Ratification, accession or succession</i>	ICERD (signature, 2001)	CEDAW (2011)	ICERD (signature, 2001)
	ICCPR (signature, 2001)	CAT (2012)	ICESCR
	CAT (signature, 2001)	OP-CAT (2013)	ICCPR (signature, 2001)
	CRC (1994)	CRPD (2012)	ICCPR-OP 2
	OP-CRC-AC (signature, 2000)		OP-CRC-AC (signature, 2000)
	OP-CRC-SC (signature, 2000)		OP-CRC-SC (signature, 2000)
			ICRMW
			ICPPED
<i>Reservations and/or declarations</i>			
<i>Complaints procedures, inquiries and urgent action<sup>3</sup></i>	ICERD (signature, 2001)	CAT, art. 20 (2012)	ICERD (signature, 2001)
	ICCPR (signature, 2001)		OP-ICESCR
	ICCPR-OP 1 (signature, 2001)		ICCPR (signature, 2001)
			ICCPR-OP 1 (signature, 2001)
			OP-CEDAW
			CAT, arts. 21 and 22
		OP-CRC-IC	
		ICRMW	
		OP-CRPD	
		ICPPED	

#### 2. Other main relevant international instruments

	<i>Status during previous cycle</i>	<i>Action after review</i>	<i>Not ratified</i>
<i>Ratification, accession or succession</i>	1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol	Palermo Protocol <sup>6</sup>	1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, and 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness
	Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 and Additional Protocols I, II <sup>4</sup> and III <sup>5</sup>		Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide
	Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court		ILO fundamental conventions <sup>7</sup>
			Convention against Discrimination in Education

1. The United Nations country team noted that, since its first universal periodic review, Nauru had acceded to CEDAW in 2011 and CRPD in 2012, and had ratified CAT in 2012. Nauru had also ratified OP-CAT in 2013.<sup>8</sup>

2. The country team urged Nauru to continue its progress in the effective implementation of recommendations accepted during the first universal periodic review, including the ratification of ICCPR and its two Optional Protocols.<sup>9</sup> The country team further encouraged Nauru to ratify ICERD,<sup>10</sup> ICRMW,<sup>11</sup> ICPPED,<sup>12</sup> OP-IESCR,<sup>13</sup> OP-CEDAW,<sup>14</sup> the three Optional Protocols to CRC<sup>15</sup> and OP-CRPD<sup>16</sup>, and recommended that it seek capacity-building assistance, guidance and technical support from the United Nations and regional partners to increase reporting on international human rights conventions.<sup>17</sup>

3. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) recommended that Nauru accede to the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons and the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.<sup>18</sup>

4. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) stated that Nauru had not acceded the Convention against Discrimination in Education (1960).<sup>19</sup> It encouraged Nauru to ratify the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972) and the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005).<sup>20</sup>

## **B. Constitutional and legislative framework**

5. The country team observed that, in 2010, a comprehensive review of the Constitution of Nauru had been undertaken and tabled in Parliament as a single package that had not passed.<sup>21</sup> It recommended that Nauru amend the Constitution to include disability as a prohibited ground for discrimination, in line with its obligations as a State party to CRPD.<sup>22</sup>

6. UNESCO was concerned that there was no freedom of information legislation and national media self-regulation body in Nauru. It encouraged Nauru to continue working on a law on access to information in accordance with international standards.<sup>23</sup>

## **C. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures**

7. The United Nations Subcommittee on the Prevention of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, in May 2015, noted that Nauru, despite being a party to OP-CAT since January 2013, had not yet established a national preventive mechanism in accordance with its treaty obligations. The Subcommittee was encouraged to receive the Government's assurances that this mechanism would be established as soon as possible and offered its assistance in this regard.<sup>24</sup> The country team urged the Government of Nauru to establish a national preventive mechanism, in line with its obligations under OP-CAT. The establishment of a national human rights institution compliant with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (Paris Principles) would serve that purpose.<sup>25</sup> It further encouraged Nauru to seek technical assistance and support from the United Nations and regional partners in fulfilling that obligation.<sup>26</sup>

8. The country team observed that Nauru did not have a child protection system or policy as required to support the incorporation into national legislation of CRC. It encouraged the introduction of a child protection programme and policy and the subsequent

implementation across all relevant legislation and instructions, including the Education Act, to strengthen compliance with CRC.<sup>27</sup>

9. The country team observed that the Nauru National Sustainable Development Strategy 2005-2025 had last been reviewed in 2009 and suggested that a further review would be useful to reflect the current economic and development situation and to strengthen the mainstreaming and protection of human rights, across all sectors, and to prioritize the advancement of human rights protection. It further encouraged Nauru to draw on technical assistance from the United Nations and development partners to support the review of the Strategy.<sup>28</sup>

## II. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

### A. Cooperation with treaty bodies

10. The country team encouraged Nauru to submit its initial reports on CRC and CEDAW at its earliest convenience.<sup>29</sup>

11. The country team noted as positive the establishment by the Government of a working group on treaties as an important step in making progress on outstanding reports. It encouraged ongoing support for the working group through the provision of adequate financial and human resources.<sup>30</sup> It further encouraged the Government and the working group to seek technical and capacity-building support from the United Nations and partners.<sup>31</sup>

12. The country team noted as positive the visit to Nauru by the Subcommittee on the Prevention of Torture, scheduled for 4-6 May 2015.<sup>32</sup> It also encouraged the Government of Nauru to seek technical assistance from the United Nations, particularly the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), with regard to the State's obligations under international law, including CAT, OP-CAT and CRC.<sup>33</sup>

#### 1. Reporting status

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Concluding observations included in previous review</i>	<i>Latest report submitted since previous review</i>	<i>Latest concluding observations</i>	<i>Reporting status</i>
Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women	-	-	-	Initial report overdue since 2013
Committee against Torture	-	-	-	Initial report overdue since 2013
Committee on the Rights of the Child	-	-	-	Initial report overdue since 1996
Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	-	-	-	Initial report overdue since 2014

## 2. Responses to specific follow-up requests by treaty bodies

### Concluding observations

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Due in</i>	<i>Subject matter</i>	<i>Submitted in</i>
--	--	--	--

### Views

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Number of views</i>	<i>Status</i>
--	--	--

### Country visits and/or inquiries by treaty bodies

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Subject matter</i>
Subcommittee on the Prevention of Torture	May 2015	Confidential

## B. Cooperation with special procedures<sup>34</sup>

	<i>Status during previous cycle</i>	<i>Current status</i>
<i>Standing invitation</i>	No	Yes
<i>Visits undertaken</i>	-	-
<i>Visits agreed to in principle</i>	-	Arbitrary detention
<i>Visits requested</i>	Arbitrary detention	Migrants
<i>Responses to letters of allegation and urgent appeals</i>	During the period under review, two communications were sent. No reply was received.	
<i>Follow-up reports and missions</i>		

13. The country team noted that the Government of Nauru had agreed to the request by the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention to visit Nauru in April 2014 and that it had later requested that the visit be postponed. It urged the Government to reschedule the visit by the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention.<sup>35</sup>

14. The country team urged the Government of Nauru to extend invitations to the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment or the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants, among other special procedures.<sup>36</sup>

### **C. Cooperation with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights**

15. In 2014, OHCHR organized a consultation on the second universal periodic review of Nauru, in partnership with the secretariat of the Pacific Islands Forum and the secretariat of the Pacific Community.<sup>37</sup>

## **III. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law**

### **A. Equality and non-discrimination**

16. The country team urged the Government of Nauru to amend national legislation to decriminalize consensual sexual activity between same-sex couples, as recommended and accepted during the first universal periodic review.<sup>38</sup>

17. The country team encouraged the Government of Nauru to develop gender equality legislation and family violence and/or domestic violence legislation to provide protection and redress for survivors and prosecution of perpetrators.<sup>39</sup> It further encouraged the Government to increase efforts to promote gender equality through community awareness and education, and to uproot patriarchal norms and attitudes that limit recognition and protection of women's rights.<sup>40</sup>

### **B. Right to life, liberty and security of person**

18. The country team noted that, while Nauru was abolitionist in practice, with no executions having been carried out since independence in 1968, article 4 (1) of the Constitution provides for the death penalty for murder, treason and other offences not resulting in death. It urged the Government to amend article 4 (1) of the Constitution, to abolish the death penalty in Nauru.<sup>41</sup>

19. The Subcommittee on the Prevention of Torture visited Nauru in May 2015, focusing on the situation of detainees on the island and the need to establish an independent body to monitor places of detention. The Subcommittee visited the police station and the prison of Nauru, as well as the Regional Processing Centre for asylum seekers, a large facility comprising three separate units housing men, women and families with children.<sup>42</sup>

20. The country team encouraged the amendment of the Criminal Code to prohibit physical abuse and sexual and other exploitation of children, including children with disabilities, and to increase penalties and sentencing against perpetrators of such abuse.<sup>43</sup>

21. The country team was concerned about the human rights and the safety of unaccompanied refugee minors released into the Nauruan community. Those minors had allegedly been subject to physical and verbal assaults and had had limited access to education following their release into community. It urged the Government to address the alleged human rights violations of unaccompanied refugee minors regarding their physical and mental health, their right to safety and security of person and property and their right to education, in line with its obligations under CRC and other international human rights conventions.<sup>44</sup>

22. The country team urged that the Criminal Code be amended to explicitly prohibit corporal punishment in all areas as a matter of priority. It also encouraged Nauru to

harmonize the Code with the Education Act 2011, which already includes such a prohibition.<sup>45</sup>

23. The country team further encouraged the introduction of reporting guidelines in schools, whereby complaints relating to any form of violence or abuse, including all forms of bullying, can be dealt with in a proper manner.<sup>46</sup>

### **C. Administration of justice and the rule of law**

24. In 2014, the Special rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers sent a communication about an alleged removal and deportation of a magistrate without due process and the interference in the independence of the judiciary. According to the information received, the President of Nauru removed the Resident Magistrate from his functions in violation of an injunction issued by the Chief Justice. Subsequently, the Chief Justice, who was abroad at the time, had his visa cancelled, preventing his return to Nauru. Serious concern was expressed that the removal of the magistrate without due process and the cancellation of the visa of the Chief Justice violated the independence of the judiciary.<sup>47</sup>

25. The country team urged the Government of Nauru to uphold the independence of judges, including through the introduction of appropriate safeguards in the Constitution and supporting legislation, and encouraged the Government to extend an invitation to the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers to support current efforts to strengthen the justice system.<sup>48</sup>

26. The country team urged the Government to develop the capacity on human rights of law enforcement officials as a matter of priority, so as to prevent violence against women and children and torture and other acts of ill-treatment. It encouraged Nauru to seek technical assistance from the United Nations, particularly OHCHR, and partners in the development and delivery of capacity-building activities.<sup>49</sup>

27. The country team encouraged the amendment of the Correctional Services Act 2009 to restrict the use of solitary confinement as a disciplinary measure in the management of prisoners, in line with State obligations under CAT. Moreover, it urged that Nauru correctional services desist from this practice immediately.<sup>50</sup>

### **D. Freedom of movement**

28. UNHCR recommended ensuring that the detention of asylum-seekers is in compliance with international legal standards and, in the absence of necessary, reasonable and proportionate limitations arising from each individual case, that asylum seekers be allowed to enjoy freedom of movement. It also recommended that the Regional Processing Centre be turned into an open centre.<sup>51</sup>

29. The country team encouraged the Government of Nauru to continue its efforts to end arbitrary detention and to ensure freedom of movement for all people in Nauru.<sup>52</sup>

### **E. Freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly, and right to participate in public and political life**

30. The Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression called on the Government of Nauru to withdraw recent amendments to the Criminal Code that unduly restrict freedom of expression. The Special Rapporteur also urged the authorities to revoke other measures that restrain access to the Internet and social media and curtail the freedom of the press. The Special Rapporteur stated that Nauru

should allow there to be a free space for expression without fear of criminal prosecution, lift all restrictions to gaining access to the Internet and social media and facilitate access to the media in the country. The Special Rapporteur also stated that freedom of the press had also been limited when, in 2014, the Government had imposed prohibitive visa fees for foreign journalists to enter the country, increasing the amount to \$6,500 for a single-entry visa.<sup>53</sup>

31. The country team noted that, in Nauru, access to information was limited, with only State-owned media resources available. In May 2014, three members of Parliament had been suspended from Parliament following their participation in critical interviews on Nauru with international media. The country team urged the Government to protect and respect media freedom, freedom of expression and freedom of information. It further urged the Government to consider the retraction of procedures and fees that restrict media freedom and freedom of information.<sup>54</sup>

32. The country team proposed an amendment to the Nauru Criminal Code, which imposes unreasonable restrictions on the assembly of three or more persons and severe penalties. It further encouraged the withdrawal of the excessive restrictions placed on the location and time of planned protests.<sup>55</sup>

33. The country team observed that Nauru had a unicameral Parliament comprising 19 elected representatives. In 2013, 20 years after the election of the first woman to Parliament, a second woman parliamentarian was successfully elected. The country team urged the Government of Nauru to put in place measures, including temporary special measures such as quotas, to effectively promote an increased participation of women in decision-making structures, including Parliament.<sup>56</sup>

#### **F. Right to social security and to an adequate standard of living**

34. The country team noted that there was limited social assistance provided by the Government through old age and disability pensions, widows' and sickness benefits and child endowment, which are administered by the local government council. It encouraged the Government to put in place legislative safeguards for social protection benefits to ensure there are safeguards for vulnerable groups, such as children, the elderly and persons with disabilities.<sup>57</sup>

#### **G. Right to health**

35. The country team observed that, in 2014, Nauru became a signatory to the Pacific Sexual Health and Well-Being Shared Agenda. It strongly encouraged Nauru, as a signatory to the Agenda, to establish, strengthen and expand integration and linkages between sexually transmitted infections and HIV, and sexual and reproductive health services.<sup>58</sup>

36. The country team observed that the under-5 mortality rate for Nauru had dropped by 27 per cent from 51/1000 in 2000 to 37/1000 in 2012. However, immediate postnatal care for newborns and mothers remained very limited. It encouraged Nauru to continue its work to strengthen services and awareness around prenatal and postnatal care, including regular health check-ups for mother and baby.<sup>59</sup>



## **H. Right to education**

37. The country team encouraged the Government to take measures towards ensuring access to education at all levels, increasing also educational standards and skills. It further encouraged the Government to step up efforts to provide free quality education for all.<sup>60</sup>

38. UNESCO strongly encouraged Nauru to make further efforts to ensure students with disabilities or students with special needs' access to education.<sup>61</sup>

39. UNESCO observed that salaries of teaching staff at all levels in Nauru were low compared with other regions,<sup>62</sup> and there was a lack of qualified local teachers. Besides, higher education in Nauru was also limited.<sup>63</sup> It encouraged Nauru to take further action to improve quality education at all levels.<sup>64</sup>

## **I. Cultural rights**

40. Noting that Nauru was a State party to the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, UNESCO encouraged it to fully implement the relevant provisions that promote access to and participation in cultural heritage and creative expression. It also encouraged Nauru to give due consideration to the participation of communities, practitioners, cultural actors and non-governmental organizations from civil society and vulnerable groups, such as minorities, indigenous peoples, migrants, refugees, young people and people with disabilities, and to ensure that equal opportunities were given to women and girls to address gender disparities.<sup>65</sup>

## **J. Persons with disabilities**

41. The country team observed that the national disability policy of Nauru was still in draft form and there was currently no legislation that specifically addressed the rights of persons with disabilities. It encouraged the Government to continue efforts to implement CRPD, including but not limited to through the adoption of a national disability policy and legislation and the mainstreaming of CRPD across all sectors.<sup>66</sup>

42. The country team further encouraged Nauru to seek and utilize technical support and guidance on promoting and protecting the human rights of persons with disabilities through an effective implementation of CRPD.<sup>67</sup>

## **K. Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers**

43. UNHCR observed that, under the 2013 memorandum of understanding signed between Nauru and Australia, asylum seekers without prior authorization would be relocated to Nauru. Currently, there was considerable uncertainty over refugees' ability to access durable solutions in Nauru, as they were only granted a temporary settlement visa to remain in the country for up to five years and did not enjoy their full rights under the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. UNHCR recommended that the question of post-processing conditions, including any settlement services, be clearly addressed in order to ensure that all refugees enjoyed the rights to which they were entitled under the Convention and other applicable international laws and standards. UNHCR further recommended that Nauru undertake, prior to any relocation, an individualized assessment of individual refugees' specific needs to ensure that appropriate support and assistance was available in the third State, including any special support required for individuals with specific needs.<sup>68</sup>

44. At the time of the visit of UNHCR in October 2013, asylum seekers were subject to deprivation of their liberty, on a mandatory basis, in a closed place without an assessment as to the necessity and proportionality of the purpose of such detention in the individual case, and without being brought promptly before a judicial or other independent authority. This was still the case for transferred asylum seekers in Nauru.<sup>69</sup> UNHCR recommended that Nauru ensure that reception arrangements for asylum seekers respect human dignity and applicable international human rights law and standards; that it provide asylum seekers with reasons for their detention in writing and in a language they understand; and that it allow them to challenge the decision to detain, with periodic reviews thereafter to ensure no one was detained longer than necessary, with express maximum periods for such detention. UNHCR further recommended that Nauru, as a matter of urgency, review the conditions at the regional processing centre with a view to alleviating the cramped conditions and exposure to heat, and to enhancing privacy for all asylum seekers.<sup>70</sup> When viewing the legal parameters and practical realities of the regional processing centre in their totality, UNHCR was of the view that the mandatory detention of asylum seekers in Nauru amounted to arbitrary detention, which is inconsistent with international law.<sup>71</sup>

45. The country team observed that the policy and implementation of offshore processing for asylum seekers had been heavily criticized by the international human rights community as inconsistent with international human rights standards, including the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and CAT.<sup>72</sup> The country team was concerned that current policies, conditions and operational approaches at the processing centre were largely non-compliant with international standards, and in particular: (a) constituted arbitrary and mandatory detention under international law; (b) despite a sound legal framework, did not provide a fair, efficient and expeditious system for assessing refugee claims; (c) did not provide safe and humane conditions of treatment in detention; and (d) did not provide for adequate and timely solutions for refugees.<sup>73</sup> The country team found that the offshore processing centres, as implemented in Nauru, did not offer durable solutions for asylum seekers and migrants, and therefore urged the Government to consider their immediate closure.<sup>74</sup>

46. UNHCR noted that it was inappropriate to send asylum-seeking children to regional processing centres in remote locations, and that the mandatory and prolonged detention of such children may be in breach of CRC and other international human rights instruments. Moreover, children had been transferred without an assessment of their best interests and without adequate services in place to ensure their mental and physical well-being. Furthermore, children were in closed detention, in difficult conditions, without access to adequate educational and recreational facilities and with a lack of a durable solution within a reasonable time frame.<sup>75</sup> UNHCR recommended that Nauru cease to receive transferred asylum-seeking children — whether accompanied, unaccompanied or separated — to Nauru under the current conditions. However, if children were transferred, Nauru should: (a) ensure they are treated in full respect of CRC and other applicable instruments; (b) prioritize their claims for international protection, which should be carried out by suitably qualified officials who are also able to determine their best interests; and (c) appoint an independent and qualified guardian and a legal adviser in the case of any unaccompanied or separated children.<sup>76</sup>

47. The country team was also concerned at the impact of detention on the physical and mental health of asylum seekers, particularly of children.<sup>77</sup> Prolonged detention was having profound negative impacts on the mental and physical health and development of children. The country team urged Nauru to release all children from immigration detention as a matter of priority. Children should be placed in detention as a measure of last resort and for the shortest appropriate period of time.<sup>78</sup>

48. UNHCR recommended that Nauru assess the legality and/or appropriateness of any relocation of a recognized refugee on a case-by-case basis, in the light of the particular modalities, legal provisions and sustainability.<sup>79</sup>

49. UNHCR also recommended that that Nauru ensure that the refusal to accept an offer for relocation to a third country did not, ipso facto, raise questions about the individual's refugee status and was not grounds for the cessation or cancellation of status.<sup>80</sup>

50. UNHCR further recommended that the necessary action be taken to implement complementary protection covering all asylum seekers who are found not to be refugees but are in need of international protection, and to establish a procedure to determine statelessness and grant protection status to stateless migrants.<sup>81</sup>

## L. Environmental issues

51. The country team was concerned that phosphate mining, under way since the early 1900s, has had a devastating impact on the physical environment of the island, starkly captured in the permanent damage to 80 per cent of land effectively lost to human habitation, agriculture or any type of development. In addition, cadmium residue, phosphate dust and other contaminants had caused air and water pollution, with negative impacts on health.<sup>82</sup>

52. The country team encouraged the Government to prioritize the enactment of legislation for sustainable development, including provisions for environmental impact assessment, environmental reporting and planning, waste management and pollution control. In view of the heavy toll that phosphate mining had taken on community health and well-being, the country team recommended that no phosphate or other mining activity be undertaken until a comprehensive impact assessment had been carried out and until a robust regulatory framework was in place to ensure that operations were undertaken sustainably and without further interference with the rights of Nauruans to health and a reasonable standard of living.<sup>83</sup>

53. The country team commented that asbestos posed an urgent health risk, with one quarter of roofs surveyed indicating the use of asbestos cement sheeting. It encouraged immediate management of this situation.<sup>84</sup>

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> Unless indicated otherwise, the status of ratification of instruments listed in the table may be found on the official website of the United Nations Treaty Collection database, Office of Legal Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat, <http://treaties.un.org/>. Please also refer to the United Nations compilation on Nauru from the previous cycle (A/HRC/WG.6/10/NRU/2).

<sup>2</sup> The following abbreviations are used in the present document:

ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
OP-ICESCR	Optional Protocol to ICESCR
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICCPR-OP 1	Optional Protocol to ICCPR
ICCPR-OP 2	Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
OP-CEDAW	Optional Protocol to CEDAW

CAT	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
OP-CRC-AC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict
OP-CRC-SC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography
OP-CRC-IC	Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure
ICRMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
OP-CRPD	Optional Protocol to CRPD
ICPPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance

<sup>3</sup> Individual complaints: ICCPR-OP 1, art. 1; OP-CEDAW, art. 1; OP-CRPD, art. 1; OP-ICESCR, art. 1; OP-CRC-IC, art. 5; ICERD, art. 14; CAT, art. 22; ICRMW, art. 77; and ICPPED, art. 31. Inquiry procedure: OP-CEDAW, art. 8; CAT, art. 20; ICPPED, art. 33; OP-CRPD, art. 6; OP-ICESCR, art. 11; and OP-CRC-IC, art. 13. Inter-State complaints: ICCPR, art. 41; ICRMW, art. 76; ICPPED, art. 32; CAT, art. 21; OP-ICESCR, art. 10; and OP-CRC-IC, art. 12. Urgent action: ICPPED, art. 30.

<sup>4</sup> Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field (First Convention); Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea (Second Convention); Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (Third Convention); Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (Fourth Convention); Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I); Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II). For the official status of ratifications, see International Committee of the Red Cross, [www.icrc.org/IHL](http://www.icrc.org/IHL).

<sup>5</sup> Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Adoption of an Additional Distinctive Emblem (Protocol III). For the official status of ratifications, see International Committee of the Red Cross, [www.icrc.org/IHL](http://www.icrc.org/IHL).

<sup>6</sup> Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

<sup>7</sup> International Labour Organization Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29); Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105); Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87); Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98); Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100); Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111); Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138); Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182).

<sup>8</sup> See country team submission for the universal periodic review of Nauru, para. 4.

<sup>9</sup> See A/HRC/17/3/Add.1, para. 2. See also A/HRC/17/3, paras. 79.2 (Algeria), 79.3 (United States of America), 79.4 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), 79.5 (Sweden), 79.6 (Brazil), 79.13 (Spain), 79.14 (Argentina), 79.17 (France), 79.20 (Chile), 79.21 (France), 79.23 (Italy), 79.24 (Slovenia) and 74.25 (Poland).

<sup>10</sup> See country team submission, para. 4.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 10.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 8.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 3.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 6.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, para.3.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 5.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 47.

<sup>18</sup> See UNHCR submission for the universal periodic review of Nauru, para. 10.

<sup>19</sup> See UNESCO submission for the universal periodic review of Nauru, para. 11.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, para.15.

- <sup>21</sup> See country team submission, para. 12.
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid., para. 7.
- <sup>23</sup> See UNESCO submission, p. 14.
- <sup>24</sup> See [www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=15926&LangID=E](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=15926&LangID=E).
- <sup>25</sup> See A/HRC/17/3/Add.1, para. 19. See also country team submission, para. 9.
- <sup>26</sup> See country team submission, para. 9.
- <sup>27</sup> Ibid., para. 26.
- <sup>28</sup> Ibid., paras.10 and 11.
- <sup>29</sup> See country team submission, para. 24.
- <sup>30</sup> Ibid., para. 18.
- <sup>31</sup> See A/HRC/17/3, para. 79.53 (Israel). See also A/HRC/17/3/Add.1, paras. 45 and 46.
- <sup>32</sup> See country team submission, para. 13.
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid., para. 51.
- <sup>34</sup> For the titles of special procedures mandate holders, see [www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/SP/Pages/Themes.aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/SP/Pages/Themes.aspx) and [www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/SP/Pages/Countries.aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/SP/Pages/Countries.aspx).
- <sup>35</sup> See country team submission, para. 14. See also A/HRC/17/3/Add.1, para. 23.
- <sup>36</sup> See A/HRC/17/3/Add.1, para. 51.
- <sup>37</sup> See OHCHR, “OHCHR in the field: Asia and the Pacific” (2014), page 223.
- <sup>38</sup> See country team submission, para. 19; A/HRC/17/3, paras. 79.74 (United Kingdom) and 79.75 (Sweden); and A/HRC/17/3/Add.1, para. 31.
- <sup>39</sup> See country team submission, para. 24. See also A/HRC/17/3/Add.1, paras. 18 and 26.
- <sup>40</sup> See country team submission, para. 24; A/HRC/17/3, paras. 79.58 (Algeria), 79.60 (Slovakia) and 79.61 (Argentina); and A/HRC/17/3/Add.1, para. 25.
- <sup>41</sup> See country team submission, para. 21. See also A/HRC/17/3/Add.1, para. 28.
- <sup>42</sup> See [www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=15926&LangID=E](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=15926&LangID=E).
- <sup>43</sup> See country team submission, para. 22. See also A/HRC/17/3/Add.1, para. 29.
- <sup>44</sup> See country team submission, paras. 55 and 56.
- <sup>45</sup> Ibid., para. 25.
- <sup>46</sup> Ibid., para. 27.
- <sup>47</sup> See A/HRC/26/21, page 47.
- <sup>48</sup> See country team submission, para. 29.
- <sup>49</sup> Ibid., para. 31.
- <sup>50</sup> Ibid., para. 32.
- <sup>51</sup> See UNHCR submission, p. 7.
- <sup>52</sup> See country team submission, para. 54.
- <sup>53</sup> See [www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=15995&LangID=E](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=15995&LangID=E).
- <sup>54</sup> See country team submission, para. 33.
- <sup>55</sup> Ibid., para. 36.
- <sup>56</sup> Ibid., para. 37.
- <sup>57</sup> Ibid., para. 38.
- <sup>58</sup> Ibid., para. 40.
- <sup>59</sup> Ibid., para. 41.
- <sup>60</sup> Ibid., para.42.
- <sup>61</sup> See UNESCO submission, p. 14.
- <sup>62</sup> Ibid., p. 8.
- <sup>63</sup> Ibid., p. 10.
- <sup>64</sup> Ibid., p. 14.
- <sup>65</sup> Ibid., p. 15.
- <sup>66</sup> See country team submission, para.44.
- <sup>67</sup> Ibid., para. 45.
- <sup>68</sup> See UNHCR submission, p. 8.
- <sup>69</sup> Ibid., p. 5.
- <sup>70</sup> Ibid., p. 7.
- <sup>71</sup> Ibid., p. 6.
- <sup>72</sup> See country team submission, para. 46.

- <sup>73</sup> Ibid., para. 47.  
<sup>74</sup> Ibid., para. 50.  
<sup>75</sup> See UNHCR submission, p. 6.  
<sup>76</sup> Ibid., pp. 7 and 8.  
<sup>77</sup> See country team submission, para. 49.  
<sup>78</sup> Ibid., para.53.  
<sup>79</sup> See UNHCR submission, p. 9.  
<sup>80</sup> Ibid., p. 9.  
<sup>81</sup> Ibid., p.11.  
<sup>82</sup> See country team submission, para. 58.  
<sup>83</sup> Ibid., para. 60.  
<sup>84</sup> Ibid., para. 57.
-