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## Acronyms and Key Terms

### The Treaties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment of Punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPD</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCPR</td>
<td>International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPR</td>
<td>Committee Human Rights Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICERD</td>
<td>International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICESCR</td>
<td>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Treaty Bodies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAT Committee</td>
<td>Committee Against Torture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW Committee</td>
<td>Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC Committee</td>
<td>Committee on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPD Committee</td>
<td>Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCPR Committee</td>
<td>Human Right Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICERD Committee</td>
<td>Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICESCR Committee</td>
<td>Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRFT</td>
<td>Country Report Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI</td>
<td>List of Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOIPR</td>
<td>List of Issues Prior to Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP</td>
<td>Inadequately Served Populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infection/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHRI</td>
<td>National Human Rights Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM</td>
<td>National Preventative Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCR</td>
<td>United Nations Human Rights Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDHR</td>
<td>Universal Declaration of Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPR</td>
<td>Universal Periodic Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inadequately Served Populations</strong></td>
<td>marginalised youth, men who have sex with men, migrant populations, people who use drugs, sex workers, and trans persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marginalised Youth</strong></td>
<td>young people between the ages of 10 to 24 who have weakened or severed family ties, are subject to social stigmatisation and who are not connected with a social institution. For the purposes of this report, marginalised youth are: youth living with HIV/AIDS, youth who identify as LGBT, youth who use drugs, migrant populations and youth who live in the street and youth in state alternative or foster care facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men who have sex with men</strong></td>
<td>male persons who engage in sexual practices with members of the same sex, regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Migrant Populations</strong></td>
<td>persons who have left their home country or country of former habitual residence and live in another country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People who use Drugs</strong></td>
<td>all persons, adult or child, who allow drugs not medically sanctioned to enter their bodies. The manner in which the drugs enters the body include but are not limited to swallowing, smoking, snorting or injecting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex Workers</strong></td>
<td>all consenting female, male and transgender persons who are eighteen years or older and who sell or exchange sex for money, goods or services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trans Persons</strong></td>
<td>individuals whose gender expression or gender identity does not conform to traditional expectations based on the physical sex into which they were born.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

This report provides a general introduction to seven of the United Nations (UN) human rights treaties and the State party reporting process under the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) and human rights treaty bodies.

The treaties covered in this report are:
1. The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;
2. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;
3. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;
4. The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women;
5. The Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;
6. The Convention on the Rights of the Child; and

The report also surveys the most recent concerns and recommendations coming out of the UPR and the treaty bodies in relation to the twelve independent English speaking countries of the Commonwealth Caribbean and the Dominican Republic. The survey specifically focuses inadequately served populations (ISPs) and how matters which concern them are represented, and in some cases are not represented, during these processes.

ISPs are groups or persons that face a higher HIV risk, mortality and morbidity when compared to the general population, and have, at the same time, less access to information and services.
ISPs include but are not limited to people living with HIV, gay men and other men who have sex with men, people who use drugs, prisoners, sex workers and trans people. Increased risks and information access will vary in localities which will result in an expansion of ISP groups to further include youth, migrants and people living in rural areas. The ISPs at the centre of this report are marginalised youth, men who have sex with men, migrant populations, people who use drugs, sex workers, and trans persons.

The report also presents in tabular form reports from past cycles of country reporting from the independent Commonwealth Caribbean countries and the Dominican Republic, including relevant dates for submissions of upcoming reports under the same mechanisms.

The aim of the report is to improve the capacity of global and regional networks and their membership to have targeted, coordinated and sustained advocacy in international human rights reporting to protect the of the rights of ISPs.

The report contains four parts and two annexes. Part A presents a brief overview of international human rights treaties and then provides a broad survey of the fundamental general principles and articles of each of the treaties in the context of the ISPs. It considers General Comments and General Recommendations made by the respective treaty bodies, jurisprudence and recommendations in concluding observations. Part B presents a short explanation of the functions of treaty bodies before describing in general terms the process of considering State reports. Part C describes what the UPR is and its reporting process. Making use of the explanation of the reporting process and an introduction into general principles, Part D undertakes a country by country analysis of the concerns and recommendations made by the UPR and the respective treaty bodies of matters related to ISPs. The concluding observations made at the end of each reporting cycle and the working group report of the UPR Working Group are the primary documents utilised in this analysis.

Annex 1 sets out the specific working methods for each treaty body for the consideration of State party reports. The methodology, outcome of the review and follow-up after the review are outlined. Additionally, the possibility and methods of NGOs contributing to each process is described.

Annex 2 presents in a tabular form the ratification status of the core UN human rights conventions. It also presents past cycles of country reporting and review in relation to the UPR and the core UN human rights conventions and upcoming exercises of reporting and review due before 2020 (with some deadlines up to 2021 included), and relevant dates for submissions of state and shadow reports.
International Human Rights Treaties

International treaties, also called conventions and covenants, are binding instruments of international law, made between States which set out rights, obligations and duties with which State parties have agreed to abide by. States become legally bound by provisions of treaties when they sign, then ratify or accede to them. Through ratification, States undertake to implement domestic measures and legislation compatible with their international human rights treaty obligations.

Though non-binding, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) is recognised as being the first international instrument to articulate the fundamental human rights and freedoms for all human beings. The core principles of universality, interdependence and indivisibility, equality and non-discrimination which have been reiterated in numerous international human rights treaties originated in the UDHR.¹

There are seven core international human right treaties in the UN human rights system. Each of these treaties has a treaty body constituted by a committee of experts whose function is to monitor the implementation of the treaty. Additionally, some of the treaties are supplemented by optional protocols which address specific thematic areas and expand the monitoring powers of the treaty bodies.

The treaties listed in the table to the right are the seven core international human rights treaties considered in this report.

---

³ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (adopted 16 December 1966, entered into force 23 March 1976) 999 UNTS 171
⁶ Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (adopted 10 December 1984, entered into force 26 June 1987) 1465 UNTS 85
International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination

I. Definition of racial discrimination
The ICERD uses a broad definition for racial discrimination which is defined as “any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life”.9 State parties are obliged to condemn racial discrimination and undertake all appropriate measures to eliminate racial discrimination.10

II. Indirect discrimination and de facto discrimination
Acts or practices which unintentionally lead to discrimination are prohibited as having the “effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise” of human rights.11 Whether an act or practice has an unjustifiable disparate impact upon a group will determine whether an action has a discriminatory effect.

III. Limits on discrimination against non-citizens
State parties are permitted to make distinctions, exclusions, restriction or preferences between its citizens and non-citizens.12 However, the permitted distinctions must be interpreted so as to “avoid undermining the basic prohibition of discrimination”13 and should be narrowly interpreted to not diminish the fundamental rights and freedoms recognised in international treaties.

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

I. The rights to life, liberty and security of the person
The ICCPR declares that “Every human being has the inherent right to life...protected by the law. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his life”.14 This is a non-derogable right which consequently should not be interpreted narrowly. Under this right, States are obliged to exercise due diligence to prevent, punish and redress deprivations of life, and to investigate and prosecute all acts of targeted violence.15

---

9 ICERD, art 1(1)
10 ICERD, art 2(1)
11 ICERD, art 1(1)
12 ICERD, art 1(2)
14 ICCPR, art 6(1)
The ICCPR also declares that “Everyone has the right to liberty and security of the person. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention.” Liberty of the person concerns freedom from confinement of the body, and security of the person concerns freedom from injury to the body, which is taken to mean bodily and mental integrity.

II. The rights to non-discrimination, equality before the law and equal protection of the law

Article 2(1) of the ICCPR contains the principle of non-discrimination which requires States to respect and ensure to all individuals the rights contained in the ICCPR “without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status”. These grounds are not exhaustive and the drafters intentionally left the possibility of other grounds of discrimination by using the phrase “other status”.

Equality before the law and equal protection of the law are guaranteed in Article 26 which states: “All persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to the equal protection of the law...” Simply put, equality before the law and equal protection of the law prohibit discrimination in States’ legislation (formal discrimination) and the application thereof (substantive discrimination), and is therefore not limited to those enumerated grounds of discrimination, unlike the general principle of non-discrimination. It must be noted that not every differentiation of treatment will constitute discrimination. In such a case, the differentiation must be reasonable and objective and have a legitimate aim under the ICCPR.

III. The right to privacy

The ICCPR provides for the right of every person to be protected against arbitrary or unlawful interference with his privacy, family and home, among others categories. States are required to prohibit such interferences and protect the right. “Unlawful” was defined to mean that no interference can occur save in cases sanctioned by law; “arbitrary interference” can extend to provisions sanctioned by law which fail to comply with the provisions, aims and objectives of the ICCPR and are unreasonable in the particular circumstances. In the context of sexual orientation, the ICCPR Committee stated that consensual sexual practices between adults of the same sex in private breaches an individuals’ right to privacy.
International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

I. Progressive realisation
State parties undertake to take steps to the maximum of its available resources, with a view to achieving progressively the full realisation of the rights recognised in the ICESCR. 21 This is called the principle of progressive realisation which acknowledges the financial constraints State parties may face. Yet it also imposes an immediate obligation to take targeted steps towards the full realisation of the ICESCR.

II. Non-discrimination
The ICESCR guarantees “everyone” the rights contained therein and States undertake to guarantee that the rights enunciated within the Covenant will be exercised without discrimination of any kind, including as to national or social origin. 22 States are under an obligation to respect this right by refraining from denying or limiting equal access for all persons.

III. The right to health
State parties recognise “the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health”. 23 This is not limited to the right to health care, but acknowledges the right to health includes “socio-economic factors that promote conditions in which people can lead a healthy life, and extends to underlying determinants of health”. 24 The right to sexual and reproductive health is a component of the right to health which extends beyond health care to the determinants of sexual and reproductive health. 25

IV. The right to work
State parties recognise “the right to work, which includes the right of everyone to the opportunity to gain his living by work which he freely chooses or accepts”. This affirms the obligations of States to assure the right of individuals the freedom to choose and accept decent work, which includes the right not to be unfairly deprived of work. 26

---

21 CESCR, art 2(1)
22 CESCR, art 2(2)
23 CESCR, art 12(1)
26 CESCR, art 6(1)
**Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women**

I. The principle of equality

The primary aim of CEDAW is the achievement of gender equality.\(^{28}\) While not defined in the CEDAW, the principle of equality runs throughout the Convention and can be divided into three theories of equality: formal equality, substantive equality and transformational equality.

Formal equality affirms that as equals, men and women should be treated the same. However, equality must go beyond formal legal obligation of equality of treatment which takes us to substantive equality. The CEDAW requires States to take all appropriate measures beyond legislation to ensure substantive equality between men and women.\(^{29}\) Transformational equality refers to improving the position of women by addressing the underlying causes of discrimination against women and their inequality.\(^{30}\)

II. The principle of non-discrimination

The CEDAW defines the term “discrimination against women” as “any distinction, exclusion or restriction made on the basis of sex which has the effect or purpose of impairing or nullifying the recognition, enjoyment or exercise by women, irrespective of their marital status, on a basis of equality of men and women, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural, civil or any other field”.\(^{31}\) Discrimination in all forms against women is condemned and States agree to use all appropriate means to eliminate discrimination against women.\(^{32}\) The human rights and fundamental freedoms mentioned are not limited to those contained in the CEDAW, but include those contained in other international treaties.\(^{33}\)

III. Specific provision: Suppress traffic in women and exploitation of prostitution

States are obliged to take all appropriate measures, including legislation, to suppress all forms of traffic in women and exploitation of prostitution of women.\(^{34}\) These practices are incompatible with the equal enjoyment of rights by men and women and with respect for their rights and dignity. In this regard, it recognised that women in prostitution are particularly vulnerable to HIV/AIDS.\(^{35}\)

---


29 CEDAW, art 3

30 CEDAW Committee ‘General Recommendation No. 25: Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Convention (temporary special measures)’ in ‘Secretariat Compilation Volume II’, 365, para 8

31 CEDAW, art 1

32 CEDAW, art 2


34 CEDAW, article 6

35 CEDAW Committee ‘General Recommendation No. 24: Article 12 of the Convention (Women and Health)’ in ‘Secretariat Compilation Volume II’, 358, para 18
I. Prohibition of torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment

The CAT provides for an absolute prohibition against torture. For an act to be considered torture there are three elements which must be present under the CAT: the infliction of severe mental or physical pain or suffering; by or with the consent or acquiescence of state authorities; for a specific purpose, such as gaining information, intimidation or punishment. Furthermore, States are also obliged to take effective measures to prevent torture.

Acts or treatment that while not amounting to torture, are cruel, inhuman and degrading (hereinafter called ill-treatment) when committed by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity are also prohibited. For acts not amounting to torture to be considered ill-treatment the following elements must be present: intentional exposure to significant mental or physical pain or suffering; and it must be by or with the consent or acquiescence of the State authorities. The obligations to prevent torture and ill-treatment extend to all contexts of custody and control: in prisons, hospitals, institutions that care of children, the mentally ill or disabled.

II. Protection for vulnerable groups

This obligation to prevent torture and ill-treatment extends to the protection of certain minority or marginalised individuals or populations. State parties are required to protect “all persons, regardless of race, colour ethnicity, age, religions belief or affiliation, political or other opinion, national or social origin, gender, sexual orientation, transgender identity, mental or other disability, health status, economic or indigenous status...”

III. Non-refoulement

The principle of “non-refoulement” guarantees that individuals have the right not to be forcibly returned to countries where they face persecution. Under the CAT, State parties shall not refoule, extradite, expel or return persons to another State where there are substantial grounds for believing that they would be in danger of being subject to torture. In evaluating whether the State’s action amounts to non-refoulement, it must be determined whether the individual concerned would be personally at a foreseeable and real risk of being subject to torture in the country to which he or she would return.
Convention on the Rights of the Child

I. Non-discrimination
All children should enjoy their rights and should not be subject to discrimination of any kind, irrespective of the child's or their parents or legal guardian's race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, property, disability, birth or other status. The CRC Committee has said that the right to non-discrimination in the CRC includes sexual orientation, gender identity and HIV/AIDS status.

II. Best interests of the child
The best interests of the child shall be the primary consideration in all actions concerning children. There are three different types of obligations for State parties: the obligation to ensure that the child's best interests are appropriately integrated and consistently applied in every action taken by a public institution; the obligation to ensure that all judicial and administrative decisions concerning children demonstrate that its primary consideration is the best interest of the child; and the obligation to ensure that the interests of the child have been assessed and taken as a primary consideration in decisions and actions taken by the private sector.

III. Right to life, survival and development
State parties recognise that every child has the inherent right to life and shall ensure to the maximum extent possible the survival and development of the child. This has been taken to mean that children have the right to benefit from economic and social policies that will allow them to survive to into adulthood.

IV. The views of the child
The CRC encourages adults to listen to the views of children and involve them in the decision-making. It neither gives children authority over adults nor interferes with parents' rights to makes decisions of their child. However, the right to express views freely and have them duly taking into account is fundamental in adolescents realising to safely and property exercise their right to health and development.

43 CRC, art 2(1)
45 CRC, art 3(1)
46 CRC Committee 'General Comment No. 14 on the rights of the child to have his or her best interests taken as a primary consideration (art 2, para 1)' (2013) UN Doc CRC/C/ GC/14 (General Comment No. 14), para 14 http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2fC%2fGC%2f14_&Lang=en accessed 30 October 2016
47 CRC, art 6(1)-(2)
48 CRC Committee 'General Comment No. 3: HIV/AIDS' (n 44), para 11
49 CRC, art 12(1)
I. General principles
The CRPD reaffirms the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights contained in the core international human rights treaty conventions. It is unique in that it sets out general principles to inform interpretation of the CRPD. The general principles include but are not limited to accessibility, equality of opportunity and full and effective participation and inclusion in society.51

II. Accessibility
Accessibility is crucial for disabled persons to lead an independent life and to participate fully and equally in society. States are required to identify and eliminate obstacles and barriers to accessibility.52 All services open or provided to the public must take into account all aspects of accessibility for persons with disabilities.53 Otherwise, persons with disabilities would be denied health care and social protection without access to the relevant service centres.

III. Equal recognition before the law
Under the CRPD, State parties reaffirm that persons with disabilities have the right to recognition everywhere as persons before the law and recognise that they enjoy legal capacity on an equal basis with others in all aspects of life. Furthermore, perceived or actual deficits in mental capacity must not be used as justification for denying legal capacity.54

---

51 CRPD, art 3
52 CRPD, art 9(2)
Monitoring of Human Rights Treaty Obligations: Treaty Bodies

Treaty bodies, which are committees of independent experts, monitor State implementation and adherence to human rights treaty obligations. This section gives a brief overview of the work of most of the functions of treaty bodies and provides a general explanation of the reporting process to treaty bodies.

What are human rights treaty bodies?

Upon the ratification, accession or succession to international human rights treaties, States undertake to promote and protect the human rights contained in the relevant treaties. Each treaty creates a treaty body to encourage and assist States fulfil their treaty obligations to ensure everyone in the State enjoys the rights enunciated in the treaty. The human rights obligations contained in the relevant treaties are monitored by the following treaty bodies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREATY</th>
<th>TREATY BODY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICERD</td>
<td>Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCPR</td>
<td>Human Rights Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICESCR</td>
<td>Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>Committee Against Torture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Committee on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPD</td>
<td>Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Function of Human Rights Treaty Bodies

Treaty bodies perform a number of functions, the aim of which is to monitor the implementation of the rights in their establishing treaty. The general functions of a treaty body include consideration of State parties’ periodic reports, consideration of individual complaints, conduct country inquiries and adopt general comments interpreting treaty provisions.

Consideration of State party periodic reports

Monitoring the implementation of the relevant rights in the treaty by reviewing State party reports is a commonality of all the treaty bodies. Each treaty body has its own unique working methods and rules of procedure to scrutinising State parties’ international human rights treaty compliance. More specific information relating to a treaty body’s working methods can be found in Annex 1. The following presents common features of the process treaty bodies go through when considering State reports.

I. The State’s Obligation to Report

States have an obligation not only to ensure that everyone enjoys the rights contained in the treaties, but to also submit regular reports to the relevant treaty bodes on the measures it has adopted to give effect to the rights contained in the relevant treaty. A State party must submit an initial report typically within one year of the treaty entering into force in that State (two years in the cases of the ICCPR, the CRC and the CRPD). The State then must submit periodic reports at intervals specified within the provision of the treaty (typically every four or five years) on the progress made to further implement the treaty. This initial report commences the first cycle of the State’s review and subsequent periodic reports represent succeeding cycles of review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREATY BODY</th>
<th>INITIAL REPORT</th>
<th>PERIODIC REPORT EVERY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICERD</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCPR</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>4 years(^{55})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICESCR(^{56})</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPD</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{55}\) Art 40 of the ICCPR give the ICCPR Committee the discretion to establish when periodic reports shall be submitted. In general, they are required every four years.

\(^{56}\) Article 17 of the ICESCR does not establish reporting periods, but grants the Economic and Social Council, which created the ICESCR Committee, the discretion to establish its own reporting periods.
In order to assist States on the form and content of their State reports, the OHCHR has prepared guidelines to assist States on the form and content of their State reports. 57

II. Submission of the Initial Report
State reports are submitted to the Secretary-General of the UN. Once submitted the report is scheduled to be considered at one of the upcoming sessions of the treaty body.

III. List of Issues and Questions
Before the session of the treaty body at which the State report will be reviewed, the treaty body will draft a list of issues (LOI) or questions based on the submitted report as well as other sources of information, such as reports by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) or national human rights institutions (NHRIs). When the list of issues is drafted depends on the treaty body. LOI are drafted at the session immediately preceding the session at which the State under review will be considered. The ICESCCR Committee, the CEDAW Committee and the CRC Committee convene a one-week, pre-sessional working group to draft the lists of issues and questions. Most of the treaty bodies appoint a country rapporteur for the State party from amongst its members who will draft the LOI for the State under review.

IV. List of Themes
The CERD Committee developed an alternative to the LOI called list of themes. The list of themes is a compilation of themes of topics which should be raised in the course of the session. It does not require written replies and is meant to guide the dialogue between the State under review and the ICERD Committee. 58

---


V. Written Response to the List of Issues
The State under review may sometimes submit a written response to the LOI and questions which can supplement the State party report.

VI. List of Issues prior to Reporting
The CAT Committee adopted a new optional reporting procedure which consists of the preparation and adoption of lists of issues prior to reporting (LOIPR). It is envisioned that the LOIPR, transmitted to State parties prior to the submission of their reports, will guide the preparation and content of their reports. They are transmitted to the State party concerned at least one year in advance of the due reporting date. The State under review’s response will constitute its periodic report.

VII. Other sources of information
Treaty bodies can accept relevant country information from third parties during the review process. UN agencies, NGOs and NHRCs among others can submit information at different times throughout the review process in the form of shadow reports or oral information. Depending where in the cycle the submissions were made, they may be incorporated into LOI, list of themes or the concluding observations. Treaty body specific details on the manner in which NGOs can participate in the process are considered in Annex 1.

VIII. Consideration of the report at the session
State parties are invited to send a delegation to the session of the committee at which their report will be considered. This is done to facilitate an interactive dialogue between the State under review and the committee during which the State can respond to committee member questions and provide additional information on recent developments.

IX. Concluding observations and recommendations
At the end of the session, concluding observations are adopted which are intended to give the State under review practical advice and encouragement on further steps to ensure implementation of the respective treaty rights. The treaty bodies recognise the positive steps taken by State to guarantee the enjoyment of the relevant rights and also identify areas for the State under review to work on to give full effect to the treaty obligations.

X. Follow-up
For subsequent reports, the State under review is expected to report back on the steps taken to implement the recommendations made by the treaty body in the previous concluding observations. Treaty bodies can also request that the State under review report back to the country rapporteur within a certain period of time. The ICERD Committee, ICCPR Committee, CEDAW Committee and the CAT Committee request in the concluding observations that the State under review report back to the country rapporteur within one year. The CEDAW Committee request follow up within two years.
The Universal Periodic Review

What is the Universal Periodic Review

The UPR is a unique mechanism of the United Nations Human Rights Council (HRC). Its objective is to improve the human rights situation on the ground of the 193 Member States of the United Nations. It is administered by the UPR Working group which consists of the 47 members of the HRC.

Under the UPR, the human rights of all UN Member States is reviewed every four and a half years with 42 States reviewed each year. The UPR sessions take place at the HRC in Geneva the basis of which are documents submitted to the HRC.

The Universal Periodic Review Reporting Process

I. Basis of the review

The UPR is based on the following documents: a national report submitted by the State under review; information contained in the reports of Special Procedures, human rights treaty-bodies, and other UN entities; and information from other stakeholders, such as NGOs NHRIs.

The reviews are conducted by the UPR Working Group which assess the fulfilment of the State’s human rights obligations and commitments found in, among others, the Charter of the United Nations; the UDHR; human rights instruments to which a State is party; voluntary pledges and commitments made by States, including those undertaken when presenting their candidatures for election to the Human Rights Council; and applicable international humanitarian law.

II. Proceeding of the review
The review commences with a presentation by the State under review of its report and responds to questions submitted in advance. Following the presentation, an interactive dialogue takes place during which any UN Member State can pose questions, comments and/or make recommendations to the State under review. Each State review is assisted by groups of three States, known as “troikas”, who serve as rapporteurs.

At the end of the review by the Working Group, the Working Group Report is prepared by the troika with the involvement of the State under review and assistance from the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). The report consists of the questions, comments, and the recommendations made by States to the State under review, as well as the responses by the State under review on whether they will accept or decline to implement the recommendations.

III. Outcome report
The final Outcome Report of the UPR is adopted at a plenary session of the HRC. If the review takes place in February or May, the final Outcome Report will be adopted in June or September, respectively. If the review takes place in December, the final Outcome Report will be adopted the following March.

IV. Follow-up
Between cycles, States are encouraged to provide the HRC, on a voluntary basis, with a midterm update on follow-up to accepted recommendations. States have a responsibility to implement the recommendations contained in the outcome report and will account for their progress at subsequent cycles.

V. How NGOs can participate
NGOs can submit reports which will form part of a compiled stakeholder information report. The deadlines for stakeholder submissions are generally at least six months before the relevant session of the UPR Working Group. NGOs can attend the UPR Working Group session and can make statements at the end of the regular session of the HRC when the outcome of the States reviews are considered.
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Country Analysis

The following is a country by country analysis of the most recent recommendations, concerns and concluding observations related to the ISPs from the most recent reporting cycles of the UPR and treaty bodies. It presents the matters concerning the ISPs in broad thematic areas which the various treaty bodies and the UPR have highlighted to the State parties. In subsequent cycles of review it is expected that State parties would provide follow-up information to these matters for the committees to continue to monitor the further implementation of the treaty in the State party.
Antigua and Barbuda

I. Trafficking and Exploitation of Sex Workers
The CEDAW Committee was concerned with women and girls – though probably not trans women and girls – trafficked and forced into sex work and the lack of information on sex work and sex trafficking. The Committee did not ask for specific information on the condition of sex work.

II. Marginalised Youth: Basic Health & Welfare
The lack of an alternative care institution for marginalised boys and absence of foster care legislation was a concern for the CRC Committee. Alternative care arrangements for marginalised girls was not addressed. The CRC Committee, also concerned by the increasing substance abuse by children, recommended that the State take action to combat drug abuse and to ensure that children receive treatment and rehabilitation.

III. Discrimination against Migrant Populations
Discrimination against migrant populations was a concern of the ICERD Committee, particularly that the country’s constitution does not prohibit discrimination based on “national or ethnic origin”. It recommended that the State remedy this. The ICERD Committee was concerned at the absence of information on the non-discriminatory implementation of the rights to education, health and with reference to migrant populations. It also requested that the State analyse and address the de facto segregation of immigrant groups into distinct communities in certain areas of the country.

---
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I. Discrimination against Minority Groups: Marginalised Youth, Migrant Populations, Men who have sex with men, and Trans Persons

The CRC Committee expressed concern that societal discrimination persists against children living in poverty and Haitian immigrant children.\(^{74}\) It however did not mention children living with HIV/AIDS, yet expressed concern at the increasing incidents of HIV/AIDS among adolescents.\(^{75}\) The CRC Committee recommended that the State reform the non-discrimination provisions in the constitution to comply with that which exists in the CRC and to adopt a strategy to eliminate discrimination against vulnerable groups.\(^{76}\)

The ICERD Committee was concerned at reports of discrimination against migrants, Haitians in particular, and recommended that the Bahamas take all necessary punitive, educational and other measures to put an end to such conduct.\(^{77}\) The Bahamas, seemingly aware of the problem, at its most recent UPR accepted Spain’s recommendation to adopt immigration policies that protect the human rights of immigrants and refugees and promote the integration of racial minorities among the population of Bahamas.\(^{78}\)

Discrimination against sexual and gender minorities was only brought up in the State’s most recent UPR review in which the Bahamas noted recommendations from the USA and Canada to adopt measures to address discrimination and criminal acts of violence against individuals based on their sexual orientation and gender identity.\(^{79}\) While trans persons are included in the sexual orientation and gender minority groups, their issues were not individually considered.

---
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II. Marginalised youth: Health and wellbeing

The high rate of teenage pregnancies, drug abuse among adolescents and the increasing incidences of HIV/AIDS were a concern – the incidences of HIV/AIDS are a recurring concern – to the CRC Committee.\textsuperscript{80} To address this the CRC Committee recommended that the State focus on adequate adolescent health services, awareness-raising and integrating the right of the child into HIV/AIDS policies.\textsuperscript{81} Looking at the vulnerability of marginalised youth and the lack of information to inform policy, the CRC Committee expressed concern at the number of children involved in sexual exploitation and child pornography and lamented the lack of specific data and targeted measures on this issue.\textsuperscript{82}
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I. Trafficking and exploitation of sex workers
The absence of information and policy and legislative action on trafficking in women and girls and their exploitation in sex work was a concern of both the CEDAW Committee and the ICCPR Committee. Neither committee mentioned trans women and girls nor the conditions and treatment of sex workers.

II. Marginalised youth: Foster care and basic health and welfare
The CRC Committee was concerned that premature decisions were precluding family reunification in the foster care system and recommended that Barbados strengthen the foster care system. It also expressed concern about the rising incidence of HIV/AIDS and its effect on children infected and affected by the disease. It recommended that the State involve adolescents in the formulation of policy, provide appropriate adolescent health services and to enable access to medical treatment without parental consent. In this regard, the CEDAW Committee encouraged Barbados to strengthen its efforts to educate women and girls on ways of self-protection.

III. Men who have sex with men, and Trans persons
The ICCPR Committee expressed concern over discrimination against homosexuals and recommended that Barbados decriminalize sexual acts between adults of the same sex and take all necessary actions to protect homosexuals from harassment, discrimination and violence. Furthermore, the State accepted a recommendation from the Netherlands in its most recent UPR to protect the human rights of LGBT persons. Neither the concerns nor the recommendations articulated issues specific to trans persons.

IV. Migrant populations
The ICERD Committee strongly recommended that Barbados ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees.
Belize

I. Trafficking and exploitation of sex workers

The CEDAW Committee said it was concerned about the lack of information regarding the extent of trafficking and exploitation of sex work in the country and called upon Belize to fully enforce the Trafficking in Persons Prohibition Act and address the root cause of trafficking and exploitation to eliminate women’s vulnerability. The potential negative impact that increased tourism could have on the incidence of sex work and trafficking was looked at.\(^90\) The CEDAW Committee also recommended that Belize take measures for the rehabilitation and social integration of women and girls who are victims of trafficking and exploitation of sex work and monitor the impact negative impact of increased sex work and enhance related prevention.\(^91\)

II. Marginalised Youth: Discrimination against Indigenous Youth

The ICERD Committee expressed general concern at the discrimination, exclusion and poverty faced by the Mayan population preventing them from accessing health care and recommended that the State guarantee access to health care. It further recommended that Belize should develop bilingual intercultural education to favour the integration of such ethnic groups.\(^92\) While not expressly mentioning its application to marginalised youth, the general concern and broad recommendation can be applied to Maya youth.

The CRC Committee was more specific in its concerns and recommendations in relation to minorities and indigenous children. It was concerned about the widespread poverty and limited access to social and health services and education. It recommended that Belize strengthen its efforts to improve the equal enjoyment of all rights of children belonging to minorities and indigenous peoples, in particular, by prioritizing effective measures to reduce poverty among them. The Committee also recommended that Belize take measures to promote respect for the views of children, especially girls, belonging to minorities and indigenous peoples and facilitate their participation in all matters affecting them.\(^93\) Belize accepted similar recommendations at its UPR to combat discrimination and expend access to health care for indigenous peoples and marginalised groups.\(^94\)
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III. Marginalised Youth: Adolescent Health

The CRC Committee was worried at the high rate of teenage pregnancies and substances abuse among adolescents. It recommended that Belize implement its Sexual and Reproductive Health Policy and ensure access to reproductive health services for adolescents. It also recommended that the State increase awareness about the harmful effects of drugs, increase access and availability of counselling and that the State collect data on substance abuse among children and adolescents.95

The CRC Committee noted with deep concern the very high incidence of HIV/AIDS and adverse consequences suffered by children with HIV/AIDS. It recommended that the State undertake preventative and awareness-raising programmes, undertake a study to assess the prevalence of HIV/AIDS, including the number of children with the disease to devise a national plan of action.96

IV. Men who have sex with men, and Trans persons

The ICCPR Committee recommended that Belize should review its constitution and legislation to prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity and investigate violence against LGBT persons. It further urged the State party to include in its initial report information on the outcome of the case challenging the constitutionality of section 53 of the Criminal Code and section 5(1)(e) of the Immigration Act.97 Additionally, in its most recent UPR review, Belize accepted a similar recommendation from the USA to provide state authorities, including law enforcement and judicial officials, with human rights training for the protection of minority groups, such as LGBT persons.98 However, in all regards, the issues of trans persons were not specifically addressed.

V. Migrant Populations

The CRC Committee and the ICERD Committee Migrant were concerned that there was no statistical data covering migrant populations with regards to certain areas of the respective conventions.99 As part of the UPR, Belize accepted Uruguay’s recommendation that the State implement legislative provisions to prevent the criminalization of irregular migration. In addition, Belize agreed to encourage the use of alternative measures to deprivation of liberty, so that the detention of asylum seekers is established as a measure of last resort, while re-establishing the mechanism to determine refugee status.100
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I. Marginalised Youth: Non-discrimination

The CRC Committee recommended that the State implement non-discrimination laws and strengthen efforts to address societal discrimination, and its impact, against vulnerable groups of children, including indigenous children. It also recommended that the State adopt a policy to elimination discrimination against vulnerable groups. However, it was silent on involving marginalised youth in the drafting of the policy. Additionally, Dominica accepted a recommendation at its most recent UPR to provide an inclusive education for all children, in particular migrant children.

II. Marginalised Youth: Basic Health & Welfare

The wellbeing of marginalised youth were of concern to the CRC Committee and recommended that Dominica continue and strengthen its efforts to improve the enjoyment of the rights of indigenous children. The Committee further recommend that the State make health and sex education part of the school curriculum; undertake measures to address the rise in alcohol consumption and ensure mental health and counselling services are accessible to, and appropriate for, all adolescents, including indigenous children and those in rural areas.

III. Men who have sex with men, and Trans persons

Issues faced by men who have sex with men and trans persons were not raised by any of the treaty bodies to which Dominica reports. These ISP groups were only raised in Dominica’s UPR during which the State noted recommendations to decriminalise homosexuality and combat discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. Issues facing trans persons were seemingly conflated with those of men who have sex with men.

IV. Migrant Populations

The State accepted recommendations at the latest UPR for Dominica to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and to provide education for migrant children.
Dominican Republic

I. Trafficking and Exploitation of Sex Workers

The extent of sex trafficking in persons in the State and the sexual exploitation of women and girls concerned the CEDAW Committee and the ICCPR Committee. Both Committees together with the ICERD Committee were also concerned at the high risk of women of Haitian origin becoming victims of trafficking, the absence of effective measures to prevent trafficking, lack of official data, and the low numbers of prosecutions and convictions of perpetrators of trafficking, commercial and sexual exploitation. However only the CEDAW Committee called upon the State to address the root causes of sex work of women and girls – likely not trans women and girls – to eliminate their vulnerability to sexual exploitation and ensure their rehabilitation.

II. Marginalised Youth: Family Environment

The CRC Committee regrets the insufficient measures taken to protect Haitian children whose parents have been deported back to their country. It reiterated its previous recommendations to support families by establishing structures and procedures provided for by Law No. 136-03. It also recommended that Dominican Republic continue to evaluate the impact of social programmes for families and not deport children who are in the care of their family in the State party and ensure that children are not deported to a country where their protection is not guaranteed.
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III. Marginalised youth: Non-discrimination

The CRC Committee noted as a positive the criminalisation of discrimination but it remained concerned about the continuous discrimination and/or violence against marginalised youth. It suggested that the State urgently address discrimination against children, including by setting up a monitoring mechanism; and by providing child-friendly complaint mechanisms in State institutions and establishments used by children.\(^\text{112}\) Such mechanisms should be developed with the input of the marginalised youth who will use them.

IV. Marginalised youth: Haitian youth

The CRC Committee was concerned that the majority of child migrants, most of them from Haiti, lack residential permits and adequate access to services. It recommended that the State strengthen efforts to provide unaccompanied migrant children with shelter, care and protection. It urged the State to continue its efforts towards the adoption of coordinated protocols between the Dominican Republic and Haiti for the protection of children, as well as protocols for the voluntary return of migrant children.\(^\text{113}\) The views of child migrants throughout the process should be considered in accordance with their age and maturity.

V. Marginalised youth: Street children

The lack of implementation and strategy to respond to the needs of these children was a concern which prompted the CRC Committee to recommend that the State conduct a study on the scope of the phenomenon of children in street situations and ensure that they are implemented effectively by including adequate resources and a monitoring mechanism under CONANI.\(^\text{114}\)

VI. People who use drugs

The ICESCR was concerned that the criminalisation of drugs disproportionately affects consumers and person who traffic small quantities, who in turn receive long sentences in very overcrowded prisons with deplorable living conditions. It recommended that the State approach the problem of drug abuse from a health and human rights perspective, reconsider the criminalisation of drug use and ensure adequate standards of living in prison.\(^\text{115}\) Neither a national nor a prison harm reduction methods were not mentioned by the ICESCR Committee. Furthermore, the link between drug use and HIV transmission was not mentioned.

VII. Gender and Sexual Minorities

Addressing its concern at reports of discrimination and ill-treatment against persons because of their sexual orientation or gender identity, the ICCPR Committee directed the Dominican Republic to indicate that it shall not tolerate any form of social stigmatization, harassment, discrimination or violence against persons because

---
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of their sexual orientation or gender identity. It further recommended that the State should ensure that any discriminatory or violent acts motivated by the sexual orientation or gender identity of the victim are investigated, prosecuted and punished.\textsuperscript{116}

The ICESCR Committee also expressed concern at the persistence of discrimination on the groups of sexual orientation and gender identity and recommended that Dominican Republic adopt one policy to address comprehensively this form of discrimination.\textsuperscript{117} In fact, the country at its latest UPR agreed to adopt legislation to protect LGBT persons against gender-based violence and discrimination.\textsuperscript{118} In so doing, there is the possibility that trans specific issues are lost within the broader classification of sexual orientation and gender identity.

\section*{VIII. Discrimination against migrant populations with respect to descent affecting the acquisition of nationality}

The ICERD Committee, the CEDAW Committee, the ICCPR Committee and the CRC Committee all commented about discrimination against migrant populations based on descent affecting the acquisition of nationality. The concluding observations from the CRC Committee are the most up-to-date as they take into consideration the 2013 Constitutional Court ruling.

The ICERD Committee and the CEDAW Committee were worried about a situation of statelessness for persons of Haitian descent due to the State not issuing or reissuing documents to Dominicans of Haitian origin.\textsuperscript{119} The ICCPR Committee was concerned about the Migration Act and that it was applied retroactively in a number of cases in which recognition of the Dominican nationality of Dominican adults of Haitian origin was withdrawn.\textsuperscript{120}

The ICERD Committee recommended that State to respect the principle of non-discrimination in access to nationality and to implement the national plan of action for regularising illegal immigrants.\textsuperscript{121} The CEDAW Committee recommended that the State review the legal provisions on nationality and their implementation in respect of women of Haitian descent and their children.\textsuperscript{122} The ICCPR Committee recommended that the State should abstain from applying the 2004 General Migration Act retroactively and maintain Dominican nationality for persons who acquired it at birth.\textsuperscript{123}
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The CRC Committee expressed a deep concern about the 2013 Constitutional Court ruling which might deprive tens of thousands of persons of Haitian descent of their nationality. It strongly urged the State to, among other things, to ensure the restoration of nationality to all individuals, including children, born before the Constitution of 2010 who are affected by the Constitutional Court’s ruling; to ensure that no individual, including children, affected by the Constitutional Court’s ruling is deported; and to apply non-retroactive and non-discriminatory citizenship policies and practices. It also recommended that the State ratify the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons and the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.

Dominican Republic, cognizant of these issues, noted France’s recommendation during the latest UPR cycle to take all necessary measures to prevent statelessness and allow all residents to fully enjoy their fundamental rights in particular persons of Haitian’s descent who have been affected by the ruling of the Constitutional Tribunal of the 23rd of September 2013.

IX. Discrimination against migrant populations with respect to descent, national or social origin

The ICERD Committee and the ICCPR Committee expressed concern about discrimination based on national origin. They recommended that the State introduce provisions to prohibit discrimination in access to public places and discrimination practiced by persons, groups or organisations and suggested that the State undertake public information campaigns against intolerance. In this regard, it was recommended that the State ensure that cases of discrimination are investigated, that the perpetrators are prosecuted and punished. The State already accepted a recommendation from Slovenia at its UPR to introduce awareness-raising activities with the aim of eliminating conditions and attitudes perpetuating discrimination based on national origin and descent.
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I. Trafficking and exploitation of sex workers

The CEDAW Committee and the ICCPR Committee did not express concern about sex workers in Grenada but looked at high levels of human trafficking and the inadequate legislation and policy to address this issue.\(^\text{129}\) However, only the CEDAW Committee called upon the State to address the root causes of sex work of women and girls to eliminate their vulnerability to sexual exploitation and ensure their rehabilitation.\(^\text{130}\) Protecting persons already in sex work from harm was not considered by either Committee.

II. Marginalised youth: Children deprived of a family environment

The CRC Committee was concerned that the limited availability of childcare homes and the absence of a complaints mechanisms. It recommended that the State strengthen the foster care system and implement an independent complaints mechanism.\(^\text{131}\)

III. Marginalised youth: Basic health and welfare

The CRC Committee also urged the Grenada to ensure that young people are aware of prevention and protection methods relating to HIV/AIDS, including safe sex practices.\(^\text{132}\)
IV. Marginalised youth: Rural young women and girls
The CEDAW Committee noted that rural women of all ages have limited access to health and social services. It recommended that the State strengthen programmes to address poverty and improve access to health care and social services for rural women.\textsuperscript{133}

V. Men who have sex with men, and Trans persons
The ICCPR Committee, concerned that the Criminal Code penalizes same-sex sexual activities between consenting adults, recommended that the State should repeal these provisions of its laws.\textsuperscript{134} In a similar vein, the State noted the recommendations at its most recent UPR to take necessary measures to effectively prevent discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity, including decriminalizing same-sex practices.\textsuperscript{135} Trans persons and the issues they face were not mentioned in either report.

VI. Migrant populations
The CEDAW Committee noted the escalating extra regional migration movements and stated that there is a high probability of an increased number of asylum-seekers. To that end, it recommended that the State accede to the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol, the 1954 Convention on Stateless Persons and the 1961 Convention on the reduction of Statelessness.\textsuperscript{136}
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I. Trafficking and exploitation of sex workers

The CEDAW Committee was concerned at the continued prevalence of trafficking in women and girls and support services for victims of trafficking and the exploitation of sex workers. It called upon the State to address the causes of exploitation of sex workers and to make efforts to ensure the recovery and social reintegration of victims. It further urged the State to ensure that data was collected and analysed on the issue. The prosecution and conviction of human traffickers and persons who exploit sex workers was not mentioned.

II. Marginalised youth: Indigenous youth

The CEDAW Committee expressed concern at the poverty, difficulty accessing health and social services, and lack of participation in decision making of rural Amerindian women. While Amerindian young women were not singled out in their concern, they would likely face similar difficulties. The Committee recommended that the State address the needs of Amerindian women by ensuring access to health, education and income-generating projects, and addressing negative customs and traditional practices.

The CERD Committee expressed deep concern about the low secondary school and attendance of indigenous children and student and the school facilities in areas predominately inhabited by indigenous peoples. It recommended that the State train rural teachers, construct schools in rural areas and use culturally appropriate text books.

III. Marginalised youth: Non-discrimination

The CRC Committee remained concerned at the prevalence of discrimination against Amerindian children. Furthermore, the Committee is concerned about discrimination against children on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. It urged the State to ensure programmes developed address the situation of discrimination.

---
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against Amerindian children and children because of their sexual identity/or gender identity.\textsuperscript{140} The view of marginalised youth should be canvased and taken into consideration in the development of such programmes.

\textbf{IV. Marginalised youth: Basic health and welfare}

The CRC Committee looked at the low level of awareness and knowledge of HIV among Amerindian and socio-economically disadvantaged persons and person who live in the interior. It was particularly concerned at the significant increase in HIV cases for person between the ages of 15 and 19 years old. It recommended that the State undertake additional awareness-raising campaigns on HIV in its rural and interior regions, with particular attention to ensuring the accessibility of such information for Amerindian and socio-economically disadvantaged persons.\textsuperscript{141}

\textbf{V. Men who have sex with men, Trans persons}

The ICESCR Committee was concerned about the criminalisation of same-sex relations and cross-dressing. However, save mention of the criminalisation of cross-dressing, trans specific issues were not enunciated. The Committee recommended repealing the criminalisation of same-sex relations between consenting adults and provide effective protection for LGBT persons against any form of discrimination on the group of their sexual orientation.\textsuperscript{142} A form of the latter recommendation was accepted by the State in its most recent UPR wherein Guyana accepted a recommendation to strengthen the protection of LGBT individuals.\textsuperscript{143}


\textsuperscript{141} Ibid, para 51-52


I. Trafficking and exploitation of sex workers

The CEDAW Committee and ICESCR Committee looked at the transnational and international sexual exploitation of women and girls – though not trans women and girls – and the low rate of prosecution and conviction of perpetrators. Sex workers were not expressly mentioned in the concerns of either Committee. Both Committees recommended that the State undertake awareness-raising initiatives, train law enforcement officials and establish specific support and rehabilitation programmes for victims. Only the CEDAW Committee recommended that Jamaica gather and analyse data and information on sex workers.

II. Marginalised Youth: Basic Health and Welfare

The CEDAW Committee, the ICCPR Committee and CRC Committee noted the disproportionately high number of young women infected with HIV, poor access to sexual and reproductive health-care information and services and absence of information on adolescent health problems. The CEDAW Committee and CRC Committee recommended that the State monitor and collect data on access to health care and improve access to and the quality of sexual and reproductive health services. In this regard, Jamaica accepted a previous similar recommendation to strengthen awareness-raising campaigns about the forms of contracting HIV/AIDS and respective preventive
measures, particularly focusing on marginalised youth. The CEDAW Committee looked at lack of access to social and government services faced by rural women of all ages—which will include young rural women. It recommended that the State strengthen programmes to address poverty and unemployment for rural women and ensure that rural women have improved access to health-care and social services.

III. Marginalised youth: Street children

Children in street situations and issues relating to the phenomenon are a recurring concern for the CRC Committee. It recommended that the State continue efforts to protect street children and reduce their number by identifying and addressing the causes of the phenomenon.

IV. Men who have sex with men, Trans persons

The continued criminalisation of consensual same-sex relationships and the consequential promotion of discrimination against homosexuals was a concern to both the ICCPR Committee and the ICESCR Committee. Neither Committee looked at issues faced by trans persons. Both Committees recommended that Jamaica decriminalise same-sex relations between consenting adults and take all measure to end discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation. Jamaica noted a similar recommendation during its most recent UPR cycle to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, sexual orientation and gender identity. The ICCPR went further to recommend that the State remove the saving clauses from the Charter of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms relating to the Offences Against the Persons Act and Sexual Offences Act.

V. Migrant populations

The CEDAW was concerned about the inadequacy of services available to migrant populations and their lack of protection from forced repatriation. It urged the State to ensure adequate services and documentation for refugees and discontinue their forced repatriation, particularly in the case of Haitian migrants. However, the effect of inadequate services and forced repatriation in the context of refugee and migrant families was not considered. The CERD Committee and the ICESCR Committee were concerned that asylum-seekers and refugees did not have identity documents and that employers did not know asylum-seekers and refugees did not need work permits. The ICESCR Committee went further and recommended that the State adopt legislation to protect the rights of asylum-seekers and refugees.

150 CEDAW Committee ‘CO Jamaica’ (n 142), para 32
151 CRC Committee ‘CO Jamaica’ (n 145), para 60-61
153 ICCPR Committee ‘CO Jamaica’ (n 145), para 16; ICESCR Committee ‘CO Jamaica’ (n 150), para 9
154 HRC ‘UPR Jamaica’ (n 147), para 121.35
155 ICCPR Committee ‘CO Jamaica’ (n 145), para 16
156 CEDAW Committee ‘CO Jamaica’ (n 142), para 33 –34
### I. Trafficking and Exploitation of Sex Workers

The CEDAW Committee was concerned about the lack of information on sex workers in Saint Kitts and Nevis, the lack of adequate measures to prosecute pimps, and absence of data on trafficking in persons. The Committee urged the State to formulate a broad strategy against trafficking and sex work, which should include the prosecution and punishment of traffickers and pimps and data collection. It did not express concern about trans women sex workers or the conditions of sex work.

### II. Marginalised youth: Basic health and welfare

The high rate of teenage pregnancy was a concern for both the CEDAW Committee and the CRC Committee. Both Committees urged the State to intensify awareness-raising and sexual education aimed at responsible sexual behaviour. The limited availability of programmes and services and lack of adequate data in the area of adolescent health, including HIV/AIDS and sexual transmitted diseases was a concern for the CRC Committee.

### III. People who use drugs

The CEDAW Committee noted that marijuana is used in the country and expressed concern about the lack of sex-disaggregated data on drug use. In this regard it encouraged the State party to collect data on the use of drugs and...
alcohol and its possible correlation with violence against women. It also encourages the State party to implement measures in order to prevent addiction to all types of drugs by young people. The correlation between drug use HIV/AIDS transmission was not explored.

**IV. Men who have sex with men, Trans persons**
Matters concerning men who have sex with men, and trans persons were not considered by the treaty bodies to which the State reports. However, in its most recent UPR review, Saint Kitts and Nevis noted the recommendation from the USA to decriminalise homosexual conduct by repealing relevant provisions within the Offences against the Person Act that may be used to criminalize homosexual conduct between consenting adults.

---

162 UN General Assembly ‘CEDAW CO Saint Kitts’ (n 157), para 107-108
St. Lucia

I. Sex workers
The lack of information on the causes and extent of sex work in women and sexual exploitation of girls – trans women and girls were not mentioned – the lack of State awareness of the scale of sex work in the tourism industry, the exploitation of sex workers and the absence of efforts to combat the phenomenon. It recommended that the State address the causes of sex work including the link between tourism and sex work and that the State effectively prosecute and punish those who exploit sex workers. The CEDAW Committee also requested data on exploitation of sex work, trafficking in women, and on the number of prosecutions and convictions for those who exploit sex workers and traffickers.164

II. Marginalised youth: basic health and welfare
In relation to health, the absence of a comprehensive study on adolescent health problems, the fact that 16- and 17-year-olds are unable to access sexual and reproductive health-care services without parental consent and the increasing rate of HIV/AIDS infections were a concern for the CRC Committee.165 The high prevalence of alcohol abuse and drug use by adolescents, insufficient educational programmes to prevent such abuse, and insufficient training of professionals to work with adolescents at risk were also concerns of the CRC Committee.166

III. Marginalised youth: children deprived of a family environment
Within the context of alternative care of children, the lack of legislation to ensure effective monitoring of alternative care; that boys in need of protection were mixed with boys in conflict with the law in State facilities; and the lack of coordination between government ministries were concerns for the CRC Committee. It recommended that the State ensure periodic review of the placement of children in foster care and increase efforts to place children in need in family-type care. It also recommended that the State strengthen coordination between government ministries to establish a more integrated child protection system.167

166 Ibid, para 48-49
167 Ibid, para 38-39
IV. Men who have sex with men, and Trans persons

The ISPs of men who have sex with men, and trans persons were not raised in any concluding observations. However, the State accepted recommendations to carry out education and awareness-raising programs on the human rights of LGBT and intersex persons and to promote social change in relation to non-discrimination on the grounds of sexual.168

I. Trafficking and sexual exploitation of sex workers

The CEDAW Committee was concerned with sexual abuse and trafficking of women and girls and the lack of alternative employment opportunities for women who wish to leave sex work and sexually exploited girls.\(^{169}\) It recommended that the State gather data and analyse data on sexual exploitation and trafficking – though not sex work.\(^{170}\) The CEDAW Committee further recommended, among others, that Saint Vincent and the Grenadines strengthen measures to prevent transnational and internal trafficking for sexual abuse and exploitation and enhance support for victims of this trafficking and persons who wish to leave sex work.\(^{171}\)

II. Marginalised youth: Non-discrimination

The ICERD Committee was concerned by the discrimination faced by persons of indigenous ancestry. While not directly addressing marginalised youth, the general nature of the concern can extend to indigenous youth who are marginalised because of their descent. The ICERD Committee recommended that the Saint Vincent and the Grenadines include in its next periodic report information on affirmative action measures adopted to develop and protect Caribs.\(^{172}\) Information on the scope of the discrimination was not requested. The CRC Committee recommended that the State ensure fully implantation of non-discrimination in the spirit of the CRC and requested specific information on the measures and programmes the State undertakes to address discrimination against minority children and children with HIV/AIDS.\(^{173}\)

---


\(^{171}\) CEDAW Committee ‘CO Saint Vincent’ (n 167), para 23


III. Marginalised youth: Basic health and welfare

The CEDAW Committee was concerned that traditional attitudes and cultural norms hamper access to contraceptives for school girls. The Committee recommended that Saint Vincent and the Grenadines ensure free and adequate access to sexual and reproductive health services, review policies and protocols governing the provision of sexual and reproductive health services to girls and provide free and confidential family planning services at the community level.¹⁷⁴

The CRC Committee was also concerned that adolescents face health risks, including drug and alcohol abuse compounded by a lack of data and treatment programmes, and HIV/AIDS and that the rate of teenage pregnancy is high. It recommended that the State increase efforts to promote adolescent health and consider strengthening reproductive health education to reduce teenage pregnancy. It also recommended that the State undertake a survey on the scope of substance abuse by children and ensure child substance abusers have access to comprehensive treatment programmes.¹⁷⁵

Street children and the lack of data in this regard was a concern for the CRC which recommended that the State undertake a study on the phenomenon and assist street children reintegrate with their families.¹⁷⁶ The views of street children should obtained in order to determine their best interest.

IV. Marginalised youth: Alternative care

With respect to the State's foster care service, the CRC Committee was concerned that there is no legislative basis for foster care procedures, the alternative care service for abandoned children is not sufficient and that in some instances of “adoption” children are handed over for money. The CRC Committee recommended that a legal basis for alternative care and foster care be established, make use of existing structures to support abandoned children and give attention to abuse of adoption procedures for the purposes of trafficking.¹⁷⁷

V. Men who have sex with men, and Trans persons

This ISP group was not referred to in any concluding observations. However, the State accepted recommendations at its most recent UPR to draft laws to prohibit discrimination and violence against women and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons and to repeal provisions which may be used to criminalize consensual, same-sex sexual activity between adults.¹⁷⁸

VI. Trans persons

The CEDAW expressed concern that women in same-sex relationships – though probably not trans women– are excluded from categories of persons who can apply for protection under the Domestic Violence Act. It urged the State party to ensure that no women is excluded from seeking protection under the Act.

ministries to establish a more integrated child protection system.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁴ CEDAW Committee ‘CO Saint Vincent’ (n 167), para 36-37
¹⁷⁵ Ibid, para 40-41.50-51
¹⁷⁶ Ibid, para 46-47
¹⁷⁷ CRC Committee ‘CO Saint Vincent’ (n 171), para 32-33
¹⁷⁹ CEDAW Committee ‘CO Saint Vincent’ (n 167), para 20-21
Trinidad & Tobago

I. Trafficking and exploitation of sex workers
The CEDAW Committee expressed concern at the prevalence of trafficking in women and girls – though probably not trans women and girls – for purposes of labour and sexual exploitation; and the lack of information on exit programmes for women wish to leave sex work was also a concern.\textsuperscript{180} The CEDAW Committee recommended that Trinidad and Tobago address the root causes of trafficking in women and girls and ensure the rehabilitation and social reintegration of victims. With regards to sex workers, it recommended that persons who exploitation sex workers are investigated and punished and that women and girl sex workers be provide with alternatives to sex work.\textsuperscript{181}

II. Marginalised youth: Non-discrimination
The CRC Committee was concerned that children living in poverty and children living with HIV/AIDS may suffer discrimination when accessing basic services. It recommended that the State implement and adopt laws guaranteeing non-discrimination.\textsuperscript{182}

III. Marginalised youth: Children deprived of a family environment and alternative care
The CRC Committee expressed concern that neglected, abused and abandoned children were placed in industrial schools together with children in conflict with the law and recommended that they are duly protected and receive assistance for their recovery and social reintegration.\textsuperscript{183}

\textsuperscript{180} CEDAW Committee 'Concluding observations on the combined fourth to seventh periodic reports of Trinidad and Tobago' (2016) UN Doc CEDAW/C/TTO/CO/4-7, para 22 http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2fC%2fTTO%2fCO%2f4-7&Lang=en accessed 6 November 2016
\textsuperscript{181} Ibid, para 23
\textsuperscript{183} Ibid, para 43-44
IV. Marginalised youth: basic health and welfare

The continuing high rate of HIV/AIDS, especially among women, was a concern of the ICESCR Committee and the CEDAW Committee. It is important and telling to note that there are 14 years between the ICECR Committee report and that of the CEDAW Committee’s which was released in 2016. Both Committees urged Trinidad and Tobago to enhance provision of education on sexual and reproductive health. In this regard, the low levels of awareness of reproductive health issues were a concern for the CEDAW Committee and CRC Committee. Both Committees recommended that the State provide effective access to information on sexual and reproductive health and rights. The CEDAW Committee further recommended that the State undertake a survey to assess the effectiveness of these measures.

Growing incidences of substance abuse by children and the lack of legislation to protect children from this was a concern, including the widespread consumption of alcohol. It recommended that Trinidad and Tobago undertake public awareness campaigns and ensure children who abuse alcohol and drugs have access to effective and comprehensive treatment resulting in recovery and social reintegration.

V. Marginalised Youth: Street Children

The lack of information on the issue and specific programmes and measures was a concern for the CRC Committee which recommended that the State undertake a study on the root causes and scope of the phenomenon, take effective measures to ensure the full development of street children and that they are recover and socially reintegrate. It also recommended that the State establish a mechanism to receive complaints from street children.

VI. Men who have sex with men, and Trans persons

The ICCPR Committee and the ICESCR Committee were both concerned at the limited grounds of discrimination in the Equal Opportunities Act. Both Committees recommended including discrimination on groups of sexual orientation or infection with HIV/AIDS, among others, to the Equal Opportunities Act. Neither decriminalisation of consensual same-sex sexual practices nor trans specific issues were considered by either Committee.
Committee on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination

I. Methodology
Once a State report is submitted, the ICERD Committee designates one of its members to be the country rapporteur for the State under review. The country rapporteur plays a leading role in drafting the list of themes; examining the State report; and preparation of the concluding observations. The review takes the form of an interactive dialogue which commences with an oral presentation by the State under review followed by the country rapporteur presenting their analysis of the country situation and raising issues or questions to be addressed. Once the country rapporteur completes her presentation, other ICERD Committee members can give their comments and questions.

II. Outcome
At the conclusion of the interactive dialogue, the ICERD Committee adopts the finalised concluding observations prepared by the country rapporteur. The State under review is given the opportunity to provide comments on the concluding observations, which are appropriately reflected and the final document is made public.

III. Follow-up
The ICERD Committee may request the State party concerned to submit an additional report or information on specific topics following consideration of the State’s report.

IV. How NGOs can participate
NGOs can submit reports at any time during the reporting cycle by providing information for the list of themes or submitting an alternative report for the consideration of the ICERD Committee. There are no official deadlines for submission. However, the ICERD Committee advises that alternative reports be sent to the Secretariat at the latest two weeks before the relevant session.

191 Ibid 15
192 ICERD, art 9; ICERD Committee ‘Rules of Procedure’ (1987) CERD/SP/2/Rev.1, rule 65 http://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=6QkG1d%2fIPPRICAwQhKb7yhssx%2fMKjcX6yaCQVmeC9H0KruQDKdQkuUcc%2fEvR0dy6FGNNb9WtL2zgnDBAvhKaz5aB7NSR3CLKetNvZBln%2b64Pfl2v0ciJTeK0g accessed 16 October 2016
193 Shirane, ‘ICERD: A Guide’ (n 188), 26
I. Methodology

Once the State report is submitted, a Country Report Task Force (CRTF) identifies in advance the questions which will constitute the focus of the dialogue between the State under review and the ICCPR Committee. A country rapporteur, appointed from among the members of the CRTF, drafts a LOI which is finalised by the CRTF and transmitted to the State parties. The State under review has two to four months to prepare for the session with the ICCPR Committee. At the session, the State under review introduces the report and replies to questions included in the LOI. Following this, the ICCPR Committee and the CRTF asks questions at the end of which the State under review is invited to reply.

II. Outcome

The country rapporteur prepares draft concluding observations which are based on the constructive dialogue held during the session and include a provisional date when the State party’s next periodic report is due. These concluding observations are adopted by the ICCPR Committee in a private session and forward to the State under review.

III. Follow-up

The ICCPR Committee can appoint a special rapporteur who will report to the ICCPR Committee in relation to information received from the State party on steps taken to meet the recommendations of the ICCPR Committee.

IV. How NGOs can participate

NGOs can submit reports and present oral information to the ICCPR Committee for the drafting of the LOI. NGOs can also submit alternative reports and oral presentations during the session. The ICCPR Committee requests that any reports are provided well in advance of the deadlines provided by the Secretariat.

---

196 Ibid
197 Ibid
198 ICCPR Committee, ‘The Relationship of the Human Rights Committee with Non-Governmental Organisations’ (2012) UN Doc CCPR/C/104/3, para 4-11 http://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=6QkG1%2fPRlCQhKb7yhsbttFNxTkgyXTPIWZn3vm0FWsg3wrXxmVxsUt5luKHql4bzyO%3b7PS2%2fAYjcc3joZBCuLW2uA8E%2fnipl3XW22%2bGDQDqr%2b7Ou2Ho8Im5Ox6P accessed 16 October 2016
Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

I. Methodology
Once the State report is submitted, a pre-sessional working group is convened. At which time, a member of the group is appointed country rapporteur. The country rapporteur has the responsibility of drafting a preliminary LOI, which is eventually finalised, adopted and sent to the State under review for reply. At the session, the State under review presents its report and can provide any new information which is relevant to the dialogue. ICESCR Committee members can then ask questions or give comments on each issue after which the State under review can reply immediately to questions.

II. Outcome
After the dialogue, the ICESCR Committee drafts and adopts a set of concluding observations which are forwarded to the State party. Once the concluding observations are adopted, the State party can submit comments on the document to the ICESCR Committee.

III. Follow-up
The ICESCR Committee may, in its concluding observations, make a specific request to the State under review to provide more information or statistical data prior to the date on which the next periodic report is due.

IV. How NGOs can participate
The ICESCR Committee invites NGOs to submit reports to be considered at the pre-sessional working group. It also invites all NGO and NHRIs to submit shadow reports which should be transmitted to the ICESCR Committee between six to three weeks before the beginning of the session. Additionally, the ICESCR Committee sets aside part of the first day at each of its sessions for NGOs to provide oral information.

---


200 Ibid, para 29

201 Ibid, para 30

202 Ibid, para 36

Committee on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women

I. Methodology
Once the State report is received, the CEDAW Committee appoints a country rapporteur for the State party from among its members. The rapporteur’s responsibilities extend to: the preparation of a draft LOI and questions, consideration of the State party’s report and the preparation of draft concluding observations.\(^{204}\) A pre-session working group finalises the LOI and questions and sends the document to the State party which is invited to provide their responses within six weeks thereafter. The State’s report is considered during open meetings. The State under review presents its report first, after which experts pose questions to which the State is given an opportunity to respond, this is then repeated in clusters.\(^{205}\)

II. Outcome
At the end of the session, the CEDAW Committee considers the main issues to be reflected in the concluding observations, which are based on the proposals of the country rapporteur and the principal areas of concern and recommendations. The finalised concluding observations are then sent to the State concerned.

III. Follow-up
The CEDAW Committee can request State parties in the concluding observations for information on steps taken to implement specific recommendations contained in the concluding observations. The request can call upon States to submit such information to the CEDAW Committee within two years.\(^{206}\)

IV. Participation of NGOS and NHRIs
The CEDAW Committee permits submissions of alternative and shadow reports and the presentation of oral information to the CEDAW Committee’s pre-sessional work group and at the meetings of the CEDAW Committee. Generally, NGOs and NHRIs are required to submit their reports to the CEDAW Committee three weeks prior to the beginning of the session. NGOs are encouraged to submit alternative and shadow reports under the CEDAW Committee’s follow up procedure and should submit the reports by the same deadline as the State party.\(^{207}\)


\(^{205}\) Ibid, para 12

\(^{206}\) Ibid, para 23

Committee Against Torture

I. Methodology
Once the State report is submitted, the CAT Committee appoints two country rapporteurs from among its members to prepare a LOI which is subsequently transmitted to the State under review. The State under review is expected to reply to the LOI before the report is examined. Two public meetings are devoted to the examination of a report. On the first day, the meeting begins with a presentation by the State under review of the report, any updates of information contained in the report and highlights pertinent matters in the reply to the LOI. Subsequently, the country rapporteurs and the CAT Committee can ask questions, seek additional information and make comments. They can raise matters that had not been referred to in the LOI. The second day is devoted to replies of the State under review to questions and follow-up issues.

II. Output
After the examination, the country rapporteurs draft proposals for concluding observations which are discussed and adopted in a closed plenary meeting of the CAT Committee. Once adopted, the concluding observations are sent to the State under review and made public.

III. Follow-up
The CAT Committee may designate a rapporteur to follow-up with the State party on its implementation of a number of the recommendations included in the concluding observations.

IV. How can NGOs participate
The CAT Committee allows NGO, NHRI and other bodies to submit written information for consideration for LOIs under the respective reporting procedures. Such information must be received before communicated deadlines prior to the opening of the session. Written information for the examination of the State under review’s report can be submitted by NGOs, NRHIs and other bodies to the CAT Committee. Such information should be received no later than three weeks before the opening of the session.

208 CAT Committee ‘Overview of Working Methods’
Committee on the Rights of the Child

I. Methodology
Once the State party report is submitted, the review process for each State begins with a pre-sessional working group of the CRC Committee convening private meetings with UN agencies and bodies, NGOs, and other competent bodies. The pre-sessional working group generates a LOI that are presented as questions to the State under Review. The State under review is then asked to respond in writing to these questions in advance of a public plenary session.

At the session, two country rapporteurs, members of the CRC Committee, lead the discussion with the State under review. The State under review makes an overview of the state of child rights in the State, after which Committee members ask questions or make comments. At the end of the discussion, the country rapporteurs summarise their observations on the State report, and make suggestions and recommendations. The State under review is then invited to make a final statement.

II. Outcome
After the discussion with the State party, the CRC Committee will agree on written concluding observations which include suggestions and recommendations for action. To better assess the country situation, the CRC Committee may in the closing observations request additional information from the State party.

III. Follow-up
The CRC Committee does not have a written follow up procedure. However, it is assumed that concerns expressed by the CRC Committee in its concluding observations should be addressed in a detailed manner by the State party in its next report.

IV. Participation by NGOs
Reports, documentation and other information by NGOs should be submitted to the CRC Committee at least two months prior to the beginning of the pre-sessional working group. Based on written information submitted the CRC Committee will issue invitations to selected NGOs to participate in the pre-sessional working group.

212 Ibid
214 Ibid, para II.A.
215 Ibid, para II.B.
216 Ibid, para II.C.
Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

I. Methodology
Once the State report is submitted, the CRPD Committee may name a country rapporteur from among its members to prepare a draft LOI on the State party’s report, as well as draft concluding observations following the constructive dialogue. The CRPD Committee will finalise the LOI and forward the list to the State.\(^{217}\) The State’s report and replies to the LOI are examined at the next plenary session over two meetings. These meetings are open to the public and take the form of a constructive dialogue.

II. Outcome
At the end of the dialogue, the CRPD Committee adopts its concluding observations in a closed meeting and may request the party to submit complementary information.\(^{218}\)

III. Follow-up
The CRPD Committee may request State parties to provide written information on the implementation of the suggestions and recommendations contained in the concluding observations adopted in relation to their previous report. In addition, it may appoint a member as a rapporteur to follow up on the concluding observations.\(^{219}\)

IV. How NGOs can participate
The CRPD Committee may invite NHRIS and NGOs to provide advice on the implementation of the convention. It accepts reports by NGOs which should be sent at least two months prior to the relevant sessions of the CRPD Committee.\(^{220}\) NGOs may attending public meetings of the CRPD Committee but have to first receive accreditation. Accredited NGOs which submitted reports may make oral presentation to the CRPD Committee.\(^{221}\)

---

219 Ibid, para 15
220 Ibid, para 19-22
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Annex II

Ratification and Reporting Tables
### Table of Treaty Ratifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>ICCPR</th>
<th>CEDAW</th>
<th>CERD</th>
<th>ICESCR</th>
<th>CRC</th>
<th>CRPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antigua and Barbuda</strong></td>
<td>19-Jul-93 (a)</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>01-Aug-89 (a)</td>
<td>25-Oct-88 (d)</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>05-Oct-93 (d)</td>
<td>07-Jan-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Bahamas</strong></td>
<td>16-Dec-08</td>
<td>26-Dec-08</td>
<td>06-Oct-93 (a)</td>
<td>05-Aug-75 (d)</td>
<td>23-Dec-08</td>
<td>20-Feb-91</td>
<td>28-Sep-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barbados</strong></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>05-Jan-73 (a)</td>
<td>16-Oct-80</td>
<td>08-Nov-72 (a)</td>
<td>05-Jan-73 (a)</td>
<td>09-Oct-90</td>
<td>27-Feb-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominica</strong></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>17-Jun-93 (a)</td>
<td>15-Sep-80</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>17-Jun-93 (a)</td>
<td>13-Mar-91</td>
<td>01-Oct-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grenada</strong></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>06-Sep-91 (a)</td>
<td>30-Aug-90</td>
<td>10-May-13</td>
<td>06-Sep-91 (a)</td>
<td>05-Nov-90</td>
<td>27-Aug-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jamaica</strong></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>03-Oct-75</td>
<td>19-Oct-84</td>
<td>04-Jun-71</td>
<td>03-Oct-75</td>
<td>14-May-91</td>
<td>30-Mar-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saint Kitts and Nevis</strong></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>25-Apr-85 (a)</td>
<td>13-Oct-06</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>24-Jul-90</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saint Lucia</strong></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>22-Sep-11</td>
<td>08-Oct-82 (a)</td>
<td>14-Feb-90 (d)</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>16-Jan-93</td>
<td>22-Sep-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</strong></td>
<td>01-Aug-01 (a)</td>
<td>09-Nov-81 (a)</td>
<td>04-Aug-81 (a)</td>
<td>09-Nov-81 (a)</td>
<td>09-Nov-81 (a)</td>
<td>26-Oct-93</td>
<td>29-Oct-10 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trinidad and Tobago</strong></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>21-Dec-78 (a)</td>
<td>12-Jan-90</td>
<td>04-Oct-73</td>
<td>08-Dec-78 (a)</td>
<td>05-Dec-91</td>
<td>25-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belize</strong></td>
<td>17-Mar-86 (a)</td>
<td>10-Jun-96 (a)</td>
<td>16-May-90</td>
<td>14-Nov-11</td>
<td>09-Mar-15</td>
<td>02-May-90</td>
<td>02-Jun-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guyana</strong></td>
<td>19-May-88</td>
<td>15-Feb-77</td>
<td>17-Jul-80</td>
<td>15-Feb-77</td>
<td>15-Feb-77</td>
<td>14-Jan-91</td>
<td>02-Sep-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominican Republic</strong></td>
<td>24-Jan-12</td>
<td>04-Jan-78 (a)</td>
<td>02-Sep-82</td>
<td>25-May-83 (a)</td>
<td>04-Jan-78 (a)</td>
<td>11-Jun-91</td>
<td>18-Aug-09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**
- Indicates the date of signature
- **N/S** Treaty not signed
- Indicates the date of adherence: ratification, accession or succession
### Universal Periodic Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date of Consideration</th>
<th>National Report</th>
<th>Compilation of UN Information</th>
<th>Stakeholders' Information</th>
<th>Working Group Report</th>
<th>Decision of the Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>09-May-16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bahamas</td>
<td>23-Jan-13</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>25-Jan-13</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>23-Oct-13</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>01-May-14</td>
<td>N/O</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>05-Feb-14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>26-Jan-15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>28-Jan-15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>13-May-15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>11-Nov-15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>05-Nov-15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>02-May-16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>10-May-16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

- **A**: Report submitted and hyperlink embedded
- **N/S**: Report not submitted
- **N/A**: Report not available
- **N/O**: Document referenced online but a copy is not available
## International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Most Recent Reporting Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Party's Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bahamas</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key

- **A**: Report submitted and hyperlink embedded
- **N/S**: Report not submitted
- **N/G**: Deadline not given
# International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Most Recent Reporting Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Party’s Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>Not a party to the Covenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bahamas</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>Not a party to the Covenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>Did not ratify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**
- **A**: Report submitted and hyperlink embedded
- **N/S**: Report not submitted
- **N/G**: Deadline not given
## International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bahamas</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize*</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>Not a party to the Covenant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>Not a party to the Covenant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key
- **A**: Report submitted and hyperlink embedded
- **N/S**: Report not submitted
- **N/G**: Deadline not given
- *****: Party recently signed the Covenant and has not previously reported
## Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bahamas</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

- **A**: Report submitted and hyperlink embedded
- **N/S**: Report not submitted
- **N/G**: Deadline not given
## Convention against Torture and Other Cruel Inhuman or Degrading Treatment of Punishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>MOST RECENT REPORTING CYCLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Party's Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bahamas</td>
<td>Did not ratify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>Did not ratify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>Not a party to the Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>Not a party to the Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>Not a party to the Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>Not a party to the Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>Not a party to the Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>Not a party to the Convention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

- **A**: Report submitted and hyperlink embedded
- **N/S**: Report not submitted
- **N/G**: Deadline not given
## Convention on the Rights of the Child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>MOST RECENT REPORTING CYCLE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Party's Report</td>
<td>List of Issues</td>
<td>Reply to List of Issues</td>
<td>Concluding Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bahamas</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**
- **A** Report submitted and hyperlink embedded
- **N/S** Report not submitted
- **N/A** Report not available
- **N/O** Document referenced online but a copy is not available
## Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda *</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bahamas*</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada*</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana*</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>Not a party to the Convention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>Did not ratify the Convention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago*</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**  
- **A**: Report submitted and hyperlink embedded  
- **N/S**: Report not submitted  
- **N/G**: Deadline not given  
- *****: Party recently signed the Covenant and has not previously reported
# Stakeholders Submission Deadlines for Upcoming Reporting Sessions (Up to 2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>UPR</th>
<th>CERD</th>
<th>ICCPR</th>
<th>ICESCR</th>
<th>CEDAW</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>CRC</th>
<th>CRPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>24-Sep-20</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bahamas</td>
<td>22-Jun-17</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>22-Jun-17</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>20-Sep-18</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>20-Jun-19</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>19-Sep-19</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>19-Mar-20</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>19-Mar-20</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>24-Sep-20</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>24-Sep-20</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>22-Mar-18</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>20-Jun-19</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>21-Jun-18</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**
- **N/P** Not a party to the instrument
- **N/R** Did not ratify the convention
- **N/G** Deadline not given
### National Report Submission Deadlines for Upcoming Reporting Sessions (Up to 2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>UPR</th>
<th>CERD</th>
<th>ICCPR</th>
<th>ICESCR</th>
<th>CEDAW</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>CRC</th>
<th>CRPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>01-Feb-20</td>
<td>24-Nov-09</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bahamas</td>
<td>01-Oct-17</td>
<td>04-Sep-06</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>01-Jul-16</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>21-Mar-08</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>01-Oct-17</td>
<td>08-Dec-07</td>
<td>29-Mar-11</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>01-Feb-19</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>01-Sep-06</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>01-Oct-19</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>01-Feb-16</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>04-Jun-16</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>01-Feb-20</td>
<td>04-Jul-16</td>
<td>04-Nov-21</td>
<td>31-May-18</td>
<td>01-Jul-16</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>12-Dec-21</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>01-Jul-20</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>25-May-02</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>01-Sep-97</td>
<td>N/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>01-Jul-20</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>08-Nov-07</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>20-Jul-20</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>01-Feb-21</td>
<td>09-Dec-06</td>
<td>31-Oct-91</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>01-Jul-19</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>N/O</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>01-Feb-21</td>
<td>03-Nov-04</td>
<td>31-Oct-03</td>
<td>30-Jun-07</td>
<td>01-Jul-20</td>
<td>N/P</td>
<td>03-Jan-09</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>01-Jul-18</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>28-Mar-15</td>
<td>01-Mar-17</td>
<td>01-Jul-20</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>01-Sep-07</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>01-Oct-19</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>31-Mar-03</td>
<td>31-Oct-20</td>
<td>01-Jul-16</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>12-Feb-18</td>
<td>N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>01-Oct-18</td>
<td>24-Jun-16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>31-Oct-21</td>
<td>01-Jul-17</td>
<td>N/G</td>
<td>10-Jan-20</td>
<td>18-Sep-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**
- **N/P**: Not a party to the instrument
- **N/R**: Did not ratify the convention
- **N/G**: Deadline not given
- **A**: Report submitted and hyperlink embedded
- **N/O**: Document referenced online but a copy is not available