The present report is a summary of six stakeholders’ submissions\(^1\) to the universal periodic review. It follows the structure of the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council. It does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), nor any judgement or determination in relation to specific claims. The information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes and, to the extent possible, the original texts have not been altered. Lack of information or focus on specific issues may be due to the absence of submissions by stakeholders regarding these particular issues. The full texts of all submissions received are available on the OHCHR website. The periodicity of the review for the first cycle being four years, the information reflected in this report mainly relates to events that occurred after 1 January 2004.

* The present document was not edited before being sent to the United Nations translation services.
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I. BACKGROUND AND FRAMEWORK

A. Scope of international obligations

1. The Legal Literacy Project, Tuvalu National Council of Women (LLP) noted with increasing concern the slow progress being made by the Government of Tuvalu towards ratification of human rights treaties with their supporting Optional Protocols. In particular, Tuvalu is neither a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) nor the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). Tuvalu has, however, ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) on 22 September 1995 and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) on 6 October 1999. The LLP and the Tuvalu Brethren Church (TBC) requested that the Government of Tuvalu consider ratification of ICCPR and ICESCR. Amnesty International (AI) recommended that the Government accede, in addition to these two Covenants, to the other core human rights treaties; enact laws through Parliament to implement in domestic law the provisions of these instruments and of the human rights treaties to which Tuvalu is a party; and ensure that the provisions of international human rights treaties and other standards are also implemented in policy and practice.

B. Constitutional and legislative framework

2. The TBC stated that the Constitution of Tuvalu contains a Bill of Rights, which guarantees protection of freedom of belief, freedom of expression and freedom of association. Freedom from discrimination on grounds of religious beliefs is also guaranteed. The Jehovah’s Witnesses in Tuvalu (JW) commended the inclusion of a Bill of Rights in the Constitution and observed that, generally, Tuvalu is a peaceful and devout nation with respect for human rights. The TBC reported that the protection of fundamental rights and freedoms is subject to certain qualifications and limitations in the Bill of Rights. Of these, most notable is a provision which allows limitations or restrictions on the exercise of rights and freedoms if the limitation is aimed at a practice which is “divisive, unsettling or offensive to the people, or directly threatens Tuvaluan values and culture.” However, any action taken by Government, or any law or act done under a law which restricts rights and freedoms otherwise protected under the Constitution must be “reasonably justifiable within a democratic society”. The JW recommended that the Falekaupule Act be amended so that the relationship between the Bill of Rights in the Constitution and the customary authority of the Falekaupule is more clearly defined and understood.

3. The TBC also indicated that international treaties ratified by Tuvalu are not automatically incorporated into domestic law and that where domestic laws are inconsistent with Tuvalu’s international obligations, the High Court has indicated that the domestic law will apply unless and until Tuvalu has amended the law to reflect its international obligations, through the usual parliamentary procedures. It added that, however, where the construction of a written law is open to more than one interpretation, an interpretation which is consistent with Tuvalu’s international obligations will be preferred. The LLP called on the Government of Tuvalu, as a matter of urgent priority, to incorporate CEDAW and CRC into its national laws.

C. Institutional and human rights infrastructure

4. The LLP reported that there was no national human rights machinery that is charged with promoting human rights. The Office of the Ombudsman, although established by the 2006 Leadership Code Act, does not exist as there is no budget allocation for it. The availability of
effective remedies for the human rights violations is therefore quite limited given the lack of resources allocated to this issue.\textsuperscript{12} It called on the Government of Tuvalu, as a matter of urgent priority, to set up the Office of the Ombudsman or a national human rights mechanism of some sort, no later than January 2009. Alternatively, it requested the Government to support regional initiatives under the Pacific Plan to set up a regional human rights mechanism for the Pacific so that the citizens of Tuvalu have access to independent tribunals.\textsuperscript{13}

\section*{II. PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS ON THE GROUND}

\subsection*{A. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms}

5. The LLP believed that reporting under international instruments is an integral national and international accountability mechanism. It noted with concern the delay in the Government of Tuvalu submitting its CEDAW and CRC Initial Reports and indicated that on 2 July 2008, the CEDAW Initial Report was sent to the OHCHR office in Suva, while the CRC Initial Report is yet to be submitted.\textsuperscript{14} The Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACP) reported the same information about the CRC\textsuperscript{15}. The LLP called on the Government of Tuvalu, as a matter of urgent priority, to submit its CRC Initial Report no later than June 2009.\textsuperscript{16}

\subsection*{B. Implementation of international human rights obligations}

1. \textbf{Equality and non discrimination}

6. The LLP expressed concern about the existence of sex and gender discrimination in some of the laws of Tuvalu that undermines the enjoyment of human rights.\textsuperscript{17} It stated that one of the reasons for the existence of discrimination in the laws of Tuvalu was due to its culture and that, historically, Tuvalu is a patriarchal society where women’s roles are confined to the homes and decisions of matters outside the family are left to the men.\textsuperscript{18} The primary source of discrimination against women is found in the Constitution of Tuvalu 1986, where the anti-discrimination clause contained in section 27(2), has omitted to recognize the freedom from discrimination on the ground of sex, thereby indirectly allowing for lawful discrimination on the grounds of sex or gender.\textsuperscript{19} Consequently, a number of laws still discriminate against women in Tuvalu, AI noticed.\textsuperscript{20} Together\textsuperscript{21} with the LLP,\textsuperscript{22} AI called on the Government of Tuvalu to amend section 27 of the Constitution and to include freedom from discrimination on the grounds of sex and gender. AI also recommended to the Government to review all relevant laws which discriminate or impact negatively on women and to amend laws and change policies and practices which either expressly discriminates against or perpetuate the discrimination and marginalisation of women, so as to bring them into line with CEDAW and other international human rights standards.\textsuperscript{23}

7. The LLP was concerned about the significant discrimination in the laws relating to inheritance of lands in Tuvalu. Land scarcity is a pressing problem in Tuvalu and the discriminatory land laws put women in a further disadvantaged position.\textsuperscript{24} AI mentioned that section 20 of the Native Lands Act (NLA) discriminates against a woman’s right to custody of her child\textsuperscript{25} and that Land Inheritance laws are also discriminatory in that a larger portion of land is given to the sons than the daughters.\textsuperscript{26} The LLP urged the Government of Tuvalu, as a matter of priority, to amend the NLA and Tuvalu Lands Code that discriminate against women and disadvantage children.\textsuperscript{27} It also called on the Government of Tuvalu to amend section 20 of the NLA to protect the paramount interests of illegitimate children.\textsuperscript{28}
8. The TBC indicated that discrimination against its members by local governing authorities in the spheres of employment and provision of public services has been problematic on some islands. Similar information was provided by the JW.

2. Right to life, liberty and security of the person

9. According to the LLP and to AI, domestic violence in Tuvalu is often overlooked due to the unavailability of data and to the lack of awareness of women’s rights and traditional and cultural pressures on victims. AI expressed serious concern regarding reports of traditional apologies and acceptance of these apologies for violence against women and girls, including rape, incest, and assaults, as they result in impunity for serious human rights abuses and encourage their perpetuation. The LLP also reported about this issue and called on the Government of Tuvalu to ensure the compulsory prosecution of domestic violence cases. AI acknowledged the initiative by the Tuvalu Police to engage its officers in training with the Pacific Prevention of Domestic Violence Programme and recommended to the Government to ensure greater public awareness of the issue of domestic violence and greater involvement of Government agencies and civil society. AI also recommended to the Government to equip the police with the relevant tools to deal effectively with domestic and sexual violence against women and to work for the enactment of appropriate legislation to address violence against women generally, and domestic violence in particular, after meaningful consultation with relevant stakeholders.

10. The GIEACP noted that corporal punishment is lawful in the home and that cruelty to children is addressed in article 226 of the Penal Code, but which also states that “nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the right of any parent, teacher, or other person, having the lawful control of a child or young person to administer reasonable punishment to him”. The GIEACP added that corporal punishment is lawful in schools under article 226 of the Penal Code; that in the penal system, corporal punishment is unlawful as a sentence for crime but it is not explicitly prohibited as a disciplinary measure in penal institutions; and that corporal punishment is lawful in alternative care settings under article 226 of the Penal Code.

3. Administration of justice and the rule of law

11. The TBC stated that in May 2006, the High Court ruled that the Falekaupule was not acting beyond its customary authority in banning the establishment and practice of new religions in the island of Nanumaga. An appeal from the decision of the High Court was filed in May 2006. The appeal is still awaiting hearing. Whilst it is established under the Constitution, the Court of Appeal for Tuvalu has never been convened. The LLP reported similar information and added that although the Court of Appeal was established as a tier of the judicial system by the Constitution, in practice, it does not exist and that the delay in convening it has caused significant delay and a restriction on access to justice for some people. AI reported similar information and indicated that there has been no concrete move towards convening the Court of Appeal and that in the absence of a functioning court of appeal, individuals’ right to seek judicial remedy is seriously curtailed. The TBC noted that it was strongly in the public interest that the principles relating to freedom of religion in Tuvalu are determined with finality by the Court of Appeal. For the appellant, the failure to convene the Court of Appeal constitutes a serious limitation on his ability to utilise the judicial system to seek an effective remedy for a human rights violation. The TBC, the LLP, the JW and AI urged the Government to convene the Court of Appeal as a matter of urgent priority.
12. AI mentioned that the physical location in Funafuti, the capital, of the only High Court of Tuvalu makes it very expensive for parties and witnesses residing in other islands to attend the hearing of their cases, as they often have to relocate for several days or even weeks to the capital for the duration of the hearing. This makes it both expensive and difficult for people to access the High Court, which sits twice a year. It recommended to the Government to find ways to make the High Court more accessible to the general public.

13. According to the TBC, in June 2006, several of its members who were dismissed from their employment at the local council of Nanumaga filed proceedings in the High Court, alleging wrongful dismissal and discrimination. Due to unavailability of lawyers during most of 2007, difficulties in communicating with the People’s Lawyer from the outer islands, and the infrequent sittings of the High Court, liability for the wrongful terminations was only determined in May 2008. A final judgment as to compensation and other orders in the proceedings is yet to be delivered.

14. The LLP noted with concern the continuous problem of access to justice in Tuvalu, most notably, in accessing the services provided by the Office of the People’s Lawyer. This is the only form of State-funded legal aid in Tuvalu and is extremely limited. The problem is heightened because there are no private law firms in Tuvalu, and the Office of the People’s Lawyer is the only agency that provides legal services to the people. AI added that the People’s Lawyer is based on Funafuti and does not adequately service or address the needs of those who live in the outlying islands and that the increasing number of cases and people seeking advice for civil and criminal matters highlights the need for more than one lawyer to serve the needs of the public. According to the LLP and AI, there have been instances where the position of the People’s Lawyer has remained unfulfilled for significant periods of time causing excessive delay in hearing clients’ cases, and resulting in some people giving up on their claims. In this regard, AI and the LLP called on the Government of Tuvalu to put measures in place to ensure that the Office of the People’s Lawyer is sustainable and has adequate human and financial resources to effectively service the needs of the public in Funafuti as well as in the other islands.

15. The LLP said it was also concerned about the present situation where the Office of the People’s Lawyer is acting for both parties. In the past, the Office of the Attorney General extended its service in acting for the other party or parties. Since 2007, the LLP has received complaints that the Attorney General’s Office is no longer affording that service to the people. Therefore, clients found that they could not obtain independent advice as the People’s Lawyer was required to advise both them and the opposing party or parties in a dispute.

16. The LLP also noted with concern the appointment of magistrates at the Island Courts, Lands Courts, and the Lands Court Appeals Panel system. These magistrates are often appointed due to their good standing in the community but do not always have formal qualifications to sit as magistrates. The LLP urged the Government of Tuvalu to appoint qualified magistrates including women magistrates, to serve in the Island Courts, Lands Courts and the Lands Court Appeals Panel. It also called on the Government of Tuvalu to do more training for magistrates in writing judgments or orders, court procedures, family law, property law, delivery of judgments and human rights.

4. Freedom of religion or belief, expression, association and peaceful assembly, and right to participate in public and political life

17. The LLP noted with concern the limitations on the exercise of rights and freedoms in Tuvalu. Section 29 of the Constitution states that it may be necessary, in some situations, to
restrict the exercise of human rights if their exercise is divisive, unsettling or offensive to the
group. The Constitutional restriction on the
exercise of rights and freedoms has been seen to undermine freedom of belief, worship,
expression, association and freedom from discrimination on the ground of religious belief.

18. The TBC mentioned that although it faced some initial challenges in Funafuti, shortly
after its registration as a religious body, it has largely operated without interference in Funafuti
over the last four years. In the outer islands, however, TBC members face significant restrictions
on their freedom of worship.

19. The TBC and the JW have found that the position taken by local governing
authorities on the outer islands (comprised of statutory bodies and customary authorities) is
generally not supportive of individual freedom of belief and expression and that several outer
islands have forbidden the introduction of new religions by resolutions. These resolutions,
passed by the traditional governing assembly of each island group, have seen TBC members face
persecution and punishment if they are perceived by the community to be acting in disobedience
of the ban on new religions. In 2003, a resolution was passed by the customary authority of the
island of Nanumaga which has forbidden all new churches other than those already established
on the island. This resolution continues to be in force to this day. Since 2006, according to the
TBC, more than ten of its members (almost every TBC member who had previously held a paid
position) have been dismissed from their positions in Government, the private sector and the
local council. The LLP referred to similar information. The TBC indicated that the
dismissals are said to be in response to the TBC members’ defiance of the resolution, and that
almost all TBC members who were employed on Nanumaga in any capacity at the time of the
resolution had received letters from the local council and from the island assembly, warning
them that they would be dismissed from work if they did not give up their faith.

20. The TBC said it was aware of several instances where members of minority religions
have been refused entry to some islands because of their religious affiliation. Local councils
have enforced these rulings by forbidding spiritual leaders from disembarking from the ship
upon its arrival at the wharf. The TBC viewed these impediments on freedom of movement as
unjustified and unlawful. Recommendations for addressing this problem include training and
awareness-raising among senior community leaders and local council officials on outer islands.

21. In the TBC’s and JW’s confirmed knowledge, the Falekaupule of Nukulaelae, Nui,
Nanumaga, Nanumea and Nukufetau have issued resolutions to forbid “new” churches preaching
or evangelising on their islands The JW said it was disheartened by the lack of supervision from
central Government on the outer islands and that restrictions on fundamental freedoms such as
freedom of belief are being tolerated and overlooked. They urged the Government of Tuvalu to
condemn all forms of religious discrimination and to work to raise the awareness of governing
authorities on the outer islands as to the importance of respecting human rights.

22. The TBC viewed any instance of discrimination on the basis of religion, particularly if
effected by governing authorities, as a very serious and unwelcome development in the
otherwise peaceful and tolerant nation of Tuvalu. The TBC and the JW called on the
Government of Tuvalu to condemn all instances of hate crimes and discrimination which targets
members of minority religious denominations. The police force, the Attorney General and the
Ministry of Home Affairs were urged to take leadership in addressing the growing concerns
relating to restrictions on religious freedoms in Tuvalu. The LLP called on the Government of Tuvalu to stop the Falekaupules from discriminating people on the basis of religion.  

23. The TBC indicated that there is only one radio outlet in the country and it is operated and managed by the Government Media Department. There is no independent media in Tuvalu at present. The only means of broadcasting publicly is via the Government-run radio station. The TBC said that several times within the past four years, it has not been allowed to broadcast its programs. The reason provided by the Media Department (and former Media Corporation) is that the program was “offensive to the people”. It added that at other times, the Media Department has censored the TBC’s programming and edited its content without permission and that the Media Department had also reduced the TBC’s time allocation. The TBC considered it to be the Government’s responsibility to eradicate discrimination in this field.

24. The LLP raised concern as to the non-participation of women in the Parliament of Tuvalu and indicated that the laws of Tuvalu allow equal eligibility to men and women to enter parliament. However, since independence in 1978, Tuvalu has had only one female politician and that was more than four years ago. In the last general election in 2006, two women contested in the election and neither of them won a seat. It called on the Government of Tuvalu to set a quota for women seats in Parliament for the next general elections.

5. Right to education and to participate in the cultural life of the community

25. The JW noted that the Constitution of Tuvalu stipulates that “except with his consent, no-one attending a place of education shall be required (a) to receive religious instruction; or (b) to take part in or attend a religious ceremony or observance, if the instruction, ceremony or observance relates to a religion or belief other than his own”. The JW indicated that throughout the preceding four years, the parents of pupils at Motufoua secondary school have requested numerous times that their children be excused from attending religious studies and services but that despite such requests, the school is continually forcing these students to attend them. They considered this to be an unjustified breach of the rights guaranteed to them under the Constitution and the Education Ordinance. The JW mentioned that it has brought this matter to the attention of the Ministry of Education several times in the preceding four years, that to date, no official response was received from the Government, and that the practices at the school have not changed.

6. Migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers

26. AI noted that the amendment of the regulations under the Passport Act to enable ‘Investor Immigrants’ to obtain Tuvaluan passports in 1999 required investor immigrants to renounce citizenship of their own nation as a precondition to obtaining the Tuvaluan passport but that, however, Tuvaluan citizenship was not conferred to a number of investor immigrants who had obtained a passport through the scheme. Several persons, some resident in Tuvalu, were thereby made stateless as a result of the scheme and upon expiry of their passports, some will be both without citizenship and also unable to travel outside Tuvalu. AI added that foreign nationals who have resided in Tuvalu for at least the preceding seven years are able to apply for citizenship by naturalisation, but where such applications are granted, a fee of AU$10,000 is payable in order to obtain the certificate of citizenship and that the Citizenship Committee has not met regularly to consider citizenship applications. Also, AI mentioned that the citizenship status of the children of investor immigrants born overseas is in question. If born outside Tuvalu, these children are not entitled to Tuvaluan citizenship. Depending on their country of origin, they may also be excluded from citizenship of their parents’ home country.
27. For AI, the Passports Bill, tabled in Parliament in May 2008, seeks to discontinue the investor immigrant passport scheme, but does not include any remedial measures to address the situation of stateless persons and those disadvantaged by the scheme. It considered that the existence of stateless persons in Tuvalu, and the practical obstacles for such persons in obtaining citizenship by naturalisation, are a violation of international human rights standards and must be addressed by the Government as a matter of priority. AI recommended that the Government amend the relevant laws to provide remedies for stateless persons, including children, and for those who have been adversely affected by the Passport scheme of 1999.

III. ACHIEVEMENTS, BEST PRACTICES, CHALLENGES AND CONSTRAINTS

28. The LLP noted with deep concern the escalating impacts of climate change on the enjoyment of human rights in Tuvalu, and in particular, the problem of sea level rise encroaching on the people’s lands and their fishing rights. It strongly believed that every Tuvaluan woman, man and child, has the right to a safe and healthy environment, as the enjoyment of their human rights link and depend largely on a safe and healthy environment for them. The LLP called, as a matter of urgent priority, for the right to a safe and quality environment to be recognized in the Constitution of Tuvalu and by regional and global agreements.

29. Earth Justice (EJ) said that the most serious threat to the human rights of the people of Tuvalu is the vulnerability of the environment, on which they have depended for millennia, to the impacts of climate change and that the plight of the people of Tuvalu illustrates how fundamental the right to an ecologically sustainable environment is to guaranteeing other rights such as the right to life, food, health, water, and culture. Citing the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, EJ indicated that in Tuvalu, climate change will threaten Tuvaluans’ access to freshwater by increasing extremes of temperature and precipitation, increasing instances of drought, and causing salinization of groundwater; jeopardize food security by damaging ocean ecosystems such as coral reef fisheries on which Tuvaluans rely for food, and impeding the agricultural capacity of the islands; threaten Tuvaluans’ physical security by subjecting Tuvaluan communities to more severe storms and cyclones, and physically destroying the very territory of Tuvalu through coastal flooding, shoreline erosion and sea-level rise; and endanger Tuvaluan culture by forcing Tuvaluans to flee their island communities to seek refuge in more environmentally secure nations, where they would no longer be able to continue traditional customs and practices.

30. EJ noted that the changes in the physical environment causing these threats have been increasing in frequency and severity over the past several decades and are predicted to increase significantly by the end of the century. EJ expressed the concern that this would result in the direct violation of many of the human rights guaranteed by Tuvalu under international law, including the right to life, the right to health, the right to be free from hunger, the right to water, the right to a healthy environment, the right to an adequate standard of living, the right to means of subsistence, the right to property, the right to culture and traditional knowledge, the rights of indigenous peoples, the right to be free from discrimination, the right to self-determination, and the right to resettlement under humanitarian law.

31. EJ recommended that the Human Rights Council encourage the Government of Tuvalu to increase efforts to provide citizens with information and education on the impact of climate change, and to provide opportunities for public participation in decision-making concerning measures to mitigate and adapt to the harms that will result. Recognizing the role of other States in causing climate change, EJ also recommended that the Government of Tuvalu must do all
within its power to increase its mitigation and adaptation efforts to protect the right of the people of Tuvalu to a clean and ecologically sustainable environment.\textsuperscript{96}

32. \textit{EJ} further recommended that the Human Rights Council encourage the international community to take immediate action to decrease global greenhouse gas emissions, to assist the State of Tuvalu in its efforts to mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change, and to collectively provide for or offset the costs of resettlement of Tuvaluan refugees in the event that resettlement becomes unavoidable.\textsuperscript{97}

33. According to \textit{AI}, overcrowding and other prevailing conditions on the main island of Funafuti increase the vulnerability and marginalisation of those who are moving there from the outer islands. The lack of effective planning and legislative controls on settlement patterns and the absence of legal provisions which recognise the rights of tenants when no legal lease exists exacerbate the situation, often leading to violations of individuals’ rights to adequate health care, sustainable livelihood and healthy environment.\textsuperscript{98} In this regard, \textit{AI} recommended that the Government consult with relevant stakeholders and civil society on how to effectively address issues of accessibility of land, overcrowding and other conditions affecting the human rights of landless tenants; that it work for the enactment of legislation to protect the rights of tenants of informal agreements or leases; and promote and protect the rights of persons currently living in squatter settlements to accessing adequate health services, clean water and sanitation.\textsuperscript{99}

\textbf{IV. KEY NATIONAL PRIORITIES, INITIATIVES AND COMMITMENTS}

N/A.

\textbf{V. CAPACITY-BUILDING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE}

34. The TBC called on the Government of Tuvalu, in conjunction with the United Nations Human Rights Council, to consider the implementation of training and awareness-raising throughout traditional island assemblies and local councils (\textit{Kaupule}) on the role and importance of protecting human rights as part of good governance.\textsuperscript{100} A similar recommendation was made by the LLP\textsuperscript{101} and the JW.\textsuperscript{102}
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