



General Assembly

Distr.: General
5 August 2010
English
Original: English/Spanish

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Ninth session
Geneva, 1–12 November 2010

**Summary prepared by the Office of the High Commissioner
for Human Rights in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the
annex to Human Rights Council resolution 5/1**

Panama*

The present report is a summary of 14 stakeholders' submissions¹ 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 United Nations 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 report has been prepared taking into consideration the four-year periodicity of the first cycle of the review.

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

I. Background and framework

A. Scope of international obligations

1. Joint Submission 6 (JS6) recommends that Panama ratify the following International Labour Organization (ILO) conventions: the Workers with Family Responsibilities Convention, 1981 (No. 156); the Maternity Protection Convention, 2000 (No. 183);² and the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169).³

2. JS3 points out that Panama has not ratified ILO Convention No. 169 and that the National Assembly has repealed the only laws providing for prior consultations on development projects that affect indigenous peoples' traditional lands.⁴

3. The Red de Derechos Humanos (RDH) recommends that Panama ratify the following conventions and treaties, among others: the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families; the amendment to article 8 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment; the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance; and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.⁵

B. Constitutional and legislative framework

4. RDH points out that in 2008 the Human Rights Committee drew attention to a phrase in article 12 of the Panamanian Constitution that allows an application for naturalization to be turned down on grounds of physical or mental disability. RDH recommends that Panama comply with the Committee's recommendation.⁶

C. Institutional and human rights infrastructure

5. The Alianza de Mujeres de Panamá (JS4) says that one of the main problems in the area of protecting women concerns the effective application of the law.⁷ While there are still some institutions working in this area, notably the Directorate for the Protection of Women's Rights and the Supreme Court's Gender and Justice Unit — though these are in need of strengthening — others, such as the Women's Office in the Ministry of Education, are gradually being wound down.⁸ And although the National Institute for Women (INAMU) has been set up, the lack of specialized institutions in various offices that could support the Institute in its work tends to weaken the institutional network and makes it difficult to provide suitable assistance throughout the country, especially for women in the provinces.

6. JS4 notes that in mid-2009 the lead agency for gender policy in Panama, INAMU, became an autonomous institution, notably in terms of its finances and administration.⁹ JS4 recommends that national mechanisms' budgets be increased, their position in the State hierarchy consolidated and their technical and political capacities strengthened.¹⁰

7. JS6 notes that the executive secretariat of the National Council of the Black Ethnic Community is having difficulty finding a home for itself and a budget to enable it to begin rolling out the Integration Plan for the National Black Ethnic Community.¹¹ JS6 recommends enforcing Act No. 16 of 10 April 2002 establishing the National Commission

against Discrimination, which includes a representative of the Coordinadora Nacional de Organizaciones Negras Panameñas (Federation of Panamanian Black Organizations).¹²

D. Policy measures

8. RDH says that the abolition of the National Directorate for Youth has highlighted the problems stemming from the failure to implement government youth policies effectively, and that the situation is exacerbated by the lack of a Youth Act and the failure, as yet, to ratify the Ibero-American Convention on Young People's Rights.¹³

9. The Alianza Estratégica de Promoción y Defensa Pública en VIH (AEPDPVIH) notes that, in response to the HIV epidemic, Panama has established a framework for action, a national coordination body and a countrywide monitoring and evaluation system.¹⁴ However, AEPDPVIH also notes that there is no budget, the coordinating authority has achieved little and there are no follow-up or evaluation mechanisms. AEPDPVIH says that representatives of the groups at greatest risk complain that they have no opportunity to press their demands for the rights to information, education and prevention in the National Commission for HIV Prevention and Control.¹⁵

10. IIMA-VIDES welcomes the establishment of the Committee for the Eradication of Child Labour and the Protection of Young Workers and the preparation of the Plan for the Eradication of Child Labour and the Protection of Young Workers for 2007–2011, aimed at protecting minors from economic and labour exploitation.¹⁶

11. The Centro de Capacitación Social de Panamá (CCSP) believes that the lack of a policy on indigenous people and the failure to respect their rights are causing the gradual disappearance of their culture, language and traditions.¹⁷

II. Promotion and protection of human rights on the ground

A. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

Cooperation with treaty bodies

12. RDH recommends that Panama follow the recommendations made by the various United Nations human rights treaty bodies and that it make up the delays in submission of its reports.¹⁸

B. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law (part to be added only if relevant)

1. Equality and non-discrimination

13. In practice, according to RDH, instances of racial discrimination in Panama are a daily occurrence and are constantly being reported by organizations of people of African descent.¹⁹

14. RDH says that the lack of procedures for submitting and investigating complaints of discrimination against women and the failure to hand down appropriate punishments when the complaints are found to be justified are two of the biggest obstacles to the effective enforcement of Act No. 4 of 1999 on equal opportunities and Executive Decree No. 53 of 2002, which regulates the Act.²⁰ RDH also says that the Ministry of Labour, in

memorandum DIGE No. 36 of 7 December 2009, produced a set of rules that are not just discriminatory but also repressive, such as this one: “Dress appropriately to give a good impression. This applies particularly to ladies. Ladies must wear make-up.”²¹

15. According to AEPDPVIH, the Act on Sexually Transmitted Infections, Human Immunodeficiency Virus and Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome Aids (Act No. 3 of 2000) needs to be overhauled to take account of the latest trends and properly guarantee the protection and defence of human rights in relation to HIV/AIDS. Despite the explicit ban on discrimination and stigmatization based on HIV, in practice these provisions prevent the reporting of violations of confidentiality or violations in the areas of work, health and education.²² Panama has no law against discrimination, and so people feel that if they go to the authorities there is a risk that their complaints will not be processed with the confidentiality and promptness they deserve.²³ AEPDPVIH says the abolition of the requirement to prove a migrant’s HIV status in migration proceedings has not been adequately publicized, even among officials and lawyers, who still demand such proof from foreigners.²⁴

16. In practice, according to RDH, instances of racial discrimination in Panama are a daily occurrence and are constantly being reported by organizations of people of African descent. This claim is borne out by the actions of the press, which denigrates individuals in references to their ethnic characteristics.²⁵

17. CCSP says that all indigenous ethnic groups commonly suffer from extreme poverty, illiteracy, racial discrimination at work and in society, a lack of legal protection and the authorities’ neglect of their most basic duties towards this vulnerable population group.²⁶

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

18. JS6 refers to the excessive use of force against, and harassment of, people of African descent by the police. JS6 points out that the treatment of Afro-Panamanians by the police and judicial system is discriminatory.²⁷

19. RDH says that the increase over the past year in deaths among women shows the ineffectiveness of policies and measures to prevent violence against women.²⁸ In this connection, RDH cites the Monitoring Centre for Gender Violence of the Ombudsman’s Office: “Of all violent deaths of women recorded by the Monitoring Centre for Gender Violence in 2009, 68 per cent were cases of murder for reasons related to gender.”²⁹ JS4 recommends the immediate application of the protection measures adopted in the Criminal Code now due to enter into force in 2014; the establishment of a State security plan on domestic violence, which should provide for hostels for victims nationwide; and the adoption of adequately funded, comprehensive legislation that will not only punish but also prevent and eradicate domestic violence.³⁰ The Ombudsman’s Office highlights the need for a new comprehensive law on violence against women.³¹

20. The Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment Against Children (GIEACPC) notes that corporal punishment of children is lawful in the home and in schools. The Family Code (1994, art. 319) and the Civil Code (art. 188) confirm the right of parents and guardians to “correct” their children “reasonably and moderately”. GIEACPC notes that the Family Code (art. 443) authorizes tutors to “moderately correct” their pupils. GIEACPC further indicates that the Civil Code (art. 188) authorizes “reasonable and moderate correction” by guardians in alternative care settings.³² GIEACPC hopes the review will highlight the importance of prohibiting all corporal punishment of children and strongly recommends that the Government enact and implement legislation to ensure complete prohibition.³³

21. RDH notes that, according to data from the Office of the Comptroller-General of Panama, the proportion of children aged between 5 and 17 who are working increased from 6 per cent in 2000 to 11 per cent in 2008.³⁴ JS6 notes that, despite the constitutional ban on children under the age of 14 working, even in domestic jobs, and despite legislative measures banning the worst forms of child labour, the use of child labour is still widespread in areas where coffee, sugar cane and vegetables are grown and in street markets.³⁵

22. RDH says that conditions in the prison system are clearly insanitary, especially in the prisons in Colón, Panamá and Bocas del Toro.³⁶ According to RDH, it is public knowledge that not even the temporary solutions — which are not the best in any case — to the problem of overcrowding have been implemented. The purchase of containers to house prisoners is a case in point.³⁷ The Ombudsman's Office notes that overcrowding persists in prisons and that some prisoners awaiting trial have been separated from convicted prisoners. The Ombudsman's Office also notes that complaints are still coming in about inadequate medical care, the lack of an uninterrupted supply of drinking water and police abuse.³⁸

23. The International Human Rights Clinic of the University of Oklahoma College of Law (IHRC-UOK) indicates that indigenous people in the prison system, despite being protected by the Constitution, suffer from inequality and hardship.³⁹

24. JS6 says that Panama is not meeting international standards for the treatment of juvenile prisoners, particularly as regards the right to continue with their studies. Inmates' complaints continue to focus on food, health, personal treatment and comradeship.⁴⁰

3. Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law

25. The Alianza Ciudadana Pro Justicia (ACPJ) says that the independence of the judiciary is under threat, and draws attention to interference by the Executive in the appointment of judges and in the work of the Public Prosecutor's Office, and the holding of competitive examinations for judges without carrying out the reform of the Judicial Service Act that has been pending since 2006.⁴¹

26. JS6 expresses concern that the Panamanian authorities have not reorganized the judiciary to improve its performance and ensure the effective rule of law.⁴²

27. ACPJ notes that there are serious concerns about the administration of justice in relation to the guarantees of habeas corpus and *amparo*. Excessive formalities, and the weak and inconsistent human rights culture in which judicial officials operate, impede citizens' access to mechanisms for the protection of human rights.⁴³ RDH points out that Panama, in the person of the President of the Supreme Court, has undertaken to comply with the recommendation in paragraph 13 of the concluding observations of the Human Rights Committee on Panama (CCPR/C/PAN/CO/3), on the prompt processing of applications for habeas corpus. However, despite initial assurances that such applications would be processed within a week, RDH notes that processing takes six months or more.⁴⁴ The Ombudsman's Office points out that the justice system has no record of sentences or investigations relating to torture, even though there are reports that it takes place.⁴⁵

28. ACPJ says that Panama's criminal justice system is still based on a written, inquisitorial process. Although the Assembly of Deputies adopted a new adversarial code of criminal procedure in 2008, the Government has postponed its implementation until September 2011.⁴⁶ ACPJ recommends that steps be taken to amend the rules of criminal procedure and that Act No. 48 of 1 September 2009 on the Code of Criminal Procedure (Adversarial System) be put into effect as soon as possible, in order to limit the powers of the Public Prosecutor's Office and judges to arbitrarily curb personal freedom using the precautionary measure of pretrial detention.⁴⁷

29. ACPJ refers to the alarming number of prisoners who have not been convicted – approximately 60 per cent of the prison population.⁴⁸ JS6 also expresses concern about the high proportion of untried prisoners and severe overcrowding in Panamanian jails – which are operating at 145.12 per cent of capacity.⁴⁹

30. ACPJ points out that there are two systems for the administration of justice in indigenous regions (*comarcas*) — the ordinary system and the indigenous one — which results in cases of people being tried twice for the same offence.⁵⁰

31. ACPJ points out a shortcoming in the police courts, which deal with minor offences, in that justice is dispensed by officials called *corregidores*, who are appointed by the political authorities and who can be dismissed for any reason whatsoever. ACPJ finds it alarming that these officials have the power to imprison someone for up to a year but are not subject to any type of judicial oversight.⁵¹ ACPJ draws attention to an agenda for judicial reform drawn up by the State Justice Commission with contributions from the three branches of government, the Ombudsman’s Office, the Bar Association and civil society. It says that a new system of community justices of the peace was due to be introduced in 2007 to deal with minor offences and local disputes, but the Government failed to implement the reform and has given no indication of when it will take the matter up again.⁵²

32. ACPJ also says that the Government has not done enough to tackle the issue of victims’ rights. There are no implementing regulations for Act No. 31 of 1998 or clear regulations on restorative justice, and legal aid for crime victims is virtually non-existent.⁵³ RDH identifies one of the basic obstacles to access to justice, especially for vulnerable population groups, as the problems affecting institutions and offices responsible for victim care.⁵⁴

33. JS6 is concerned that Panama has not accepted the recommendation of the Committee on the Rights of the Child to bring the administration of juvenile justice fully into line with the Convention on the Rights of the Child and other international instruments. It is also concerned that Act No. 6 of 8 March 2010 may lead to the introduction of a tougher regime of juvenile criminal responsibility, particularly as it increases the maximum period of pretrial detention.⁵⁵

34. According to RDH, the age of criminal responsibility has recently been lowered from 14 to 12 years, while there is no special rehabilitation system for minors.⁵⁶

35. JS5 says that the report of the Truth Commission of Panama, set up in 2001, recorded 116 murders and enforced disappearances during the dictatorship. According to JS5, the Public Prosecutor’s Office has not dealt with these cases in a responsible fashion. JS5 asks the Human Rights Council to urge Panama to deal with the complaints of the victims’ families with regard to clarification, justice and reparation.⁵⁷

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

36. The Institute on Religion and Public Policy (IRPP) indicates that the Government does “a good job” in upholding the Constitution, which provides for freedom of religion to all citizens regardless of their faith.⁵⁸

37. JS3 says that people acting in defence of human rights, particularly the right to be involved in environmental issues, have been subjected to reprisals and harassment.⁵⁹

38. RDH says that women’s participation in public and political life has suffered serious setbacks.⁶⁰ Despite the requirement in the Electoral Code that 30 per cent of candidates for elected posts should be women, there is no mechanism to ensure that this is actually the case.⁶¹ JS6 demands that a 50 per cent electoral quota for women be written into the Electoral Code. JS6 urges that Panama be called upon to comply with the recommendation

of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women to adopt strategies to increase the number of women involved in decision-making at all levels, especially at the level of municipalities.⁶²

5. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

39. JS6 claims that Panama repeatedly violates the right to freedom of association. Panamanian legislation limits the exercise of this right by requiring that trade unions have a minimum of 40 members – a figure that is too high by international standards. It also discriminates against immigrant workers by requiring that union leaders be Panamanian, leaving immigrant workers without protection. Also, trade union rights are only guaranteed to 11 members of the board. In addition, the Ministry of Labour, through the Department of Trade Union Organizations, has arrogated to itself the right to decide who the union leaders will be, subject to endorsement by the union's congress or general assembly.⁶³ JS6 recommends that Panama be required to comply with the ILO Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize Convention, 1948 (No. 87).⁶⁴

40. JS6 claims that Panama has for years blocked the organization of trade unions in the public sector. Moreover, strikes in the public sector are constrained by the Government's power to submit the conflict to forced arbitration, the obligation to provide minimum essential services and the requirement that 50 per cent of employees must work, a list that features activities in breach of the fundamental principles of freedom of association.⁶⁵

41. RDH points out that there is still a wage gap between men and women in the labour market and that the practice of asking questions about pregnancy in job interviews persists, with no proper mechanism for investigating or punishing such behaviour.⁶⁶ JS4 recommends that current legislation on paid domestic work be amended, that labour inspections of employers be stepped up and that employers who breach the Labour Code be severely punished. It also calls for enforcement of the Equal Opportunities Act (No. 4), the gender equality standards contained in the international conventions signed by Panama, and existing domestic legislation.⁶⁷

42. JS4 points out that the recognition of indigenous and peasant women as workers excludes them from a range of mechanisms that would give them access to land, credit, technology and social security coverage, among other things.⁶⁸

6. Right to social security and to an adequate standard of living

43. IHRC-UOK notes the high rates of poverty and extreme poverty, especially among indigenous children. It indicates that indigenous children are not registered at birth.⁶⁹ Underlining that 82 per cent of Panama's indigenous population lives in remote, rural areas, IHRC-UOK notes that access to treatment is often difficult for those in need of medical attention.⁷⁰ It stresses that those who are able to reach health-care centres often choose not to, due to a lack of understanding and respect for traditional medicines, treatments and cultural customs in such centres. Indigenous populations face extremely high mortality rates resulting from complications during pregnancy and childbirth. IHRC-UOK also notes that there is a tremendous lack of food, causing malnutrition among 60 per cent of indigenous children.⁷¹

44. JS6 notes that the poor in Panama are typically indigenous people or people of African descent. Most of the poor live in urban, rather than rural, areas. Most of the people in urban pockets of poverty are of African descent.⁷²

45. IIMA-VIDES expresses concern about the disparities in living standards and access to basic social services such as education, health care, drinking water and sanitation among various population groups, particularly those living in urban and rural areas, as well as

indigenous peoples.⁷³ According to RDH, the health situation of indigenous peoples is going from bad to worse.⁷⁴

46. JS4 says that the number of women dying from complications related to pregnancy or childbirth is a matter of concern.⁷⁵ JS6 also mentions the alarming level of maternal mortality, particularly among indigenous women.⁷⁶ According to JS4, the maternal mortality rate among indigenous women is currently around 70 per 100,000 live births. The hardest hit areas are the indigenous regions, especially Ngöbe-Buglé, where there is a lack of health facilities and midwives have no transport or proper equipment.⁷⁷

47. JS3 talks of how economic activities related to mining, tourism, uncontrolled land use and the development of infrastructure projects pose a threat and cause serious harm to the environment and affect human rights.⁷⁸

48. JS3 also says that the lack of control over economic activities and planning has hastened environmental destruction.⁷⁹ The Ombudsman's Office says that there is now an environmental crisis as a result of poor solid-waste management, which poses a serious risk to people's health.⁸⁰

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

49. RDH says that intercultural bilingual education has not been introduced in indigenous territories, even though it is recognized in the Education Act; the illiteracy rate in indigenous areas is the highest in the country.⁸¹

50. IUHR-UOK reports that indigenous children face discrimination and a lack of access to adequate cultural and linguistic education. It notes that as indigenous peoples are concentrated in rural areas, transportation to schools can be costly and time-consuming. Not all children speak Spanish and school curricula do not reflect an understanding of the relevance of indigenous cultural perspectives. The majority of teachers are not indigenous and cannot speak their students' mother tongue.⁸² IUHR-UOK recommends that Panama work to preserve bilingual and cultural education.⁸³

51. JS6 refers to the paucity of good-quality education in places where there are settlements of people of African descent. JS6 notes that the official school curriculum makes no reference to African ancestry or the history of African peoples.⁸⁴ JS6 recommends that textbooks be revised to cut out implicit racial stereotypes that disparage the ethnicity and race of people of African descent.⁸⁵

8. Minorities and indigenous peoples

52. Cultural Survival (CS) reports that, in the field of indigenous rights, Panama has a thoroughly mixed record. It notes that the system of reserved territories, the *comarcas*, offers strong protection for indigenous lands and autonomy. It also remarks that two governmental bodies address indigenous concerns, as does the Ombudsman.⁸⁶ According to CS, however, the gap between stated intentions and government action is huge,⁸⁷ the Government consistently fails to protect indigenous citizens and, when large-scale national development is at stake, it actively furthers their abuse.⁸⁸ Indigenous peoples — Kuna, Emberá, Wounán, Ngöbe, Buglé, Naso and Bribri — estimated to number 285,000 persons in 2000, constitute roughly 10 per cent of the national population. CS warns that their lands are threatened by a recent wave of intensified exploitation of natural and social resources.⁸⁹

53. JS3 talks about the lack of participation, ignorance of the rights of indigenous communities, the lack of access to justice and of judicial guarantees, and the criminalization of social protest.⁹⁰ JS3 recommends that Panama adopt the recommendations of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous people, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Inter-American

Commission on Human Rights;⁹¹ ratify ILO Convention No. 169 and incorporate the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples into domestic law;⁹² and recognize the work of human rights defenders and take measures to afford them full protection.⁹³

54. On 18 June 2009, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) granted precautionary measures for members of the indigenous communities of the Ngobe people in relation to a 20-year concession which had been approved for a company to build hydroelectric dams along the Teribe-Changuinola River. IACHR believed that precautionary measures should be granted to avoid irreparable harm to the right to property and security of Ngobe indigenous people in the province of Bocas del Toro.⁹⁴

55. IHRC-UOK notes that Panama has failed to enforce the territorial integrity of indigenous *comarcas* and non-*comarca* traditional indigenous lands, which has led to lost land, inadequate food production and environmental degradation. According to IHRC-UOK, forced evictions from traditional lands not recognized as *comarcas* has often occurred without compensation.⁹⁵ Both the Kuna of Madungandi and the Embera of Bayano have faced considerable challenges regarding land removals and lack of compensation, and the Naso community has been denied a *comarca*.⁹⁶ IHRC-UOK recommends, inter alia, assisting in enforcing laws that restrict non-indigenous settlements on *comarca* land; compensate the Madungandi and Embera people who were removed from traditional lands; pass legislation to establish a *comarca* for the Naso people; and implement a titling and recognition plan that proactively recognizes traditional lands.⁹⁷

9. Migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers

56. RDH reports the following violations in the areas of migration and asylum: the deportation of migrants in border areas without giving them access to legal assistance; and the detention in migrant centres of people recognized as being in need of temporary protection, and the failure to regularize them.⁹⁸ RDH also points out that the guarantees due to people in need of international protection are not respected by the police and migration authorities, with the detention of “asylum-seekers in transit”.⁹⁹

57. Panama continues to promote a policy that restricts migration to the nationals of certain countries, through the system of “authorized visas”. According to RDH, this practice constitutes an act of discrimination on grounds of country of nationality.¹⁰⁰ The new migration law and the regulations thereto tightened up legalization procedures, increased processing costs, imposed higher financial requirements that disadvantage less well-off migrants, and introduced large fines, all in an attempt to stem migration. “Preventive” operations have also been stepped up under the policy, to detect undocumented immigrants, leading to more deportations, especially of nationals of Colombia and Central American countries.¹⁰¹

58. RDH also says that the National Assembly promulgated Act No. 25 of 2008, which grants residency to refugees who have had refugee status for more than 10 years. However, residency is granted on an exceptional basis and is temporary, so that it is not available to the majority of the refugee population in Panama.¹⁰²

59. According to RDH, one of the legal gaps in Decree No. 23 of 10 February 1998 is the lack of a provisional document that would give asylum-seekers the right to work while their application for refugee status is being processed.¹⁰³ As a consequence, during this process, which takes about eight months, asylum-seekers cannot officially work in Panama. This leaves them even more vulnerable, as their undocumented status makes them a target for extortion by police officers or for detention by officials of the National Migration Service, since they are not issued with any document to show their case is being processed.¹⁰⁴

III. Achievements, best practices, challenges and constraints

N/A

IV. Key national priorities, initiatives and commitments

N/A

V. Capacity-building and technical assistance

N/A

Notes

- ¹ The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org. (One asterisk denotes a non-governmental organization in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council. Two asterisks denote a national human rights institution with “A” status).

Civil society

ACPJ	Joint submission Nr. 1 – Alianza Ciudadana Pro Justicia: Fundación para el Desarrollo de la Libertad Ciudadana- Centro de Asistencia Legal Popular Instituto de Criminología de la Universidad de Panamá- Colegio Nacional de Abogados- Asociación Panameña de Derecho Constitucional-Comisión de Justicia y Paz.-Centro de Estudio y Acción Social de Panamá-Comisión Nacional Pro Valores Cívicos y Morales-Central General Autónoma de Trabajadores de Panamá, Panama;
AEPDPVIH	Joint submission Nr. 2 – Alianza Estratégica de Promoción y Defensa Pública en VIH, Panama;
CCSP	Centro de Capacitación Social de Panamá, Panama;
CS	Cultural Survival, Cambridge, Massachusetts, United States of America;*
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End Corporal Punishment of Children, United Kingdom;
IIMA-VIDES	Joint submission Nr. 7 – Instituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice* and VIDES International,* Roma, Italy;
IHRC-UOK	International Human Rights Clinic of the University of Oklahoma College of Law, Oklahoma, United States of America;
IRPP	The Institute on Religion and Public Policy, Washington D.C., United States of America;
JS3	Joint submission Nr. 3 – Asociación Ambientalista de Chiriquí (ASAMCHI), Asociación Interamericana para la Defensa del Ambiente (AIDA), Centro de Estudios y Acción Social Panameño (CEASPA), Centro de Incidencia Ambiental (CIAM)-Panamá, Colectivo de Derechos Humanos, Colectivo Voces Ecológicas, Colibrí-Asociación Ecologista de Panamá, Comité de Moradores de la Isla Pedro González, Frente Santeño contra la Minería, Fundación para el Desarrollo Integral del Corregimiento de Cerro Punta (FUNDICCEP), Grupo Campesino de La Pintada, Grupo La Zapatilla Verde, Human Rights Everywhere (HREV)/Comuna Sur, “Justicia, Paz e Integridad de la Creación” de los Misioneros Claretianos de Centroamérica. Panama;
JS4	Joint submission Nr. 4 – Alianza de Mujeres de Panamá. Suscriben el documento las siguientes organizaciones: Coordinadora de Organizaciones para el Desarrollo Integral de la Mujer (CODIM), Comité de América Latina y el Caribe para la Defensa de los Derechos de la Mujer (CLADEM-Panamá), Foro Mujer y Desarrollo, Coordinadora Nacional de Mujeres Indígenas de Panamá (CONAMUIP), Agenda Económica de las Mujeres (AGEM). Adhieren también el Centro de Asistencia Legal Popular (CEALP) y la Red de Derechos Humanos (RDH-Panamá), Panamá;
JS5	Joint submission Nr. 5 – Coordinadora Popular de Derechos Humanos de Panamá COPODEHUPA y Comité de Familiares de Desaparecidos de Panamá Héctor Gallego (COFADEPA-HG), Panama;
JS6	Joint submission Nr. 6 – Coordinadora Popular de los Derechos Humanos de Panamá (COPODEHUPA); Coordinadora Nacional de Organizaciones Negras Panameñas; Comité contra el Racismo; Centro de Estudios y Acción Social Panameño (CEASPA); Centro de la Mujer Panameña (CEMP); Red de Mujeres Afropanameñas; Centro de Capacitación Social de Panamá (CCSP); Observatorio de Género y Economía de la Universidad de Panamá; Comité de

América Latina y el Caribe para la Defensa de los Derechos de la Mujer - Panamá (CLADEM Panamá); Espacio de Encuentro de Mujeres (EEM); Central Convergencia Sindical; Confederación Nacional de Trabajadores de la República de Panamá (CTRP); Comité Isla Pedro González; Colectivo Derechos Humanos Universidad de Panamá (DDHHUP); Centro de Incidencia Ambiental (CIAM); Colectivo Voces Ecológicas, Panama;

RDH-Panamá Joint submission Nr. 8 – Red Derechos Humanos: Centro de Iniciativas Democráticas (CIDEM), Comité de América Latina y el Caribe para la Defensa de los Derechos de la Mujer (CLADEM-Panamá), Justicia y Paz, Centro de Asistencia Legal Popular (CEALP), Derechos Humanos Universidad de Panamá (dd.hh.up), Servicio Jesuita de Refugiados, Coordinadora de Organizaciones para el Desarrollo Integral de la Mujer (CODIM), Foro Mujer y Desarrollo, Coordinadora Nacional de Mujeres Indígenas de Panamá (CONAMUIP), Panama.

- ² JS6, page 5.
³ JS6, page 7.
⁴ JS3, page 5, paras. 22–23.
⁵ RDH-Panamá, pages 2–3.
⁶ RDH, page 10.
⁷
⁸ Alianza de Mujeres de Panamá (JS4), page 3.
⁹ Alianza de Mujeres de Panamá (JS4), pages 4–5.
¹⁰ Alianza de Mujeres de Panamá (JS4), pages 4–5.
¹¹ JS6, page 6.
¹² JS6, page 7.
¹³ RDH, page 7.
¹⁴ AEPDPVIH, page 1.
¹⁵ AEPDPVIH, pages 2 and 3. See also submission from Defensoría del Pueblo, page 5.
¹⁶ IMMA-VIDES Intl', page 5.
¹⁷ CCSP, p. 4.
¹⁸ RDH, page 2.
¹⁹ RDH, pages 8–9.
²⁰ RDH, page 6.
²¹ RDH, page 6. See also submission JS6, page 4.
²² AEPDPVIH, page 9. See also submission from Defensoría del Pueblo, page 5.
²³ AEPDPVIH, page 9.
²⁴ AEPDPVIH, page 9.
²⁵ RDH, page 8.
²⁶ CCSP, page 3.
²⁷ JS6, page 7.
²⁸ RDH, page 6.
²⁹ RDH, page 6. See also submission from la Alianza de Mujeres de Panamá (JS4), pages 3–4.
³⁰ Alianza de Mujeres de Panamá (JS4), pages 3–4. See also submission JS6, pages 4–6
³¹ Defensoría del Pueblo, page 3.
³² GIEACPC, page 2.
³³ GIEACPC, page 2.
³⁴ RDH, page 7.
³⁵ JS6, page 8.
³⁶ RDH, page 5.
³⁷ RDH, page 5.
³⁸ Defensoría del Pueblo, pages 2–3.
³⁹ IHRC-UOK, pages 1, 6 and 7.
⁴⁰ JS6, pages 2–3.
⁴¹ ACPJ, page 2.
⁴² JS6, pages 2–3.

- ⁴³ JS1, page 2.
⁴⁴ RDH, pages 3–4. See submission for cases cited.
⁴⁵ Defensoría del Pueblo, page 2.
⁴⁶ JS1, page 2.
⁴⁷ JS1, page 3.
⁴⁸ ACPI, page 2. See also submission from the Alianza de Mujeres de Panamá (JS4), pages 8–9.
⁴⁹ JS6, pages 2–3.
⁵⁰ JS1, page 1.
⁵¹ JS1, page 1.
⁵² JS1, pages 1–2.
⁵³ JS1, page 2.
⁵⁴ RDH, page 3.
⁵⁵ JS6, pages 2–3.
⁵⁶ RDH, page 7.
⁵⁷ JS5, pages 1–2. See submission for details on cases cited. See also submission from RDH, page 4.
⁵⁸ IRPP, page 1.
⁵⁹ JS3, pages 9–10. See submission for cases cited.
⁶⁰ RDH, page 6.
⁶¹ Alianza de Mujeres de Panamá (JS4), pages 9–10.
⁶² JS6, page 6.
⁶³ JS6, page 8.
⁶⁴ JS6, page 8.
⁶⁵ JS6, page 8.
⁶⁶ RDH, page 6.
⁶⁷ Alianza de Mujeres de Panamá (JS4), pages 5–6.
⁶⁸ Alianza de Mujeres de Panamá (JS4), pages 6–7.
⁶⁹ IHRC-UOK, page 2.
⁷⁰ IHRC-UOK, page 5.
⁷¹ IHRC-UOK, page 5.
⁷² JS6, pages 4–5.
⁷³ IMMA-VIDES Intl', page 6.
⁷⁴ RDH, page 8.
⁷⁵ Alianza de Mujeres de Panamá (JS4), page 7.
⁷⁶ JS6, page 4.
⁷⁷ Alianza de Mujeres de Panamá (JS4), page 7.
⁷⁸ JS3, page 1. See also submission from JS6, pages 9–10.
⁷⁹ JS3 page 3 para. 11.
⁸⁰ Defensoría del Pueblo, page 4.
⁸¹ RDH, pages 7–8. See also submission from the Defensoría del Pueblo, page 3.
⁸² IHRC-UOK, page 2.
⁸³ IHRC-UOK, page 2.
⁸⁴ JS6, page 6.
⁸⁵ JS6, page 7.
⁸⁶ CS, page 1.
⁸⁷ CS, page 1.
⁸⁸ CS, page 1.
⁸⁹ CS, page 1. See submission for cases cited.
⁹⁰ JS3 page 1.
⁹¹ JS3, page 10.
⁹² JS3, page 10.
⁹³ JS3, page 10.
⁹⁴ IACHR-OAS, Annex 6.
⁹⁵ IHRC-UOK, page 4.
⁹⁶ IHRC-UOK, page 4.
⁹⁷ IHRC-UOK, page 4. See also submission from the IACHR-OAS, Annex 3.
⁹⁸ RDH, pages 9–10.

⁹⁹ RDH, page 10.

¹⁰⁰ RDH, pages 9–10.

¹⁰¹ RDH, pages 9–10. See also submission from the Defensoría del Pueblo, page 4.

¹⁰² RDH, pages 9–10. See also submission from the Defensoría del Pueblo, page 4.

¹⁰³ RDH, pages 9–10.

¹⁰⁴ RDH, pages 9–10. See also submission from IACHR-OAS, Annex 1.