



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
20 November 2015

Original: English

---

## Human Rights Council

Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review

Twenty-fourth session

18-29 January 2016

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

### **Singapore**

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



## I. Background and framework

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

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

	<i>Status during previous cycle</i>	<i>Action after review</i>	<i>Not ratified/not accepted</i>
<i>Ratification, accession or succession</i>	CEDAW (1995)	CRPD (2013)	ICERD (signature, 2015)
	CRC (1995)	ICERD (signature, 2015)	ICESCR
	OP-CRC-AC (2008)		ICCPR ICCPR-OP 2 CAT OP-CAT OP-CRC-SC ICRMW ICPPED
<i>Reservations and/or declarations</i>	CEDAW (reservations: art. 2 (a)-(f), art. 11 (1), art. 16 (1) (a) (c) and (h) and (2) and art. 29 (1), 1995)	CEDAW (partial withdrawal of reservation, arts. 2 and 16, 2011)	
	CRC (declarations: arts. 12-17, 19 and 37; general reservations: art. 28 (1) (a) and art. 32, 1995)	CRPD (reservations: art. 12 (4), art. 25 (e) and art. 29 (a) (iii), 2013)	
	OP-CRC-AC (declaration: art. 3 (2), minimum age of recruitment 16 years and 6 months, 2008)		
<i>Complaints procedures, inquiries and urgent action<sup>3</sup></i>			ICERD OP-ICESCR ICCPR ICCPR-OP 1 OP-CEDAW CAT OP-CRC-IC ICRMW OP-CRPD, art. 6 ICPPED

## 2. Other main relevant international instruments

	<i>Status during previous cycle</i>	<i>Action after review</i>	<i>Not ratified</i>
<i>Ratification, accession or succession</i>	Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide		Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court Palermo Protocol <sup>4</sup>
	Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 and Additional Protocol III <sup>6</sup>		Conventions on refugees and stateless persons <sup>5</sup> Additional Protocols I and II to the 1949 Geneva Conventions <sup>7</sup>
	ILO fundamental conventions except Nos. 87 and 111 <sup>8</sup>		ILO Conventions Nos. 87 and 111 <sup>9</sup> ILO Conventions Nos. 169 and 189 <sup>10</sup>
			Convention against Discrimination in Education

1. In 2011, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women encouraged Singapore to ratify ICESCR, ICCPR, ICERD, CAT, ICRMW, ICPPED<sup>11</sup> and OP-CEDAW.<sup>12</sup> In 2014, the Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended that Singapore ratify OP-CRC-SC and OP-CRC-IC.<sup>13</sup>

2. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women noted the partial withdrawal by Singapore of its reservations to articles 2 and 16 and the progress made to align its legislation with CEDAW. It expressed concern about Singapore's reservations to article 2 (a)-(f), article 16 (1) (a) (c) and (h) and (2) and article 11 (1). It called upon Singapore to fully incorporate the parts of articles 2 and 16 that were now applicable in Singapore and consider withdrawing its remaining reservations to those articles and to article 11 (1).<sup>14</sup>

3. The same Committee encouraged Singapore to ratify the ILO Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111) and to sign and ratify the ILO Domestic Workers Convention 2011 (No. 189).<sup>15</sup>

4. The Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended that Singapore consider ratifying the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol, the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons and the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.<sup>16</sup> It also recommended that Singapore ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.<sup>17</sup>

5. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women called upon Singapore to ratify the Palermo Protocol.<sup>18</sup> The Committee on the Rights of the Child encouraged Singapore to ratify the Convention on Cluster Munitions and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction.<sup>19</sup>

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

6. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women acknowledged the commitment of Singapore to the principles of gender equality and non-discrimination. It called upon Singapore to place high priority on the full incorporation of CEDAW into its domestic legal system.<sup>20</sup>

7. The Committee on the Rights of the Child was concerned at the lack of clarity as to whether all the provisions of OP-CRC-AC were covered in Singapore's domestic legislation. It recommended that Singapore ensure that OP-CRC-AC is fully incorporated into the domestic legal system.<sup>21</sup>

8. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women welcomed amendments made to the Evidence Act and the Criminal Procedure Code; the Women's Charter; and the Children and Young Persons Act, which protected girls and young women against abuse, neglect and exploitation.<sup>22</sup>

9. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) noted that, in answer to a parliamentary question, the Deputy Prime Minister of Singapore had stated that between 2003 and 2012, each year about 500 to 600 stateless persons in Singapore had submitted applications for Singapore citizenship, and that each year an average of 91 per cent of those citizenship applications had been approved. In that regard, UNHCR recommended that Singapore: provide UNHCR with up-to-date statistics on the number and profile of stateless persons residing in Singapore and statistics, by year, on the number of such persons able to acquire nationality; accede to the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons and to the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness; and revise its nationality law to facilitate the realization of every child's right to a nationality, removing the power to deprive children of nationality and closing a gap in the law so that children born in Singapore who cannot acquire another nationality automatically acquire Singaporean nationality.<sup>23</sup>

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

10. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women regretted that Singapore had not yet taken steps to establish an independent national human rights institution with a wide mandate to protect and promote women's human rights. It recommended that Singapore establish, within a clear time frame, such an institution in accordance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles).<sup>24</sup>

11. While noting the redesignation of the Women's Desk as the Office for Women's Development on 1 July 2011, the same Committee was concerned about the Office's limited authority, resources and capacity to ensure that gender equality policies were fully implemented. It reiterated its previous recommendation<sup>25</sup> and encouraged Singapore to elevate the status of the national machinery for the advancement of women, to strengthen its mandate and to provide the necessary resources.<sup>26</sup>

## II. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

### A. Cooperation with treaty bodies

#### 1. Reporting status

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Concluding observations included in previous review</i>	<i>Latest report submitted since previous review</i>	<i>Latest concluding observations</i>	<i>Reporting status</i>
Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women	August 2007	-	July 2011	Fifth report overdue since July 2015
Committee on the Rights of the Child	February 2011	2011 (OP-CRC-AC)	September 2014 (OP-CRC-AC)	Combined fourth and fifth reports due in 2017
Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	-	-	-	Initial report due in 2015

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

<i>Concluding observations</i>			
<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Due in</i>	<i>Subject matter</i>	<i>Submitted in</i>
Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women	2013	Withdrawal of reservations; domestic workers and foreign wives <sup>27</sup>	2013; <sup>28</sup> further information requested <sup>29</sup>

### B. Cooperation with special procedures<sup>30</sup>

	<i>Status during previous cycle</i>	<i>Current status</i>
<i>Standing invitation</i>	No	No
<i>Visits undertaken</i>	Racism	
<i>Visits agreed to in principle</i>		Human rights of older persons
<i>Visits requested</i>	Human rights defenders Summary executions	Cultural rights Freedom of peaceful assembly and of association
<i>Responses to letters of allegations and urgent appeals</i>	During the period under review, 12 communications were sent. The Government replied to eight of them.	

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

12. Singapore contributed financially to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) in 2011, 2013, 2014 and 2015.<sup>31</sup>

## **III. Implementation of international human rights obligations**

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

13. While noting that the general principles of equality and non-discrimination were guaranteed in the Constitution, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women remained concerned at the absence of a specific definition of discrimination against women in accordance with article 1 of CEDAW. It reiterated its previous recommendation<sup>32</sup> and urged Singapore to incorporate into its legislation a definition of discrimination against women encompassing both direct and indirect discrimination and to prohibit all forms of discrimination against women.<sup>33</sup>

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

14. Singapore was featured in a study entitled “Moving away from the death penalty: lessons in South-East Asia”, published in 2014 by the OHCHR Regional Office for South-East Asia in Bangkok.<sup>34</sup> In the study, it was noted that Singapore had executed two people for drug-related offences on 18 July 2014, lifting its de facto moratorium of three years since the start of a legislative review in 2011, which had concluded in January 2013.

15. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was particularly concerned that, despite the legal equality accorded to spouses, discriminatory traditional cultural attitudes that continued to utilize the “head of the household” concept, assigning that role to men, persisted. It called upon Singapore to eliminate patriarchal attitudes and stereotypes that discriminate against women.<sup>35</sup>

16. The same Committee noted with appreciation the creation of the National Family Violence Networking System.<sup>36</sup> It expressed concern at the persistence of violence against women. While welcoming the amendments to the Penal Code in 2008 on the criminalization of the rape of a spouse, the Committee was concerned that the law applied only if the perpetrator and the victim were living apart and were in the process of terminating their marriage, and if the victim had applied for a personal protection order. The Committee urged Singapore to specifically criminalize domestic violence and marital rape, ensure that the definition of rape covers any non-consensual sexual act, and encourage women to report incidents of domestic and sexual violence.<sup>37</sup>

17. The Committee on the Rights of the Child regretted the imposition of caning on members of the armed forces, including underage volunteers, for various offences under the Singapore Armed Forces Act. It urged Singapore to prohibit by law all forms of corporal punishment in all settings.<sup>38</sup>

18. The same Committee regretted that the Children and Young Persons Act still did not cover children between the ages of 16 and 18. It recommended that Singapore explicitly include the prohibition of recruitment or use of children in conflict situations in the Act and include explicit legal provisions providing for the protection of children who have been recruited or used in conflict situations, or have in any other way fallen victim to armed

conflict. The Committee recommended that Singapore harmonize the definition of the child in its national laws, in line with CRC.<sup>39</sup>

19. The same Committee noted that children who had reached the age of 16 years and 6 months may be voluntarily recruited into the Singapore Armed Forces. It recommended that Singapore consider discontinuing voluntary recruitment under the age of 18 and reduce the notice required to be given by underage volunteers to request release.<sup>40</sup>

20. The Committee was also concerned that the recruitment of children below the age of 15 had not been defined as a war crime. It recommended that Singapore increase both the fine and the length of the term of imprisonment for such offences.<sup>41</sup>

21. The same Committee urged Singapore to implement legislation specifically prohibiting firearms exports, including of small arms and light weapons, and the provision of military assistance to countries where children were known to be, or may potentially be, recruited or used in armed conflict and/or hostilities.<sup>42</sup>

22. While welcoming the establishment of the Inter-agency Task Force on Trafficking in Persons and the adoption of the definition of “trafficking in persons”, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women remained concerned at the continuing prevalence of trafficking in women and girls in the country, the alleged criminalization and deportation of trafficked women and girls as immigration offenders and the low reporting rate. It called upon Singapore to enact specialized legislation against trafficking in persons, strengthen its measures to combat all forms of trafficking in women and children, and ensure the prosecution and punishment of individuals involved in trafficking and the protection and rehabilitation of victims.<sup>43</sup>

23. UNHCR recommended that Singapore ensure proper investigation, prosecution and adequate sanctions in all cases of human trafficking, including through the training of government officials, such as those in law enforcement and the judiciary; allocate resources to provide for the adequate protection of victims and witnesses, including through the establishment and running of safe shelters; and establish within the regulations a referral mechanism for victims of trafficking who may be in need of international protection.<sup>44</sup>

### **C. Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law**

24. The Committee on the Rights of the Child was concerned at the application of extraterritorial jurisdiction being limited to grave breaches of international humanitarian law under the Geneva Conventions of 1949. It recommended that Singapore ensure that extraterritorial jurisdiction is exercised regarding all offences under OP-CRC-AC.<sup>45</sup>

25. The same Committee was concerned about the possibility of extradition being limited to the offences listed in the First Schedule of the Extradition Act. It recommended that Singapore ensure that the list of offences permitting extradition under the domestic extradition regime includes all crimes under OP-CRC-AC.<sup>46</sup>

26. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women noted with appreciation the efforts to revise discriminatory legislation and align Syariah law with civil law. It remained deeply concerned at the preservation of the dual marriage regime and the discriminatory provisions that persisted in the laws relating to marriage, divorce and nationality that denied women equal rights with men. It was concerned at the lack of free choice of adjudication between Syariah Court and family court. The Committee called upon Singapore to harmonize its domestic legislation with its obligations under CEDAW and provide for equal choice of adjudication between Syariah and family courts.<sup>47</sup>

27. While welcoming the existence of a complaints mechanism for members of the armed forces, the Committee on the Rights of the Child noted with concern that that

mechanism was managed by the Ministry of Defence. It recommended that Singapore establish a complaints mechanism outside that Ministry, with a clear mandate to receive and investigate complaints from national servicemen, in particular under the age of 18, regarding all areas covered by OP-CRC-AC, and ensure its confidentiality and accessibility. The mechanism should be provided with the necessary resources for it to function adequately.<sup>48</sup>

28. The same Committee regretted that underage volunteers were subject to military law and trial by the Subordinate Military Court. It recommended that Singapore ensure that if charges are brought against underage volunteers, trials are held in civilian courts and are consistent with the standards on juvenile justice set out in CRC.<sup>49</sup>

#### **D. Right to privacy, marriage and family life**

29. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned that, despite some of the steps taken to harmonize Syariah law and civil law, Muslim women could not enjoy equal rights with men with regard to family, marriage and divorce. It was concerned that women's equal share in all marital property was not guaranteed in clear legislation. The Committee called upon Singapore to ensure equality between women and men in marriage and family relations and amend without delay all remaining discriminatory provisions and administrative regulations.<sup>50</sup>

30. The same Committee was concerned by the lack of legal provisions governing de facto unions, which may deny women protection and redress in case of separation or violence against them. It called upon Singapore to review its legal system governing marriage and family relations with a view to extending existing legal provisions to couples living in de facto unions.<sup>51</sup>

31. While acknowledging the legal reforms that made polygamy practically impossible, the Committee was also concerned at the continued legal authorization of polygamy. It called upon Singapore to legislate, without delay, a complete ban on polygamy in all societal groups.<sup>52</sup>

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

32. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) noted that the right to freedom of expression was enshrined in article 14 of the Constitution. It also noted that, pursuant to chapter 21 of the Penal Code, defamation was a criminal offence and could lead to punishment by fines or prison terms of up to two years. UNESCO further noted the existence of the Defamation Act, which dealt with defamation in detail.<sup>53</sup> It recommended that Singapore decriminalize defamation and place it within a civil code in accordance with international standards.<sup>54</sup>

33. UNESCO noted that the Media Development Authority was a regulatory body under the Ministry of Communications and Information. It had passed an Internet Code of Practice binding on all Internet content providers and aimed at ensuring that no prohibited material would be broadcast via the Internet.<sup>55</sup>

34. The Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression urged Singapore to review the decision to sentence an adolescent blogger to four weeks in prison for posting a video and a caricature of Singapore's late founder, former Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew.<sup>56</sup> The OHCHR Regional Office for South-East Asia released a press statement expressing concern about the conviction of the 16-



year-old, Amos Yee, for uploading remarks and images critical of Mr. Lee.<sup>57</sup> The Special Rapporteur expressed concern about the physical and psychological effect of the teenage blogger's time in custody, stressing that his detention did not meet the standards set by CRC. He stated that condemning an adolescent to prison for expressing his opinion was clearly unacceptable pursuant to international standards for freedom of expression and for the rights of the child, while welcoming the release of the blogger, who had already served more than a month in custody, reportedly under harsh conditions that had affected his health. The Special Rapporteur noted that the court's deeply unfortunate decision not only curbed the adolescent's rights but also exerted a deterrent effect on others in Singapore who criticized public figures or the Government.<sup>58</sup>

35. The Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression also emphasized that the mere fact that a form of expression was considered to be insulting to a public figure was not sufficient to justify the imposition of penalties. He highlighted that openness to all forms of criticism was always to be expected in the necessary debate on present or past public figures, no matter how revered by the public. He also emphasized that the reported treatment and conditions of detention had been particularly harsh and would never meet the minimum standards regarding the imposition of custodial measures for children, which should be used as a last resort, only for the shortest possible period of time and only if it is in the best interests of the child, and should be limited to exceptional cases.<sup>59</sup>

36. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women noted with concern that Singapore had no plans to adopt temporary special measures to accelerate the achievement of substantive equality between women and men. It reiterated its previous recommendation<sup>60</sup> and called upon Singapore to apply temporary special measures in areas in which women are underrepresented or disadvantaged and allocate additional resources where needed.<sup>61</sup>

37. While welcoming the increase in the number of women in public service, the Committee also noted with concern that no women were full ministers in the Cabinet and that women in Singapore continued to be underrepresented in decision-making in the Government, the judiciary and the diplomatic service, as well as in the private sector. It recommended that Singapore, inter alia, adopt laws and policies aimed at the promotion of women's full and equal participation in decision-making in all areas of public, political and professional life.<sup>62</sup>

## **F. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work**

38. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women reiterated its concern regarding the reservation made by Singapore to article 11 (1) of CEDAW. It urged Singapore to withdraw its reservation and eliminate occupational segregation, both horizontal and vertical, and to adopt legislation guaranteeing equal pay for work of equal value to narrow and close the wage gap between women and men.<sup>63</sup>

39. The Committee also remained concerned at the situation of foreign domestic workers. It encouraged Singapore to amend the existing labour legislation so that it applies to such workers, or adopt new legislation ensuring that such workers are entitled to adequate wages, decent working conditions, including a day off, benefits and access to complaint and redress mechanisms.<sup>64</sup> Within the Committee's follow-up framework, Singapore reported that the Employment of Foreign Manpower Act had been amended to impose harsher penalties for employers found in breach of work pass conditions.<sup>65</sup> The Committee noted with appreciation the amendments, but expressed concern that the weekly day off was not mandatory.<sup>66</sup>

40. The same Committee encouraged Singapore to repeal the law requiring a work-permit holder, including foreign domestic workers, to be deported on grounds of pregnancy or the diagnosis of sexually transmitted diseases such as HIV/AIDS.<sup>67</sup> Within the Committee's follow-up framework, Singapore reported that such laws were necessary to protect the population.<sup>68</sup> In 2014, the Committee requested follow-up information on the actions taken to repeal the law.<sup>69</sup>

41. The Committee also reiterated its previous concern about the situation of foreign wives of Singaporean citizens. It encouraged Singapore to provide work permits to foreign wives with a social visit pass and review its system of granting citizenship to foreign wives within a clear and reasonable time frame after marriage.<sup>70</sup> Within the Committee's follow-up framework Singapore reported that the new Long Term Visit Pass Plus scheme had been introduced to provide greater support to Singaporean families with foreign spouses who were not yet permanent residents or citizens.<sup>71</sup> The Committee regretted that there were conditions for obtaining the passes under the scheme.<sup>72</sup>

42. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women expressed concern at the lack of a legal definition and prohibition of sexual harassment. It urged Singapore to enact legislative provisions on sexual harassment in the workplace and in educational institutions, including sanctions, civil remedies and compensation for victims.<sup>73</sup>

43. The same Committee noted with appreciation measures to support parenthood, including longer maternity leave and extended childcare and infant leaves for both parents.<sup>74</sup> It expressed concern that the paid maternity leave of 16 weeks applied only to citizen births and that single unwed mothers did not receive the same benefits as married women. It was deeply concerned at the cases in which pregnant employees were forced to resign. The Committee urged Singapore to ensure that all women employees, in both the public and private sectors, are guaranteed paid maternity leave, regardless of their nationality and marital status.<sup>75</sup>

## **G. Right to health**

44. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned at the lack of clear guidelines for non-medical practitioners. It called upon Singapore to impose stricter regulations with regard to safety and extend the existing guidelines for medical practitioners to non-medical practitioners, such as aesthetic clinics, beauty salons and spas, and conduct regular monitoring of their activities.<sup>76</sup>

## **H. Right to education**

45. UNESCO noted that, since the first cycle of the universal periodic review, no specific additional measures had been taken to ensure education for all, particularly for poor children, persons with disabilities and persons living with HIV/AIDS, to promote and guarantee gender equality in educational institutions, and to ensure human rights education and training for the judiciary and law enforcement officials.<sup>77</sup>

## **I. Cultural rights**

46. UNESCO encouraged Singapore to ratify the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. It also encouraged Singapore to facilitate the participation of communities, practitioners, cultural actors and non-governmental organizations from civil society, as well as vulnerable groups, including minorities,

indigenous peoples, migrants, refugees, young peoples and peoples with disabilities, and to ensure that equal opportunities are given to women and girls to address gender disparities in access to and participation in cultural heritage and creative expressions.<sup>78</sup>

## J. Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers

47. The Committee on the Rights of the Child was concerned that Singapore was not a party to any treaties relating to the treatment of refugees, at the absence of a law on the treatment of refugees and at the possibility that a case-by-case approach may lead to unequal treatment. It urged Singapore to uphold the principle of non-refoulement in all circumstances.<sup>79</sup> UNHCR noted that there was no domestic legal framework for the protection of refugees and asylum seekers, including in respect of the principle of non-refoulement. In that regard, it recommended that Singapore formulate and enact national asylum legislation in cooperation with UNHCR to protect asylum seekers and refugees on the territory of Singapore. It also recommended that, pending the establishment of national asylum procedures, Singapore consider implementing other temporary alternative measures to grant safety and temporary refuge to asylum seekers and refugees.<sup>80</sup>

48. UNHCR noted that asylum seekers were often subject to detention and corporal punishment, since they were considered to have violated the provisions of the 1959 Immigration Act.<sup>81</sup> UNHCR emphasized that the detention of asylum seekers and refugees should be used only as a last resort where necessary and justified. Entry in search of protection should not be considered an unlawful act and asylum seekers should not be penalized solely for illegal entry or stay related to a need for international protection. Alternatives to detention should be sought and given preference, in particular for certain categories of persons with specific needs. If detained, asylum seekers should be entitled to minimum procedural safeguards, including the possibility to contact and be contacted by UNHCR, as well as access to counsel and prompt judicial review of the appropriateness and legality of their confinement. Detention should in no way constitute an obstacle to the asylum seekers' possibilities to pursue their asylum application.<sup>82</sup>

49. The Committee on the Rights of the Child urged Singapore to, inter alia, ensure the full protection of asylum-seeking and refugee children, particularly unaccompanied children, and identify at an early stage asylum-seeking, refugee or migrant children who may have been involved in armed conflict abroad.<sup>83</sup> It recommended that Singapore take into account its general comment No. 6 (2005) on the treatment of unaccompanied and separated children outside their country of origin.<sup>84</sup>

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> Unless indicated otherwise, the status of ratification of instruments listed in the table may be found on the official website of the United Nations Treaty Collection database, Office of Legal Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat, <http://treaties.un.org/>. Please also refer to the United Nations compilation on Singapore from the previous cycle (A/HRC/WG.6/11/SGP/2).

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

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

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

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

<sup>4</sup> Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

<sup>5</sup> 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol, 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, and 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.

<sup>6</sup> Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field (First Convention); Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea (Second Convention); Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (Third Convention); Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (Fourth Convention); Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Adoption of an Additional Distinctive Emblem (Protocol III). For the official status of ratifications, see International Committee of the Red Cross, [www.icrc.org/IHL](http://www.icrc.org/IHL).

<sup>7</sup> Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I); and Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II). For the official status of ratifications, see International Committee of the Red Cross, [www.icrc.org/IHL](http://www.icrc.org/IHL).

<sup>8</sup> International Labour Organization (ILO) Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29); Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105); Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98); Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100); Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138); and Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182).

<sup>9</sup> ILO Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87) and Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111).

<sup>10</sup> ILO Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169), and Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189).

<sup>11</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1, para. 41.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 37.

<sup>13</sup> See CRC/C/OPAC/SGP/CO/1, para. 28.

<sup>14</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1, paras. 13-14.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 31-32.

<sup>16</sup> See CRC/C/OPAC/SGP/CO/1, para. 25.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 18.

- <sup>18</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1, para. 26.
- <sup>19</sup> See CRC/C/OPAC/SGP/CO/1, para. 27.
- <sup>20</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1, paras. 9-10.
- <sup>21</sup> See CRC/C/OPAC/SGP/CO/1, paras. 5-6.
- <sup>22</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1, para. 4.
- <sup>23</sup> See UNHCR submission for the universal periodic review of Singapore, pp. 6-7.
- <sup>24</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1, paras. 35-36.
- <sup>25</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/3, para. 18.
- <sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 17-18.
- <sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 42.
- <sup>28</sup> CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1/Add.1. See also letter dated 15 November 2013 from the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women addressed to the Permanent Mission of Singapore to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva. Available from [http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CEDAW/Shared%20Documents/SGP/INT\\_CEDAW\\_FUL\\_SGP\\_15772\\_E.pdf](http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CEDAW/Shared%20Documents/SGP/INT_CEDAW_FUL_SGP_15772_E.pdf).
- <sup>29</sup> See letter dated 10 September 2014 from the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women addressed to the Permanent Mission of Singapore to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva. Available from [http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CEDAW/Shared%20Documents/SGP/INT\\_CEDAW\\_FUL\\_SGP\\_18186\\_E.pdf](http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CEDAW/Shared%20Documents/SGP/INT_CEDAW_FUL_SGP_18186_E.pdf).
- <sup>30</sup> For the titles of special procedure mandate holders, see [www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/SP/Pages/Welcomepage.aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/SP/Pages/Welcomepage.aspx).
- <sup>31</sup> OHCHR Report 2011, OHCHR Report 2013, OHCHR Report 2014 and OHCHR Report 2015 (forthcoming).
- <sup>32</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/3, para. 14.
- <sup>33</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1, paras. 11-12.
- <sup>34</sup> Available from <http://bangkok.ohchr.org/files/Moving%20away%20from%20the%20Death%20Penalty-English%20for%20Website.pdf>.
- <sup>35</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1, paras. 21-22.
- <sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 5.
- <sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 23-24.
- <sup>38</sup> See CRC/C/OPAC/SGP/CO/1, paras. 21-22.
- <sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 15-16.
- <sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 11-12.
- <sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 17-18.
- <sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 27.
- <sup>43</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1, paras. 25-26.
- <sup>44</sup> UNHCR submission for the universal periodic review of Singapore, p. 6.
- <sup>45</sup> See CRC/C/OPAC/SGP/CO/1, paras. 19-20.
- <sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>47</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1, paras. 15-16.
- <sup>48</sup> See CRC/C/OPAC/SGP/CO/1, paras. 7-8.
- <sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 11-12.
- <sup>50</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1, paras. 33-34.
- <sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>53</sup> See UNESCO submission for the universal periodic review of Singapore, paras. 19-20.
- <sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 32.
- <sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 22.
- <sup>56</sup> Public statement by the Special Rapporteur dated 8 July 2015. Available from [www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=16213&LangID=E#sthash.u5b3j6ok.dpuf](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=16213&LangID=E#sthash.u5b3j6ok.dpuf).
- <sup>57</sup> <http://bangkok.ohchr.org/files/ROB%20Press%20Statement%20220615.pdf>.
- <sup>58</sup> Public statement by the Special Rapporteur dated 8 July 2015.
- <sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>60</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/3, para. 20.
- <sup>61</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1, paras. 19-20; see also paras. 27-28.
- <sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 27-28.

- <sup>63</sup> Ibid., paras. 29-30.
- <sup>64</sup> Ibid., paras. 31-32.
- <sup>65</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1/Add.1, para. 20.
- <sup>66</sup> Letter dated 10 September 2014 from the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women addressed to the Permanent Mission of Singapore to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, p. 2.
- <sup>67</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1, para. 32.
- <sup>68</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1/Add.1, para. 29.
- <sup>69</sup> Letter dated 10 September 2014 from the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women addressed to the Permanent Mission of Singapore to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, pp. 2-3.
- <sup>70</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1, paras. 31-32.
- <sup>71</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1/Add.1, para. 33.
- <sup>72</sup> Letter dated 10 September 2014 from the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women addressed to the Permanent Mission of Singapore to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, p. 2.
- <sup>73</sup> See CEDAW/C/SGP/CO/4/Rev.1, paras. 29-30.
- <sup>74</sup> Ibid., para. 5.
- <sup>75</sup> Ibid., paras. 29-30.
- <sup>76</sup> Ibid., paras. 21-22.
- <sup>77</sup> See UNESCO submission for the universal periodic review of Singapore, para. 28.
- <sup>78</sup> Ibid., para. 30.
- <sup>79</sup> See CRC/C/OPAC/SGP/CO/1, paras. 23-24.
- <sup>80</sup> UNHCR submission for the universal periodic review of Singapore, pp. 3-4.
- <sup>81</sup> Ibid., p. 3.
- <sup>82</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>83</sup> See CRC/C/OPAC/SGP/CO/1, para. 24.
- <sup>84</sup> Ibid., para. 25.
-