United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/24/DNK/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
9 November 2015

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twenty-fourth session
18-29 January 2016

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

Denmark*

The present report is a summary of 23 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review. It follows the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council in its decision 17/119. 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. As provided for in Human Rights Council resolution 16/21, where appropriate, a separate section is provided for contributions by the national human rights institution of the State under review that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles. The full texts of all submissions received are available on the OHCHR website. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the periodicity of the review and developments during that period.

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

I. Information provided by the national human rights institution of the State under review accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles

1. The Danish Institute for Human Rights (DIHR) noted that Denmark and the Faroe Islands have not established a national human rights institution (NHRI) covering the latter. DIHR recommended extending its mandate to the Faroe Islands as well.[2]

2. DIHR stated that during its UPR in 2011, Denmark was recommended to develop a national human rights action plan. Denmark has adopted several action plans on human trafficking, domestic violence and ethnic equal treatment. Human rights action can be strengthened through national plans on the rights of vulnerable groups like children.[3]

3. DIHR noted that Danish anti-discrimination legislations offer insufficient protection against discrimination. It recommended express prohibition of discrimination against persons with disabilities and discrimination as to religious belief, sexual orientation or age outside the labour market.[4]

4. DIHR noted that persons under legal guardianship under Danish Guardianship Act are not allowed to vote or to stand for election. It recommended that Denmark amends national legislation so that these persons are allowed to vote and stand for election.[5]

5. DIHR observed that immobilisation through physical restraint beyond 48 hours is regular in psychiatric hospitals. It recommended that Denmark abolish this practice and limit coercive measures in psychiatric institutions through legislative amendments and revision of guidelines.[6]

6. DIHR reported that training of interpreters does not meet the requirements for minority languages. It recommended that interpreters be trained on refugee and migrant languages and EU directive 2010/64/EU on the right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings be implemented.[7]

7. DIHR stated that in Denmark, solitary confinement is used extensively, including with children. Solitary confinement can in some cases result in inhumane and degrading treatment. Although measures have been adopted to reduce the use of solitary confinement, its use as a disciplinary measure has increased. DIHR recommended that Denmark limit the use of solitary confinement and abolish solitary confinement of children.[8]

II. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Background and framework

1. Scope of international obligations[9]

8. AI called on Denmark to ratify and implement ICPPED, ICRMW, and OP-ICESCR without delay.[10]

9. AI was concerned that Denmark's reservations and territorial exemptions concerning a number of international instruments remained in place limiting the applicability of international law in Greenland and the Faroe Islands.[11] Greenland HRC noted that the request in 2012 for Denmark to revoke/abrogate territorial reservations for Greenland to OP-CRC-SC has not been met.[12]

2. Constitutional and legislative framework

10. AI regretted the government's decision not to incorporate the full spectrum of international human rights obligations into national legislation despite recommendations by a government appointed Committee of Experts.[13] AI recommended that Denmark offer assistance to the self-governing authorities in the Faroe Islands and Greenland and make legislative amendments to meet its international human rights obligations. It called on Greenland and Faroe Islands authorities to take active steps to remove legal barriers to international human rights instruments.[14]

11. JS2 observed that the only result of the Committee of Experts tasked with incorporating human rights instruments into Danish law was the Government's decision to accede to the OP-CRC-IC, and recommended that core UN human rights instruments be incorporated into national legislation.[15] BRD recommended that the CRC be incorporated in Danish law.[16]

12. BRD reported that the government was planning to lower the age of criminal responsibility and recommended maintaining it at 15 years.[17]

13. AI observed that in 2011, the government announced an evidence-based review of counter-terrorism legislation. An expert group was appointed for this task. However, AI was concerned that additional counter-terrorism legislation could be passed before the review has even been completed. AI recommended that the introduction of any new legislation be postponed until the expert group has completed its review making sure that new legislations do not violate Denmark's human rights obligations.[18]

14. JS2 was concerned that the Danish Constitution states that persons under extensive form of guardianship do not have the right to vote. They recommended amending the Constitution as well as the legislation on elections and on guardianship to ensure that all citizens above 18 years of age have the right to vote.[19]

15. BRD recommended introducing laws on the child's physical and mental learning environment and a complaint mechanism for children in day care centres and schools.[20]

16. ADF noted that Denmark enacted laws prohibiting "hate speech" and stated that the official commentary on Article 266(b) states that "This provision was inserted in the Criminal Code in 1971 in connection with Denmark's ratification of ICERD, to ensure full compliance with Article 4 of the Convention." They recommended repealing section 140 and section 266(b) of the Criminal Code as the restrictions on speech go far beyond what is permitted under international law.[21]

17. Greenland's HRC and JS2 reported no protection against discrimination outside the labour market, i.e. in social security, health services, education and housing. They recommended adopting legislation to prohibit discrimination as to race, ethnicity, age, religion, sexual orientation and disability.[22] Greenland HRC reported an absence of national complaints procedure other than taking a case to court or referring it to the parliament's ombudsman's office. It recommended adopting legislation to ensure access to effective remedy for victims of discrimination.[23]

18. DAD reported that 1.2 million parents do not receive public information automatically for their own children based on old family legislation. DAD recommended amending the law to clearly specify that parents are entitled to all information about their children, unless they state otherwise.[24]

3. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures

19. AI was concerned that the Special Office for Children cannot consider a complaint until all administrative remedies have been exhausted. The Office has had to inform 93% of the

complainants that their cases could not be considered. AI recommended increasing the Office's mandate and powers to provide advisory or legal assistance in a wider range of cases.[25]

20. JS2 and AI recommended the adoption of a national plan of action on the prevention of sexual violence and the right of victims to access justice.[26].

21. JS2 recommended developing an action plan to eradicate child poverty to help families who have lived in poverty for less than two years.[27]

22. BRD observed that Danish children lacked awareness of their human rights and recommended that children receive human rights education, mainly on CRC, from primary to lower secondary schools.[28]

III. Implementation of international human rights obligations

A. Equality and non-discrimination

23. JS2 observed that some public authorities, such as ministries and municipalities, neglect their obligation for gender mainstreaming and recommended that Denmark monitor and address public authorities' non-compliance with mainstreaming obligations and explicitly prohibit gender discrimination.[29]

24. JS1 observed that in many cities nightclubs have unlawful, unofficial quotas on the number of foreigners or people of colour to admit. In a few cases such discrimination has resulted in minor fines. JS1 recommended that Denmark monitor, prosecute and punish discriminatory door policies.[30]

25. The CoE reported that the fourth report of the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance on Denmark denounced discrimination in employment, education and housing and regretted that spousal reunification rules had become stricter. Additionally, citizenship, spousal reunification and permanent residence requirements, are very difficult for non-ethnic Danes to meet. Negative political discourse on migrants, including Muslims, has had a disproportionately adverse effect on these groups. The CoE report recommended reviewing the spousal reunification rules in order to stop discrimination against non-ethnic Danes and intensify efforts to recruit members of ethnic minorities in the police.[31]

26. OSCE reported that hate crimes are highlighted in the 2012-2015 Prosecutor's, Lawyers, Judges and Police Training Strategy. The Danish authorities informed ODIHR that they setup a national anti-discrimination unit and a report thereon would be submitted to ODIHR during 2014 reporting cycle, in November 2015.[32] According to a survey by EU-FRA around 30 percent of respondents felt personally discriminated against or harassed in the last 12 months on the grounds of their sexual orientation. 11 percent of LGBT persons were discriminated against in employment and 10 percent felt discriminated against by school or university personnel. The prevalence of hate-motivated harassment is 17 percent.[33] JS2 noted that LGBT persons did not have equal access to health care. For instance, all women, except for transsexuals, may legally receive cosmetic breast surgery. It recommended an end to lengthy evaluation and delay in sexological clinic decisions.[34]

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

27. The CoE reported that during its 2012 visit to Greenland**,** the Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) reiterated its recommendation to reinforce safeguards on restrictions on remand prisoners' communication with the outside. It recommended taking steps to ensure that the minimum safeguards set out by

the Committee are applied rigorously. The CPT recommended enhanced training of prison officers, particularly communication skills. At Ringe State Prison, the CPT was concerned about inter-prisoner violence, intimidation and sexual exploitation and recommended a comprehensive anti-bullying strategy.[35] In respect of Grenen and Sølager Secure Institutions for Juveniles, the Committee remained concerned that the majority of juveniles on remand suffered communication restrictions often for extensive periods.[36]

28. BRD reported that solitary confinement still occurs either for disobedience or being at risk of harming oneself/others. BRD recommended prohibiting the use of solitary confinement against persons under 18. BRD was concerned that juvenile offenders are often incarcerated together with adults. Figures from the Danish Prison and Probation Service show that minors in 510 cases were placed in adult prisons in 2013.[37] JS2 stated that the non-compliance by Denmark with recommendation 106.100 of the first UPR contradicts Denmark's obligations under CRC Art. 37(c). JS2 recommended amending the time limit for all placements of children in solitary confinement and end the use of security cells and immobilization of children.[38]

29. FRA noted that an EU survey showed that 52% of interviewed women in Denmark have experienced physical and/or sexual violence by current and/or previous partners or non-partners since the age of 15, 42 % of the most serious incidents of partner violence resulted in injuries. Sixty percent of women experienced some form of psychological violence in their relationships; the prevalence of sexual harassment is 80 percent.[39] AI observed that in 2013, the Criminal Code provisions on sexual abuse were strengthened in Denmark. Between 400 and 600 cases of rape are reported annually to the police at a rate of up to 4,400 per year with only one out of five reported rapes results in a conviction and majority of cases closed without reaching trial. The Faroe Islands Penal Code lags behind and in certain instances reduces penalty for rape and sexual violence within marriage. AI recommended the authorities in the Faroe Islands to bring the Penal Code in line with international standards; provide for equal protection for all rape victims and establish an independent monitoring mechanism.[40] FRA noted that in Denmark, Act No. 112 of 2012 is expected to strengthen the protection of persons against persecution, harassment and violation of privacy, including stalking.[41] JS4 reported that 29,000 women and 8000 men in Denmark experience partner violence every year.[42]

30. JS4 noted that stalking is rarely stopped by the authorities; bullying, psychological violence and harassment are not criminal offenses. Restraining and exclusion orders are enforced only if issued by the police. The same stalker can often pursue several people with impunity. Stalking victims must personally submit all evidence to the police to initiate prosecution. Police or prosecutors reject nearly all stalking cases.[43]

31. JS2 stated that as a consequence to Denmark noting the UPR recommendation No. 106.124, victims of trafficking are still treated primarily as irregular migrants, and policies and practices still emphasize return of victims to their countries rather than ensuring redress and protection. It recommended the adoption of strategies to identify victims of trafficking and establishing an independent National Rapporteur on Human Trafficking.[44] The CoE urged the authorities to ensure that potential victims are treated as persons who have been exposed to human rights violations. The Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Persons (GRETA) called for measures to ensure that potential victims of trafficking for labour exploitation are not punished for their illegal entry or residence in Denmark while the identification procedure is pending.[45] JS2 and the CoE urged Denmark to review the system for granting residence permits to victims of trafficking.[46] FRA reported that the number of persons identified as victims of trafficking has risen over the last few years.[47] The Committee of the Parties to the CoE Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings recommended preventive measures to address trafficking for labour exploitation, so that all victims of trafficking are provided with adequate assistance during their stay.[48]

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

32. AI noted that the Danish Aliens Act and the Administration of Justice Act allow for expulsion and deportation of foreign nationals suspected of terrorism-related activities, allowing for the use of secret evidence to support expulsion on "national security grounds". Consequently, courts appoint a security-cleared "secret" lawyer for expulsion purposes. This lawyer has access to the secret material during closed hearings, but is barred from discussing the evidence with the individual concerned or his/her attorney. AI was concerned that these measures breach due process and equality of arms and recommended reforming expulsion processes in national security cases.[49]

33. AI noted that the police complaints system in the Faroe Islands is inadequate and that pre-trial detention can be prolonged indefinitely. It urged the Faroe Islands to put forward a bill to ensure that the law is amended and a time limit and an independent police complaint mechanism urgently established.[50]

34. BRD noted that children subjected to coercive treatment in psychiatric institutions have limited access to remedies. Children under 15 years of age do not have access to remedies if they have been subjected to coercive treatment to which their parents have consented. BRD recommended that children from 12 years of age have access to remedy if they are subjected to coercive treatment in psychiatric institutions.[51]

35. Greenland HRC observed that the legal status of government agencies is confusing for the citizens. It recommended clarifying the status and mandates of administrative structures within central government.[52] It recommended that both Greenlandic and Danish languages be available in Greenlandic courts. It is up to the judge to decide whether Greenlandic or Danish will be applied in court proceedings. It recommended making written evidence available in a language that is well understood by the parties in a court case.[53]

36. JS2 observed that as of May 2015, identification marks on uniforms of law enforcement officials have not become compatible with accepted recommendation 106.76 of the first cycle.[54]

D. Right to privacy, marriage and family life

37. AI was concerned over the introduction of a number of bills restricting the right to privacy and impacting the right to a remedy for violations. Amendments to the Administration of Justice Act and other laws since 2006 have weakened independent judicial oversight of police access to private and confidential information.[55] JS3 recommended that Denmark bring its communication surveillance laws and access to information by the Danish Defence Intelligence Services (DDIS) from data collected by other intelligence agencies in line with international human rights standards and address and sanction security breaches of personal data.[56]

38. AI noted that legalizing same-sex marriage in Denmark does not extend to the Faroe Islands, and recommended that the self-governing authorities of the Faroe Island amend the Marriage Law to allow same sex marriages.[57]

39. DAD noted that more than 33 percent of all children do not live together with both parents due to high divorce rates. It recommended that parents regardless of the family forms should protect the best interest of the child. The State should only intervene if required.[58] DAD and MN observed a lack of cooperation between Danish Social Services organised in the municipalities and the State Administration in child, family and social cases. It recommended that only family courts can make decisions thereon.[59] In 2014 a new legislation sanctioned parents who are not able or are not willing to cooperate on visitation rights. Around 100,000 cases need to be reviewed because of lack of fair trial.[60] MN stated that matters of custody can be taken to court but no witnesses are admissible in family matters and professionals who take the

stand in the case cannot be cross-examined. Custody cases are decided on "cooperation potential" between the parents. Courts do not consider suspicion of violence as relevant.[61]

E. Freedoms of religion or belief, expression, association and peaceful assembly

40. PTFD noted that under existing laws, Danish citizens pay mandatory taxes to the military through the tax system. It recommended drafting legislation on Peace Tax, which respects the individual's right to be free from paying taxes to the military and which also requires the citizen to also pay taxes to peace and security. PTFD also noted that given the growing number of refugees seeking asylum from war, Denmark is recommended to accommodate its tax system accordingly.[62]

41. JS1 recommended that rampant hate speech on the social media should be monitored and addressed. JS1 observed that the public discourse in Denmark, especially during the recent general election campaign, has been hard and directed at Muslims and refugees in particular. It recommended that police registers all hate crimes and that victims be allowed to institute criminal proceedings in case the Public Prosecutor doesn't press charges. JS1 recommended that campaigns against discrimination of minorities and people of colour are waged at regular intervals in order to counter racial tensions.[63] The CoE Commissioner for Human Rights encouraged the Danish authorities to step up efforts to combat hate speech, and in particular Islamophobia, which continues to be widespread in public and political debate. They should also raise awareness about the limits of freedom of expression in accordance with international standards.[64]

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

42. JS2 noted that Danish women are still underpaid. The principle of equal pay applies both to equal work and to work of equal value. However, work of equal value is neither described nor defined in the Act. It recommended all those involved in negotiating wages to define jobs of equal value.[65]

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

43. JS1 noted that there are discriminatory rules against disadvantaged people in certain marginalised housing areas. Thirty-one publicly subsidised housing areas have been labelled 'ghettos'. JS1 recommended repealing all negatively discriminatory housing legislation.[66]

44. JS2 observed that one of the key obstacles to alleviating homelessness is the lack of affordable housing. This causes discrimination on the housing market. It recommended Denmark to supply affordable and healthy public housing.[67]

H. Right to health

45. AI observed that since June 2014, transgender persons are allowed to obtain official documents reflecting their gender identity without having to undergo surgery or mental disorder diagnosis. AI remained concerned that the new bill allows for the health authorities to lay down a series of procedural rules on access to hormone treatment and correctional surgery. AI recommended adopting rules to establish reasonable time limits for the provision of hormone treatment, remove transgender from the official list of diagnosable mental illnesses, but rather persons with a physical disorder.[68]

46. FPV was concerned that existing abortion legislation in the Faroe Islands permits abortions up to 4 weeks later than Denmark. FPV was concerned with the health impact of the easy availability of contraception without prescription and recommended that the age for buying contraceptives be set at 18.[69]

I. Right to education

47. BRD stated that in 2013, 13,719 children in Denmark were placed in alternative care with long delays. Some vulnerable children have not received education for a period of time, whilst others have not benefited from the education due to a variety of social problems, leading to low academic performance. BRD recommended that the child's schooling should start immediately after alternative care decisions.[70]

J. Persons with disabilities

48. BRD observed that Denmark was in the process of including a greater proportion of children with disabilities in the standard education system. BRD stated that an inclusive education system must prioritise both social coherence and physical accessibility. BRD recommended that Denmark monitor the implementation of how the student learning objectives are adapted to pupils with special needs and focus on the quality of the physical environment's suitability for supporting inclusion.[71]

49. Javni stated that in the Faroe Islands there is a great lack of suitable housing for people with learning disabilities. If the latter choose to stay in their own homes they will not receive the necessary staff service. The lack of service is usually justified by economics.[72]

50. The CoE Commissioner was concerned about the trend among local authorities to accommodate persons with disabilities in residences with 20 to 80 housing units and called on local authorities to build housing facilities which are compliant with CRPD. Progress is also required to replace substituted decision-making with supported decision-making for persons considered incapable of managing their own matters by abolishing the full incapacitation and plenary guardianship as a first step. He urged the adoption of measures to ensure that persons with disabilities can enjoy their right to vote and to expand protection against discrimination to cover all areas of life and to improve legislation and practices regarding coercion in psychiatry.[73]

K. Minorities and indigenous peoples

51. ODVV expressed serious concerns over discrimination against minorities in Denmark, such as Muslims. It urged the government to take effective measures to promote tolerance and combat unlawful attitudes, and stereotypes against minorities. ODVV called on the government to identify legislation that would draw a line between freedom of speech and hate speech and to adopt stronger measures to secure minorities representation in the social and political spheres.[74] JS1 recommended establishing an independent and State-subsidised board comprising representatives of anti-racist and ethnic minority NGOs to promote equal treatment and mutual respect in the same way as the former Board of Ethnic Equality dissolved in 2002.[75] They recommended refraining from legislating against ritual male circumcision but preserve the freedom of belief.[76]

52. The CoE reported that the Council of Europe's Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, called for introducing additional and targeted initiatives and policies to combat all manifestations of intolerance, racism and xenophobia, ensure that persons belonging to the German minority continue to be able to communicate fully using the German language with all bodies of administration. They

recommended expanding the mandate of DIHR, promoting integration, diversity and tolerance and raising public awareness of minorities and recognition of their cultural heritage.[77]

53. JS2 said that children of non EU or EEA families whose Danish is not the first language, including children of third-country nationals, should benefit from mother tongue language lessons free of charge.[78]

L. Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers

54. JS1 expressed concern that a newly drafted immigration policy dividing immigrants into two groups, those who can and will integrate in the Danish society and those who cannot and will not and cannot integrate. They recommended sensitizing political parties on discriminatory party policies and not to introduce discriminatory legislation based on prejudice against foreigners.[79] JS1 recommended prohibiting ethnic profiling and sensitize police to non-discrimination methods.[80]

55. FRA noted that ethnic discrimination in education and segregation in schools on ethnic grounds remains a problem in Denmark.[81] BRD recommended that refugee children of school-age have the right to free mother tongue education, including in the asylum system.[82]

56. JS1 noted that in 2002 Denmark introduced a ban on family reunification for spouses under the age of 24 years and recommended that this rule be abolished.[83]

57. JS2 observed that a February 2015 amendment to the Aliens Act limited the opportunities for family reunification for persons granted temporary protection status. They called for amending the Aliens Act so that all of the refugees have the right to family reunification immediately after receiving a residence permit and raise the age limit for family reunification for children to 18 in the Aliens Act section 9, no. 2.[84]

58. The CoE reported after its visit to Denmark in November 2013 that the Danish authorities should improve the protection they provide to migrant children, by ensuring full respect of their rights, in particular with regard to family reunification proceedings involving children.[85] BRD reported that in the period 2009-2014, between 282 and 818 unaccompanied minors per year sought asylum in Denmark. Many disappeared from child accommodation centres before their asylum cases were processed.[86] The CoE and BRD recommended that Denmark examine the causes of these disappearances and effectively prevent such disappearances.[87] JS2 noted that according to the Aliens Act, the residence permit of an unaccompanied minor asylum-seeker with no access to a social network in the country of origin is withdrawn when he or she turns 18. They recommended that their residence permits be automatically renewed when turning 18.[88] JS2 recommended that asylum-seeking children should be accommodated in asylum centres that meet their specific needs.[89]

59. JS2 was concerned that Denmark's asylum system does not identify all asylum-seeker categories entitled to residence permits as stipulated by the principle of non-refoulement. They recommended that systematic medical examinations be carried out on all asylum-seekers upon arrival to Denmark, so as to identify victims of torture.[90]

60. JS1 recommended that with the asylum seeker's consent, interviews with the Danish Immigration Service be recorded and a copy of the interview be stored by the Danish Immigration Service and another copy be given to the asylum seeker to avoid inconsistency abuse.[91]

61. JS2 observed that it is difficult for asylum-seekers to obtain new evidence if their applications are rejected. Sometimes repatriation cannot be implemented. Consequently, many rejected asylum-seekers await deportation for several years. They recommended introducing an upper time limit before expulsion, pending response from the recipient country or from the country of origin and further individual assessments of the need for motivational measures,

meaning that they only receive meals, with no allowances or care-giver allowance. This situation may last for many years.[92]

62. BFA reported that an unknown number of refugees who have been denied asylum have now been waiting for over 14 years in the Danish refugee system without any time limit for how long they can wait until their status is determined. In 2013, a change in the Danish law regarding refugees meant that refugees seeking asylum on the basis of some specific conditions could be allowed to live outside the asylum centres until their cases were decided. It is required, however, that they sign an oath to return home voluntarily. At the same time, however, a practice has been initiated, which operates with the concept of "the formative years", which are defined as starting at the age of eight. BFA recommended that the asylum-seekers who cannot be returned to their homeland within five years be offered resident permits and to drop all other requirement.[93]

63. AI noted that in 2014, the Parliament passed an amendment to the Aliens Act, providing temporary protection to certain foreign nationals fleeing widespread human rights violations and abuse (i.e. Syrian nationals). However, those granted protection as "war refugees'' are not entitled to family reunification until after one year, contrary to those given refugee status in Denmark under standard procedures. AI recommended granting family reunification to "war refugees" and their families after arrival in Denmark and establishing a monitoring system to effectively identify torture survivors and ensure that they are not placed in custody.[94]

64. FRA observed that persons held in airport transit zone in Denmark do not have access to food, water and a place to rest and alternative systems do not appear to exist. Destitute passengers depend on ad hoc solutions or do not receive food and water at all while in transit, unless they are detained.[95]

M. Human rights and counter-terrorism

65. AI considered that although in its first UPR, Denmark accepted recommendations relating to counter-terrorism, they have not been properly implemented. Denmark has stated that the United States Central Intelligence Agency's alleged use of Danish territory for rendition purposes has been investigated by the Danish Institute for International Studies. AI believed that this investigation is inadequate as the Institute focused exclusively on the territory of Greenland, and recommended a full and independent investigation of Denmark's role in the CIA rendition program.[96]

66. JS2 and JS3 reminded that in the first cycle of UPR, Denmark noted a recommendation to "carry out an inclusive evidence-based evaluation of the Danish antiterrorism legislation". They reported problematic provisions in the Law 602/2013 and noted the new anti-terror package will expand surveillance measures in Denmark and abroad. Act No. 713/2014 on Cyber Security establishes a Center for Cyber Security within the Danish Defence Intelligence Service which may impact the right to privacy, freedom of expression and association. They recommend that the government to take steps towards compliance with international human rights standards by ensuring the application of principles of legality, necessity, adequacy, proportionality to communication surveillance, and respecting process of authorisation from a competent judicial authority as well as the right to effective remedy.[97]

N. Situation in, or in relation to, specific regions or territories

67. CS stated that in 2011 UPR, Denmark accepted two recommendations on Indigenous Peoples, the Inuit. It reported the excitement surrounding extractive industry as it holds promises of independence for Greenland; however, extractive industry damages the environment. It reported that many Inuit are jobless due to an international stigma on subsistence hunting. Although Denmark recognizes Inuit as Indigenous, it legally views them as Danish citizens. CS

recommended that Denmark continue to uphold the principles of the Global Compact on extractive industries in Greenland and more actively recognize subgroups of the Inuit in order to ensure the continuation of their distinct cultures; and investigate Danish colonial practices in Greenland and issue appropriate apologies and reparations to impacted individuals.[98]

68. Greenland HRC noted that there is no publicly accessible database containing both historical and current Greenlandic laws and historical as well as current law of the Kingdom of Denmark applicable in Greenland. It recommended introducing the concept of consolidated acts in Greenlandic law to improve foreseeability and accessibility; establish a database containing relevant Greenlandic laws, and all applicable laws of the Kingdom of Denmark on Greenland and limit the use of royal decrees.[99]

69. Greenland HRC observed that there is a human resources deficit and a lack of measures to prevent maltreatment and child abuse. They recommended upgrading municipal competences to promote child protection and assist families' substance abuse rehabilitation efforts.[100]

70. Greenland HRC reported that under Greenland's national law there is no general prohibition of discrimination on the ground of disability. It recommended supporting the creation of representative organisations of persons with disabilities in Greenland.[101]

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 national human rights institution with "A" status).

Civil society

Individual submissions:

ADF International	ADF International, Geneva (Switzerland);
AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
BfA	Bedsteforældre for Asyl, Holte (Denmark);
CS	Cultural Survival, Cambridge (United States of America);
DAD	The Danish Fathers Association, Copenhagen (Denmark);
FPV	Føroya Pro Vita, Fuglafjørður (Føroyar, Faeroe Islands) (Denmark);
Javni	Javni, Tórshavn (Faeroe Islands) (Denmark);
MN	Mom Network, Tjele (Denmark);
ODVV Organization	Organization for Defending Victim of Violence, Tehran (Islamic Republic of Iran); PNBTN Professions Netværket Barnets Tarv Nu (Professional Network NGO), Frederiksberg (Denmark);
PTFD	Peace Tax Fund of Denmark, Fredskattefonden i Danmark, Aarhus (Denmark).

Joint submissions:

JS1	Joint submission 1 submitted by: SOS mod Racisme Denmark, Copenhagen (Denmark), Documentation and Advisory Centre on Racial Discrimination (DACoRD), Copenhagen (Denmark), and European Network Against Racism – Denmark (ENAR), Frederiksberg (Copenhagen);
JS2	Joint submission 2 submitted by: DIGNITY - Danish Institute Against Torture, Copenhagen (Denmark), Danish Association of Legal Affairs, Danish Helsinki Committee for Human Rights, Danish Red Cross, Danish Refugee Council, Danish-Russian Association, DIGNITY – Danish Institute Against Torture, Disabled Peoples Organization Denmark, European Anti-Poverty Network, European Network Against Racism, Joint Council for Child Issues, LGBT Denmark; Oasis, Refugees Welcome, Save the Children Denmark, United Nations

	Association Denmark, Women's Council in Denmark, and Youth for Human Rights;
JS3	Joint submission 3 submitted by: Privacy International (PI), London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), and IT-Political Association of Denmark (IT-Pol), (Denmark);
JS4	Joint submission 4 submitted by: Forældrenetværket (Parents Network for Victims of Stalking), Tórshavn (Faeroe Islands) (Denmark), and Trolde (Trolls).

National human rights institution(s):

DIHR	The Danish Institute for Human Rights*, Copenhagen (Denmark);
Greenland HRC	The Human Rights Council of Greenland (HRC Greenland, Inuit Pisinnaatitaaffiinut Kalaallit Nunaata Siunnersuisoqatigiivi, Nuuk (Greenland) (Denmark);
BRD	The National Council for Children, Copenhagen (Denmark).

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):

CoE	The Council of Europe, Strasbourg, France.
EU FRA	European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, Vienna (Austria);
OSCE-ODIHR	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights/Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.

[2] DIHR, p. 2.
[3] DIHR, p. 2, 3.
[4] DIHR, p. 3, 4.
[5] DIHR, p. 4, 5.
[6] DIHR, p. 5.
[7] DIHR, p. 6.
[8] DIHR, p. 6, 7.
[9] 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.

[10] AI, p. 1, 2, 7. See also *Mid-term Progress Report 2014*, recommendations 106.4 (Spain), 106.11 (France), 106.17 (Brazil), and 106.21 (Ecuador). *Mid-term Progress Report 2014*, recommendation 106.4 (Spain)
[11] AI, p. 2, 7.

[12] The HRC of Greenland, p. 1, 2.
[13] AI, p. 1, 2.
[14] AI, p. 2, 7.
[15] JS2, p. 2. See also recommendations 106.26, 106.28, 106.29, and 106.33. Not accepted.
[16] BRD, p. 2.
[17] BRD, p. 5.
[18] AI, p. 3, 7.
[19] JS2, p. 8.
[20] BRD, p. 2.
[21] ADF, p. 1-5.
[22] The HRC of Greenland, p. 1-2 and JS2, p. 2, 3.
[23] The HRC of Greenland, p. 2.
[24] DAD, p. 2.
[25] AI, p. 2, 7.
[26] JS2, p. 10 and AI, p. 7.
[27] JS2, p. 9.
[28] BRD, p. 4.
[29] JS2, p. 3.
[30] JS1, p. 4, 5. See also recommendations 106.54 - 106.57, 106.59 - 106.61, 106.64, 106.65, 106.67 - 106.71, accepted, and 106.58 not accepted.
[31] CoE, p. 3-4.
[32] OSCE/ODIHR, p. 3.
[33] FRA, p. 6, 7.
[34] JS2, p. 9, 10.
[35] CoE, p. 1.
[36] CoE, p. 1.
[37] BRD, p. 5.
[38] JS2, p. 3, 4.
[39] FRA, p. 9.
[40] AI, p, 5, 7.
[41] FRA, p. 11.
[42] JS4, p. 1-8.
[43] JS4, p. 1-8.
[44] JS2, p. 5.
[45] CoE, p. 6-7.
[46] JS2, p. 5 and CoE, p. 6-7.
[47] FRA, p. 11.
[48] CoE, p. 6-7.
[49] AI, p. 3, 7.
[50] AI, p. 2, 3, and 7.
[51] BRD, p. 2.
[52] The HRC of Greenland, p. 3.
[53] The HRC of Greenland, p. 4.
[54] JS2, p. 6.
[55] AI, p. 3, 4.
[56] JS3, p. 15.
[57] AI, p. 6, 7.
[58] DAD, p. 3, 4.
[59] DAD, p. 4, 5 and MN, p. 1-2.
[60] PNBTN, p. 1, 2.
[61] MN, p. 3, 4.
[62] PTFD, p. 2, 3-5.
[63] JS1, p. 4. See also recommendations 106.107, 106.54 - 106.57, 106.59 - 106.62, 106.64, 106.66, 106.67 - 106.70, 106.71 and 106.96, accepted and 106.58 not accepted.
[64] CoE, p. 3.
[65] JS2, p. 8.

[66] JS1, p. 3, 4. See also Recommendations: 106.60, 106.61, Accepted.
[67] JS2, p. 9.
[68] AI, p. 6, 7.
[69] FPV, p. 1, 2, 3, 5.
[70] BRD, p. 7.
[71] BRD, p. 7.
[72] Javni, p. 1-3.
[73] CoE, p. 3.
[74] ODVV, p. 1-2.
[75] JS1, p. 3. See also recommendations: 106.107, 106.54 – 106.57, 106.59, 106.61, 106.64, 106.67 – 106.71, 106.96 accepted, and 106.58 not accepted.
[76] JS1, p. 6, 7. See also recommendations106.61, 106.64, 106.67 - 106.71, accepted.
[77] CoE, p. 5.
[78] JS2, p. 11.
[79] JS1, p. 4. See also recommendations 106.54 - 106.57, 106.59, 106.60, 106.64, 106.71, accepted.
[80] JS1, p. 6. See also recommendations106.55, 106.63, 106.64, and 106.80 accepted.
[81] FRA, p. 11.
[82] BRD, p. 8.
[83] JS1, p. 6, 7. See also recommendations 106.102, 106.103, 106.116, 106.129, 106.130 not accepted.
[84] JS2, p. 7. See also recommendations 106.116. and 106.130. Not accepted.
[85] CoE, p. 2-3.
[86] BRD, p. 9.
[87] BRD, p. 9 and CoE, p. 2-3.
[88] JS2, p. 12. See also recommendations106.119. Partly accepted.
[89] JS2, p. 12. See also recommendations 106.100. Not accepted.
[90] JS2, p. 12. See also recommendations 106.117 and 106.126. Not accepted.
[91] JS1, p. 8.
[92] JS2, p. 13.
[93] BFA, p. 1-3.
[94] AI, p. 4, 5, 7.
[95] FRA, p. 10.
[96] AI, p. 1, 2, 7.
[97] JS2, p. 14 and JS3, p. 4-8. JS3, p. 1-2 and 15. See also A/HRC/18/4, para 106.133(Netherlands).
[98] CS, p. 1-6. See also 2011 recommendations 106.47 and 106.113.
[99] The HRC of Greenland, p. 2.
[100] The HRC of Greenland, p. 5.
[101] The HRC of Greenland, p. 5, 6.