



---

**Human Rights Council**  
**Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review**  
**Forty-first session**  
7–18 November 2022

## **Kingdom of the Netherlands\***

### **Compilation of information prepared by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights**

#### **I. Background**

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the outcome of the previous review.<sup>1</sup> It is a compilation of information contained in relevant United Nations documents, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

#### **II. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with human rights mechanisms**

2. The Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity recommended the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families,<sup>2</sup> the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights,<sup>3</sup> the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure<sup>4</sup> and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.<sup>5</sup>

3. The Committee against Torture recommended that the Kingdom withdraw its declaration on the exclusive territorial application of the Optional Protocol to the European Netherlands and ensure the applicability thereof throughout the country, including in the Caribbean Netherlands.<sup>6</sup>

4. The same Committee recommended the extension of the territorial application of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol thereto to all the constituent countries.<sup>7</sup>

5. It was recommended that the Kingdom of the Netherlands withdraw its reservation to article 10 (1) and (2) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,<sup>8</sup> as well as its reservations to articles 26, 37 (c) and 40, and its interpretative declarations to articles 14, 22 and 38, of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.<sup>9</sup>

---

\* The term “the Kingdom of the Netherlands” is used in the present report to refer to the four parts that constitute the Kingdom of the Netherlands: the Netherlands, Aruba, Curaçao and Sint Maarten. The term “the Netherlands” is used in the present report to refer to one of the four parts that constitute the Kingdom of the Netherlands.



6. The Kingdom of the Netherlands made annual financial contributions to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.<sup>10</sup>

### **III. National human rights framework**

#### **Institutional infrastructure and policy measures**

7. The Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance noted with regret that the National Action Plan on Human Rights applied only to the Netherlands, but not to Aruba, Curaçao or Sint Maarten.<sup>11</sup> The Human Rights Committee was concerned about gaps in protection in the legislative and institutional frameworks and about different levels of protection afforded to individuals in the four constituent countries (the Netherlands, Aruba, Curaçao and Sint Maarten).<sup>12</sup>

8. The Human Rights Committee recommended that the Kingdom of the Netherlands intensify its efforts to put in place a legislative, policy and institutional framework to ensure the protection of and to promote human rights in the Caribbean constituent countries, and that it harmonize human rights protection standards across all its constituent countries and municipalities with a view to addressing existing protection gaps.<sup>13</sup>

9. The Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended establishing a standing government structure to coordinate and prepare reports to, and engage with, international and regional human rights mechanisms, and to coordinate and track national follow-up to, and implementation of, treaty obligations and the recommendations and decisions emanating from such mechanisms.<sup>14</sup>

10. The Committee against Torture recommended that the Netherlands ensure the complete financial and operational independence of the national preventive mechanism, including by ensuring that it had a separate specifically earmarked budget, and consider reviewing the current formation of the mechanism with a view to bringing it fully into line with the guidelines on national preventive mechanisms of the Subcommittee on Prevention on Torture and the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles). The Government should ensure that all aspects of detention facilities leased to foreign countries and military detention facilities, including those managed overseas, are effectively monitored.<sup>15</sup>

### **IV. Promotion and protection of human rights**

#### **A. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law**

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

11. The Human Rights Committee recommended that the Netherlands review its anti-discrimination legislation to ensure that it provided full and effective protection against discrimination on all the prohibited grounds under the Covenant in all spheres and prohibited direct, indirect and multiple discrimination.<sup>16</sup> The Special Rapporteur on racism recommended that the Netherlands adopt a definition of racial discrimination that encompassed its human rights law obligations.<sup>17</sup> Additionally, the Special Rapporteur recommended that the Kingdom of the Netherlands harmonize its commitments to racial equality throughout its four constituent countries and three special municipalities.<sup>18</sup>

12. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was concerned that minorities continued to face racial discrimination in many areas of life, including in employment, housing, education, and health and social care.<sup>19</sup> The Special Rapporteur on racism recommended taking the necessary special measures in the political, economic, social and cultural spheres to ensure the equality of racial and ethnic minorities and that they enjoyed effective protection from and access to remedies for racial discrimination.<sup>20</sup> The Committee recommended combating stereotypes and eliminating the historically rooted

racial discrimination against people of African descent in the political, social and economic spheres.<sup>21</sup>

13. The Human Rights Committee was concerned that persons belonging to ethnic minority groups continued to face discrimination in the labour market in the Netherlands.<sup>22</sup> The Special Rapporteur on racism stated that ethnic minorities faced discrimination both during hiring, and afterwards, once they were in the workplace.<sup>23</sup>

14. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was concerned that many people with an immigrant background continued to face discrimination in access to employment.<sup>24</sup>

15. The same Committee recommended adopting the draft bill that would require companies to adopt a recruitment and selection policy that eliminated racial bias, and that it set clear targets that were focused on preventing and addressing racial discrimination in employment.<sup>25</sup> The Human Rights Committee recommended that the Netherlands intensify its efforts to effectively implement the action plan against labour market discrimination (2018) and the national action programme to combat discrimination (2016).<sup>26</sup>

16. Furthermore, the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations of the International Labour Organization (ILO) urged the Netherlands to strengthen its efforts to effectively address discrimination and ensure equality of opportunity and treatment in education and employment for non-Western persons with a migration background.<sup>27</sup>

17. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was concerned that people protected under the Convention, including but not limited to people of African descent, Asian people and people of Asian descent, members of Jewish and Muslim communities, and migrants, continued to be victims of hate speech and hate crimes.<sup>28</sup> Likewise, the Human Rights Committee remained concerned at the persistent racist hate speech used against migrants, refugees, Muslims, Jews and other ethnic and religious minorities by politicians and high-level public officials, through social media and at public events.<sup>29</sup>

18. The Human Rights Committee recommended that the State strengthen efforts to combat hate speech and incitement to discrimination or violence on racial, ethnic or religious grounds, preventing hate speech, particularly by politicians and high-level public officials, and developing an effective strategy to reduce online hate speech.<sup>30</sup>

19. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination recommended that the State, through its criminal legislation, ensure that racist motivation was taken into account as an aggravating circumstance for criminal offences.<sup>31</sup>

20. The same Committee was concerned by reports that individuals continued to experience profiling by the police on the basis of their ethnicity, descent and skin colour, during traffic controls, identity checks, preventive searches and border stops. It was also concerned that the problem of racial profiling was not recognized as a systemic issue.<sup>32</sup> The Human Rights Committee recommended ensuring that legislation explicitly prohibited racial profiling by the police.<sup>33</sup> The Special Rapporteur on racism recommended combating racial profiling and eradicating racial discrimination in policing, and collecting data on stop-and-search practices.<sup>34</sup>

21. The Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights noted that a digital tool used by the Government of the Netherlands to detect welfare fraud discriminated against the poorest members of society and undermined the rights to privacy and social security. The tool, called “System Risk Indication”, employed an algorithmic risk model, and identified some people as more likely to commit benefit fraud, and was used in areas with a high proportion of low-income residents, migrants and ethnic minorities. In February 2020, the Special Rapporteur applauded a landmark ruling by the District Court of The Hague ordering an immediate halt to the tool because it violated human rights norms.<sup>35</sup>

## **2. Right to life, liberty and security of person, and freedom from torture**

22. The Human Rights Committee recommended strengthening the institutional safeguards to regulate euthanasia (assisted suicide) in accordance with its general comment No. 36 (2018) on the right to life, including by considering the introduction of an independent ethics committee to conduct ex ante reviews of medical decisions on requests for termination of life or assisted suicide.<sup>36</sup>

23. The Committee against Torture recommended promoting the adoption of specific legislation defining torture in line with articles 1 and 2 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment throughout all the constituent countries, and ensuring that a crime of torture was not subject to any statute of limitation.<sup>37</sup>

24. The Committee against Torture remained concerned at reports of the high percentage of pretrial detainees and the low level of use of alternatives, and the high percentage of juvenile detainees on remand.<sup>38</sup> The Committee recommended amending the legislation to reduce the maximum duration of pretrial detention and limiting the grounds for pretrial detention.<sup>39</sup> The Human Rights Committee recommended ensuring that pretrial detention was used as a measure of last resort and for the shortest possible time, and promoting non-custodial alternative measures.<sup>40</sup>

25. The Committee against Torture recommended that the State ensure that all detainees were afforded all fundamental legal safeguards from the outset of the deprivation of liberty, including adequate access to lawyers, particularly in the Caribbean part of its territory, and guarantee the right of detainees to notify a person of their own choosing of their detention.<sup>41</sup>

## **3. Human rights and counter-terrorism**

26. The Human Rights Committee was concerned about the amendments to the Dutch Nationality Act which provided for revocation of nationality, in absentia, of dual nationals on the basis of information that they had left the State to voluntarily join the military service of a foreign State or a terrorist organization. It was concerned about the barriers faced by persons affected who were outside the country to appeal such a decision.<sup>42</sup> The State should revise the Dutch Nationality Act to ensure effective safeguards against arbitrary loss of nationality and discriminatory effects and to ensure the effective exercise of the right to appeal.<sup>43</sup>

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

27. The Human Rights Committee was concerned by the disproportionately high representation of persons belonging to ethnic minority groups, particularly persons of African descent, in the prison population in the Netherlands.<sup>44</sup>

28. The Committee against Torture was concerned about reports indicating that in the European part of the Kingdom, health-care services in prisons were inadequate, that medical screening of newly arriving detainees was often delayed, and that traumatic injuries that might come from inter-prisoner violence were not properly recorded.<sup>45</sup> The Committee recommended ensuring that medical screening was promptly and effectively conducted and injuries were properly recorded.<sup>46</sup> The Human Rights Committee recommended ensuring that inmates had access to an adequate level of health-care services.<sup>47</sup>

29. The Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended that the State consider raising the age of criminal responsibility to at least 14 years and consider a review of legislation to ensure the application of its child justice system to all children below the age of 18 years.<sup>48</sup>

30. The Committee against Torture recommended that the State ensure that minors were detained as a last resort only and for the shortest possible period and that they were separated from adults and afforded full legal safeguards, and that it use non-custodial measures for minors who were in conflict with the law. It recommended ensuring that minors were not tried under the adult criminal law and did not serve their sentences in adult penitentiary institutions.<sup>49</sup>

## **5. Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life**

31. The Human Rights Committee was concerned by legislation providing for a ban on face-covering clothing in public buildings and on public transport, which might restrict the right to freedom of religion beyond the level of necessity and proportionality.<sup>50</sup> The Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief stated that the Netherlands should consider revisiting the face-covering clothing ban to identify a more proportionate response to security concerns which did not violate women's rights to freedom of movement and to access public services on an equal basis with others.<sup>51</sup>

32. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) reported that defamation was criminalized under the Criminal Code. If the defamation was against the public authorities, the terms of imprisonment could be increased by one third. UNESCO recommended decriminalizing defamation and placing it within a civil code.<sup>52</sup>

33. The Human Rights Committee recommended reviewing the Public Assemblies Act, with a view to removing the prohibition on demonstrations due to a lack of prior notification and to bringing the Act in line with relevant international standards.<sup>53</sup>

## **6. Right to privacy**

34. The Human Rights Committee was concerned about the Intelligence and Security Services Act 2017, which provided the intelligence and security services with sweeping surveillance and interception powers, including bulk data collection. The Act did not provide for a clear definition of case-specific bulk data collection, clear grounds for extending retention periods for information collected, or adequate safeguards against bulk data hacking.<sup>54</sup>

## **7. Prohibition of all forms of slavery, including trafficking in persons**

35. The Committee against Torture recommended that the Government prevent and combat trafficking in human beings, especially trafficking of children.<sup>55</sup>

36. The ILO Committee of Experts requested the Government to strengthen its efforts regarding the identification of victims of trafficking and to ensure their access to remedies in civil and criminal procedures and appropriate protection and assistance for the victims.<sup>56</sup> The Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended that the State issue special residency permits for all alleged child victims of trafficking, irrespective of related criminal investigations.<sup>57</sup>

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

37. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was concerned that the unemployment rate for ethnic minorities remained high and was continuing to rise, despite significant educational achievements on their part.<sup>58</sup>

38. The Special Rapporteur on racism stated that the unemployment rate of migrants remained two and half times higher than that of other Netherlanders. Individuals considered to be of a second-generation, non-Western migration background generally faced an even higher unemployment rate, despite superior educational qualifications compared with individuals of a first-generation, non-Western migration background.<sup>59</sup>

39. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was concerned that the unemployment rate among persons with disabilities was almost twice as high as among persons without a disability and that persons with disabilities often worked at levels below their qualifications.<sup>60</sup>

40. The same Committee was concerned about the significant gender pay gap, particularly in the private sector.<sup>61</sup>

## **9. Right to social security**

41. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights called upon the Netherlands to review the entitlement conditions for social security benefits with a view to ensuring the effective protection of all beneficiaries and to take measures to enable municipalities to

provide adequate support to all those affected by the decrease in the amounts of their social security benefits as a result of legislative amendments.<sup>62</sup>

#### **10. Right to an adequate standard of living**

42. The Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended that the State ensure an integrated and development-oriented approach to child poverty and that all children in all constituent countries have an adequate standard of living, including by increasing social benefits for low-income families with children, simplifying application procedures for financial support, and strengthening the system of family benefits across all departments.<sup>63</sup>

43. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was concerned about the significant rise in homelessness, in particular among marginalized and disadvantaged individuals and groups.<sup>64</sup> The Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context stated that the sharp increase in the number of persons living in homelessness was an indication that the right to adequate housing was not being effectively implemented.<sup>65</sup> The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights urged the Government to investigate the root causes of homelessness and take all necessary measures, including securing affordable social housing.<sup>66</sup>

#### **11. Right to health**

44. The ILO Committee of Experts noted that health and safety measures for migrant workers were reportedly not enforced during the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, as they worked and lived without being able to respect social distancing, and without hygiene precautions, and were pressed to work even with COVID-19 symptoms.<sup>67</sup>

45. The Human Rights Committee recommended ensuring that adequate sexual and reproductive health-care services and information were accessible to all men, women and adolescents throughout the country.<sup>68</sup>

46. The Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended adopting a comprehensive and effective gender-sensitive sexual and reproductive health policy for adolescents, and integrating sexual and reproductive health education into all levels of education and ensuring that it included age-appropriate education on gender equality, sexual diversity, sexual and reproductive health rights, responsible parenthood and sexual behaviour, and violence prevention.<sup>69</sup>

#### **12. Right to education**

47. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was concerned by reports of discrimination against students with ethnic minority and immigrant backgrounds.<sup>70</sup> The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was concerned about segregation in a large number of schools and the consequent inequalities in educational attainment, especially for children belonging to ethnic minorities.<sup>71</sup> It recommended reducing segregation and attainment gaps by investing more resources in education for children from ethnic minorities.<sup>72</sup> The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination recommended increasing equal opportunities for all children in education, regardless of their background, and ensuring that all children received an adequate assessment from their teachers for their admission to secondary school – without discrimination, including implicit bias, on the basis of race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin.<sup>73</sup>

48. The Committee on the Rights of the Child was concerned about the increase in the number of children with disabilities attending special schools and the lack of access to early education.<sup>74</sup> The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regretted that the Appropriate Education Act did not provide children with disabilities with a right to be included in mainstream education, nor a right to quality education.<sup>75</sup> The Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended ensuring that all children with disabilities had access to and benefited from inclusive education at all levels, including in Bonaire, Saba and Sint Eustatius.<sup>76</sup>

49. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights recommended that human rights education be provided in schools at all levels and in universities.<sup>77</sup> The Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended developing human rights education materials that fostered respect for and appreciation of diversity.<sup>78</sup>

### **13. Development, the environment, and business and human rights**

50. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights called upon the State to progressively increase its official development assistance to 0.7 per cent of gross national income and to pursue a human rights-based approach, including human rights impact assessments, in its development cooperation policy.<sup>79</sup>

51. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was concerned about reports that the effects of climate change, which were already palpable in some of the islands in the Caribbean part of the Kingdom, would threaten a plethora of human rights and would disproportionately impact vulnerable groups. The Committee was concerned about reports that the islands were not receiving support to address those issues.<sup>80</sup> The Committee recommended that the State mitigate, and protect vulnerable groups from, the negative effects of climate change, and that it consider avenues to provide full support to the communities affected.<sup>81</sup>

52. The Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended that the State reduce greenhouse gas emissions in line with its international commitments.<sup>82</sup>

53. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights regretted that the 2014 national action plan on business and human rights only contained guidelines primarily for Dutch companies operating abroad and that it did not provide for formal monitoring mechanisms.<sup>83</sup>

54. The Committee on the Rights of the Child was concerned about reports of the negative impact of the business sector, including in oil extraction and soy production, on children's rights and the environment and about the lack of legal accountability for businesses violating children's rights.<sup>84</sup>

55. While noting the Government's commitment to phasing out gas extraction in Groningen by the end of 2022, the Human Rights Committee remained concerned by the serious effects that gas extraction operations had on the safety and well-being of inhabitants in the region.<sup>85</sup> The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was concerned at reports of damage to people's homes in Groningen due to gas extraction.<sup>86</sup> The Human Rights Committee recommended that the Government ensure the physical safety and mental well-being of people residing in the gas extraction area in Groningen and the security and safety of their homes, and provide adequate compensation to the victims.<sup>87</sup>

56. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights recommended ensuring compliance with human rights obligations for companies operating on the territory of the State and removing the legal and practical obstacles to holding companies domiciled under the country's jurisdiction accountable for violations of economic, social and cultural rights, resulting from their operations on the national territory or abroad.<sup>88</sup> The Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity stated that Dutch businesses and funds should make more effort to integrate the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights into their day-to-day operations and in all their activities related to the advancement of international solidarity.<sup>89</sup>

## **B. Rights of specific persons or groups**

### **1. Women**

57. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights recommended that the State intensify its efforts to increase the level of representation of women in decision-making positions, in particular the number of women mayors and as members of company boards of directors.<sup>90</sup>

58. The ILO Committee of Experts noted the high number of women engaged in part-time work and their concentration in jobs that were generally lower paid. It reported that during the COVID-19 pandemic the number of hours worked by women had declined more rapidly than the number of hours worked by men, which had had a negative impacting on the labour market position of women and the achievement of equal remuneration.<sup>91</sup>

59. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights recommended ensuring the economic independence of women by promoting their access to full-time work, including by investing more in childcare and other family support services.<sup>92</sup> The Committee recommended changing the perception by society of stereotyped gender roles, including through awareness-raising campaigns on equal career opportunities and equal sharing of family responsibilities between men and women.<sup>93</sup>

60. The Human Rights Committee and the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women noted the persistence of violence against women, including domestic violence.<sup>94</sup> The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women noted the lack of a comprehensive gender-specific analysis of domestic violence.<sup>95</sup>

61. The Human Rights Committee recommended stepping up efforts to combat violence against women and domestic violence, including by revising provisions on sexual violence and domestic violence, particularly those relating to the definition of rape and other sexual violence offences, in the criminal laws of all four constituent countries, in line with international human rights standards.<sup>96</sup> The Committee against Torture recommended ensuring that all victims of violence against women had adequate access to medical and legal services, counselling, safe emergency accommodation and shelters.<sup>97</sup>

## **2. Children**

62. Noting the high number of children separated from their families due to economic reasons, the Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended that the State prohibit the separation of children from their families and their placement in alternative care on the basis of the economic situation of their families alone.<sup>98</sup>

63. The same Committee recommended that the State further strengthen its system of foster care and substitute family homes, with a view to phasing out the institutionalization of children, and allocate adequate funds towards families to promote and support care in a family environment.<sup>99</sup>

64. The Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent stated that children of African descent were allegedly more likely than other children to be reported to agencies as suspected victims of maltreatment, due to negative stereotypes about parents of African descent. They were more often forcibly removed from their homes because of racial prejudice, rather than the risk to which they were exposed. The Working Group noted the reported disparities in how the social welfare system treated white families in the Netherlands and those of African descent.<sup>100</sup> In this regard, the Working Group expressed concerns about the prevalence of racism in the welfare system.<sup>101</sup>

65. The Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended ensuring that all forms of sale of children were criminalized, and preventing and addressing the online sale of children for the purpose of sexual exploitation and abuse.<sup>102</sup>

## **3. Persons with disabilities**

66. The Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended strengthening support provided to children with disabilities for their social integration and individual development.<sup>103</sup>

## **4. Minorities**

67. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination recommended that the State provide targeted support for Roma, Sinti and Travellers in the areas of housing, education and employment and that it counter the phenomenon of anti-Gypsyism and ensure that any decision affecting these groups is based on prior consultation with their representatives.<sup>104</sup>



## 5. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons

68. The Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended that the State prohibit the performance of unnecessary medical or surgical treatment on intersex children where those procedures may be safely deferred until children are able to provide their informed consent.<sup>105</sup>

69. The Committee against Torture recommended taking all measures necessary to protect lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons from threats and any form of violence, including hate crimes.<sup>106</sup>

## 6. Migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers

70. The ILO Committee of Experts urged the Government to take proactive measures to promote equality of opportunity and treatment for migrants in employment, in particular by combating exploitation of migrant workers and ensuring safe working conditions.<sup>107</sup>

71. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) noted that reduced State funding for the asylum process had led to a large backlog of pending asylum applications in 2020 with long waiting periods in the asylum procedure.<sup>108</sup> The Human Rights Committee recommended that the State intensify its efforts to reduce the backlogs in the asylum application process and the family reunification process.<sup>109</sup>

72. UNHCR was concerned that the risk of refoulement was increased by the decrease in quality of the refugee status determination procedure. Instances had been reported where forced returns had led to arrests of failed asylum-seekers upon arrival in the country of origin.<sup>110</sup> The Committee against Torture was concerned at numerous reports alleging that the State had acted in breach of the principle of non-refoulement and that the fast-track asylum procedure for individuals coming from countries designated as “safe” might not allow a thorough assessment of their special circumstances.<sup>111</sup>

73. The Human Rights Committee recommended ensuring that the principle of non-refoulement was secured in law and strictly adhered to in practice in all circumstances by all constituent countries.<sup>112</sup> The Committee against Torture recommended allowing sufficient time for asylum-seekers, especially those in the fast-track procedure, to fully indicate the reasons for their application and to obtain and present crucial evidence in order to guarantee fair and efficient asylum procedures and ensure the right to appeal, with a suspensive effect.<sup>113</sup>

74. The Committee against Torture was concerned at reports of the continued practice of detaining asylum-seekers and undocumented migrants in closed facilities and that the cumulative length of the repeated detention periods often exceeded the 18-month time limit.<sup>114</sup> The Human Rights Committee recommended that the State ensure that immigration detention was used only as a measure of last resort and for as short a period as possible, and that it promote and apply non-custodial alternative measures in a systematic manner.<sup>115</sup>

75. The Committee against Torture expressed concern that the detention conditions of asylum-seekers and migrants reportedly failed to meet international standards, and that migrant detainees were held in heavily guarded institutions with cameras and high walls and were often held in cells with other prisoners under the criminal regime.<sup>116</sup> UNHCR recommended ensuring the increased availability of sustainable, flexible and responsive reception facilities for asylum-seekers and refugees.<sup>117</sup>

76. The Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended that the State prohibit and prevent the separation of asylum-seeking and migrant children from their parents and the detention and/or deportation of children across all constituent countries, including Aruba and Curaçao, on the basis of their or their parents’ migration status.<sup>118</sup>

77. The same Committee recommended that the State prioritize the immediate transfer of asylum-seeking children and their families from emergency reception facilities and invest the resources necessary to improve and expand reception facilities that are child-friendly, with a view to preventing overcrowding and frequent transfers of children between different facilities.<sup>119</sup>

78. The Human Rights Committee was concerned about reports of a high number of unaccompanied minors who had gone missing from State-run asylum reception centres.<sup>120</sup>

The Committee recommended that the State intensify its efforts to investigate this phenomenon and address its underlying causes, and prevent future occurrences.<sup>121</sup>

79. UNHCR stated that in recent years most family reunification applications had been approved at first instance, with an increasing approval rate since 2019. Nevertheless, UNHCR had identified persisting challenges in the process and recommended that the State ensure that it applied inclusive and flexible criteria in family reunification procedures which took into consideration the specific circumstances of refugee families, including by avoiding a narrow interpretation of dependency and exploring flexible requirements on evidence to prove family links.<sup>122</sup>

80. Furthermore, the Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended that the State review its system of family reunification involving unaccompanied children, particularly for those living independently and those who did not have parents or whose parents could not be traced, with a view to broadening the criteria for emotional ties with other family members or legal guardians.<sup>123</sup>

## **7. Stateless persons**

81. UNHCR recommended establishing a statelessness determination procedure and ensuring that recognized stateless persons were granted legal residency and could fully enjoy their basic rights under the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons.<sup>124</sup>

82. In 2020, the Human Rights Committee found that the State had violated a child's rights by registering "nationality unknown" in his civil records, as this left him unable to be registered as stateless and therefore be given international protection as a stateless child.<sup>125</sup>

83. The Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended ensuring that children with an "unknown" nationality, a status that left them unable to be registered as stateless and to obtain international protection, did not remain with such a status for a prolonged period of time.<sup>126</sup> It recommended guaranteeing all stateless children born or present within the territory of the State the right to acquire nationality irrespective of residency status.<sup>127</sup> Similarly, UNHCR recommended facilitating naturalization for stateless children, and refraining from creating additional legal barriers to naturalization, such as a requirement that the parents did not obstruct their departure and did not withdraw themselves from supervision by the authorities.<sup>128</sup>

## **C. Specific regions or territories**

84. The Committee against Torture regretted that despite the commitment made by the Governments of Aruba and Curaçao during the universal periodic review in 2012, none of the autonomous territories had established a national human rights institution.<sup>129</sup> The Human Rights Committee recommended establishing a national human rights institution in Aruba, Curaçao and Sint Maarten in accordance with the Paris Principles.<sup>130</sup>

85. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination recommended that the State evaluate the impact of the economic support provided during the COVID-19 pandemic on the population of Aruba, Curaçao and Sint Maarten, as compared with the impact on the population of the Netherlands, and ensure that no discrimination had occurred in the enjoyment of their rights under the Convention.<sup>131</sup>

86. The Human Rights Committee was concerned that there were growing reports of human smuggling and trafficking in the Caribbean part of the Kingdom, that victims of trafficking, especially women, were reportedly subjected to inhumane and degrading treatment, including sexual violence, and that the response of the relevant authorities was not adequate and often failed to identify and protect victims or to prosecute perpetrators.<sup>132</sup>

87. The same Committee was concerned that the Criminal Code of Sint Maarten criminalized the provision of abortion-related information or services.<sup>133</sup> The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights urged the State to adopt a legislative framework on abortion in Sint Maarten to ensure that services, goods, facilities and information on sexual

and reproductive health were available, accessible, acceptable and of high quality for all people in Sint Maarten.<sup>134</sup>

88. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights recommended combating domestic violence and child abuse in Aruba, Curaçao and Sint Maarten.<sup>135</sup>

89. The Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended ensuring the explicit prohibition of corporal punishment by law in alternative care settings, day care and schools in Bonaire, Saba and Sint Eustatius, and strengthening awareness-raising campaigns aimed at promoting positive, non-violent and participatory forms of child-rearing and discipline and underscoring the adverse consequences of corporal punishment.<sup>136</sup>

90. The same Committee recommended establishing a system of foster care in Aruba, Curaçao and Sint Maarten for children who could not stay with their families.<sup>137</sup>

91. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was concerned at the prevalence of poverty in Aruba, Curaçao and Sint Maarten and regretted that the absence of reliable data in those constituent countries prevented an accurate assessment of the situation.<sup>138</sup>

92. The Human Rights Committee noted the challenges posed by the large influx of Venezuelans seeking international protection in the Caribbean constituent countries of the Kingdom in recent years. The Committee was concerned about the limits of the legal framework governing asylum, which resulted in shortcomings in dealing with asylum-seekers.<sup>139</sup> The Committee against Torture was concerned that neither Aruba, Curaçao nor Sint Maarten had adopted its own refugee and asylum legislation, thereby creating a significant gap in the legal framework concerning protection against refoulement.<sup>140</sup>

93. The Committee against Torture was concerned that the authorities of Curaçao had reportedly forcibly returned more than 1,000 Venezuelans to their country in 2017, some of whom had expressed a fear of being subjected to torture and ill-treatment upon their return.<sup>141</sup> The Committee was concerned that in Curaçao, persons in need of international protection awaiting deportation were detained in closed facilities in appalling conditions and were subjected to ill-treatment and sexual assaults by police and immigration officials, against whom no charges had been brought.<sup>142</sup>

94. The same Committee recommended the establishment of a national asylum determination procedure in Aruba, Curaçao and Sint Maarten that permitted a thorough assessment of whether there was a substantial risk that the applicant would be subjected to torture in the country of destination.<sup>143</sup>

95. The Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended that the State remove the barriers faced by asylum-seeking and refugee children in Aruba and Curaçao in accessing education, health care, housing and other essential services to ensure that all such children had access to all basic services without discrimination.<sup>144</sup>

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> [A/HRC/36/15](#), [A/HRC/36/15/Add.1](#) and [A/HRC/36/2](#).
- <sup>2</sup> [CERD/C/NLD/CO/22-24](#), para. 41; [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 45; and [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 57.
- <sup>3</sup> [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 56.
- <sup>4</sup> [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 44.
- <sup>5</sup> [A/HRC/41/44/Add.2](#), para. 99.
- <sup>6</sup> [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 23.
- <sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 12. See also [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 18; and [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 37.
- <sup>8</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 10.
- <sup>9</sup> [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 6.
- <sup>10</sup> OHCHR, *United Nations Human Rights Report 2021*, pp. 110, 113, 114, 130, 478, 491, 522, 525, 528, 533 and 543; OHCHR, *United Nations Human Rights Report 2020*, pp. 104, 107, 108, 118, 135, 168, 170, 175, 184, 185, 189, 342 and 423; OHCHR, *United Nations Human Rights Report 2019*, pp. 86, 90, 92, 98, 109, 114, 125, 149, 152, 156, 164 and 168; OHCHR, *United Nations Human Rights Report 2018*, pp. 72, 76, 84, 101, 109, 133, 136, 141, 149 and 152; and OHCHR, *United Nations Human Rights Report 2017*, pp. 79, 83, 84, 90, 102, 104, 106, 111, 115, 121 and 132.

- <sup>11</sup> [A/HRC/44/57/Add.2](#), para. 37.
- <sup>12</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 5.
- <sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 6.
- <sup>14</sup> [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 48.
- <sup>15</sup> [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 23. See also [CAT/OP/NLD/1](#), paras. 39, 41, 43, 45 and 47; and [https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2fCAT%2fFUL%2fNLD%2f42058&Lang=en](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2fCAT%2fFUL%2fNLD%2f42058&Lang=en).
- <sup>16</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 14. See also [A/HRC/44/57/Add.2](#), para. 97; and [A/HRC/43/48/Add.1](#), para. 72.
- <sup>17</sup> [A/HRC/44/57/Add.2](#), para. 97. See also [CERD/C/NLD/CO/22-24](#), para. 8.
- <sup>18</sup> [A/HRC/44/57/Add.2](#), para. 97.
- <sup>19</sup> [CERD/C/NLD/CO/22-24](#), para. 25. See also [A/HRC/44/57/Add.2](#), paras. 68 and 97.
- <sup>20</sup> [A/HRC/44/57/Add.2](#), paras. 97–98. See also [CERD/C/NLD/CO/22-24](#), para. 26.
- <sup>21</sup> [CERD/C/NLD/CO/22-24](#), para. 28.
- <sup>22</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 15. See also [A/HRC/44/57/Add.2](#), paras. 70–72.
- <sup>23</sup> [A/HRC/44/57/Add.2](#), para. 71.
- <sup>24</sup> [CERD/C/NLD/CO/22-24](#), para. 21. See also [A/HRC/44/57/Add.2](#), para. 72.
- <sup>25</sup> [CERD/C/NLD/CO/22-24](#), para. 22.
- <sup>26</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 16.
- <sup>27</sup> See [https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100\\_COMMENT\\_ID,P13100\\_COUNTRY\\_ID:4058211,102768:NO](https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100_COMMENT_ID,P13100_COUNTRY_ID:4058211,102768:NO).
- <sup>28</sup> [CERD/C/NLD/CO/22-24](#), para. 11.
- <sup>29</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 15. See also [CERD/C/NLD/CO/22-24](#), para. 11; and [A/HRC/41/44/Add.2](#), para. 82.
- <sup>30</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 16. See also [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 15; [A/HRC/43/48/Add.1](#), para. 73; and [CERD/C/NLD/CO/22-24](#), para. 12.
- <sup>31</sup> [CERD/C/NLD/CO/22-24](#), para. 18.
- <sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 15. See also [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 48.
- <sup>33</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 49. See also [CERD/C/NLD/CO/22-24](#), para. 16.
- <sup>34</sup> [A/HRC/44/57/Add.2](#), para. 98. See also [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 45.
- <sup>35</sup> See <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2019/10/netherlands-building-surveillance-state-poor-says-un-rights-expert> and <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2020/02/landmark-ruling-dutch-court-stops-government-attempts-spy-poor-un-expert>.
- <sup>36</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 29.
- <sup>37</sup> [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 8.
- <sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 26.
- <sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 27.
- <sup>40</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 45. See also [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 27.
- <sup>41</sup> [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 10.
- <sup>42</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 50.
- <sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 51.
- <sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 48.
- <sup>45</sup> [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 30.
- <sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 31.
- <sup>47</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 41.
- <sup>48</sup> [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 41.
- <sup>49</sup> [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 37. See also [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 41.
- <sup>50</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 58. See also [A/HRC/43/48/Add.1](#), para. 65.
- <sup>51</sup> [A/HRC/43/48/Add.1](#), para. 74. See also [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 59.
- <sup>52</sup> UNESCO submission for the universal periodic review of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, paras. 5 and 12.
- <sup>53</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 61.
- <sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 54.
- <sup>55</sup> [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 47.
- <sup>56</sup> See [https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100\\_COMMENT\\_ID,P13100\\_COUNTRY\\_ID:3959531,102768:NO](https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100_COMMENT_ID,P13100_COUNTRY_ID:3959531,102768:NO).
- <sup>57</sup> [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 39.
- <sup>58</sup> [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 25.
- <sup>59</sup> [A/HRC/44/57/Add.2](#), para. 69.
- <sup>60</sup> [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 27.
- <sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 22. See also

- [https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100\\_COMMENT\\_ID,P13100\\_COUNTRY\\_ID:4058204,102768:NO](https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100_COMMENT_ID,P13100_COUNTRY_ID:4058204,102768:NO).
- 62 [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 32.
- 63 [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 33.
- 64 [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 42.
- 65 See communication NLD 4/2019, available from <https://spcommreports.ohchr.org/TMResultsBase/DownloadPublicCommunicationFile?gId=25008>, p. 3.
- 66 [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), paras. 42–43. See also communication NLD 4/2019, available from <https://spcommreports.ohchr.org/TMResultsBase/DownloadPublicCommunicationFile?gId=25008>, p. 3; [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 33; and [A/HRC/41/44/Add.2](#), para. 84.
- 67 See [https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100\\_COMMENT\\_ID,P13100\\_COUNTRY\\_ID:4058211,102768:NO](https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100_COMMENT_ID,P13100_COUNTRY_ID:4058211,102768:NO). See also [https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100\\_COMMENT\\_ID,P13100\\_COUNTRY\\_ID:4059724,102768:NO](https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100_COMMENT_ID,P13100_COUNTRY_ID:4059724,102768:NO).
- 68 [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 31.
- 69 [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 30.
- 70 [CERD/C/NLD/CO/22-24](#), para. 19.
- 71 [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 50.
- 72 *Ibid.*, para. 51.
- 73 [CERD/C/NLD/CO/22-24](#), para. 20. See also [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 15.
- 74 [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 26.
- 75 [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 52.
- 76 [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 27.
- 77 [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 21.
- 78 [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 35.
- 79 [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 10. See also [A/HRC/41/44/Add.2](#), para. 103.
- 80 [CERD/C/NLD/CO/22-24](#), para. 37.
- 81 *Ibid.*, para. 38. See also [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 32.
- 82 [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 32.
- 83 [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 11.
- 84 [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 13. See also NLD 3/2022, available from <https://spcommreports.ohchr.org/TMResultsBase/DownloadPublicCommunicationFile?gId=27127>.
- 85 [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 34.
- 86 [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 11. See also [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6/Add.1](#), paras. 9–10.
- 87 [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 35.
- 88 [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 12. See also [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 13.
- 89 [A/HRC/41/44/Add.2](#), para. 100.
- 90 [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 23.
- 91 See [https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100\\_COMMENT\\_ID,P13100\\_COUNTRY\\_ID:4058204,102768:NO](https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100_COMMENT_ID,P13100_COUNTRY_ID:4058204,102768:NO).
- 92 [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 23.
- 93 *Ibid.*
- 94 [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 32. See also [CEDAW/C/NLD/QPR/7](#), para. 9.
- 95 [CEDAW/C/NLD/QPR/7](#), para. 9.
- 96 [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 33.
- 97 [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 49.
- 98 [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 24.
- 99 *Ibid.*, para. 25.
- 100 See communication NLD 1/2018, available from <https://spcommreports.ohchr.org/TMResultsBase/DownloadPublicCommunicationFile?gId=24097>, p. 4. See also <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2018/11/un-experts-express-concern-about-racial-bias-dutch-child-welfare-system>.
- 101 See <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2018/11/un-experts-express-concern-about-racial-bias-dutch-child-welfare-system>.
- 102 [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 42.
- 103 *Ibid.*, para. 27.
- 104 [CERD/C/NLD/CO/22-24](#), para. 32.
- 105 [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 23. See also [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 49; and [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 53.
- 106 [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 51. See also [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 15.

- <sup>107</sup> See [https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100\\_COMMENT\\_ID,P13100\\_COUNTRY\\_ID:4058211,102768:NO](https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100_COMMENT_ID,P13100_COUNTRY_ID:4058211,102768:NO).
- <sup>108</sup> UNHCR submission for the universal periodic review of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, pp. 1–2.
- <sup>109</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 19.
- <sup>110</sup> UNHCR submission, p. 4.
- <sup>111</sup> [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 11. See also [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 19.
- <sup>112</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 19.
- <sup>113</sup> [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 12. See also UNHCR submission, p. 5.
- <sup>114</sup> [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 15. See also [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 24.
- <sup>115</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 25. See also [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 17.
- <sup>116</sup> [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 16.
- <sup>117</sup> UNHCR submission, p. 6.
- <sup>118</sup> [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 37. See also [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 19.
- <sup>119</sup> [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 37.
- <sup>120</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 20. See also [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 38.
- <sup>121</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 21.
- <sup>122</sup> UNHCR submission, pp. 2–3.
- <sup>123</sup> [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 38.
- <sup>124</sup> UNHCR submission, p. 4. See also <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2020/12/netherlands-violated-childs-right-acquire-nationality-un-committee-finds>.
- <sup>125</sup> See <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2020/12/netherlands-violated-childs-right-acquire-nationality-un-committee-finds>.
- <sup>126</sup> [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 18.
- <sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>128</sup> UNHCR submission, p. 4.
- <sup>129</sup> [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 24.
- <sup>130</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 12. See also [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 25; [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6/Add.1](#), para. 4; and <https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/lib-docs/HRBodies/UPR/Documents/Session27/NL/NetherlandsHCLetter.pdf>.
- <sup>131</sup> [CERD/C/NLD/CO/22-24](#), para. 30.
- <sup>132</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 26.
- <sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 30.
- <sup>134</sup> [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 45. See also [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 31.
- <sup>135</sup> [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 34.
- <sup>136</sup> [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 22.
- <sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 25.
- <sup>138</sup> [E/C.12/NLD/CO/6](#), para. 37.
- <sup>139</sup> [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 18.
- <sup>140</sup> [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 11. See also [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 18.
- <sup>141</sup> [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 11.
- <sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 11 and 16. See also [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 18; [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 36; and communication NLD 2/2022, available from <https://spcommreports.ohchr.org/TMResultsBase/DownloadPublicCommunicationFile?gId=27100>, pp. 1–4.
- <sup>143</sup> [CAT/C/NLD/CO/7](#), para. 12. See also [CCPR/C/NLD/CO/5](#), para. 18.
- <sup>144</sup> [CRC/C/NLD/CO/5-6](#), para. 37.