



Project Report

**Treaty Body Focused Review Pilot of
Grenada**

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Project partners and participants | 1 |
| Planning and logistics | 2 |
| Step 1: Selection of second pilot country (1 – 15 November 2021)..... | 3 |
| Step 2: Selection of participating TBs and recommendations under focused review (15– 30 November 2021) | 3 |
| Step 3: Selection of participants for the focused review pilot (15 January 2021 – 4 February 2022)..... | 4 |
| Step 4: Briefings with national stakeholders (31 January 2022 – 11 March 2022) | |
| | 5 |
| Step 5: Submission of focused review questionnaire to national taskforce, statutory bodies and CSOs (11 February 2022) | 6 |
| Step 6: National stakeholders submit reply to focused review questionnaire (by 10 March 2022) | 6 |
| Step 7: The focused review pilot session (22 -24 March 2022)..... | 6 |
| Media coverage | 9 |
| Outcomes and challenges of the focused review model | 9 |
| Outcomes | 12 |
| Challenges | 15 |
| Conclusion and way forward | 15 |
| Annex A - Agenda | 17 |
| Annex B - Questionnaire | 21 |
| Annex C – List of Participants | 28 |
| List of Participants - National Taskforce of Sierra Leone (IMC) | 28 |
| List of Participants – CSOs and Human Rights State Institutions..... | 29 |

Introduction

From 22 to 24 March 2022, the [Geneva Human Rights Platform](#) (GHRP) and the [Commonwealth Secretariat](#) - in collaboration with the Government of Grenada - conducted the second pilot of a UN treaty body (TB) focused review in St. George's, Grenada. This new pilot procedure, initiated by the GHRP, consists of a review carried out between full reporting cycles at the national level, designed to provide an update on how countries implement specific recommendations issued by different TBs. The pilot in Grenada focused on the latest recommendations for follow-up of two TBs, namely the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and the Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC).¹

The pilot in Grenada is the second such exercise, following the TB focused review pilot held in Freetown, Sierra Leone, from 7 – 9 December 2021. For more information on the focused review procedure and its objectives please visit GHRP's dedicated [portal](#) and read the [project report](#) of the first TB focused review pilot in Sierra Leone.

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of the focused review pilot in Grenada- its *scope, planning and logistics*, and to evaluate *its short-term outcomes and lessons learned*. Two sets of evaluation forms (pre and post activity) given to the national participants were used to analyse the outcomes of the pilot and the lessons learned. In the appendices, this report also includes the *programmatic documentation* of the pilot (agenda, focused review questionnaire, list of participants). In addition, the GHRP - in collaboration with the two participating TB members - has drafted a *compilation of updates on the recommendations under focused review*. These updates – the substantive outputs of the TB focused review pilot - are the result of exchanges between the TB members and the national actors stakeholders who participated in each of the dedicated sessions, namely, representatives of the relevant ministries, statutory bodies and civil society organisations (CSOs). This compilation will be shared with the relevant national authorities and the two TBs, thus informing the next cycle of official reviews.

Project partners and participants

The GHRP of the Geneva Academy and the Human Rights Unit of the Commonwealth Secretariat coordinated the pilot project, following consultations with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Grenada facilitated by the Commonwealth Secretariat. TB-NET provided its network to engage with Grenadian civil society representatives. The GHRP briefed and consulted with the OHCHR and the chairs of two TBs on the selection of

¹ The CEDAW has adopted a written follow-up procedure. The CRC has not adopted a follow-up procedure, which led to an ad-hoc selection of recommendations under focused review. The methodology for selection is explained in p.4 below.

participating TB members and the recommendations for consideration under focused review.

A total of 32 participants attended the two-day sessions in St. George's, Grenada, ensuring adequate representation of the various national stakeholders of both CEDAW and CRC.

The team involved in the planning and implementation of the pilot included:

- Representatives from the TBs, participating in their personal capacity:
 - Benoit Van Keirsbilck (Belgium), member of the Committee on the Rights of the Child
 - Leticia Bonifaz Alfonzo (Mexico), member of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women
- Representatives from the *core planning group*:
 - Felix Kirchmeier, Executive Director, GHRP
 - Domenico Zipoli, Research Fellow and Project Coordinator, GHRP
 - Yashasvi Nain, Human Rights Officer, Human Rights Unit of the Commonwealth Secretariat
 - Felix Daniel Gomez, Human Rights Officer, Capacity Building Programme, OHCHR Regional Office for Central America and Dominican Republic (RO-CADR)

The composition of the national team that contributed to the pilot included a total of 26 representatives from various governmental and non-governmental institutions. The national participants were selected according to three groups of stakeholders:

- 10 representatives of relevant ministries, including members of the National Coordinating Committee on Human Rights (NMRF)
- 3 representatives of statutory bodies with a human rights mandate
- 13 representatives of national CSOs, divided among the two TBs' areas of competence

The full lists of participating national stakeholders can be accessed in Annex C.

Planning and logistics

Given the successful methodology developed for the [first focused review pilot in Sierra Leone](#), the GHRP and the Commonwealth Secretariat decided to continue their collaboration and identified additional pilot countries in different regional settings. GHRP then conducted a mapping exercise by creating country-specific “focused review working tables” including:

- a detailed reporting history;
- a collation of follow-up recommendations issued by different TBs;
- relevant recommendations from other UN human rights mechanisms; and
- mapping of Grenada’s national human rights system, based on the list of state delegations, independent state institutions, and non-state actors that have participated in TB and UPR cycles in the past (either as part of delegations or by submitting parallel reports).

Following such analysis, Grenada was identified as a suitable second pilot country. In this context, the GHRP and the Commonwealth Secretariat established a functional timeline, divided into the following six steps:

Step 1: Selection of the second pilot country (1 – 15 November 2021)

Planning for the TB focused review pilot of Grenada began on 10 November 2021, with a meeting hosted by the Commonwealth Secretariat with representatives from the GHRP and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Business and CARICOM Affairs of Grenada. This initial meeting was important to introduce the concept and expectations of the project as well as to determine its scope and feasibility, including political interest of the government of Grenada and TB reporting status of the country.

Soon thereafter, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Grenada communicated its agreement to participate in the pilot project. On this occasion, it was agreed that the focused review pilot session would take place from 22 – 24 March 2022

Step 2: Selection of participating TBs and recommendations under focused review (15– 30 November 2021)

Upon agreement by Grenada to participate in the pilot, TB selection fell on those that had issued their latest COBs within the last 10 years and that had not yet received a response to the respective recommendations for follow-up. Grenada therefore agreed to include the following two TBs as part of the focused review pilot:

- Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women ([CEDAW/C/GRD/CO/1-5](#), 2012)
- Committee on the Rights of the Child ([CRC/C/GRD/CO/2](#), 2010)

As delineated in the project’s concept note, the focused review pilot would serve the purpose of providing updates on the status of implementation of the recommendations for follow-up issued by the selected TBs. As such, the pilot organizers would base their identification on recommendations that the TBs themselves considered as “urgent, priority or protective, and implementable within one or two years”. The following follow-up recommendations were identified as subject of the focused review (“recommendations under focused review”):

- Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW/C/GRD/CO/1-5):
 - para 18: National machinery for the advancement of women
 - para 24 (a), (c), (f), (h) and (i): Violence against women

As the CRC had not yet adopted a follow-up procedure, the selection of recommendations under focused review followed a different methodology. The GHRP identified those COBs that the Committee considered “not yet implemented or sufficiently implemented”². Thus, the CRC focused review would continue to “focus” on the issues deemed most urgent while adhering to the Committee’s official outputs. The following recommendations were identified under the focused review:

- Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC/C/GRD/CO/2):
 - para 10: Harmonization of legislation
 - para 26 - 27: Discrimination
 - para 33: Corporal punishment
 - para 60 - 61: Juvenile justice

Once the recommendations were identified, the GHRP compiled all recommendations under focused review into one document, the “focused review questionnaire” (See Annex B), pending approval by the participating TB members. This document represents the core instrument issued to the various stakeholders engaged in the focused review pilot

Step 3: Selection of participants for the focused review pilot (15 January 2021 – 4 February 2022)

The GHRP and the Commonwealth Secretariat coordinated the selection and invitation of participants to the focused review pilot according to four main categories: TB Members and OHCHR, Ministerial Representatives, Statutory Bodies and CSOs.

TB Members - the “TB delegation” - and OHCHR

The GHRP briefed both TBs during the preparatory stages of the pilot through email exchanges with the Chairs of both TBs, who then consulted their Bureau. The GHRP then bilaterally contacted the identified members to confirm their participation and inform them of the nature of the exercise, including their agreement to the identified recommendations under focused review for each TB.

Due to the nature of the pilot project and its regional focus, the GHRP consulted with various divisions of the OHCHR, including the Secretaries of the two TBs, the TB Capacity Building Programme, the OHCHR Regional Office for Central and Dominican Republic (RO-CADR) and the UN Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean Multi-Country

² CRC, Concluding Observations issued to Grenada, 1. General measures of implementation (arts. 4, 42 and 44, para. 6 of the Convention), para 6, CRC/C/GRD/CO/2, 2010.

Office (MCO). . A representative of the Treaty Body Capacity Building Programme of RO - CADR attended the pilot focused review session in St. George's as an observer.

Government representatives - the “national taskforce”

The GHRP and the Commonwealth Secretariat invited the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Grenada to set up a “national taskforce”, comprising representatives of all relevant ministries, in order to coordinate cooperation ahead of and during the focused review pilot.

The National Coordinating Committee for Human Rights (NCC), led by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, played a key role in the selection of the 10 ministerial representatives as well as in coordinating their preparation towards the focused review pilot.

Statutory bodies with a human rights mandate and CSOs

The GHRP and the Commonwealth Secretariat also reached out to three statutory bodies with a relevant human rights mandate, namely the Office of the Ombudsman, the Child Protection Authority and the Grand Bacolet Juvenile Rehabilitation and Treatment Centre. Following the bilateral meetings, one representative from each institution was invited to participate in the focused review pilot.

The GHRP, in consultation with TB-NET member organizations, prepared a list of national CSOs that actively involved in monitoring and reporting to CEDAW and CRC. The selection of CSOs was based on parallel reports submitted during the last review cycle as well as ongoing collaboration between TB-NET member organizations and Grenadian CSOs. A total of 10 CSOs were invited, divided between the two TBs' areas of competence.

The full list of participating national stakeholders is available in Annex C.

Step 4: Briefings with national stakeholders (31 January 2022 – 11 March 2022)

The GHRP and the Commonwealth Secretariat organized several online sessions to brief all national stakeholders on the modalities of the focused review. These briefings were tailored to each of the three categories of national actors:

- Specifically for members of the National Coordinating Committee for Human Rights (NCC), the GHRP and the Commonwealth Secretariat organized two online briefings during the weeks leading up to the focused review pilot session (31 January 2022 and 4 March 2021). During these briefings, the NCC also proposed a series of visits as part of the focused review pilot, to take place the day before the two-day pilot session.
- In the weeks leading up to the focused review pilot session, the GHRP and the Commonwealth Secretariat also organized two separate online briefing

sessions with representatives of CSOs and representatives from the statutory bodies (16 February and 11 March 2021).

Step 5: Submission of focused review questionnaire to national taskforce, statutory bodies and CSOs (11 February 2022)

After the two participating TB members approved the recommendations for the draft focused review questionnaire, the GHRP finalized the document and prepared it for submission to all participating national actors. This document contains the compilation of the identified recommendations under focused review. On 11 February, the GHRP and the Commonwealth Secretariat shared the focused review questionnaire with the NCC, the statutory bodies and the CSO representatives.

Step 6: National stakeholders submit reply to focused review questionnaire (by 10 March 2022)

As part of the focused review pilot, all participating national actors had the opportunity to submit a written reply to the recommendations in the focused review questionnaire by 10 March 2022. The GHRP and the Commonwealth Secretariat felt this was a reasonable timeframe given the timing of the national stakeholders' receipt of the questionnaire, the limited amount of recommendations under focused review and the time required by the TB delegation to prepare for the focused review session.

The purpose of these replies was to provide updates to the TB delegation on the government's progress in implementing the identified recommendations.

A total of 3 responses to the focused review questionnaire were received:

- 2 comprehensive replies from the national taskforce, led by the Ministry of Social Development, Housing and Community Empowerment who channelled information from all participating ministries into CRC and CEDAW-specific submissions
- 1 reply from the Office of the Ombudsman.

Upon receipt, the GHRP promptly forwarded each reply to the TB delegation for analysis and preparation toward the focused review pilot session.

Step 7: The focused review pilot session (22 -24 March 2022)

The pilot session took place over two days, from March 23 to 24, at Radisson Hotel Grand Anse conference facilities in St George's, Grenada. The agenda of the session is available in Annex A. On March 22, a full day of in-situ visits to relevant institutions preceded the actual discussions around the TB recommendations. Below is a brief overview of the proceedings.

.

March 22 – in situ visits

Prior to the focused review sessions, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Social Development organized a full day of visits to institutions relevant to the recommendations under focused review.

The schedule of visits proceeded as follows:

- 11-12pm: [Programme for Adolescent Mothers](#)
- 2 - 3pm: [Grand Bacolet Rehabilitation and Treatment Centre](#)
- 4 - 5pm: [CEDARS Home for Abused Women and their Children](#)

These visits allowed the TB delegation to witness first hand and interact with three institutions relevant to the core themes covered by the recommendations under focused review: the national machinery for the advancement of women, violence against women, juvenile justice, the harmonization of legislation on child rights, as well as corporal punishment and discrimination.

March 23 – opening ceremony

The opening ceremony, attended by all participants, included a series of introductory remarks by representatives of key national authorities as well as by the organisers of the pilot project. The list of speakers included the following:

- Roxie K. Mc Leish *Hutchinson, Permanent Secretary*, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, International Business and CARICOM Affairs
- Michael A. Mitchell, Technical Adviser, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, International Business and CARICOM Affairs
- Felix Kirchmeier, Executive Director, GHRP
- Yashasvi Nain, Human Rights Officer, Commonwealth Secretariat
- Leticia Bonifaz Alfonzo, member of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women
- Michelle Brathwaite, Human Rights Adviser, UN Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean Multi-Country Office

During the opening segment Domenico Zipoli, Research Fellow and Project Coordinator of the GHRP, presented the rationale and process of the focused treaty body review project.

On this occasion, all participants received a “pre-focused review evaluation form” designed to square their prior knowledge of/experience with TB activity and their expectations from the pilot sessions.

March 23 (morning and afternoon sessions) – informal private briefings with statutory bodies and CSOs

The remainder of the day was dedicated to informal, private briefings between the TB delegation, statutory bodies and CSOs. These briefings, which replicated as much as possible the modalities of engagement with national stakeholders in Geneva, served

the purpose of informing the TB delegation of the government's action/inaction vis-à-vis the recommendations under focused review. To ensure free exchange between CSOs and TB members, these meetings remained private, without the presence of government representatives.

Informal private briefings with statutory bodies (09:45 – 12:00, incl. tea break):

- 1 hr briefing between the TB delegation and the Office of the Ombudsman (CEDAW-specific)
- 1 hr briefing between the TB delegation, the Office of the Ombudsman, the Child Protection Authority and the Grand Bacolet Juvenile Rehabilitation and Treatment Centre (CRC-specific)

Informal private briefings with CSOs (13:00 – 16:00):

- 1.5 hr briefing between the TB delegation and CSOs (CEDAW-specific)
- 1.5 hr briefing between the TB delegation and CSOs (CRC-specific)

The GHRP acted as moderator during all informal private briefings. Each briefing began with short presentations by representatives of each statutory body/CSO. The TB delegation then responded with follow-up questions and requests for clarification. Both members of the TB delegation were allowed to take the floor and ask questions, which fostered inter-committee cooperation and benefited from the expertise of each TB member. The floor was then open for an open exchange between statutory bodies/CSO representatives and the TB delegation.

March 24 (morning sessions) – focused review pilot sessions with government representatives

The focused review sessions with government representatives took place throughout the morning of the second day of proceedings. The agenda was divided into two TB-specific sessions, with the national taskforce and the TB delegation required to fully participate in both sessions. This was considered essential, both from a substantive and technical assistance perspective, to overcome the traditional sectoral distinctions between TB and ministerial mandates. One representative from each participating statutory body and six CSO representatives attended both sessions as observers.

Treaty body focused review with government representatives (8:45 – 13:00, including tea break):

- 2 hr CEDAW focused review session
- 2 hr CRC focused review session

A representative from the GHRP/Commonwealth Secretariat moderated both focused review sessions. Each session began with a short presentation by a member of the TB in question. This first part of the session served the purpose of introducing an element

of capacity building into the exercise, providing an overview of how the Committee functions as well as substantive clarifications on specific treaty provisions. During each session, the national taskforce focal points (i.e. a representative from the Ministry of Social Development, Housing and Community Empowerment) provided an update on the government's implementation of the relevant recommendations. The TB delegation responded with follow-up questions and requests for clarification followed by an open discussion between government representatives and the two TB members.

March 24 afternoon session - Lessons learned, benefits and challenges of the focused review pilot

The afternoon of the second day – attended by all participants – concluded the event with an open dialogue on lessons learned, benefits, and challenges of the focused review pilot. The session continued with a *tour-de-table*, where each participant gave a short presentation on the benefits and challenges of the focused review pilot in Grenada. These first-hand evaluations formed the basis for the outcome analysis that follows below. All participants were asked to complete a “post-focused review evaluation form” to understand if expectations were met and how an in-country focused review would impact their engagement with the TB review cycles.

Media coverage

The focused review pilot of Grenada received notable media attention. A team from the national broadcasting corporation was present at both the opening and the closing of the event.

Outcomes and challenges of the focused review model

The GHRP, in collaboration with the two participating TB members, drafted a confidential *compilation of updates on the recommendations under focused review*, detailing specific findings following the focused review.

Given the number of recommendations and the overlapping themes, they can be broadly clustered around core themes: the national machinery for the advancement of women, violence against women, juvenile justice, harmonization of legislation on child rights, as well as corporal punishment and discrimination. Where possible, discussions used an ‘all mechanisms approach’, linking the recommendations under focused review with relevant recommendations accepted by Grenada during the previous UPR cycle.

For the purposes of this report, the following are some key points raised during the discussions:

The Division of Gender and Family Affairs within the Ministry of Social Development has established a National Machinery for Gender Equality and a Women Empowerment Unit, headed by a Director and Senior Coordinator and affiliated staff

from key Ministries and Departments. The National Machinery is the result of the National Gender Equality Policy and Action Plan (GEPAP), which was supported by UN Women. GEPAP was approved by the Government in 2014 and covers the period 2014-2024. The National Machinery works to ensure gender responsive implementation of national policies, laws, in delivery of education and health services, social services, safety net programmes, and labour programmes. A growing list of gender focal point persons assists in the gender mainstreaming and implementation activities mandated under the Gender Equality Policy and Action Plan (GEPAP) 2014-2024. The Division carries out its mission despite challenges in acquiring suitable human and material resources to complete and sustain its activities. Persistent budgetary and human resource constraints have sometimes led to reliance on contractual services and partnership with national CSOs.

In order to address violence against women, the Government of Grenada adopted the National Strategic Action Plan to Reduce Gender Based Violence (2013 – 2018). The plan provided strategic direction to reduce the incidence of all forms of gender-based violence in Grenada. This National Action Plan included, among other things, strategies to identify, protect and support victims as they transition from disempowered individuals to survivors who are empowered to make decisions and take actions for their best interests; and to identify, punish and rehabilitate perpetrators to reduce offending and re-offending, whether they are current or potential victims. In the years following the CEDAW review (2013 – 2016), significant actions were taken to enforce legislation to address violence against women and girls. These laws and regulations include, inter alia, the Domestic Violence Act (No. 19 of 2010), the Child (Protection and Adoption) Act (No. 20 of 2010) and amendments to sexual offences provisions in the Criminal Code (No 29 of 2012), including introduction of marital rape. In September 2018, the Royal Grenada Police Force established a Special Victims Unit (SVU), whose main task is to respond to cases of intimate partner violence/domestic violence, sexual violence and child abuse.

On the issue of harmonization of legislation in the area of child rights, Grenada has passed and enacted in quick succession the Child Protection and Adoption Act 2010, the Domestic Violence Act 2010, the Juvenile Justice Act 2012 and the Child Registration Act 2013 as part of the “family law reform project”. This law reform project reflects a nation-wide strategy to strengthen the legislative framework on family and child protection. Specifically, the Child Protection and Adoption Act 2010 established the Child Protection Authority (CPA) as the statutorily mandated body to address all aspects of child protection cases, from receiving reports to conducting investigations, placing of children, initiating legal proceeding and doing all relevant follow up. Although the CPA has recently increased their human resources, there are still inadequate human and financial resources to fully implement and monitor these laws. Furthermore, there has been no progress towards establishing a national coordinating body. The Grenada Network on the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CSO)

currently plays the role of coordinating body in relation to governmental and non-governmental responses to the CRC recommendations.

The Juvenile Justice Amendment Act 2017 explicitly prohibits corporal punishment as a sentence for a crime committed by a child but corporal punishment is still permitted under the Criminal Code of Grenada and the Education Act 2002 also continues to permit corporal punishment. It is expected that the issue of corporal punishment will be addressed in the upcoming legislative review. In practice, however, corporal punishment is a rooted practice in Grenadian society and is frequently practiced by school principals. The government has introduced mandatory reporting as part of a new child protection policy for educational facilities. However, monitoring and implementing of this policy remains difficult in practice.

The Criminal Code Amendment Act 2012 has comprehensively addressed the issue of ensuring that provisions referring to the minimum age of consent for sexual acts apply to both boys and girls. Similarly, the 2012 Amendment Act provides equal protection for boys and girls against sexual abuse and exploitation.

The Juvenile Justice Act of 2012, which came into force in 2016, raised the age of criminal responsibility from 7 to 12 years. The act contemplates restoration and alternative sentencing and various measures are being taken to ensure that detention in Grenada's only juvenile facility (Grand Bacolet Rehabilitation and Treatment Centre) is an absolute last resort. Currently, there is no family court in Grenada, but throughout Magistrate's jurisdiction, one day per month is reserved exclusively for juvenile matters. Furthermore, the state does not offer a victim support programme. Several CSOs, in collaboration with the Ministry of Social Development and Housing (through the Spotlight Initiative), run programs to prepare victims for court.

In addition, all pilot sessions addressed various issues related to the Office of the Ombudsman and the implications of its progress towards full accreditation as a Paris Principles- compliant NHRI. Grenada is in fact "actively considering" establishing an independent NHRI. The Office of the Ombudsman, in collaboration with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, recently contributed to an Institutional Needs Assessment (INA) commissioned by the Commonwealth Secretariat. The INA is now available to all stakeholders.

On the last day of the pilot, all 26 national participants received a post-activity evaluation form. The responses from these participants formed the basis of the following analysis of the project's outcomes and challenges.

Outcomes

Strengthened capacity of national human rights actors to engage with the TB state reporting procedure

Almost all participants considered the focused review procedure as a useful means to assist national stakeholders in the monitoring and implementation of TB recommendations. According to the participants of the pilot, the focused review procedure:

- improves the way national organizations engage with TBs by providing a unique opportunity for dialogue between TB members and national actors to occur in-country (CSO);
- it provides useful clarifications on the official rules of procedure and working methods of the various TBs, including the available “entry points” for national institutions to provide their input to the monitoring process (statutory body);
- it broadens the understanding of the respective roles that each national human rights actor may have in assessing the status of implementation of the TB recommendations (statutory body);
- it can lead to greater accountability of the state, as discussions on human rights implementation in this format take place in capital, where key policy decisions are made (government);
- it can help different ministries and departments to work more effectively given the focused approach taken vis-à-vis a certain number of TB recommendations (government);
- it represents a very good and innovative monitoring and evaluation tool to assess the country’s progress on specific human rights issues (government).

Increased access for national stakeholders

Another outcome is the expanded scope of participation, which improves opportunities for direct engagement by individuals and organizations normally excluded from standard Geneva-based TB proceedings. This includes all national stakeholders, including representatives of relevant ministries, statutory bodies with a human rights mandate and CSOs. With this in mind, participants felt that the focused review procedure:

- increases cross-sectoral participation, compared to the cost of travel to Geneva. The opportunity to interact directly with members of TBs at the national level is critical for small organizations and can lead to form better strategies in monitoring the implementation of TB recommendations (CSO);
- represents an invaluable opportunity to obtain important information on how to best implement the TB recommendations by those who were directly involved in drafting them (government);

- serves as capacity building for colleagues involved in TB reporting for the first time and prepares them for participation in subsequent TB reviews (government).

Promotes cooperation among national human rights actors

The pilot led to further strengthening of the national taskforce on human rights and provided an additional opportunity for cooperation among different statutory bodies and CSOs. On this point, participants considered that the focused review:

- provides an opportunity for expansive and comprehensive discussions between the government and CSOs that would otherwise be less effective (CSO);
- addresses the challenge of coordination between ministries and statutory bodies, as the presence of TB members on the ground can be used to foster national dynamics and renew collaborative cooperation strategies (statutory body);
- highlights the need for more effective collaboration among different national stakeholders, groups and minorities to develop synergies on reporting and data collection among various government departments; (government);
- strengthens the work of the NMIRF by creating a space for dialogue and information sharing among all national stakeholders involved in TB monitoring, reporting and implementation (government);
- strengthens communication among national stakeholders and provides a valuable opportunity to keep each other updated on the steps being taken towards implementation of human rights obligations/recommendations (government).

More constructive environment

Exchanges between TB members and national human rights actors “in-country” provide a space for more informal discussions than dialogues in Geneva. According to the participants, the focused review:

- appears more “intimate” and allows discussion on implementation challenges with relevant TB members, providing answers and clarifications on real and contextualized human rights issues (CSO);
- improves the confidence of national stakeholders to engage meaningfully with TB members (statutory body);
- facilitates representation of diverse national human rights stakeholders and their interaction “around the table”, fosters networking at the national-level and encourages in-depth discussions compared to the traditional “filling of a questionnaire” under the standard reporting procedure (statutory body);

- leads to more open and less formal discussions between TB members and government representatives (government).

Greater specificity and attention to the national context, including the possibility of in-situ visits

Most participants, including the two members of TBs, appreciated the opportunity to discuss context-sensitive issues faced by Grenada in implementing TB recommendations. According to several participants, this approach is much more thorough and useful than the ‘standard’ preparation for the full TB review, which relies on desk research, email exchanges and siloed participation by different national human rights actors. The focused discussions on the few selected recommendations ensured that national stakeholders focused on the most important, practical issues towards full implementation. At the same time, in-situ visits to institutions relevant to the recommendations under focused review facilitated a deeper understanding of the situation on the ground by TB members.

According to the participants, a focused approach and face-to-face interaction between national stakeholders and TB members in country:

- pushes the TB members to look at the reality on the ground and understand the challenges faced by both the government and CSOs in reporting to the TB system and ultimately implementing its recommendations (CSO);
- The in-situ visits fostered debate during the dialogue with state actors, and allowed the questions asked to be more targeted and adapted to the reality of the country (government).

Strengthened visibility of the TB system

The presence of TB members in St. George’s was reported in the national media, as a team from the national broadcasting corporation was present at both the opening and closing of the event. This demonstrates the potential to increase the visibility of the TB system by bringing it closer to the people. On this aspect, participants agreed that the pilot:

- has generated momentum within the ministries and among CSOs, especially through the series of briefings in preparation for the focused review sessions (CSO);
- encouraged the various departments to recognize their limitations and learn about their roles and responsibilities in relation to their human rights reporting obligations (government).

Challenges

Timeline and pre-focused review guidance

A number of participants felt the project's timeline was too demanding, especially considering that the organizers did not submit the focused review questionnaire until mid-February. National participants should have been given more notice, including a more structured timeline leading up to the event. One participant, speaking on behalf of a CSO, also felt that more detailed, systematic guidance prior to the event would have benefited CSO participation.

Submission of replies to focused review questionnaire

The pilot would have benefited from a higher number of replies to the focused review questionnaire. Only 3 national stakeholders submitted written replies to the questionnaire. Therefore, the TB members did not receive information on every topic covered in the recommendations under focused review. It was also not possible to receive written updates from all stakeholders involved in the process. In such instances, the TB members' preparation relied on desk research.

Participation of stakeholders from the region

According to various stakeholders who participated in the sessions, the opportunity to interact in person with TB members facilitated them to provide a more comprehensive and thorough account of the human rights situation on the ground. However, the inclusion of subnational institutions from remote islands (e.g. Carriacou) would have increased the quality of the exercise. Taking the focused review away from the capital would have granted others the opportunity to contribute to the process. The local context is quite different, and other Grenadian islands should have the opportunity to understand the state's obligations as a member of UN and as a signatory to various UN human rights treaties.

Conclusion and way forward

This second TB focused review pilot has demonstrated similar benefits to the first pilot in Sierra Leone. A national review focusing on selected recommendations conducted in-between the full-scale Geneva-based reviews can have a meaningful impact on national stakeholder participation by strengthening their role and accessibility vis-à-vis the TB system. This in-country interaction facilitated multi-sectoral participation that otherwise would not have occurred in Geneva. This stimulated a nation-wide discussion on the implementation of TB recommendations and the role of each stakeholder group's monitoring and reporting to the various TBs. A focused review also facilitates the formation of national coalitions, and promotes collaboration between governmental and non-governmental actors and within various stakeholder groups. By visiting relevant institutions, TB members were able to better contextualize Grenada's issues, which led to very practical discussions on how best to approach the

recommendations under focused review, which will likely have an impact on implementation efforts. In addition to gaining practical insights into how the TB system works, stakeholders gained a better understanding of how TBs can act as an integrated and coherent system.

The conclusion of the second pilot has further facilitated the identification of specific recommendations towards a more defined format for a possible TB focused review procedure. In this regard, the GHRP and the Commonwealth Secretariat are currently discussing the possibility of conducting additional pilots in Europe and the Asia-Pacific throughout 2022-23. At the end of the process, a report covering the outcomes of all pilots will inform the current discussions among TB Chairs and Member States on the most effective format for a future focused/follow up review, in line with the trends emerging from the [informal conversations held by OHCHR with Chairs and TB experts](#) held throughout March and April 2022.

Annex A – Agenda



The Commonwealth

DRAFT AGENDA

Treaty Body Focused Review Pilot of Grenada

23 – 24 March 2022, 08:30 – 16:00,

Location

Radisson Grenada
Grand Anse Beach, Grand Anse, Grenada

A project of the:

**GENEVA
ACADEMY**

Académie de droit international
humanitaire et de droits humains
Academy of International
Humanitarian Law and Human Rights

The Geneva Academy, a Joint Centre of

THE GRADUATE
INSTITUTE
GENEVA

INSTITUT DE HAUTES
ÉTUDES INTERNATIONALES
ET D'HAUT Niveau
GRADUATE INSTITUTE
OF INTERNATIONAL
AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

UNIVERSITÉ
DE GENÈVE
FACULTY OF LAW

Agenda

DAY 1

| | |
|---------------|--|
| 08:30 – 09:00 | Welcome Tea |
| 09:00 – 09:30 | Welcome and Introductory Remarks |
| 09:30 – 09:45 | Presentation of the Focused Review Pilot Initiative |
| 09:45 – 10:45 | Statutory bodies session - Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women Member of the Committee the Elimination of Discrimination against Women |
| | Representative from the Office of the Ombudsman of Grenada |
| | <i>Technical moderation: Representative from the GHRP/Commonwealth</i> |
| 10:45 – 11:00 | Tea Break |
| 11:00 – 12:00 | Statutory bodies session - Committee on the Rights of the Child Member of the Committee on the Rights of the Child Representative from the Office of the Ombudsman of Grenada Representative from the Child Protection Authority Representative from the Grand Bacolet Juvenile Rehabilitation Centre |
| | <i>Technical moderation: Representative from the GHRP/Commonwealth</i> |
| 12:00 – 13:00 | Lunch Break |
| 13:00 – 14:30 | CSO session – Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women Member of the Committee the Elimination of Discrimination against Women CSO Representatives <i>Technical moderation: Representative from the GHRP/Commonwealth</i> |
| 14:30 – 16:00 | CSO session – Committee on the Rights of the Child Member of the Committee on the Rights of the Child CSO Representatives |

DAY 2

| | |
|---------------|--|
| 08:00 – 08:30 | Welcome Tea |
| 08:30 – 08:45 | Wrap-up from Day 1 Representative from the GHRP |
| | Representative from the Commonwealth Secretariat |
| 08:45 – 10:45 | Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women Focused Review Member of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women Ministerial Representatives (National Coordinating Committee and relevant other Ministries) <i>Short initial presentation on the functioning of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women: Member of the Committee</i> <i>Technical moderation: Representative from the GHRP/Commonwealth</i> |
| 10:45 – 11:00 | Tea Break |
| 11:00 – 13:00 | Committee on the Rights of the Child Focused Review Member of the Committee on the Rights of the Child Ministerial Representatives (National Coordinating Committee and relevant other Ministries) <i>Short initial presentation on the functioning of the Committee on the Rights of the Child: Member of the Committee</i> <i>Technical moderation: Representative from the GHRP/Commonwealth</i> |
| 13:00 – 14:00 | Lunch Break |
| 14:00 – 15:30 | Lessons learned, benefits and challenges of the Focused Review Pilot Open dialogue on lessons learned, benefits and challenges with Office Ministerial Representatives, Office of the Ombudsman and CSOs <i>Short initial presentation on the results from evaluation forms and technical moderation: Representative from the GHRP/Commonwealth</i> |
| 15:30 – 16:00 | Closing of Focused Review Pilot of Grenada |

Background

The focused review pilot of Grenada will involve the participation of one member or former member from each TB selected (CEDAW and CRC), acting in their personal capacity. Relevant OHCHR Secretariat staff might also be involved (e.g. Committee Secretaries and/or human rights officers working on Grenada) as well as staff from the United Nations Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean Multi-Country Office (MCO).

Given the current numbers of COBs issued by the different Treaty Bodies, the focused review will cluster recommendations around a limited number of core-themes. The selection of COBs for the focused review will be thus based on those selected under the follow-up procedure, where applicable (see Draft Focused Review Questionnaire). Such assessment will take into consideration overlapping COBs from different TBs and recommendations issued by Special Rapporteurs (SRs) and those issued during the latest Universal Periodic Review (UPR) cycle. Specific links will be highlighted between the selected COBs and relevant Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). State representatives may also solicit advice on specific COBs, which will be considered by the participating TB members for inclusion in the focused review. To fully realize the potential of national engagement, the focused review needs to include the participation of all relevant actors of the national human rights system, namely governmental actors (NMRF, line ministries, sub-national governments, national statistics offices, etc.), parliament (due to many COBs requiring legislative change), law enforcement and security actors (penitentiary, police, military, etc.), the NHRI, other independent state actors (judiciary, thematic ombudsmen, etc.) but also the UN resident coordinator, or UN agencies present in the country. Additionally, the focused review needs to uphold the highest standards of civil society participation in informing the process.

In practice, the focused review will take place during two days. Day 1 is dedicated to statutory bodies and CSO input. Day 2 is dedicated to the focused review sessions of each TB with representatives from relevant ministries.

- Day 1: two 1h statutory bodies sessions (CEDAW and CRC) and two 1.5h CSO sessions (CEDAW and CRC);
- Day 2: two 2h Treaty Body Focused Review sessions with ministerial representatives (CEDAW and CRC)

On Day 2, space will be provided for an open dialogue with ministerial representatives as well as representatives from statutory bodies and CSO representatives, to discuss lessons learned, benefits and challenges of the focused review pilot.

In terms of attendance requirements by the different stakeholders (in total, xx participants):

- Day 1: Welcome and Introductory remarks and presentation of the focused review initiative will be open to all participants.
- Day 1: CSO sessions will be confidential (TB delegation and CSO representatives only).
- Day 2: Individual Treaty Body Focused Review sessions will require the presence of all ministerial representatives participating to the event, regardless of line ministry of belonging. The sessions will be open to statutory bodies and CSO observers (TB delegation, ministerial representatives and selected representatives from statutory bodies/CSO as observers).



FOCUSED REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Treaty Body Focused Review Pilot of Grenada

Background

The *Focused Review Questionnaire* aims at identifying the steps taken by the State concerned towards the implementation of UN Treaty Bodies' follow-up recommendations as well as the needs/capacity necessary towards such implementation. These recommendations are clearly identified in a paragraph at the end of the concluding observations and represent specific Concluding Observations from the last review cycle that the Treaty Bodies have recognized as urgent, priority or protective, and implementable within one or two years. If the Treaty Body has not adopted a follow-up procedure, the recommendations under focused review will be those recommendations it made in its latest concluding observations that were considered "not yet implemented or sufficiently implemented".

The present questionnaire addresses the follow up recommendations to Grenada issued by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC). The focused review sessions will be based on a constructive dialogue between the national taskforce representatives and participating members of each of the two Treaty Bodies.

This questionnaire will be submitted to Grenada and its governmental agencies as well as to all other national stakeholders, inviting them to report on the status of implementation of the above recommendations. It is thus expected that, upon receipt of this questionnaire, those stakeholders prepare and submit a written reply 10 days in advance of the event (14 March 2021), in order to provide an update - in the context of the Focused Review Pilot - on the measures taken to implement the above-mentioned recommendations.

Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)

Review Cycle (I - V): 51st Session (2012)

Concluding Observations (COB): [CEDAW/C/GRD/CO/1-5](#)

FOLLOW-UP COB

45. The Committee requests the State party to provide, within two years, written information on the steps taken to implement the recommendations contained in **paragraphs 18 and 24 (a), (c), (f), (h) and (i)** above.

| Selected Paragraph | Theme | Recommendation |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Para. 18 | National machinery for the advancement of women | <p>17. While welcoming the functional review of the Division of Gender and Family Affairs of the Ministry of Social Development in 2009 and subsequent improvements in terms of restructuring and an increase in posts, the Committee is concerned about the limited financial and human resources allocated to the Division and to the Domestic Violence Unit in the Ministry and the insufficient training of new staff. The Committee is further concerned over the delays in developing the comprehensive national gender-equality policy and action plan. The Committee is also concerned about the lack of an independent national human rights institution in the State party.</p> <p>18. Recalling its general recommendation No. 6 (1988) on effective national machinery and publicity, and the guidance provided in the Beijing Platform for Action on the necessary conditions for the effective functioning of national mechanisms, the Committee recommends that the State party:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) Strengthen the capacity of the Division of Gender and Family Affairs and the Domestic Violence Unit, including by providing adequate human, technical and financial resources, with clear and well-defined responsibilities, to formulate, implement, provide advice on, coordinate and oversee the preparation and implementation of legislation and policy measures in the field of gender equality;(b) Urgently finalize and adopt a comprehensive, result-oriented national gender-equality policy and a related plan of action with specific indicators and targets, which should include an effective strategy on gender equality based on the Convention, the Committee's general recommendations and the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, with the involvement of all relevant bodies of the State apparatus and in consultation with relevant non-governmental organizations;(c) Consider establishing an independent national human rights institution in accordance with the principles |

| | | |
|---|---------------------------|--|
| | | relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (Paris Principles), a women's ombudsman or another specialized body with authority to consider as well as issue opinions and make recommendations on complaints submitted by women alleging violations of their human rights. |
| Para. 24 (a), (c), (f), (h) and (i) | Violence against women | <p>23. While welcoming the adoption of the Domestic Violence Act (2010) and the National Domestic Violence and Sexual Abuse Protocol (2011), and the drafting of a national strategic action plan for the prevention, protection and punishment of gender-based violence, the Committee notes with concern the high incidence of violence against women, including domestic violence, sexual abuse and incest. The Committee is further concerned about the limited enforcement of the Domestic Violence Act; gaps in legislation on violence against women, in particular those relating to the fact that marital rape is not criminalized and to the restrictive definition of rape; the lack of sufficient awareness and training among judges, prosecutors and police officers and health professionals on violence against women; the fact that the domestic violence hotline is not operational; the limited disaggregated data available on violence against women; and information indicating that cases of gender-based violence are underreported due to prevalent social and cultural factors. The Committee is also concerned at the high prevalence of sexual harassment in the workplace and in the society at large and the absence of legislation in this regard.</p> <p>24. Recalling its general recommendation No. 19 (1992) on violence against women, the Committee urges the State party:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) To urgently finalize the development of the national strategic action plan for the prevention, protection and punishment of gender-based violence for its early adoption; (c) To review and amend the Criminal Code's section on sexual offences and the procedures that accompany them to fully address all forms of violence against women, including by revising the provisions on sexual violence and criminalizing marital rape with no preconditions, within a clear time frame; (f) To strengthen victim assistance and support programmes through measures to provide victims of violence against women with legal aid, medical support, including mental health services, and shelters as well as rehabilitation services, as appropriate; (h) To operationalize the domestic violence hotline; (i) To urgently adopt comprehensive legislation to combat sexual harassment. |

Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC)

Review Cycle II: 54th Session (2010)

Concluding Observations (COBs): [CRC/C/GRD/CO/2](#)

| COBs |
|---|
| 5. The Committee welcomes efforts by the State party to implement the Committee's concluding observations on the State party's initial report. Nevertheless, the Committee notes with regret that many of these concluding observations have not been significantly addressed. |
| 6. The Committee urges the State party to take all necessary measures to address those recommendations it made in its concluding observations on the initial report that have not yet been implemented or sufficiently implemented, in particular on discrimination, harmonization of legislation, corporal punishment and juvenile justice , and to provide adequate follow-up to the recommendations contained in the present concluding observations on the second periodic report. In this context, the Committee draws the attention of the State party to its general comment No. 5 (2004) on general measures of implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. |

| Selected Paragraph | Theme | Recommendation |
|--------------------|------------------------------|---|
| Para. 10 | Harmonization of legislation | <p>Legislation</p> <p>7. With the exception of the Ombudsperson Bill, the Committee notes that a number of bills on issues related to child rights exist; however these bills have not yet been passed. The Committee regrets that the Convention has still not been integrated into national legislation. It is also concerned that there are insufficient human and material resources to draft legislation and to implement legislation that has been passed.</p> <p>8. The Committee urges the State party to take, as a matter of priority, all appropriate measures to expedite the adoption of the Status of the Child Bill, the Childcare and Adoption Bill, the Domestic Violence Bill and the Juvenile Justice Bill and to ensure adequate human and financial resources for full implementation of the provisions of these laws when adopted.</p> <p>Coordination</p> <p>9. The Committee notes that the State party assigned the Ministry of Social Development to coordinate and implement child rights-related activities with other ministries and non-governmental organizations. However, given the multiple roles played by staff of the Ministry of Social Development due to a severe shortage of human resources, the Committee is concerned that there is no entity to specifically focus on coordination between the different ministries and between the national, provincial and local levels, as well as on the harmonization of national policies and plans of action related to child rights.</p> |

| | | |
|---------------|---------------------|---|
| | | 10. The Committee recommends that the State party enhance coordination and implementation of the Convention by establishing a national coordinating body that could develop a national plan of action and institutionalize and strengthen coordination. |
| Para. 26 - 27 | Discrimination | <p>25. The Committee notes with interest the development of a National Gender Policy and that activities aimed at discouraging discrimination take place in schools. However, recalling the concerns expressed in its previous concluding observations (CRC/C/15/Add.121, paras. 13 and 14), the Committee regrets that the State party's legislation has not been amended to also offer boys protection against sexual abuse and exploitation and that the minimum age of consent to sexual activity refers only to girls. The Committee also notes with concern that pregnant teenage girls are often requested to leave school and their return to school is left to the discretion of the school principals.</p> <p>26. The Committee urges the State party to amend its legislation in order to ensure that provisions referring to the minimum age of consent to sexual activity apply to both boys and girls and to ensure that the law provides equal protection for boys and girls against sexual abuse and exploitation. The Committee also encourages the State party to take all necessary measures to ensure that pregnant teenage girls have full and equal access to education without discrimination.</p> <p>27. The Committee requests that specific information be included in the next periodic report on the measures and programmes relevant to the Convention on the Rights of the Child undertaken by the State party to follow up on the Declaration and Programme of Action adopted at the 2001 World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance as well as the outcome document adopted at the 2009 Durban Review Conference, taking into account general comment No.1 (2001) on the aims of education.</p> |
| Para. 33 | Corporal punishment | <p>32. While the Committee notes the State party's indication that the use of corporal punishment is discouraged in the 2002 Education Act and that the Standards for Childcare Homes prohibit the use of corporal punishment, it nevertheless recalls the concern expressed in its previous concluding observations (CRC/C/15/Add.121, para. 21) and is concerned that corporal punishment remains lawful in the home, that authorized persons in schools are permitted to administer corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure and that corporal punishment is a sentencing option in the judicial system.</p> <p>33. The Committee recommends that the State party explicitly prohibit by law all forms of violence against children, including corporal punishment, in all settings, including in the family, schools, alternative childcare and places of detention for children, and implement those laws effectively. It also recommends that the State party intensify its awareness-raising campaigns in order to change perceptions regarding corporal punishment and promote alternative forms of discipline in a manner consistent with the child's human dignity and in accordance with the Convention, especially article 28, paragraph</p> |

| | | |
|---------------|------------------|--|
| | | <p>2. The Committee encourages the State party to take into account the Committee's general comment No.8 (2006) on the right of the child to protection from corporal punishment and other cruel or degrading forms of punishment and the Report on Corporal Punishment and Human Rights of Children and Adolescents prepared by the Office of the Rapporteur on the Rights of the Child of the Organization of American States.</p> |
| Para. 60 - 61 | Juvenile justice | <p>59. Recalling its previous concluding observations (CRC/C/15/Add.121, para. 12), the Committee is deeply concerned that the current minimum age of criminal responsibility is extremely low (7 years old). The Committee notes with concern that the number of juveniles committing offences has increased rapidly since 2007. The Committee notes that most of the sentencing of juvenile offenders is community service orders. The Committee also notes the current practice to designate two days a week as family court days in the Magistrate Court and the High Court but regrets the absence of a full-time family court and of judges and lawyers specialized in child rights. The Committee further notes that the "current judicial practice" is to not send children under the age of 16 to prison but rather to practice mediation and alternative sentencing options. However, it remains concerned that children between the ages of 16 and 18 are incarcerated and that these children are not detained in separate facilities from adults. The Committee is also concerned that corporal punishment remains a part of the Criminal Code and is not explicitly prohibited in the Juvenile Justice Bill that the State party intends to adopt in 2010. The Committee notes with regret that no formal training has been made available for professionals involved with children in conflict with the law.</p> <p>60. The Committee urges the State party to ensure that juvenile justice standards are fully implemented, in particular articles 37 (b), 39 and 40 of the Convention, as well as the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (the Beijing Rules), the United Nations Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency (the Riyadh Guidelines) and the United Nations Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty (the Havana Rules). In particular the Committee recommends that the State party, while taking into account the Committee's general comment No. 10 (2007) on the administration of juvenile justice :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Raise the minimum age for criminal responsibility to a more internationally acceptable age; (b) Take all necessary measures, including strengthening different forms of mediation, and extending it to all children, including those between the ages of 16 and 18, and strengthening the policy of alternative sanctions for juvenile offenders, to ensure that children, including those aged between 16 and 18 years, are held in detention only as a last resort and for as short a time as possible; (c) Take all necessary measures to ensure that when detention is carried out, it is done so in compliance with the law and respects the rights of the child as set out under the Convention, and that children are held |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>separately from adults in both pretrial detention and after being sentenced;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (d) Take all necessary measures to ensure that conditions in detention facilities are not contrary to the child's development and meet international minimum standards; (e) Enact legislation to explicitly prohibit corporal punishment as a sentencing option in the judicial system; (f) Take steps to improve the system of juvenile justice, including through the establishment of juvenile or family courts, and ensure that the system has adequate human and financial resources to allow it to function properly; (g) Take the necessary steps to ensure that persons working with children in the justice system, juvenile judges, etc. receive appropriate training; (h) Seek technical assistance and other cooperation from the United Nations Interagency Panel on Juvenile Justice, which includes UNODC, UNICEF, OHCHR and NGOs. <p>Protection of witnesses and victims of crimes</p> <p>61. The Committee also recommends that the State party ensure, through adequate legal provisions and regulations, that all children victims and or witnesses of crimes, e.g. children victims of abuse, domestic violence, sexual and economic exploitation, abduction, and trafficking and witnesses of such crimes, are provided with the protection required by the Convention and that it take fully into account the United Nations Guidelines on Justice in Matters Involving Child Victims and Witnesses of Crime (annexed to Economic and Social Council resolution 2005/20 of 22 July 2005).</p> |
|--|--|--|

Annex C – List of Participants

List of Participants - National Taskforce of Sierra Leone (IMC)

| NAME and SURNAME | Position and Ministry |
|------------------------------|---|
| Roxie K. Mc Leish Hutchinson | Permanent Secretary, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, International Business and CARICOM Affairs |
| Michael A. Mitchell | Adviser, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, International Business and CARICOM Affairs |
| Nakitha St Paul Panchoo | Foreign Service Officer, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, International Business and CARICOM Affairs |
| Robert Branch | Legal Officer, Ministry of Legal Affairs |
| Jaqueline Pascal | Officer, Ministry of Social Development, Housing and Community Empowerment (MoSDHCE) |
| Jicinta Alexis | Officer, MoSDHCE |
| Aisha Collymore | Officer, MoSDHCE |
| Alicia St Pauli | Officer, Her Majesty's Prisons |
| John Chimsum | Officer, Ministry of Education |
| Kenita Paul | Officer, Central Statistical Office |

List of Participants – CSOs and Human Rights State Institutions

| NAME and SURNAME | CSOs |
|------------------|---|
| X | Grenada National Coalition on the Rights of the Child (GNCRC) |
| X | Grenada Human Rights Organization (GHRO) |
| X | Program for Adolescent Mothers (PAM) |
| X | Grenada Trade Union Council (GTUC) |
| X | Grenada Conference of Churches |
| X | Grenada National Organization of Women (GNOW) |
| X | GrenCHAP |
| X | Grenada Planned Parenthood Association (GPPA) |
| | The Girl Guides Association of Grenada (GGAG) |
| X | Legal Aid and Counselling Clinic (LACC) |
| NAME and SURNAME | STATUTORY BODIES |
| Ronnie Marryshow | Office of the Ombudsman |

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| Yvonne Da Breo | Child Protection Authority |
| Melisse Ogilvie | Grand Bacolet Juvenile Center |