



General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/HRC/WG.6/5/MCO/3
19 February 2009

Original: ENGLISH/FRENCH

HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Fifth session
Geneva, 4-15 May 2009

**SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER
FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, IN ACCORDANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 15 (C) OF
THE ANNEX TO HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL RESOLUTION 5/1***

Monaco

The present report is a summary of two stakeholders' submissions¹ to the universal periodic review. It follows the structure of the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council. It does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), nor any judgement or determination in relation to specific claims. The information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes and, to the extent possible, the original texts have not been altered. Lack of information or focus on specific issues may be due to the absence of submissions by stakeholders regarding these particular issues. The full texts of all submissions received are available on the OHCHR website. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the four-year periodicity of the first cycle of the review.

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

I. BACKGROUND AND FRAMEWORK

A. Scope of international obligations

1. The Council of Europe Commission against Racism and Intolerance (COE/ECRI) indicated that Monaco has ratified the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, albeit with a reservation to Article 2 (1)⁵ and noted in this respect that Monaco “reserves the right to apply its own legal provisions concerning the admission of foreigners to the labour market of the Principality”. COE/ECRI welcomed Monaco’s decision to recognize the competence of the Committee for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider, under Article 14 of the said Convention, complaints from individuals and groups of individuals alleging violations by the State of the rights set out therein.²
2. COE/ECRI mentioned that Monaco has not ratified International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention 111 on discrimination (employment and occupation) as it is not a member of the ILO³ and recommended that Monaco ratify the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Convention against Discrimination in Education and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.⁴
3. COE/ECRI recommended that Monaco withdraw the interpretative declarations and reservations made under Articles 2.2, 6, 9, 11 and 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.⁵ The Government of Monaco made comments regarding this recommendation.⁶

B. Constitutional and legislative framework

4. COE/ECRI stated that the Constitution of Monaco includes provisions granting rights to Monegasques alone and that the Monegasque authorities have explained that this differentiation is necessary because of the particular situation of nationals, who are a minority in their own country. However, while understanding this distinctive feature of Monegasque society, which can indeed, in some cases, justify differential treatment based on objective and reasonable criteria, COE/ECRI stressed that such differential treatment should not in practice result in discrimination.⁷ It recommended that the Monegasque authorities include in the Constitution of Monaco a provision establishing the principle of equal treatment, the State’s commitment to promoting equality and the right of individuals to be free from discrimination on grounds such as race, colour, language, religion, nationality and national or ethnic origin.⁸
5. COE/ECRI noted that regarding naturalized Monegasques’ participation in the electoral process, Articles 54 and 79 of the Constitution provide that they are not eligible to stand in local or national elections until they have been naturalized for five years and that the Monegasque authorities are reviewing this provision in order to reduce the requirement to one year, which is a positive step in the integration of naturalized persons.⁹ COE/ECRI encouraged the Monegasque authorities in this review and recommended its completion as soon as possible. It also recommended that Article 29 of the Constitution, which grants the right of peaceful assembly to Monegasques alone, be extended to all persons within Monaco’s jurisdiction.¹⁰
6. COE/ECRI called on the Monegasque authorities to ensure that the Principality’s legislation includes the requirement that reasons be given for decisions concerning applications for naturalization.¹¹ The Government of Monaco made comments regarding this issue.¹²

C. Institutional and human rights infrastructure

7. COE/ECRI mentioned that there is no independent body specializing in the protection of human rights and/or in combating racism and racial discrimination in Monaco and that it was informed by the Monegasque authorities that they are considering setting up a human rights institution. It recommended that the Monegasque authorities set up, as soon as possible, an independent body specializing in the protection of human rights, whose tasks will include combating racism and racial discrimination.¹³ The Government of Monaco made comments regarding the issues raised in this paragraph.¹⁴

8. COE/ECRI welcomed the Monegasque government's decision to set up, on 23 March 2006, a commission responsible for considering requests by victims of despoilment in Monaco during the Second World War or their heirs.¹⁵ It encouraged the Monegasque authorities to continue to provide material and logistical support to the Commission and recommended that they ensure that the Commission's decisions are implemented.¹⁶

D. Policy measures

9. COE/ECRI recommended that the Monegasque authorities step up their efforts to include human rights education in general, and education for combating racism and racial discrimination in particular, including through a cross-disciplinary approach, in the Principality's school curricula. It also recommended that school curricula cover the contribution of the various communities living in Monaco to Monegasque society and awareness-raising on the subject of diversity.¹⁷ COE/ECRI further recommended that the Monegasque authorities continue to ensure that teaching staff at all levels receive initial and in-service training in human rights in general and issues concerning racism and racial discrimination in particular.¹⁸

10. COE/ECRI recommended that the Monegasque authorities consider ways of establishing a system for ethnic data collection according to the rules laid down by Law No. 1.165 regulating the processing of nominal information, in order to assess the situation of the various groups living in the Principality and frame policies aimed at resolving the problems they might face in areas such as employment, housing and access to state benefits and public services. It also recommended that they conduct an information campaign on the law and on the work of the Monitoring Commission for Nominal Information.¹⁹

II. PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS ON THE GROUND

Implementation of international human rights obligations

1. Equality and non discrimination

11. As regards legislation against racist acts, COE/ECRI welcomed Law No. 1.299 of 15 July 2005 on freedom of public expression²⁰ and recommended that the Monegasque authorities ensure that the general public and all those concerned are aware of the sections of the law on freedom of public expression that concern incitement to racial hatred and that members of the judiciary and police officers receive training in applying these provisions.²¹ COE/ECRI stated that apart from this law, Monaco's criminal legislation does not provide for sanctions in respect of other types of racist act, such as attacks motivated by racial hatred, nor does it provide for the racist motivation of a criminal offence to be considered as an aggravating circumstance at the time of sentencing.²² COE/ECRI recommended that the Monegasque authorities ensure, in accordance with paragraphs 18-23 of its General Policy Recommendation No. 7, that the Principality's criminal legislation provides for racist acts to be punished and for the racist motivation of a criminal offence

to be considered as an aggravating circumstance at the time of sentencing and that criminal legislation is amended accordingly.²³ The Government of Monaco made comments regarding the issues raised in this paragraph.²⁴ COE/ECRI recommended that the Monegasque authorities ensure that criminal offences of a racist nature committed in Monaco are in practice listed separately so that, if necessary, the existence of this type of problem can be established and appropriate measures can be taken.²⁵ The Government of Monaco made comments regarding this recommendation.²⁶

12. COE/ECRI noted that, generally speaking, the Principality appears to lack civil and administrative legislation against racial discrimination in areas such as employment and said that it was informed by the Monegasque authorities that the National Council is considering two bills on fixed-term and indefinite-term employment contracts.²⁷ According to COE/ECRI, such legislation should 1) define and prohibit direct and indirect racial discrimination, and 2) provide that acts such as announced intention to discriminate, instructing another to discriminate and inciting another to discriminate are considered as forms of discrimination. The legislation should also provide that the prohibition of discrimination applies to all public authorities as well as to all natural or legal persons, both in the public and in the private sector, in all areas, including employment, membership of professional organizations, education, housing, health, social protection, goods and services intended for the public and public places, and the pursuit of economic activity.²⁸

13. COE/ECRI encouraged the Monegasque authorities in their enactment of the bills on fixed-term and indefinite-term employment contracts and recommended that they ensure that this is done without delay and that these laws include provisions against racial discrimination, in line with its General Policy Recommendation No. 7.²⁹

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

14. The European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (COE/CPT) said that when its delegation had visited Monaco (28-31 March 2006) it had heard no allegations of torture or serious physical ill-treatment from persons recently detained by the police and had found no evidence of such practices. Moreover, information from other sources, including from judges, lawyers and members of the medical profession, had confirmed the delegation's good impression.³⁰

15. Nevertheless, COE/CPT pointed out that the delegation had received numerous complaints about the systematic tight handcuffing of persons stopped or escorted by the police and that the delegation had seen for itself during visits to various places of detention that the practice was widespread, particularly when newcomers were being admitted to the short-stay prison.³¹ It had also seen medical certificates indicating the transitory neurological after-effects of such practices.

16. In that context, COE/CPT emphasized that the delegation had looked at the instructions on handcuffing distributed within the public security services and considered that they were too general; there was a need to distribute more detailed instructions that would emphasize the concepts of appropriateness and proportionality and give practical guidelines on handcuffing procedures. Moreover, the views of the judicial and administrative authorities in their respective areas of responsibility should be sought when the new instructions were drawn up. COE/CPT recommended that a detailed circular on handcuffing should be drafted and distributed to the police force in light of the above comments.³² The Monegasque authorities made comments on that recommendation.³³

17. COE/CPT reported that its review of Monegasque legislation had revealed that torture as such was not defined as an offence when committed in Monaco, whereas acts of torture were prosecuted when committed outside Monaco (Code of Criminal Procedure, art. 8, para. 1) or when they

constituted aggravating circumstances in certain crimes against the person. Furthermore, the concept of torture had not been explicitly included in the Constitution when it was revised in 2002. COE/CPT invited the Monegasque authorities to take measures that would allow torture to be criminalized in the Monegasque Criminal Code.³⁴ The Monegasque authorities made comments on that recommendation.³⁵

18. COE/CPT added that it had received no allegations of physical ill-treatment of patients by staff of the Department of Psychiatry and Medical Psychology at the Princess Grace Hospital at the time of the visit; on the contrary, the relationship between staff and patients was excellent. However, COE/CPT was very concerned about the use of restraints by the police officers guarding prisoners who had been hospitalized. COE/CPT noted that the restraints were sometimes used without the agreement of medical staff and even in defiance of their explicit instructions.³⁶

19. Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) indicated that corporal punishment of children is lawful in alternative care settings³⁷ and in the home and that provisions against violence and abuse in the Criminal Code are not interpreted as prohibiting corporal punishment in childrearing.³⁸ It added that corporal punishment in schools is considered unlawful and is not among the permitted disciplinary measures in the Education Law (2007), but that there is no explicit prohibition.³⁹ Corporal punishment is unlawful in the penal system as a sentence for crime and it is considered unlawful as a disciplinary measure in penal institutions but there is no explicit prohibition, according to GIEACPC.⁴⁰

20. GIEACPC recalled that in its concluding observations on Monaco's initial report in 2001, the Committee on the Rights of the Child expressed concern that corporal punishment is not prohibited by law, and recommended prohibition in the family.⁴¹

3. Administration of justice and the rule of law

21. COE/CPT raised the question of compliance with article 19 of the Constitution, which provided that "except in cases of *flagrante delicto*, no one may be arrested without the reasoned order of a judge, which must be served at the time of arrest or, at the latest, within 24 hours". The delegation noted that the time limit (24 hours maximum between the actual deprivation of liberty and service of the reasoned order of the judge) was not always respected and had been exceeded on a number of occasions by several hours.⁴²

22. COE/CPT pointed out that, over the years, a practice had developed within the public security services whereby police officers considered it sufficient to bring the person concerned before the judge within the 24-hour time limit. COE/CPT considered that such an interpretation was not in accordance with the Constitution, which explicitly stipulated that the reasoned order of the judge must be served within 24 hours of the deprivation of liberty. COE/CPT recommended that that practice should be ended immediately and that a copy of the arrest warrant, indicating the time at which it was issued, should be given to the detainee.⁴³ The Monegasque authorities made comments on that recommendation.⁴⁴

23. COE/CPT identified a major shortcoming of Monaco Prison, despite the major works carried out in it over the past 20 years. Most of the prison cells were in a converted army munitions warehouse, which had never been intended to house detainees. In the view of COE/CPT, that state of affairs had had a noticeable and probably irreversible effect on some aspects of prison life. It therefore recommended that the authorities should explore ways and means of moving Monaco Prison into new, purpose-built prison facilities.⁴⁵ The Monegasque authorities made comments on that recommendation.⁴⁶

24. COE/CPT stated that, in addition to the absence of activity programmes, a restrictive “zero tolerance” regime had been applied to all detainees without distinction since the double escape of 2003, in an attempt to make the cell block into a “refuge” where detainees, convicted prisoners and those awaiting trial were not permitted to have any personal objects (such as food, changes of clothing or family parcels). The stated aim of the practice - namely, to make any escape impossible and prevent any trafficking as well as to reduce staffing needs - could not fail to have adverse effects on the lives of detainees.⁴⁷

25. COE/CPT was of the view that a zero-tolerance policy of restrictions that permanently and without distinction affected all detainees, convicted prisoners and persons awaiting trial - men and women, minors and adults alike - was unacceptable. Such a regime could only be justified if it was based on an individual risk assessment and was applied to particular detainees only for as long as strictly necessary. COE/CPT found that the application of such a regime to all detainees at all times was a form of collective punishment under a different name, and recommended that the Monegasque authorities should reconsider the relevance of the zero-tolerance regime. COE/CPT considered that other, more selective, measures could be used to monitor people and things entering the prison.⁴⁸ The Monegasque authorities made comments on that recommendation.⁴⁹

26. COE/CPT reported that its delegation had been informed that Monaco Prison sometimes housed minors. It considered that the incarceration of young offenders aged 13 and 14 for some 10 days in December 2005 was frankly unacceptable. According to COE/CPT, it was far preferable for young offenders to be placed in detention centres specifically reserved for minors.⁵⁰

27. COE/CPT said that it recognized the practical difficulties facing the Monegasque authorities in that respect, but was confident that they would find a way to resolve the problem. COE/CPT recommended that as long as minors were detained in Monaco Prison, particular attention should be given to their education (including physical education).⁵¹ The Monegasque authorities made comments on that recommendation.⁵²

28. COE/ECRI recommended that the Monegasque authorities ensure that members of the judiciary⁵³ and police officers⁵⁴ receive initial and in-service training in human rights in general and in issues concerning racism and racial discrimination in particular. The Government of Monaco made comments regarding these recommendations.⁵⁵

4. Right to privacy, marriage and family life

29. According to COE/ECRI, law No. 1.165 of 23 September 1993 regulating the processing of nominal information provides in Section 12 that the collection, recording and use of information indicating membership of a racial or religious group are prohibited unless the persons concerned give their express consent in writing. This section nevertheless provides for some derogations from the rule, namely on the one hand, concerning processing carried out by a public law corporation and justified by reasons relating to the public interest and on the other hand with regard to members of a church institution or a political, religious, philosophical, humanitarian or trade union grouping, within the statutory or social aim of the institution or grouping and for the purposes of its functioning. This law also established the Monitoring Commission for Nominal Information.⁵⁶

30. COE/ECRI recommended that the Monegasque authorities ensure that such a data collection system complies with European regulations and recommendations on data protection and protection of privacy, as recommended in ECRI’s General Policy Recommendation No. 1 on combating racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and intolerance. They should also ensure that data collection

fully respects the anonymity and dignity of the persons questioned and complies with the principle of informed consent. In addition, the system for collecting data on racism and racial discrimination should take account of the dimension of equality between women and men, especially in terms of the possibility of double or multiple discrimination.⁵⁷

5. Freedom of expression and association

31. COE/ECRI said that Monaco has several media outlets, including a daily newspaper edited and printed in France, one weekly newspaper, a private television channel²⁴ and cable television and that according to the information it has received, no Monegasque journalists have to date been charged with racist or anti-Semitic remarks.⁵⁸ COE/ECRI recommended that the Monegasque authorities encourage the setting up of an independent self-regulatory body to deal with complaints against the media and that they encourage the drafting of a code of professional ethics for the media which will take account, among others, of the issues of racism and racial discrimination.⁵⁹ The Government of Monaco made comments regarding this recommendation.⁶⁰ COE/ECRI also recommended that the Monegasque authorities support any initiatives taken to raise media awareness of these issues.⁶¹

32. As regards setting up associations, COE/ECRI indicated that members of civil society have welcomed the Monegasque authorities' decision to allow foreigners to set up an association by simply declaring the fact, rather than by requesting authorization as was previously the case. COE/ECRI considered that this decision places them on an equal footing with Monegasque citizens.⁶²

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

33. COE/ECRI stated that there is in Monaco's employment sector a system of priority: firstly for citizens, followed by their spouses, non-citizens living in Monaco, then French citizens from the neighbouring municipalities, and lastly non-Monegasques living outside the Principality and these municipalities. The nationality criterion applies for the purposes of recruitment (on the basis of equal merit), redundancy and the suppression of posts. COE/ECRI indicated that it has no information on the practical application of this system and does not know whether any research has been done on the subject and that it is therefore difficult to establish whether or not there are cases of discrimination in the application of this system.⁶³ COE/ECRI considered it necessary to adopt legislation to prevent and/or punish, in the implementation of this system, any discrimination on grounds such as race, colour, language, religion, nationality and ethnic or national origin. This law could also cover areas such as promotion and access to training.⁶⁴

34. COE/ECRI called on the Monegasque authorities to ensure that the recruitment and dismissal system established in the Principality does not in practice result in discrimination on grounds such as race, colour, language, religion, nationality and ethnic or national origin and that they establish legal safeguards to that effect, for example by introducing provisions ensuring equality in promotion and access to training.⁶⁵ COE/ECRI also recommended that the Monegasque authorities ensure that the new law on the status of non-Monegasque civil servants provides for adequate safeguards against discrimination on grounds such as race, colour, language, religion, nationality and ethnic or national origin.⁶⁶

35. COE/ECRI recommended that the Monegasque authorities continue to combat the use of illegal workers and pay special attention to the situation of domestic employees.⁶⁷ The Government of Monaco made comments regarding this recommendation.⁶⁸

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

36. COE/ECRI mentioned that Monaco has three housing sectors: the public sector, which is state-owned and open only to nationals; the so-called protected sector, which is reserved for Monegasques and other categories of persons, namely the children, spouses, widows/widowers or divorced spouses of a Monegasque, the parents of a child born of a union with a Monegasque, persons born in Monaco who have lived there since birth and whose parents were living there when they were born, and persons who have lived in the Principality for at least 40 continuous years; and the private sector.⁶⁹

37. COE/ECRI recommended that the Monegasque authorities ensure that the housing priority system favouring Monegasque citizens and other categories of persons does not in practice result in discrimination against non-Monegasque workers⁷⁰ and that the Monegasque authorities ensure that the five-year residence requirement governing non-Monegasques' eligibility for housing benefit is reduced.⁷¹

38. COE/ECRI reported that the Principality also distinguishes between Monegasques and non-Monegasques in terms of certain state benefits and that the State thus awards only nationals benefits such as business start-up grants and benefits for unemployed mothers. COE/ECRI noted on this point that Monaco has made interpretative declarations and reservations to Article 2.2 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which requires States Parties to guarantee that the rights set out in the Covenant will be exercised without any discrimination on grounds such as race, colour, language, religion or national origin.⁷²

39. COE/ECRI noted that all workers and pensioners, as well as their families benefit from a social security system and the benefits provided by it. However, it was concerned at the fact that foreigners are required to live in the Principality for five years before being entitled to certain social and medical assistance measures. It therefore welcomed the Monegasque authorities' assurances that a change to this requirement is under consideration with regard to social assistance.⁷³

40. COE/ECRI recommended that the Monegasque authorities ensure that there is no discrimination between nationals and non-nationals in the matter of State benefits.⁷⁴ COE/ECRI also recommended that the Monegasque authorities reduce as soon as possible the five-year residence requirement for non-Monegasques to be entitled to social and medical assistance.⁷⁵

41. COE/CPT emphasized that the current legislation on the internment and protection of the mentally ill in Monaco appeared, by and large, to conform to the criteria set out by COE/CPT in that regard, although two gaps should be pointed out. First, the delegation had noted that the initial internment order was generally approved by the court only four to six weeks after involuntary hospitalization, while the average length of stay in such cases in the Princess Grace Hospital was one to three months. Therefore, the order was often approved only days before the chief medical officer of the Princess Grace Hospital proposed the patient's release. COE/CPT recommended that the Monegasque authorities should take immediate steps to significantly reduce the length of the relevant court-approval procedures.⁷⁶ The Monegasque authorities made comments on that recommendation.⁷⁷

42. Moreover, the judge did not hear the patient concerned, but merely reviewed the various items contained in the file (medical certificate, expert report and so on) *in camera*. COE/CPT considered that that procedure should be supplemented by holding a judicial hearing at the hospital, as that would allow all the parties involved (patient, doctor and judge) to be in direct contact, and would

also allow the judge to hear the comments of the patient and doctor and to convey his decision directly to the patient (with the assistance of the doctor, if necessary). Moreover, the judge's order should be included in the patient's file and the patient should receive a copy. COE/CPT recommended that the Monegasque authorities should take steps to improve procedures for the involuntary internment of psychiatric patients.⁷⁸ The Monegasque authorities made comments on that recommendation.⁷⁹

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

43. COE/ECRI stated that there are approximately 5,900 school pupils in Monaco and compulsory education is free of charge in state schools for Monegasque children and children living in Monaco.⁸⁰ It encouraged the Monegasque authorities to continue to grant the children of cross-frontier workers access to State schools, and to pay special attention to the case of children whose parents received their whole education in the Principality or work there. COE/ECRI also encouraged the Monegasque authorities to continue to ensure that non-French-speaking children can quickly learn French and recommended that they pursue and reinforce the steps taken to cater for pupils from different backgrounds.⁸¹ The Government of Monaco made comments regarding the issues raised in this paragraph.⁸²

9. Migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers

44. COE/ECRI said that there are three procedures for removing foreigners from the Principality of Monaco: deportation; turning a person back and banishment and that as regards banishment, it welcomed the Monegasque authorities' assurances that the legislation authorizing this measure, which is one of the ignominious sentences that may be imposed by a judge in criminal law, is in the process of being repealed.⁸³ COE/ECRI encouraged the Monegasque authorities to remove banishment from Monaco's legislation as soon as possible and recommended that they introduce procedural safeguards for the implementation of turning back and deportation measures as soon as possible. It recommended that they ensure that these safeguards are clearly stated, for example in the future law on public security, and that this law is voted without delay.⁸⁴ COE/ECRI recommended that the Monegasque authorities ensure that the asylum application procedure in the Principality comprises all the necessary safeguards.⁸⁵ The Government of Monaco made comments regarding the issues raised in this paragraph.⁸⁶

III. ACHIEVEMENTS, BEST PRACTICES, CHALLENGES AND CONSTRAINTS

N/A

IV. KEY NATIONAL PRIORITIES, INITIATIVES AND COMMITMENTS

N/A

V. CAPACITY-BUILDING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

N/A

Notes

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

Civil society

GIEACPC Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children*, London, United Kingdom

Regional intergovernmental organization

COE COE/ECRI, Council of Europe, Strasbourg, France/European Commission against Racism and Intolerance and COE/CPT, Council of Europe, Strasbourg, France/European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

² COE/ECRI, p. 7, para. 3.

³ COE/ECRI, p. 8, para. 4.

⁴ COE/ECRI, p. 8, para. 5.

⁵ COE/ECRI, p. 17, para. 44.

⁶ COE/ECRI, p. 30.

⁷ COE/ECRI, p. 8, para. 7.

⁸ COE/ECRI, p. 9, para. 9.

⁹ COE/ECRI, p. 9, para. 8.

¹⁰ COE/ECRI, p. 9, para. 10.

¹¹ COE/ECRI, p. 10, para. 13.

¹² COE/ECRI, pp. 28-29.

¹³ COE/ECRI, p. 13, para. 27.

¹⁴ COE/ECRI, p. 30.

¹⁵ COE/ECRI, p. 13, para. 26.

¹⁶ COE/ECRI, p. 13, para. 28.

¹⁷ COE/ECRI, p. 14, para. 32.

¹⁸ COE/ECRI, p. 14, para. 33.

¹⁹ COE/ECRI, p. 21, para. 63.

²⁰ COE/ECRI, p. 10, para. 14.

²¹ COE/ECRI, p. 11, para. 17.

²² COE/ECRI, p. 10, para. 15.

²³ COE/ECRI, p. 11, para. 16.

²⁴ COE/ECRI, p. 29.

²⁵ COE/ECRI, p. 21, para. 65.

²⁶ COE/ECRI, p. 31.

²⁷ COE/ECRI, p. 11, para. 19.

²⁸ COE/ECRI, p. 12, para. 19.

²⁹ COE/ECRI, p. 12, para. 22.

³⁰ COE/CPT, p. 12, para. 9.

³¹ COE/CPT, p. 12, para. 9.

- ³² COE/CPT, p. 12, para. 10.
- ³³ COE/CPT/Response of the Monegasque authorities, p. 4.
- ³⁴ COE/CPT, p. 12, para. 11.
- ³⁵ COE/CPT/Response of the Monegasque authorities, p. 5.
- ³⁶ COE/CPT, p. 36, para. 75.
- ³⁷ GIEACPC, p. 2, para. 1.4.
- ³⁸ GIEACPC, p. 2, para. 1.1.
- ³⁹ GIEACPC, p. 2, para. 1.2.
- ⁴⁰ GIEACPC, p.2, para. 1.3.
- ⁴¹ GIEACPC, p. 2, para. 2.
- ⁴² COE/CPT, p. 20, para. 30.
- ⁴³ COE/CPT, p. 20, para. 30.
- ⁴⁴ COE/CPT/Response of the Monegasque authorities, p. 8.
- ⁴⁵ COE/CPT, pp. 21-22, para. 33.
- ⁴⁶ COE/CPT/Response of the Monegasque authorities, p. 9.
- ⁴⁷ COE/CPT, p. 26, para. 47.
- ⁴⁸ COE/CPT, p. 26, para. 48.
- ⁴⁹ COE/CPT/Response of the Monegasque authorities, pp. 11-12.
- ⁵⁰ COE/CPT, p. 27, para. 49.
- ⁵¹ COE/CPT, p. 27, para. 49.
- ⁵² COE/CPT/Response of the Monegasque authorities, pp. 12-13.
- ⁵³ COE/ECRI, p. 12, para. 24.
- ⁵⁴ COE/ECRI, p. 20, para. 59.
- ⁵⁵ COE/ECRI, pp. 29 and 31.
- ⁵⁶ COE/ECRI, p. 20, para. 61.
- ⁵⁷ COE/ECRI, p. 21, para. 64.
- ⁵⁸ COE/ECRI, p. 18, para. 51.
- ⁵⁹ COE/ECRI, p. 19, para. 52.
- ⁶⁰ COE/ECRI, p. 30.
- ⁶¹ COE/ECRI, p. 19, para. 53.
- ⁶² COE/ECRI, p. 16, para. 36.
- ⁶³ COE/ECRI, p. 21, para. 67.
- ⁶⁴ COE/ECRI, p. 22, para. 67.
- ⁶⁵ COE/ECRI, p. 22, para. 71.
- ⁶⁶ COE/ECRI, p. 22, para. 72.
- ⁶⁷ COE/ECRI, p. 22, para. 73.
- ⁶⁸ COE/ECRI, p. 31.
- ⁶⁹ COE/ECRI, p. 16, para. 39.

- ⁷⁰ COE/ECRI, p. 16, para. 40.
- ⁷¹ COE/ECRI, p. 16, para. 41.
- ⁷² COE/ECRI, pp. 16-17, para. 42.
- ⁷³ COE/ECRI, p. 17, para. 43.
- ⁷⁴ COE/ECRI, p. 30.
- ⁷⁵ COE/ECRI, p. 17, para. 44.
- ⁷⁶ COE/CPT, p. 42, para. 94.
- ⁷⁷ COE/CPT/Response of the Monegasque authorities, p. 22.
- ⁷⁸ COE/CPT, p. 42, para. 95.
- ⁷⁹ COE/CPT/Response of the Monegasque authorities, p. 23.
- ⁸⁰ COE/ECRI, p. 17, para. 45.
- ⁸¹ COE/ECRI, p. 18, para. 48.
- ⁸² COE/ECRI, p. 30.
- ⁸³ COE/ECRI, p. 15, para. 34.
- ⁸⁴ COE/ECRI, p. 16, para. 37.
- ⁸⁵ COE/ECRI, p. 16, para. 38.
- ⁸⁶ COE/ECRI, p. 30.
