



General Assembly

Distr.: General
15 July 2019

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Twenty-ninth session

15 June–3 July 2015

Agenda item 1

Organizational and procedural matters

Report of the Human Rights Council on its twenty-ninth session

Vice-President and Rapporteur: Mothusi Bruce Rabasha **Palai** (Botswana)

GE.19-12001(E)



* 1 9 1 2 0 0 1 *

Please recycle A small graphic of a recycling symbol, consisting of three chasing arrows forming a triangle.



Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Part One Resolutions, decisions and President's statement adopted by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-ninth session	4
I. Resolutions	4
II. Decisions	5
III. President's statement	5
Part Two Summary of proceedings	6
I. Organizational and procedural matters	6
A. Opening and duration of the session	6
B. Attendance	6
C. Agenda and programme of work	6
D. Organization of work	7
E. Meetings and documentation	8
F. Visits	8
G. Enhanced interactive dialogue on the human rights of migrants	8
H. Dialogue with the Co-Facilitator of the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda	9
I. Selection and appointment of mandate holders	9
J. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	10
K. Adoption of the report of the session	10
II. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General	11
A. Update by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights	11
B. Reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General	12
C. Interactive dialogue on the oral update of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the atrocities committed by the terrorist group Boko Haram and their effects on human rights in the States affected	12
D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	12
III. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development	14
A. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders	14
B. Panel discussions	24
C. General debate on agenda item 3	28
D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	29
IV. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention	43
A. Interactive dialogue with the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic	43
B. Interactive dialogue with the commission of inquiry on human rights in Eritrea	43
C. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders	44
D. General debate on agenda item 4	45
E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	46

V.	Human rights bodies and mechanisms	49
A.	Social Forum.....	49
B.	Forum on Business and Human Rights.....	49
C.	Open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the right to peace	49
D.	General debate on agenda item 5	49
E.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	50
VI.	Universal periodic review	51
A.	Consideration of universal periodic review outcomes	51
B.	General debate on agenda item 6	119
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	120
VII.	Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories	122
A.	Interactive dialogue with the independent international commission of inquiry to investigate all violations of international humanitarian law and international human rights law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, particularly in the occupied Gaza Strip, in the context of the military operations conducted since 13 June 2014.....	122
B.	General debate on agenda item 7	123
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	123
VIII.	Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action.....	125
	General debate on agenda item 8	125
IX.	Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action	127
A.	Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders	127
B.	General debate on agenda item 9	127
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	128
X.	Technical assistance and capacity-building.....	129
A.	Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders	129
B.	General debate on agenda item 10	130
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	131
Annexes		
I.	Attendance.....	133
II.	Agenda	139
III.	Documents issued for the twenty-ninth session	140
IV.	Special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-ninth session.....	163

Part One

Resolutions, decisions and President's statement adopted by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-ninth session

I. Resolutions

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
29/1	Fiftieth anniversary of the adoption and fortieth anniversary of the entry into force of the International Covenants on Human Rights	2 July 2015
29/2	Protection of the human rights of migrants: migrants in transit	2 July 2015
29/3	Human rights and international solidarity	2 July 2015
29/4	Elimination of discrimination against women	2 July 2015
29/5	Elimination of discrimination against persons affected by leprosy and their family members	2 July 2015
29/6	Independence and impartiality of the judiciary, jurors and assessors, and the independence of lawyers	2 July 2015
29/7	The right to education	2 July 2015
29/8	Strengthening efforts to prevent and eliminate child, early and forced marriage	2 July 2015
29/9	Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism	2 July 2015
29/10	Human rights and the regulation of civilian acquisition, possession and use of firearms	2 July 2015
29/11	The negative impact of corruption on the enjoyment of human rights	2 July 2015
29/12	Unaccompanied migrant children and adolescents and human rights	2 July 2015
29/13	Mission by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to improve human rights, accountability, reconciliation and capacity in South Sudan	2 July 2015
29/14	Accelerating efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women: eliminating domestic violence	2 July 2015
29/15	Human rights and climate change	2 July 2015
29/16	The grave and deteriorating human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic	2 July 2015
29/17	Situation of human rights in Belarus	2 July 2015
29/18	Situation of human rights in Eritrea	2 July 2015
29/19	The Social Forum	2 July 2015
29/20	The incompatibility between democracy and racism	2 July 2015
29/21	Situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar	3 July 2015

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
29/22	Protection of the family: contribution of the family to the realization of the right to an adequate standard of living for its members, particularly through its role in poverty eradication and achieving sustainable development	3 July 2015
29/23	Cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights	3 July 2015
29/24	Capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights	3 July 2015
29/25	Ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem	3 July 2015

II. Decisions

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
29/101	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Kyrgyzstan	24 June 2015
29/102	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Guinea	24 June 2015
29/103	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Lao People's Democratic Republic	25 June 2015
29/104	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Spain	25 June 2015
29/105	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Lesotho	25 June 2015
29/106	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Kenya	25 June 2015
29/107	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Armenia	25 June 2015
29/108	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Guinea-Bissau	25 June 2015
29/109	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Sweden	26 June 2015
29/110	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Grenada	26 June 2015
29/111	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Turkey	26 June 2015
29/112	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Kuwait	26 June 2015
29/113	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Kiribati	1 July 2015
29/114	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Guyana	2 July 2015

III. President's statement

<i>President's statement</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
PRST/29/1	Enhancing the efficiency of the Human Rights Council	3 July 2015

Part Two

Summary of proceedings

I. Organizational and procedural matters

A. Opening and duration of the session

1. The Human Rights Council held its twenty-ninth session at the United Nations Office at Geneva from 15 June to 3 July 2015. The President of the Council opened the session.
2. In accordance with rule 8 (b) of the rules of procedure of the Human Rights Council, as contained in part VII of the annex to Council resolution 5/1, the organizational meeting of the twenty-ninth session was held on 26 May 2015.
3. At its organizational meeting, the Human Rights Council, pursuant to a request from the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, in his capacity as Chair of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, decided to postpone the panel discussion on the issue of unilateral coercive measures and human rights until its thirtieth session.
4. The twenty-ninth session consisted of 46 meetings over 15 days (see para. 20 below).

B. Attendance

5. The session was attended by representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council, observer States of the Council, observers for non-Member States of the United Nations and other observers, and observers for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations, intergovernmental organizations and other entities, national human rights institutions and non-governmental organizations (see annex I).

C. Agenda and programme of work

6. At the 1st meeting, on 15 June 2015, the President of the Human Rights Council referred to the letter of 29 May 2015 from the Permanent Representative of Latvia, on behalf of the European Union, containing a request to hold an enhanced interactive dialogue on the human rights of migrants during the first week of the twenty-ninth session of the Council with the participation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and other stakeholders, including the International Committee of the Red Cross and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, the International Labour Organization (ILO), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the World Health Organization. The Council, pursuant to the proposal of its Bureau, decided to hold the enhanced interactive dialogue on 15 June 2015 (see paras. 29–34).
7. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council, pursuant to the proposal of its President and Bureau, decided to invite the co-facilitator of the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda for a briefing on the current status of the negotiations and to hold a brief dialogue with him on 18 June 2015 (see paras. 35–38).
8. Also at the same meeting, the President stated that the Vice-President of the Human Rights Council and focal point of the Bureau on accessibility issues would present an oral report to the Council at the end of its twenty-ninth session.
9. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the agenda and programme of work of the twenty-ninth session, as modified.

10. At the 25th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the President stated that the consideration of the universal periodic review outcome of Kiribati had been postponed to 1 July 2015 owing to the fact that the document containing the position of Kiribati on the recommendations made during its review at the twenty-first session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review was still pending approval.

11. At the same meeting, the President stated that, following a request from Guyana, the consideration of the review outcome of Guyana had been postponed to 2 July 2015.

D. Organization of work

12. At the 1st meeting, on 15 June 2015, the President outlined the modalities for the enhanced interactive dialogue on the human rights of migrants, including the speaking time limits, which would be two minutes for statements by States Members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

13. At the same meeting, the President outlined the modalities for the dialogue with the Co-Facilitator of the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda, including speaking time limits, which would be two minutes for statements by States Members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

14. Also at the same meeting, the President referred to the recommendation of the Bureau of 8 June 2015 concerning advance inscription on the list of speakers for clustered interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders under agenda item 3 at the twenty-ninth session of the Human Rights Council. He also referred to the modalities and the schedule of advance inscription.

15. At the same meeting, the President, further to the decision taken at the organizational meeting of the twenty-ninth session of the Human Rights Council, held on 26 May 2015, outlined the modalities for the clustered interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders under agenda item 3. The total duration of each clustered interactive dialogue would not exceed four hours. As soon as the list of speakers would be available following the electronic registration, the secretariat would calculate the estimated time needed to complete the clustered interactive dialogue with the mandate holders. Should the total duration of a given interactive dialogue be estimated to last less than four hours, the speaking time limits would be five minutes for States Members and three minutes for observer States and other observers. However, if it would be estimated to be more than four hours, the speaking time limits would be reduced to three minutes for States Members and two minutes for observer States and other observers. Should this measure be deemed insufficient to ensure that the total duration not exceed four hours, the speaking time limit would be further reduced.

16. Also at the same meeting, the President outlined the modalities for the general debates, including the speaking time limits, which would be three minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

17. At the 7th meeting, on 16 June 2015, the President outlined the modalities for panel discussions, including the speaking time limits, which would be two minutes for statements by States Members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

18. At the 21st meeting, on 23 June 2015, the President outlined the modalities for individual interactive dialogues, including the speaking time limits, which would be three minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

19. At the 26th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the President outlined the modalities for the consideration of the outcomes of the universal periodic review under agenda item 6, including the speaking time limits, which would be 20 minutes for the State concerned to present its views; where appropriate, 2 minutes for the national human rights institution with “A” status of the State concerned; up to 20 minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and United Nations agencies to express their views on the

outcome of the review, with varying speaking times according to the number of speakers in accordance with the modalities set out in the appendix to the annex to resolution 16/21; and up to 20 minutes for stakeholders to make general comments on the outcome of the review.

E. Meetings and documentation

20. The Human Rights Council held 46 fully serviced meetings during its twenty-ninth session.

21. The list of the resolutions, decisions and the President's statement adopted by the Human Rights Council is contained in Part One of the present report.

F. Visits

22. At the 2nd meeting, on 15 June 2015, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Igor Crnadak, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

23. At the same meeting, the Minister of State for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Baroness Anelay, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

24. At the 9th meeting, on 17 June 2015, the Minister for Human Rights of Yemen, Ezzedin al-Asbahi, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

25. At the 21st meeting, on 23 June 2015, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Georgia, Khatuna Totladze, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

26. At the 25th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the Minister for Justice of South Sudan, Paulino Wanawilla Unango, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

27. At the 40th meeting, on 1 July 2015, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Regional Integration and Member of Parliament of Ghana, Hanna Tetteh, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

28. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Dominican Republic, Andrés Navarro García, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

G. Enhanced interactive dialogue on the human rights of migrants

29. At its 3rd meeting, on 15 June 2015, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to its decision taken on the same day (see para. 6 above), an enhanced interactive dialogue on the human rights of migrants.

30. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the enhanced interactive dialogue.

31. At the same meeting, the Deputy Director General for Field Operations and Partnerships of ILO, the Deputy Director General of IOM and the Director for the Division of International Protection of UNHCR made statements.

32. Also at the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants, François Crépeau, made a statement.

33. During the ensuing discussion at the same meeting, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, France, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Georgia, Greece, Iraq, Italy, Libya, Malaysia, Malta, Monaco, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Senegal, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Holy See;

(c) Observer for a United Nations entity, specialized agency and related organization: United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF);

(d) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: European Union, Organization of Islamic Cooperation;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (also on behalf of Conectas Direitos Humanos), Human Rights Watch, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Save the Children International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

34. At the same meeting, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights answered questions and made concluding remarks. The Deputy Director General for Field Operations and Partnerships of ILO, the Deputy Director General of IOM and the Director of the Division of International Protection of UNHCR also answered questions and made concluding remarks.

H. Dialogue with the Co-Facilitator of the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda

35. At its 14th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the Human Rights Council held a dialogue with the Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations and Co-Facilitator of the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda, David Donoghue.

36. The Co-Facilitator made a statement on the current status of the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda.

37. During the ensuing dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Co-Facilitator questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bangladesh, Brazil (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Croatia, Egypt, France, Germany, Maldives, Morocco, Slovenia, Spain and Uruguay), China, Mexico, Montenegro;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Switzerland;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation.

38. At the same meeting, the Co-Facilitator answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

I. Selection and appointment of mandate holders

39. At the 46th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the President of the Human Rights Council presented the list of candidates to be appointed for the six vacancies for special procedure mandate holders.

40. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Pakistan, Paraguay, Portugal and the United States of America made statements on the appointment of the special procedure mandate holders.

41. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council appointed six special procedure mandate holders in accordance with Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21 and its decision 6/102 (see annex IV).

J. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Enhancing the efficiency of the Human Rights Council

42. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft President's statement A/HRC/29/L.34.

43. At the same meeting, the President of the Council orally revised the draft President's statement.

44. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Estonia, Japan, Mexico, the Russian Federation, the United States of America and Viet Nam made general comments on the draft President's statement as orally revised.

45. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft President's statement as orally revised. The Chief of the Programme Support and Management Services of OHCHR made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft President's statement as orally revised.

46. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft President's statement as orally revised (PRST 29/1).

47. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of China and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made comments on the President's statement.

K. Adoption of the report of the session

48. At the 46th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representatives of Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica (also on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico and Uruguay), Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malta, South Sudan and Switzerland (also on behalf of Liechtenstein) made statements on the adopted resolutions as observer States.

49. At the same meeting, the Vice-President of the Human Rights Council and Focal Point of the Bureau on accessibility issues presented an oral report on the work of the Task Force on accessibility for persons with disabilities.

50. Also at the same meeting, the Vice-President and Rapporteur of the Human Rights Council made a statement in connection with the draft report of the Council on its twenty-ninth session.

51. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted ad referendum the draft report on the session (A/HRC/29/2) and entrusted the Rapporteur with its finalization.

52. Also at the same meeting, the following made statements in connection with the session:

(a) Representative of a State Member of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States);

(b) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of Allied Rainbow Communities International, Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship, the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, the Human Rights House Foundation, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues and the International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association).

53. At the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council made a closing statement.

II. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General

A. Update by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

54. At the 1st meeting, on 15 June 2015, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement providing an update of the activities of the Office of the High Commissioner.

55. During the ensuing general debate, at the 1st and 2nd meetings, on the same day, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Egypt¹ (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Uganda and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)¹ (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Japan, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco (also on behalf of States members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Namibia, Nigeria, Norway¹ (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and the State of Palestine), Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Greece, Honduras, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Philippines, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, South Sudan, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Uruguay;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Service for Human Rights, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Muslim Congress.

56. At the 4th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Bahrain, Burundi, Egypt, Japan and the Republic of Korea made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

¹ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

B. Reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General

57. At the 19th meeting, on 22 June 2015, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented the thematic reports and oral updates prepared by the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8.

58. At the 20th meeting, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on the thematic reports and oral updates presented by the Deputy High Commissioner under agenda items 2 and 3 (see chapter III, sect. C).

C. Interactive dialogue on the oral update of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the atrocities committed by the terrorist group Boko Haram and their effects on human rights in the States affected

59. At the 39th meeting, on 1 July 2015, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-23/1, an oral update of his Office on violations and abuses of human rights and atrocities committed by the terrorist group Boko Haram in the States affected by such acts.

60. At the same meeting, the representatives of Cameroon, Chad, the Niger and Nigeria made statements as the States concerned.

61. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 39th and 40th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the High Commissioner questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Congo, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ireland, Morocco, Sierra Leone, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Benin, Burundi, Canada, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Libya, Mali, Mauritania, New Zealand, Poland, Rwanda, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Togo;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: African Union, European Union;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Center for Reproductive Rights, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (also on behalf of the Women's Consortium of Nigeria), Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme (also on behalf of Nord-Sud XXI).

62. At the 40th meeting, on the same day, the High Commissioner answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar

63. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.30, sponsored by Pakistan on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. Subsequently, Tunisia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

64. At the same meeting, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, orally revised the draft resolution.

65. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of China, India, Japan, Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the United States of America and Viet Nam made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised. In their statements, the representatives of China, India and the Russian Federation disassociated the respective States from the consensus on the draft resolution as orally revised.

66. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, the consideration of and action on the draft resolution as orally revised was postponed to 3 July 2015.

67. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the consideration of and action on the draft resolution as orally revised was resumed.

68. At the same meeting, the representative of Myanmar made a statement as the State concerned.

69. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

70. At the same meeting, the representatives of Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

71. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 29/21).

Mission by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to improve human rights, accountability, reconciliation and capacity in South Sudan

72. At the 44th meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of the United States of America introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.8, sponsored by Albania, Paraguay, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Subsequently, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, the Congo, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Ghana, Iceland, Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Sierra Leone and Slovenia joined the sponsors.

73. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America orally revised the draft resolution.

74. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Albania, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Paraguay and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

75. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised. The Chief of the Programme Support and Management Services of OHCHR made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

76. At the same meeting, the representative of Brazil made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

77. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 29/13) (see also para. 938).

III. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development

A. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders

Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants

78. At the 4th meeting, on 15 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants, François Crépeau, presented his reports (A/HRC/29/36 and Add.1–3).

79. At the same meeting, the representative of the European Union made a statement as the organization concerned.

80. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Italy, Malta and Sri Lanka made statements as the States concerned.

81. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 4th meeting, on 15 June 2015, and at the 5th meeting, on 16 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Congo, Ecuador² (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, France, Gabon, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Benin, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Greece, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey;

(c) Observer for the Sovereign Military Order of Malta;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Conectas Direitos Humanos (also on behalf of Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales), Edmund Rice International Limited, Franciscans International, Jubilee Campaign, Save the Children International, Terre des Hommes International Federation, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

82. At the 5th meeting, on 16 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

83. At the 21st meeting, on 23 June 2015, the representative of Eritrea made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

Special Rapporteur on minority issues

84. At the 4th meeting, on 15 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Rita Izsák, presented her study of the human rights situation of Roma worldwide, with a particular focus on the phenomenon of anti-Gypsyism (A/HRC/29/24).

85. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Argentina, Brazil, China, France, Ghana, India, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

² Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

(b) Representatives of observer States: Austria, Bulgaria, Chile, Czech Republic, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union;

(d) Observers for national human rights institutions: Office of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights of Hungary (by video message), Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain (also on behalf of the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission) (by video message);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Lutheran World Federation, Minority Rights Group, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

86. At the 5th meeting, on 16 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises

87. At the 5th meeting, on 16 June 2015, the Chair of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, Michael Addo, presented the report of the Working Group (A/HRC/29/28 and Add.1–3).

88. At the same meeting, the representative of Azerbaijan made a statement as the State concerned.

89. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 5th and 6th meetings, on 16 June 2015, and at the 8th meeting, on 17 June, the following made statements and asked the Chair questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, France, Ghana, Ireland, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Norway² (also on behalf of Argentina, Ghana and the Russian Federation), Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Chile, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Madagascar, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Centre Europe-Tiers Monde – Europe-Third World Centre, Conectas Direitos Humanos, Franciscans International, Human Rights Now, International Service for Human Rights, Korea Center for United Nations Human Rights Policy, Liberation.

90. At the 6th meeting, on 16 June 2015, the Chair answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children

91. At the 5th meeting, on 16 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children, Maria Grazia Giammarinaro, presented her reports (A/HRC/29/38 and Add.1–2).

92. At the same meeting, the representative of Malaysia made a statement as the State concerned.

93. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Human Rights Commission of Malaysia made a statement by video message.

94. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 5th and 6th meetings, on 16 June 2015, and at the 8th meeting, on 17 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Belarus² (also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Egypt, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Nicaragua, Nigeria, the Philippines, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Singapore, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, the United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Botswana, China, Cuba, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Indonesia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Chad, Chile, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Greece, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Madagascar, Myanmar, Panama, Philippines, Republic of Moldova, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Uruguay;

(c) Observer for a United Nations entity, specialized agency and related organization: International Organization for Migration (IOM);

(d) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union;

(e) Observer for the Sovereign Military Order of Malta;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers, the Marist International Solidarity Foundation, Pax Christi International – International Catholic Peace Movement and Pax Romana), Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities), International Humanist and Ethical Union, Korea Center for United Nations Human Rights Policy, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

95. At the 8th meeting, on 17 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences

96. At the 8th meeting, on 17 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, Rashida Manjoo, presented her reports (A/HRC/29/27 and Add.1–4).

97. At the 9th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Afghanistan, Honduras and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements as the States concerned.

98. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission and the Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain (also on behalf of the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission and the Scottish Human Rights Commission) made statements by video messages.

99. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 9th and 10th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador² (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, Estonia, France, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tunisia² (also on behalf of

the Group of Arab States), United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Iraq, Italy, Luxembourg, Mali, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Rwanda, Slovenia, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union;

(d) Observer for the International Committee of the Red Cross;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Association for Progressive Communications, Center for Reproductive Rights, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Human Rights Now, Indian Law Resource Center, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Lesbian and Gay Association, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Lutheran World Federation, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization.

100. At the 10th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons

101. At the 8th meeting, on 17 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons, Chaloka Beyani, presented his reports (A/HRC/29/34 and Add.1–3).

102. At the 9th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Azerbaijan, Haiti and Ukraine made statements as the States concerned.

103. At the same meeting, the representative of the Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement.

104. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 9th and 10th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Estonia, France, Ghana, Ireland, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Austria, Chile, Colombia, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Georgia, Greece, Honduras, Iraq, Italy, Mozambique, Philippines, Rwanda, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, State of Palestine;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observer for the International Committee of the Red Cross.

105. At the 10th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

106. At the 11th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Armenia and Azerbaijan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

107. At the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia and Azerbaijan made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression

108. At the 10th meeting, on 17 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, David Kaye, presented his reports (A/HRC/29/32 and Add.1).

109. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 11th meeting, on 17 June 2015, and at the 12th meeting, on 18 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Latvia, Montenegro, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union, Organization of Islamic Cooperation;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship (also on behalf of Amnesty International and the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues), Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Association for Progressive Communications, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association), International Service for Human Rights, Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

110. At the 12th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

111. At the 14th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Angola, China and Malaysia made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

112. At the 21st meeting, on 23 June 2015, the representative of Ukraine made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association

113. At the 10th meeting, on 17 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, Maina Kiai, presented his reports (A/HRC/29/25 and Add.1–3).

114. At the same meeting, the representatives of Kazakhstan and Oman made statements as the States concerned.

115. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 11th meeting, on 17 June 2015, and at the 12th meeting, on 18 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Estonia, France, Ghana, India, Ireland, Latvia, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Norway, Poland, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Togo, Tunisia;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence internationale pour le développement, Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Association for Progressive Communications, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights House Foundation, International Service for Human Rights, Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany, World Organisation Against Torture (also on behalf of the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues).

116. At the 12th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

117. At the 14th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Angola, China and Malaysia made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

118. At the 21st meeting, on 23 June 2015, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers

119. At the 12th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers, Gabriela Knaul, presented her reports (A/HRC/29/26, Corr.1 and Add.1–4).

120. At the same meeting, the representatives of Portugal, Qatar, Tunisia and the United Arab Emirates made statements as the States concerned.

121. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Office of the Ombudsman (Provedoria de Justiça) of Portugal made a statement.

122. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 12th and 13th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Estonia, France, Ghana, India, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tunisia³ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Burkina Faso, Chile, Czech Republic, Egypt, Fiji, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Sudan, Switzerland;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence internationale pour le développement, Alsalam Foundation, Amnesty International, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Development Innovations and Networks, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

123. At the 13th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

³ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health

124. At the 12th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, Dainius Pūras, presented his reports (A/HRC/29/33 and Add.1).

125. At the same meeting, the representative of Malaysia made a statement as the State concerned.

126. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Human Rights Commission of Malaysia made a statement by video message.

127. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 12th and 13th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador³ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Burkina Faso, Chile, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lithuania, Panama, Republic of Moldova, Slovenia, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, State of Palestine;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission (by video message);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Alliance Defending Freedom, Allied Rainbow Communities International (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association), Arab Commission for Human Rights, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Human Rights Now, Liberation, VIVAT International (also on behalf of Franciscans International), World Barua Organization.

128. At the 13th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the right to education

129. At the 13th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the right to education, Kishore Singh, presented his reports (A/HRC/29/30 and Add.1–2).

130. At the 14th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Algeria and Bhutan made statements as the States concerned.

131. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 14th meeting, on 18 June 2015, and at the 16th meeting, on 19 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador³ (also on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, Estonia, France, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Tunisia³ (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Benin, Chile, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Georgia, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mali, Sri Lanka;

(c) Observer for a United Nations entity, specialized agency and related organization: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO);

(d) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alliance Defending Freedom, Alsalam Foundation, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, International Muslim Women's Union, International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (also on behalf of Association Points-Coeur, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, the Catholic International Education Office, the Congregation of our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers, Fondazione Marista per la Solidarietà Internazionale ONLUS, the Foundation for GAIA, the Institute for Planetary Synthesis, the International Catholic Child Bureau, the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, New Humanity, the Planetary Association for Clean Energy, Servas International and the Women's Board Educational Cooperation Society), Jubilee Campaign, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Plan International (also on behalf of Arigatou International), Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization.

132. At the 16th meeting, on 19 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity

133. At the 13th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity, Virginia Dandan, presented her report (A/HRC/29/35).

134. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 14th meeting, on 18 June 2015, and at the 16th meeting, on 19 June, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador³ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, Ghana, India, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Benin, Chile, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Khoei Foundation, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of the Congregation of our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Edmund Rice International Limited, the Foundation for GAIA, the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education, Pax Christi International – International Catholic Peace Movement, Pax Romana and the Planetary Association for Clean Energy), Indian Council of South America, Jubilee Campaign, World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace.

135. At the 14th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions

136. At the 16th meeting, on 19 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Christof Heyns, presented his reports (A/HRC/29/37 and Add.1–5).

137. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 16th meeting, on 19 June 2015, and at the 18th meeting, on 22 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Brazil, China, Cuba, France, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Morocco, Netherlands, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Egypt, Italy, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, State of Palestine;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence internationale pour le développement, Alsalam Foundation, Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y Justicia de Género (also on behalf of Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales), Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Franciscans International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Muslim Congress.

138. At the 16th meeting, on 19 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice

139. At the 16th meeting, on 19 June 2015, the Chair of the Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice, Emna Aouij, presented the report of the Working Group (A/HRC/29/40 and Add.1–3).

140. At the same meeting, the representatives of Chile, Peru and Spain made statements as the States concerned.

141. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 16th meeting, on 19 June 2015, and at the 18th meeting, on 22 June, the following made statements and asked the Chair questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador³ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Estonia, France, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Colombia, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Slovenia, Sudan, Switzerland, Tunisia, Uruguay;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union, Organization of Islamic Cooperation;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Center for Reproductive Rights, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Defence for Children International, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association and the Swedish Federation of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights), International Humanist and Ethical Union, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

142. At the 16th meeting, on 19 June 2015, the Chair answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights

143. At the 18th meeting, on 22 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, Philip Alston, presented his report and that of his predecessor (A/HRC/29/31 and Add.1).

144. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 18th and 19th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador³ (also on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tunisia³ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Burkina Faso, Chile, Djibouti, Egypt, Greece, Haiti, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Niger, Norway, Sudan, Togo;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Development Association, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Association, Franciscans International, Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Human Rights Commission of Pakistan, Indian Law Resource Center (also on behalf of Amnesty International), International Buddhist Relief Organisation, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

145. At the 19th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

146. At the 21st meeting, on 23 June 2015, the representative of Ukraine made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

147. At the 18th meeting, on 22 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, Ben Emmerson, presented his report (A/HRC/29/51).

148. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 18th and 19th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, France, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Chile, Egypt, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, New Zealand, Niger, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union;

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission (also on behalf of the Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain and the Scottish Human Rights Commission) (by video message);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Indian Council of South America, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural

Development Association, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization.

149. At the 19th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

150. At the 20th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Qatar, the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

151. At the same meeting, the representatives of Qatar, the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

B. Panel discussions

Panel discussion on realizing the equal enjoyment of the right to education by every girl

152. At its 7th meeting, on 16 June 2015, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 27/6, a panel discussion on realizing the equal enjoyment of the right to education by every girl.

153. The High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Associate Director for Programme Partnerships of the Division of Programmes at UNICEF, Marilena Viviani, moderated the panel discussion.

154. At the same meeting, the panellists Reem Al Hashemi, Barbara Bailey, Kishore Singh, Hannah Godefa and Adama Coulibaly made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

155. During the ensuing first part of the panel discussion, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Ecuador⁴ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Egypt⁴ (also on behalf of Algeria, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Nigeria (also on behalf of Argentina, Austria, Ecuador, Finland and Norway), Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar (on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council), Tunisia⁴ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Canada, Egypt, Slovenia (also on behalf of Austria and Croatia), Togo;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Conseil des droits de l'homme de la Mauritanie;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Lesbian and Gay Association, Plan International (also on behalf of Arigatou International, Defence for Children International, Save the Children and Save the Children International).

156. At the end of the first part of the panel discussion, at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

157. During the second part of the panel discussion, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil, China, Estonia, India, Mexico, Namibia, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates;

⁴ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Colombia, Fiji, Greece, Liechtenstein, Nepal, Rwanda, Turkey;

(c) Observer for a national human rights institution: Conseil national des droits de l'homme du Maroc;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, European Disability Forum, International Humanist and Ethical Union.

158. At the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

Annual full-day discussion on the human rights of women

159. The Human Rights Council held, in accordance with Council resolutions 6/30, 23/25 and 26/15, an annual full-day discussion on the human rights of women on 19 June 2015. The meeting was divided into two panel discussions.

160. The first panel discussion was held at the 15th meeting, on the same day, and was focused on the theme "Eliminating and preventing domestic violence against women and girls". The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The General Secretary of the World Young Women's Christian Association and African Union Goodwill Ambassador for the Campaign to End Child Marriage, Nyaradzayi Gumbonzvanda, moderated the panel discussion.

161. At the same meeting, for the first panel discussion, the panellists Marie Yves Rose Morquette Myrtil, Blanca Hernández Oliver, Nur Hasyim, Begoña Lasagabaster, Julia Estela Monárrez Fragoso and Sven Pfeiffer made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the first panel discussion into two parts, both held at the same meeting.

162. During the ensuing first part of the first panel discussion, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), China (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Sudan, Thailand, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam), Ecuador⁴ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Mexico, Morocco (on behalf of States members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Paraguay, Philippines⁴ (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Norway (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Sweden);

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Conseil national des droits de l'homme du Maroc;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Allied Rainbow Communities International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

163. At the end of the first part of the first panel discussion, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

164. During the ensuing second part of the first panel discussion, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Argentina, Brazil, Germany, Indonesia, Namibia, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Ecuador, Iraq, Mali, Monaco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Slovenia, Thailand, Holy See;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: Organization of Islamic Cooperation;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Africa Culture Internationale Human Rights, Friends World Committee for Consultation, Indian Law Resource Center.

165. At the same meeting, the panellists for the first panel discussion answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

166. The second panel discussion was held at the 17th meeting, on the same day. The panel discussion was focused on the theme “Women’s human rights and participation in power and decision-making”. The Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Chair of the Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice, Emna Aouij, moderated the panel discussion.

167. At the same meeting, the panellists Arancha González, Shirin Akhter, Lucrèce Falolou, Michèle Ollier and Lilian Soto made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the second panel discussion into two parts, both held at the same meeting.

168. During the ensuing first part of the second panel discussion, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Ecuador⁴ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, Montenegro, Pakistan, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Austria (also on behalf of Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland), Croatia, Finland (also on behalf of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, International Service for Human Rights, World Blind Union.

169. At the end of the first part of the second panel discussion, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

170. During the ensuing second part of the second panel discussion, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, El Salvador, Estonia, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Sierra Leone, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Canada, Czech Republic, Greece, Kuwait, Lithuania, Niger, Rwanda;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, International Development Law Organization;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: All China Women’s Federation, Global Network for Rights and Development.

171. At the end of the second part of the second panel discussion, the panellists for the second panel discussion answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

Panel discussion on the effects of terrorism on the enjoyment by all persons of human rights and fundamental freedoms

172. At its 37th meeting, on 30 June 2015, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 28/17, a panel discussion on the effects of terrorism on the enjoyment by all persons of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

173. The Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council, Mothusi Bruce Rabasha Palai, moderated the panel discussion.

174. At the same meeting, the panellists Ben Emmerson, Steven Siqueira and Mauro Miedico made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

175. During the ensuing first part of the panel discussion, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania (also on behalf of Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Monaco, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey and the United States of America), Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Cuba, Ecuador⁴ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Egypt⁴ (also on behalf of Algeria, Jordan, Morocco and Saudi Arabia), Hungary⁴ (also on behalf of Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay), Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland⁴ (also on behalf of Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America), United States of America;

(b) Representative of an observer State: Denmark (also on behalf of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden);

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Conseil national des droits de l'homme du Maroc;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation, Human Rights Watch (also on behalf of the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues and the International Service for Human Rights).

176. At the end of the first part of the panel discussion, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

177. During the second part of the panel discussion, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Estonia, India, Ireland, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Sierra Leone, Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Egypt, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kuwait, Niger, Syrian Arab Republic, Holy See;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, International Organization of la Francophonie;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amuta for NGO Responsibility, Arab Commission for Human Rights, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Friends World Committee for Consultation (also on behalf of Amnesty International), Organization for Defending Victims of Violence.

178. At the end of the second part of the panel discussion, the panellists answered questions and made concluding remarks.

C. General debate on agenda item 3

179. At its 20th meeting, on 22 June 2015, and its 21st meeting, on 23 June, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on thematic reports and oral updates under agenda items 2 and 3, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil (also on behalf of Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay), Chile⁴ (also on behalf of Brazil, Colombia and Uruguay), Germany, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)⁴ (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Mongolia⁴ (also on behalf of Australia, Austria, Canada, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Maldives, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Sweden, Tunisia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America), Montenegro, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan (also on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar (on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council), Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Burkina Faso, Mauritania, Norway, Slovenia, Spain;

(c) Observer for a United Nations entity, specialized agency and related organization: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS;

(d) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, International Development Law Organization;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Agence internationale pour le développement, Al-Khoei Foundation, All Russian Public Organization “Russian Public Institute of Electoral Law”, Alliance Defending Freedom, Allied Rainbow Communities International (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association), Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International (also on behalf of Human Rights Watch), Arab Commission for Human Rights, Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Association Duneny, BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, British Humanist Association, Center for Reproductive Rights, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Colombian Commission of Jurists, Conectas Derechos Humanos, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Franciscans International, Friends World Committee for Consultation, Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l’enfant (also on behalf of the Consortium for Street Children, Foundation ECPAT International (End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Trafficking in Children for Sexual Purposes), International Movement ATD Fourth World, Plan International and Save the Children International), Helios Life Association, Il Cenacolo, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Lesbian and Gay Association, International Muslim Women’s Union, International Service for Human Rights, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Peivande Gole Narges Organization, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l’homme, Save the Children International, Society for Threatened Peoples, United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind

Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

180. At the 20th meeting, on 22 June 2015, the representatives of India and Pakistan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

181. At the 21st meeting, on 23 June 2015, the representatives of China and Saudi Arabia made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Fiftieth anniversary of the adoption and fortieth anniversary of the entry into force of the International Covenants on Human Rights

182. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.2, sponsored by the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Mexico, Peru, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

183. At the same meeting, the representative of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made general comments on the draft resolution.

184. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution.

185. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

186. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 29/1).

187. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representatives of Japan and South Africa made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

Protection of the human rights of migrants: migrants in transit

188. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Mexico introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.3, sponsored by Mexico and co-sponsored by Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cyprus, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Ireland, Kenya, Montenegro, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal and Uruguay. Subsequently, Angola, Armenia, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Greece, Haiti, Morocco, the Niger, Nigeria, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

189. At the same meeting, the representative of Mexico orally revised the draft resolution.

190. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

191. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

192. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 29/2).

193. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of Japan made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Human rights and international solidarity

194. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.6, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe. Subsequently, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Indonesia, the Philippines and Tunisia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

195. At the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Mexico and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

196. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Latvia, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Montenegro, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

197. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 33 votes to 14, with no abstentions (resolution 29/3).

Elimination of discrimination against women

198. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representatives of Colombia and Mexico introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.7/Rev.1, sponsored by Colombia and Mexico, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United States of America, Uruguay and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Austria, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Lithuania, Norway, Panama, the Republic of Korea, Togo, Tunisia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

199. At the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and South Africa made general comments on the draft resolution.

200. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 29/4).

201. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Elimination of discrimination against persons affected by leprosy and their family members

202. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Japan, also on behalf of Brazil, Estonia, Ethiopia, Morocco, Portugal and Romania, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.10, sponsored by Brazil, Estonia, Ethiopia, Japan, Morocco, Portugal and Romania, and co-sponsored by Andorra, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, the Congo, Cyprus, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Montenegro, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Belgium, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ghana, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Myanmar, the Netherlands, Nigeria, the Philippines, Serbia, Singapore, Timor-Leste, Tunisia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

203. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 29/5).

Independence and impartiality of the judiciary, jurors and assessors, and the independence of lawyers

204. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representatives of Hungary⁵ and Mexico, also on behalf of Australia, Botswana, Maldives and Thailand, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.11, sponsored by Australia, Botswana, Hungary, Maldives, Mexico and Thailand, and co-sponsored by Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Algeria, Armenia, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Fiji, Haiti, Indonesia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, Tunisia, Uruguay and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

205. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

206. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 29/6).

207. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

The right to education

208. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Portugal introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.14/Rev.1, sponsored by Portugal and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Qatar, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and

⁵ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Armenia, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Germany, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Maldives, Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Romania, Sierra Leone, Togo, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

209. At the same meeting, the representative of Pakistan introduced amendment A/HRC/29/L.31 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.14/Rev.1. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.31 was sponsored by China and Pakistan.

210. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Portugal made general comments on the draft resolution and the amendments.

211. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Portugal, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/29/L.31. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United States of America

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Republic of Korea, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

212. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/29/L.31 by 9 votes to 22, with 16 abstentions.

213. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Pakistan, a separate vote was taken on the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

214. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote on the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

215. The voting on the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution was as follows:

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

216. The Human Rights Council adopted the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.14/Rev.1 by 30 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

217. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.14/Rev.1 without a vote (resolution 29/7).

218. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Strengthening efforts to prevent and eliminate child, early and forced marriage

219. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representatives of Sierra Leone and Italy⁵ (also on behalf of Argentina, Canada, Ethiopia, Honduras, Maldives, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Poland, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Zambia) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.15, sponsored by Argentina, Canada, Ethiopia, Honduras, Italy, Maldives, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Poland, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Zambia, and co-sponsored by Andorra, Angola, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chad, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, the United States of America and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Albania, Armenia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, France, Haiti, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Monaco, the Niger, the Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

220. At the same meeting, the representatives of Italy⁵ (also on behalf of Argentina, Canada, Ethiopia, Honduras, Maldives, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Poland, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Zambia) and Sierra Leone orally revised the draft resolution.

221. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Qatar (on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council) made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

222. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

223. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 29/8).

224. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

225. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Mexico introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.17/Rev.1, sponsored by Mexico and co-sponsored by Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Colombia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Guatemala, Ireland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands, Norway, Peru, San Marino, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Subsequently, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, France, Greece, Iceland, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, New Zealand, Poland, Serbia, Slovenia, Sweden, Tunisia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

226. At the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

227. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 29/9).

228. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of Sierra Leone made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Human rights and the regulation of civilian acquisition, possession and use of firearms

229. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representatives of Ecuador and Peru introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.18, sponsored by Ecuador and Peru, and co-sponsored by Cuba, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Switzerland and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, the Congo, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Greece, Haiti, Ireland, the Niger, Panama, the Philippines, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Thailand and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

230. At the same meeting, the representative of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made general comments on the draft resolution.

231. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution.

232. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

233. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Abstaining:

France, Japan, Republic of Korea, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

234. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 41 votes to none, with 6 abstentions (resolution 29/10).

235. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representatives of Japan and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

The negative impact of corruption on the enjoyment of human rights

236. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Morocco (also on behalf of Austria, Brazil, Ethiopia, Indonesia and Poland) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.19, sponsored by Austria, Brazil, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Morocco and Poland, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Chad, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Mexico, Montenegro, New Zealand, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Slovakia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Ukraine. Subsequently, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, France, Haiti, Iceland, Israel, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Peru, the Philippines, Qatar (on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council), the Republic of Korea, Romania, Serbia, Singapore, Slovenia, Sweden, Tunisia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), the United States of America and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

237. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution.

238. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 29/11).

239. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representatives of Japan and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

Unaccompanied migrant children and adolescents and human rights

240. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of El Salvador, also on behalf of Nicaragua, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.24, sponsored by El Salvador and Nicaragua, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Haiti, Honduras, Morocco, Namibia, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Thailand, Tunisia, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Greece, Guatemala, Japan, the Philippines, Portugal, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey joined the sponsors.

241. At the same meeting, the representatives of Bolivia (Plurinational State of) and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments on the draft resolution.

242. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 29/12).

Accelerating efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women: eliminating domestic violence

243. At the 44th meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Canada introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16/Rev.1, sponsored by Canada and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Benin, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mali, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Chad, Costa Rica, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, El Salvador, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Madagascar, Mexico, Mongolia, Romania, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia and Turkey joined the sponsors.

244. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia, also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, the Russian Federation and the United Arab Emirates, introduced amendments A/HRC/29/L.27 and A/HRC/29/L.29 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16/Rev.1. Amendments A/HRC/29/L.27 and A/HRC/29/L.29 were sponsored by Bahrain, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. Subsequently, Bangladesh and the Sudan joined the sponsors of both amendments.

245. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the United Arab Emirates introduced amendments A/HRC/29/L.26 and A/HRC/29/L.28 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16/Rev.1. Amendments A/HRC/29/L.26 and A/HRC/29/L.28 were sponsored by Bahrain, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. Subsequently, Bangladesh and the Sudan joined the sponsors of both amendments.

246. At the same meeting, the representatives of Argentina, Brazil, France, Japan, Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights

Council), Pakistan (also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Libya, Oman, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates) and Viet Nam made general comments on the draft resolution and the amendments. In his statement, the representative of Pakistan (also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Libya, Oman, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates) disassociated the respective Member States from the consensus on the ninth preambular paragraph and paragraphs 2, 4, 8 (a) and (h) and 9 (a) of the draft resolution.

247. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Albania made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/29/L.26.

248. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Sierra Leone, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/29/L.26. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, China, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Algeria, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Viet Nam

249. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.26 was rejected by 13 votes to 24, with 7 abstentions.⁶

250. At the same meeting, the representative of Ireland made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/29/L.27.

251. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Sierra Leone, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/29/L.27. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Botswana, China, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Congo, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Algeria, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Maldives, Viet Nam

252. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/29/L.27 by 13 votes to 23, with 7 abstentions.⁷

253. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Sierra Leone, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/29/L.28. The voting was as follows:

⁶ Three delegations did not cast a vote.

⁷ Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Mexico and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) did not cast a vote. The representative of Mexico subsequently stated that the delegation had intended to vote against the amendment.

In favour:

Bangladesh, Botswana, China, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Estonia, France, Germany, India, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Algeria, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Namibia, South Africa, Viet Nam

254. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/29/L.28 by 14 votes to 21, with 9 abstentions.⁸

255. At the same meeting, the representatives of Montenegro and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/29/L.29.

256. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Sierra Leone, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/29/L.29. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Botswana, China, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Congo, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Algeria, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Maldives, Nigeria, Viet Nam

257. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/29/L.29 by 12 votes to 24, with 8 abstentions.⁸

258. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Saudi Arabia, a separate vote was taken on paragraph 8 (a) of the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Albania, Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam

Against:

Botswana, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, South Africa

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bangladesh, China, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Maldives, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

⁸ Three delegations did not cast a vote.

259. The Human Rights Council adopted paragraph 8 (a) of draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16/Rev.1 by 29 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.^{9, 10}

260. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Saudi Arabia, a separate vote was taken on paragraph 9 (a) of the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Albania, Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam

Against:

Botswana, Morocco, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bangladesh, China, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Maldives, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

261. The Human Rights Council adopted paragraph 9 (a) of draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16/Rev.1 by 30 votes to 3, with 14 abstentions.

262. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16/Rev.1 without a vote (resolution 29/14).

263. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of the United States of America made general comments and the representative of South Africa made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Human rights and climate change

264. At the 44th meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representatives of Bangladesh and the Philippines introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.21, sponsored by Bangladesh and the Philippines, and co-sponsored by Bosnia and Herzegovina, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Mauritania, Peru, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, the Dominican Republic, Fiji, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Kiribati, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal, Saint Lucia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Timor-Leste, Tunisia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Tuvalu and Vanuatu joined the sponsors.

265. At the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), South Africa and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

266. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution.

267. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 29/15).

268. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representatives of Japan and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

⁹ One delegation did not cast a vote.

¹⁰ The representative of South Africa subsequently stated that there had been an error in the delegation's vote and that it had intended to vote in favour of paragraph 8 (a) of the draft resolution.

Protection of the family: contribution of the family to the realization of the right to an adequate standard of living for its members, particularly through its role in poverty eradication and achieving sustainable development

269. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representatives of Saudi Arabia and Egypt¹¹ (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Tunisia and Uganda) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25, sponsored by Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and Tunisia, and co-sponsored by Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States except South Africa), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Malaysia, Maldives, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation except Albania), Sri Lanka and Tunisia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States). Subsequently, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation except Albania) withdrew co-sponsorship of the draft resolution. Subsequently, the Dominican Republic, Egypt (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation except Albania and Pakistan (see also para. 280)), Haiti, the Philippines and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

270. At the same meeting, the President announced that amendment A/HRC/29/L.36 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 had been withdrawn. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.36 was sponsored by South Africa.

271. Also at the same meeting, the representative of South Africa (also on behalf of Brazil, Chile and Uruguay) introduced amendment A/HRC/29/L.37 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.37 was sponsored by Brazil, South Africa and Uruguay. Subsequently, Chile and Colombia joined the sponsors.

272. At the same meeting, in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the representative of the Russian Federation (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia and Uganda) moved the adjournment of consideration of amendment A/HRC/29/L.37.

273. Subsequently, the representatives of China and Indonesia made statements in favour of the motion. The representatives of Brazil and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements against the motion.

274. Under the same rule, a recorded vote was taken on the motion to adjourn the consideration of amendment A/HRC/29/L.37. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Gabon, Sierra Leone, Viet Nam

275. The Human Rights Council adopted the motion to adjourn the consideration of amendment A/HRC/29/L.37 by 22 votes to 21, with 3 abstentions.¹² Consequently, the Council adjourned the consideration of amendment A/HRC/29/L.37.

¹¹ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

¹² One delegation did not cast a vote.

276. At the same meeting, the representative of Norway¹³ (also on behalf of Albania, Chile and Ireland) introduced amendment A/HRC/29/L.38 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.38 was sponsored by Albania, Ireland and Norway. Subsequently, Chile, Finland and Sweden joined the sponsors.

277. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Uruguay introduced amendment A/HRC/29/L.39 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.39 was sponsored by Belgium, Luxembourg and Uruguay. Subsequently, Chile, Finland and Sweden joined the sponsors.

278. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.39 was accepted by the sponsors of draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25, which was orally revised accordingly.

279. At the same meeting, the representative of Norway¹³ (also on behalf of Albania and Denmark) introduced amendment A/HRC/29/L.40 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 as orally revised. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.40 was sponsored by Albania, Denmark and Norway. Subsequently, the Czech Republic, Finland and Sweden joined the sponsors.

280. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Pakistan announced that amendment A/HRC/29/L.41 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 as orally revised had been withdrawn. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.41 had been sponsored by Pakistan. As a consequence, Pakistan subsequently joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 as orally revised (see also para. 269).

281. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Bangladesh, Estonia (also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay), Indonesia, Ireland, Morocco, Pakistan, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, the United Arab Emirates and the United States of America (also on behalf of Australia and Canada) made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised and amendments A/HRC/29/L.38 and A/HRC/29/L.40.

282. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

283. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Netherlands and Qatar made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/29/L.38.

284. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Qatar, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/29/L.38. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Gabon, Ghana, Kazakhstan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Viet Nam

¹³ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

285. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/29/L.38 by 18 votes to 23, with 5 abstentions.¹⁴

286. At the same meeting, the representatives of Morocco and the Netherlands made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/29/L.40.

287. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Morocco, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/29/L.40. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Gabon, Kazakhstan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Viet Nam

288. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/29/L.40 by 19 votes to 23, with 4 abstentions.¹⁴

289. At the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Mexico, Paraguay and South Africa made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on the draft resolution as orally revised.

290. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Montenegro, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

291. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 as orally revised by 29 votes to 14, with 4 abstentions (resolution 29/22).

292. At the same meeting, the representative of Sierra Leone made general comments and the representatives of Cuba and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

The right to freedom of expression, including in the form of art

293. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.20 had been withdrawn by the sponsors. Draft

¹⁴ One delegation did not cast a vote.

resolution A/HRC/29/L.20 had been sponsored by Benin, Latvia, the United States of America and Uruguay, and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Lithuania, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Peru, the Republic of Moldova, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, the Dominican Republic, Liechtenstein, Malta, San Marino and Tunisia had joined the sponsors.

294. As a consequence, the Human Rights Council did not consider amendments A/HRC/29/L.32 and A/HRC/29/L.33 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.20. Amendments A/HRC/29/L.32 and A/HRC/29/L.33 had been sponsored by Pakistan on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation with the exception of Albania and Benin.

IV. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention

A. Interactive dialogue with the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic

295. At the 21st meeting, on 23 June 2015, the Chair of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro, provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 28/20, an oral update.

296. At the same meeting, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

297. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 21st and 22nd meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Chair questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria, Belgium¹⁵ (also on behalf of Luxembourg and the Netherlands), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Maldives, Morocco, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Iceland (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden), Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, New Zealand, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Association of World Citizens, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Presse Emblème Campagne, Union of Arab Jurists, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, World Jewish Congress.

298. At the 22nd meeting, on the same day, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made final remarks as the State concerned.

299. At the same meeting, the Chair answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

300. At the 23rd meeting, on the same day, the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

B. Interactive dialogue with the commission of inquiry on human rights in Eritrea

301. At the 23rd meeting, on 23 June 2015, the Chair of the commission of inquiry on human rights in Eritrea, Mike Smith, presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 26/24, the report of the Commission (A/HRC/29/42).

302. At the same meeting, the representative of Eritrea made a statement as the State concerned.

303. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 23rd meeting, on 23 June 2015, and at the 24th meeting, on 24 June, the following made statements and asked the Chair questions:

¹⁵ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Cuba, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Ghana, Ireland, Republic of Korea, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Djibouti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Luxembourg, Norway, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Conscience and Peace Tax International, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights Watch, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, Jubilee Campaign.

304. At the 24th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the representative of Eritrea made final remarks as the State concerned.

305. At the same meeting, the Chair answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

C. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus

306. At the 23rd meeting, on 23 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus, Miklós Haraszti, presented his report (A/HRC/29/43).

307. At the same meeting, the representative of Belarus made a statement as the State concerned.

308. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, China, Cuba, Estonia, France, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Russian Federation (also on behalf of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Zimbabwe;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, United Nations Watch.

309. At the same meeting, the representative of Belarus made final remarks as the State concerned.

310. Also at the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea

311. At the 24th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea, Sheila B. Keetharuth, presented her report (A/HRC/29/41).

312. At the same meeting, the representative of Eritrea made a statement as the State concerned.

313. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Ireland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representative of an observer State: New Zealand;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Association of World Citizens, Conscience and Peace Tax International, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, United Nations Watch.

314. At the same meeting, the representative of Eritrea made final remarks as the State concerned.

315. Also at the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

D. General debate on agenda item 4

316. At its 24th and 25th meetings, on 24 June 2015, and its 28th meeting, on 25 June, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 4, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Cuba, France, Germany, Iran (Islamic Republic of)¹⁵ (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland (also on behalf of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America), Japan, Latvia (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America), Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Liechtenstein, Montenegro and Ukraine), Montenegro, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Eritrea, Georgia, Iceland, Israel, Malaysia, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Africa Culture Internationale Human Rights, African Development Association, Agence internationale pour le développement, Al-Khoei Foundation, Alsalam Foundation, Alulbayt Foundation, American Association of Jurists (also on behalf of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers), Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Article 19 – The International Centre

against Censorship (also on behalf of CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation), Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Asian Legal Resource Centre (also on behalf of Franciscans International), Association Dunenyo, Association of World Citizens, Baha'i International Community, British Humanist Association, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Center for Inquiry, Center for Reproductive Rights, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Centrist Democratic International, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (also on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union, Conectas Direitos Humanos, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Minority Rights Group and the Washington Office on Latin America), CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Conectas Direitos Humanos, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Association, European Union of Jewish Students, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Franciscans International (also on behalf of Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University, the Center for International Environmental Law, the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World – Council of Churches, Edmund Rice International Limited, the Foodfirst Information and Action Network, the Foundation for GAIA, the Institute for Planetary Synthesis, International Movement ATD Fourth World, the Planetary Association for Clean Energy and the Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem), Gazeteciler ve Yazarlar Vakfı, Human Rights House Foundation (also on behalf of Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship and the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues), Human Rights Law Centre, Human Rights Watch, Il Cenacolo, Indian Council of South America, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, International Muslim Women's Union, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Minority Rights Group, Nonviolent Radical Party – Transnational and Transparty, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Peivande Gole Narges Organization, Presse Emblème Campagne, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Reporters Sans Frontiers International – Reporters without Borders International, United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Victorious Youths Movement, VIVAT International, World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council, World Muslim Congress, World Organisation Against Torture (also on behalf of the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues).

317. At the 26th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the representatives of Bahrain, Burundi, China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Maldives, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan and Uzbekistan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

318. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Japan and the Republic of Korea made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

319. At the 28th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

The grave and deteriorating human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic

320. At the 44th meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (also on behalf of France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and the United States of America) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.4, sponsored by France, Germany, Italy, Jordan,

Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United Arab Emirates. Subsequently, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Ireland, Lithuania, Monaco, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Sierra Leone and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

321. At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland orally revised the draft resolution.

322. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba, Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Qatar, the Russian Federation, the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

323. At the same meeting, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

324. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil and Pakistan made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

325. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the Russian Federation, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Albania, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Bangladesh, Congo, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, South Africa, Viet Nam

326. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised by 29 votes to 6, with 12 abstentions (resolution 29/16).

Situation of human rights in Belarus

327. At the 44th meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Latvia, on behalf of the European Union, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.12, sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Canada, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America. Subsequently, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

328. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments on the draft resolution.

329. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Belarus made a statement as the State concerned.

330. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution.

331. At the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil and Mexico made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

332. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the Russian Federation, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Albania, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Maldives, Montenegro, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, India, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates

333. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 21 votes to 8, with 18 abstentions (resolution 29/17).

Situation of human rights in Eritrea

334. At the 44th meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Djibouti introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.23, sponsored by Djibouti and Somalia, and co-sponsored by Croatia, Cyprus, France, Montenegro and New Zealand. Subsequently, Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

335. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), the Russian Federation and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution. In their statements, the representatives of China and the Russian Federation disassociated the respective Member States from the consensus on the draft resolution.

336. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Eritrea made a statement as the State concerned.

337. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution.

338. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 29/18).

339. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote. In his statement, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela disassociated the Member State from the consensus on the resolution.

V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms

A. Social Forum

340. At the 28th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Chair-Rapporteur of the 2015 Social Forum, Faisal bin Abdulla al-Henzab, presented the report of the 2015 Social Forum, held from 18 to 20 February 2015 (A/HRC/29/44).

B. Forum on Business and Human Rights

341. At the 28th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Chief ad interim of the Special Procedures Branch at OHCHR presented, on behalf of the Chair-Rapporteur, the report containing a summary of discussions at the third annual Forum on Business and Human Rights, held from 1 to 3 December 2014 (A/HRC/29/29).

C. Open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the right to peace

342. At the 28th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Chair-Rapporteur of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the right to peace, Christian Guillermet-Fernández, presented the report of the working group on its third session, held from 20 to 24 April 2015 (A/HRC/29/45).

D. General debate on agenda item 5

343. At its 28th meeting, on 25 June 2015, and its 32nd meeting, on 26 June, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 5, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ghana, India, Ireland, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia and Ukraine), Russian Federation (also on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Cuba, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam (on behalf of ASEAN);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Austria, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Norway, Tunisia;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Africa Culture Internationale Human Rights, Agence internationale pour le développement, Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Association of World Citizens, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, the Institute for Planetary Synthesis, the Institute of Global Education, the Ius Primi Viri International Association, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale and Pax Romana), BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, CAPAJ – Comisión Jurídica para el Autodesarrollo de los Pueblos Originarios Andinos, Center for Global Nonkilling, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Colombian Commission of Jurists, Conectas Direitos Humanos, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Human Rights Law Centre, Il Cenacolo, Indian Council of South America, Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'homme (also on behalf of the Global Network for

Rights and Development), International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Muslim Women's Union, International Service for Human Rights, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Servas International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, World Barua Organization, World Muslim Congress.

E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Social Forum

344. At the 44th meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.5/Rev.1, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Argentina, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Colombia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, El Salvador, Malaysia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Qatar, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe. Subsequently, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Indonesia, Mexico, Qatar (on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council), Tunisia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

345. At the same meeting, the representatives of Japan, Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution. In her statement, the representative of the United States of America disassociated the Member State from the consensus on the draft resolution.

346. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution.

347. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/19).

VI. Universal periodic review

348. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 60/251, Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, Council decision 17/119 and President's statements PRST/8/1 and PRST/9/2 on modalities and practices for the universal periodic review process, the Council considered the outcome of the reviews conducted during the twenty-first session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, held from 19 to 30 January 2015.

349. In accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 5/1, the President of the Council stated that all recommendations must be part of the final document of the universal periodic review and accordingly, the State under review should clearly communicate its position on all recommendations either by indicating that it "supported" or "noted" each recommendation.

A. Consideration of universal periodic review outcomes

350. The section below contains, in accordance with paragraph 4.3 of President's statement 8/1, a summary of the views expressed on the outcome by States under review and by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council, and general comments made by other stakeholders before the adoption of the outcome by the Council in plenary session.

Kyrgyzstan

351. The review of Kyrgyzstan was held on 19 January 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Kyrgyzstan in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KGZ/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KGZ/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KGZ/3).

352. At its 26th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Kyrgyzstan (see sect. C below).

353. The outcome of the review of Kyrgyzstan comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/4), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/29/4/Add.1).

1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

354. The delegation of Kyrgyzstan stated that the State had accepted 139 recommendations out of 196 recommendations during the session of the Working Group. It had not supported 28 recommendations and had postponed making a decision on its position with regard to the remaining 29 recommendations until the June session of the Human Rights Council. Of those remaining 20 recommendations, Kyrgyzstan had accepted 11 and noted 18. All the recommendations that had been made during the review would remain under consideration by the Government, and the fact that some recommendations

had not been supported did not imply that those recommendations would not be implemented.

355. The delegation provided additional clarifications on several recommendations that Kyrgyzstan had not supported and thus had noted. Regarding the recommendations on cooperating with special procedure mandate holders and issuing a standing invitation to them, the State had regularly received visits by special rapporteurs. Since 2001, seven special rapporteurs had visited the country. The Government had in principle agreed to visits of the special rapporteurs on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, on the situation of human rights defenders, and on the human rights to safe drinking water and sanitation, and of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances. The question of issuing a standing invitation to special procedure mandate holders was under the consideration of the Government.

356. The delegation provided clarifications regarding the Government's position relating to the recommendations on revoking laws that did not comply with international standards on the prohibition of discrimination based on sexual orientation. The Constitution guaranteed all rights and freedoms to everyone living in the country and subject to the jurisdiction of Kyrgyzstan, and prohibited discrimination on the grounds of sex, race, language, disability, ethnicity, religion, age, political affiliation, education, origin, property or other status, and other circumstances. Therefore, the Constitution guaranteed that the principle of non-discrimination would be embodied in any new laws. In addition, the Criminal Code did not contain any restrictions on the exercise of the rights of members of sexual minorities. A draft law on creating a positive attitude towards non-traditional sexual relations had been initiated by a group of parliamentarians, not by the Government, and it was not aimed at infringing the rights of sexual minorities.

357. According to the Constitution, the international treaties to which Kyrgyzstan was a party, and generally recognized principles and norms of international law, were an integral part of the legal system of Kyrgyzstan, and the provisions of international human rights treaties were directly applicable.

358. Regarding the draft law on "foreign agents", the parliamentary hearing on the draft law, which had been initiated by parliamentarians, had been held in December 2014 with the participation of representatives of Government and of non-governmental organizations. During the hearing, there had been negative comments on the draft law. It remained under the consideration of two committees, and a discussion on it at the parliamentary session had not been scheduled.

359. The Constitution guaranteed the right to freedom of opinion and expression, including the freedom to seek, receive and impart information freely. The Law on Mass Media was consistent with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, and the main principle of the freedom of information was a responsibility to strive for, by revealing facts and disseminating information without malicious intent. That in turn implied that journalists should take full responsibility for their words written or broadcast and that the thorough verification of disseminated information was the foundation of socially responsible journalism.

360. The coordination council on human rights, which had been established in 2013, had a mandate to ensure the implementation of the State's international human rights obligations. Kyrgyzstan was a party to eight of the nine core international human rights instruments and to 40 additional human rights conventions of the United Nations and of other organizations. The Government had submitted its periodic reports to six treaty bodies since 2010. The State recognized the competency of the Human Rights Committee and the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women to consider and examine individual complaints.

361. In recent years, Kyrgyzstan had intensified its efforts to ensure the protection of human rights and respect for the rule of law. Serious efforts had been made to bring legislation into line with the provisions of the Constitution and with the State's international human rights obligations. A new policy had been developed to set guidelines for the further improvement of legislation and its implementation in practice in order to

strengthen human rights mechanisms, improve governance, and reform law enforcement bodies and the judicial system.

362. The Government would continue to implement its international human rights obligations in the framework of a State policy, taking into account national and regional development peculiarities, and historical, cultural and religious characteristics. The Government had been considering ways and mechanisms to implement the recommendations made during the review. The coordination council on human rights was considering a holistic approach in the implementation of the recommendations made by various human rights mechanisms of the United Nations.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

363. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kyrgyzstan, 13 delegations made statements.

364. Belarus referred to the responsible approach that Kyrgyzstan had adopted during its second review and pointed out that the Government had supported the majority of the recommendations, which demonstrated the State's commitment to strengthen its national capacity to promote and protect human rights.

365. China commended Kyrgyzstan for its constructive participation in the universal periodic review and for having accepted the majority of the recommendations. Kyrgyzstan had accepted the recommendation made by China on implementing its poverty reduction strategy.

366. Cuba welcomed the effective implementation of the recommendations from the first review of Kyrgyzstan, which had demonstrated the State's commitment to promote and protect human rights. It noted with appreciation the acceptance by Kyrgyzstan of the recommendations made by Cuba on implementing its national sustainable development strategy as a means to combat poverty and to ensure the rights and the quality of life of persons with disabilities.

367. Ghana stated that the establishment of the national centre for the prevention of torture, and the adoption of the Children's Code and of the act on peaceful assembly demonstrated the Government's commitment to improve the human rights situation in the country. It encouraged Kyrgyzstan to enhance the respect for human rights anchored in the rule of law and good governance.

368. India welcomed the acceptance by Kyrgyzstan of a large number of the recommendations made during its review. The State had gained from its participation in the review and it would continue its efforts in the coming years to implement the recommendations it had accepted.

369. Kuwait referred to the commitment of Kyrgyzstan to implement the recommendations from the previous review, including those on establishing the coordination council on human rights. It noted with appreciation that the State had accepted the recommendations made by Kuwait on providing victims of trafficking with the necessary assistance and services.

370. The Russian Federation pointed out that Kyrgyzstan had supported the majority of the recommendations made during its review. It noted with appreciation the State's efforts to strengthen its human rights institutions and mechanisms and to bring its legislation and legislative practice into line with its international human rights obligations.

371. Sierra Leone commended Kyrgyzstan for having supported a large number of the recommendations made during its review. It noted with interest that efforts would be made to ensure better protection against child or early marriage and that the Government continued to work to strengthen the role of the judiciary and to ensure the rule of law, demonstrating its commitment to promote human rights.

372. Tajikistan referred to the commitment of Kyrgyzstan to cooperate with international human rights mechanisms, to adopt legislation to combat terrorism and extremism, and to step up its efforts to improve the human rights situation and respect for the rule of law.

373. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela referred to the commitment of Kyrgyzstan to promote and protect human rights and to the State's efforts and progress in implementing the recommendations made during its first review.

374. Viet Nam commended Kyrgyzstan for the progress it had made in protecting and promoting human rights since its previous review. It referred to the efforts of the State to protect the rights of vulnerable groups, especially women and children, and noted with appreciation the acceptance by Kyrgyzstan of a large number of recommendations, including two made by Viet Nam.

375. Afghanistan noted with appreciation the constructive engagement of Kyrgyzstan in the review and its acceptance of a significant number of the recommendations made. It referred to the State's strong commitment to strengthen the rule of law and its democratic institutions, and to bring legislation into line with the Constitution and international standards.

376. Albania noted with appreciation the acceptance by Kyrgyzstan of a large number of recommendations and encouraged the State to implement them. It also encouraged the State to make efforts to improve detention conditions, combat violence against women and children, and improve procedures for birth registration. It noted with appreciation the establishment of the coordination council on human rights and encouraged the State to strengthen its institutional capacity to implement human rights standards.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

377. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kyrgyzstan, six other stakeholders made statements.

378. The World Organization against Torture was concerned about the attempts to restrict the freedom of association by requiring the registration of non-governmental organizations as "foreign agents" and by restricting their foreign funding. It welcomed the acceptance by Kyrgyzstan of eight recommendations on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, and encouraged the State to translate those commitments into effective reforms. It was concerned about the State's rejection of several recommendations that had called for the adoption of legislation prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation.

379. Human Rights Watch stated that, despite the fact that Kyrgyzstan had accepted recommendations calling for accountability for the abuses relating to the events of June 2010, the Government had failed to address those abuses adequately in the south of the country. Two problematic bills pending before Parliament – an anti-gay "propaganda" bill and a "foreign agents" bill – would seriously curb the freedoms of association and of expression. The problem of gender-based violence, and violence and discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons persisted despite some steps taken by the Government.

380. Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship stated that the new draft amendments permitting the blocking of websites without a court order offered vague definitions of extremism and terrorism, which could lead to broad interpretation, threatening the freedom of expression. The law on "foreign agents" would establish wider government control over the activities of non-governmental organizations and permit their suspension. In addition, Article 19 called upon Kyrgyzstan to withdraw the draft amendments that sought to ban the creation of positive attitudes towards lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons.

381. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland stated that violations of the basic human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons were increasing despite the fact that the State had accepted recommendations on protecting their rights. The discriminatory anti-propaganda bill, which prohibited the formation of positive attitudes towards non-traditional sexual relations, was still under discussion in Parliament. If approved, it would close all doors for human rights defenders to protect the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. The public discussion of the bill itself had caused an increase in hate crimes and violence against those individuals.

382. Amnesty International welcomed the acceptance by Kyrgyzstan of the majority of the recommendations made during the review. It was concerned, however, by the increasing restrictions on the freedom of expression and association, discrimination and violence against minority groups, and by the failure to investigate human rights violations during the events of June 2010. Parliament had been considering a draft legislation on “foreign agents”, which, if adopted, could criminalize the work of human rights defenders and restrict the activities of non-governmental organizations. Amnesty International referred to the State’s lack of commitment to protect the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons.

383. Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik regretted that Kyrgyzstan had not ratified the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure during the reporting period. Furthermore, the State had not accepted the recommendations on ratifying the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the ILO Domestic Workers Convention (No. 189), or on enacting specific anti-discrimination legislation. Bride kidnappings must be stopped. Kyrgyzstan had accepted 150 recommendations.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

384. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, of the 196 recommendations received, Kyrgyzstan had accepted 150 recommendations and noted 46.

385. The delegation of Kyrgyzstan expressed sincere appreciation to the Human Rights Council and all States for the constructive dialogue and for their valuable observations and recommendations during the review. The dialogue and the adoption of the national report would contribute to the further implementation of national policies to fulfil the State’s international human rights obligations.

386. In conclusion, the delegation emphasized the firm intention of Kyrgyzstan to improve its human rights situation further and to ensure the compliance of its national legislation with the letter and spirit of international law. That process was complex and required systematic efforts, as well as the cooperation and input of all political actors, civil society representatives and government institutions. The Government would continue to maintain a close and constructive dialogue with OHCHR and the Human Rights Council.

Kiribati

387. The review of Kiribati was held on 19 January 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Kiribati in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KIR/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KIR/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KIR/3).

388. At its 41st meeting, on 1 July 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Kiribati (see sect. C below).

389. The outcome of the review of Kiribati comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/5), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues

that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/29/5/Add.1).

1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

390. On 30 June, Kiribati sent a document indicating its position on the pending recommendations and a letter informing the Human Rights Council that, unfortunately, it was not in a position to send a representative to that session of the Council. The Council therefore proceeded with the consideration of the outcome of Kiribati based on the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review of Kiribati (A/HRC/29/5 and A/HRC/29/5/Add.1). The report and its addendum, together with the additional information provided by Kiribati, constituted the outcome of the review.

391. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council read a letter from the representative of Kiribati in which the State thanked the Council for rescheduling the consideration of the outcome of the universal periodic review of Kiribati from 24 June 2015 to 1 July. Kiribati stated that the process of consultation on the review outcome was important if it was to foster national ownership of those outcomes. For a small nation like Kiribati, dispersed over 3.5 million square kilometres of ocean, the extensive consultation had been challenging and had taken longer than expected. The State therefore welcomed the Council's understanding and decision to reschedule the consideration of its review. With regard to the recommendations it had received, Kiribati had accepted 70, considered 32 and ultimately noted 13. Of the 32 recommendations that it had considered, Kiribati stated that it would continue to work with key stakeholders, including other government ministries and departments, to build capacity and provide the resources necessary with a view to considering the acceptance of such recommendations in the future.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

392. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kiribati, five delegations made statements.

393. China was pleased with the constructive participation of Kiribati in the review and its acceptance of most of the recommendations. It commended the State for having accepted the recommendations of China on increasing investing in education, improving enrolment and the quality of education, emphasizing the impact of climate change and cooperating actively with the international community to address climate change. China noted with appreciation the efforts made by Kiribati to increase employment, empower women and protect disabled children, refugees and migrants. China supported the adoption of the report of the Working Group on Kiribati.

394. Cuba noted with satisfaction the adoption by Kiribati of laws protecting childhood, youth, the family and education, together with the establishment of the Ministry for Women, Youth and Social Affairs. Free access to health services and international cooperation agreements in favour of the population of Kiribati were other major achievements. Cuba was pleased to note that its recommendation on the follow-up on the national plan for development with a view to achieving increased social protection and gender equality had been accepted by Kiribati, and it recommended the adoption of the report of the Working Group on Kiribati.

395. Ghana noted with satisfaction the progress that Kiribati had made in implementing a number of recommendations from its first review. It lauded the State for having passed the Family Peace Act, the Education Act, and the Children, Young People and Family Welfare Act, and the constitutional amendment establishing the Ministry for Women, Youth and Social Affairs. It encouraged Kiribati to further strengthen its commitment to promote human rights. It recommended the adoption of the report of the Working Group on Kiribati.

396. Sierra Leone was pleased with the efforts that Kiribati had made to address the recommendations from its previous review; however, it had hoped that the State would have provided more detailed information on its intentions with regard to the recommendations. It referred to the State's expressed intention to continue to work with

human rights mechanisms and its vulnerability to climate change. It commended Kiribati for having created a coalition of the nations most affected by climate change and for having called for international assistance to address climate change. Sierra Leone supported the adoption of the report of the Working Group on Kiribati.

397. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela underlined the fact that Kiribati had achieved remarkable progress in the field of human rights, such as the passing of the Children, Young People and Family Welfare Act of 2013 and the Education Act of 2013 and the creation of the Ministry for Women, Youth and Social Affairs. Despite economic difficulties, Kiribati had shown openness to constructive dialogue and its commitment to achieve the objectives proposed in its second review. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela therefore recommended the adoption of the report of the Working Group on Kiribati.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

398. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kiribati, two other stakeholders made statements.

399. Franciscans International was pleased with the commitment of Kiribati to combat climate change, and referred to the need for urgent global action to address climate change. It welcomed the recommendations that Kiribati had received, especially those related to climate change. It called upon States Members of the United Nations to put the countries most affected by climate change at the centre of consideration in the upcoming negotiations in Paris and insisted on a human rights based approach. It recommended that urgent action be taken to tackle climate change, for example by establishing a United Nations special procedure.

400. The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) welcomed the passing of the Child, Young People and Family Welfare Act and policy and the Family Peace Act. It urged Kiribati to implement those laws through appropriate resource allocation. It referred to measures to reduce violence against women and children and highlighted the need to reduce newborn deaths through a series of measures. It also urged the State to ratify the optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child and to submit its overdue periodic report to the Committee on the Rights of the Child, and it offered its technical support to that end.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

401. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 115 recommendations received, Kiribati had supported 70 recommendations and noted 45.

Guinea

402. The review of Guinea was held on 20 January 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Guinea in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GIN/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GIN/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GIN/3).

403. At its 26th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Guinea (see sect. C below).

404. The outcome of the review of Guinea comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/6), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/29/6/Add.1).

1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

405. The delegation of Guinea stated that States Members of the Human Rights Council had supported Guinea by making positive contributions and useful recommendations.

406. Guinea had received 194 recommendations, not only to consolidate its gains but also to continue the reforms necessary to build a State of law respectful of human rights.

407. In January, Guinea had decided to delay taking a stance on all the recommendations until it had consulted with institutional, political and social partners in the country. A large information and awareness-raising campaign on the recommendations had been launched to make stakeholders more familiar with them.

408. After the Government had debated the recommendations, it communicated its position to civil society organizations during a workshop. On that occasion, those organizations had promised to assist the authorities in the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

409. A committee on the follow-up to and implementation of the recommendations had been established. That committee was composed of representatives of civil society and members of the interministerial committee in charge of drafting reports for human rights mechanisms.

410. Regarding the recommendations on the trial relating to the events of 28 September 2009, the Government was committed to ensuring justice for the victims through a fair and equitable trial.

411. Reforms of the security and justice sectors would be pursued in order to make justice credible and defence forces respectful of human rights.

412. With regard to the recommendations on gender equality and fighting violence against women, the Government was committed to continuing its social and institutional reforms so that women were protected against all forms of violence.

413. The delegation reiterated the Government's commitment to respect civil and political rights and to enable every Guinean citizen to enjoy them fully, particularly in the view of the forthcoming elections. It was important to consolidate and expand those rights.

414. With regard to the reconciliation process, the Government had launched national consultations in order to define a coherent and appropriate approach to the inclusive and consensual reconciliation process.

415. Regarding the national human rights institution, the authorities continued their efforts to make the institution operational and in conformity with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (Paris Principles).

416. In the light of the international crisis and of the health crisis caused by the outbreak of Ebola virus disease, Guinea needed the support of the international community in order to guarantee its citizens a dignified life.

417. Due to the difficult political, social and cultural context, characterized by strong resistance to change, the Government had noted the recommendations on the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons and on the abolition of the death penalty. That position was not definitive since the role of a government was to ensure the enjoyment of the rights of all citizens. Awareness-raising campaigns on the death penalty would be pursued and a national debate would be launched. The delegation highlighted the fact that

the revision of the Penal Code, which had already proposed the abolition of the death penalty, had been drafted and would be submitted to the National Assembly.

418. The challenges in the field of human rights in the country were obvious, as was the complex nature of the issue, given the weakness of Guinean public institutions and sociocultural resistance. However, the fight for human rights was imperative. The delegation referred to the importance of public education, training and awareness-raising in that context.

419. In conclusion, the delegation reiterated its call to the international community to support Guinea and its people.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

420. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Guinea, 19 delegations made statements.

421. The Niger commended Guinea for the creation of the Ministry for Human Rights and Civil Liberties, the establishment of a national human rights commission and the adoption of several measures in the context of gender promotion and the fight against discrimination and violence.

422. Rwanda was pleased that Guinea had accepted a considerable number of recommendations, in particular one made by Rwanda on accelerating the process of ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

423. Senegal commended Guinea for having invited special procedure mandate holders, for having established an independent national human rights commission and for having ratified several optional protocols. The State was committed to continuing its reforms in the field of justice, including through the creation of a steering committee for justice reform. The authorities were committed to ensuring women and vulnerable people the full enjoyment of their rights.

424. Sierra Leone referred to the State's establishment of the new and unprecedented Ministry for Human Rights and Civil Liberties. Because Guinea was an Ebola-affected country, it was understandable that the Government had focused on the health crisis, addressing issues of stigmatization and dealing with the aftermath of the impact of Ebola virus disease. It called for further technical, political and institutional assistance to help Guinea to meet its human rights commitments and obligations.

425. South Africa welcomed the acceptance by Guinea of a large number of recommendations. It welcomed the strides the State had made, including its recent efforts to give a new impetus to economic and social development in the country and its efforts in the fight against Ebola virus disease. It encouraged Guinea to continue to tackle the constraints and challenges it faced, including in the context of the democratization process and the establishment of reforms.

426. The Sudan was pleased with the steps Guinea had taken to promote and protect the human rights of its citizens, especially after the outbreak of Ebola virus disease in 2014. It wished the State success in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

427. Togo commended Guinea for the remarkable progress it had made in the implementation of the recommendations from its first review. It noted with appreciation that the Government had accepted most of the recommendations from its second review, including those made by Togo. Lastly, it invited the international community to assist Guinea in the implementation of the recommendations.

428. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela highlighted the fact that Guinea had created an interministerial task force aimed at ensuring national policies in favour of the family and against gender violence. It acknowledged the efforts made by the Government to comply with its human rights commitments and to achieve its objectives, as reflected in its second review. It encouraged Guinea to continue to strengthen its social policies in order to further improve the living conditions of its people.

429. Albania commended Guinea for the implementation of the recommendations, in particular the creation of the Ministry for Human Rights and Civil Liberties. It also welcomed the State's significant success in the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women and vulnerable people and the reforms it had made to ensure the full enjoyment of their rights.

430. Botswana commended Guinea for its continued efforts to build a democratic State with efficient public institutions. It also applauded the State for having taken steps to address human rights violations and to end impunity. It was pleased that Guinea had acceded to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict.

431. Burkina Faso stated that, despite the difficult political, economic and social context exacerbated by Ebola virus disease, Guinea had made considerable efforts to build a society respectful of human rights. It wished the State every success in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted and called upon the international community to provide the State with assistance.

432. China commended Guinea for its decision to accept the majority of the recommendations, including the one made by China. It urged the State to continue its efforts to improve human rights and public health, to correct prejudices against women, to make efforts to eradicate old, unhealthy practices and to enhance its capacity to deal with Ebola virus disease and other major public health incidents.

433. Côte d'Ivoire commended Guinea for having accepted a large number of recommendations. While encouraging the Government to consolidate its achievements and to continue its efforts to face the remaining challenges, it called upon the international community to continue to provide Guinea with technical and financial assistance.

434. Cuba recognized the efforts made by Guinea to reduce hunger and poverty and reiterated the importance of ensuring that the international community supported the Government's actions to improve the access of the population to health care. It was important to increase the cooperation and assistance of the international community to support the State's efforts to strengthen its health infrastructure, including to combat the threat of Ebola. Cuba welcomed the acceptance by Guinea of the recommendations that it had made.

435. Djibouti encouraged Guinea to continue its human rights reforms in order to consolidate its institutions based on democratic principles. It also recommended that the international community and OHCHR support Guinea in the implementation of the recommendations.

436. Ethiopia thanked Guinea for having accepted a significant number of recommendations, including those made by Ethiopia on continuing to provide effective training to build the capacity of the armed forces, the police and other security forces on human rights, especially those of vulnerable groups, and on strengthening its efforts to combat traditional practices that were harmful to women and children, particularly female genital mutilation.

437. Ghana commended Guinea for the appointment of the Minister for Human Rights and Civil Liberties and for the ongoing reforms in the areas of justice and elections. It urged the Government to consider the effective implementation of the recommendations seriously, particularly those on the ratification of the core United Nations human rights treaties and those on the establishment of an independent national human rights commission in conformity with the Paris Principles. The establishment in Accra of the United Nations Mission for Ebola Emergency Response in support of the fight against Ebola virus disease in Guinea and other West African States reflected the commitment of the international community to assist the people of Guinea in the enjoyment of their right to health.

438. Kuwait welcomed the commitment of Guinea to the human rights conventions and the universal periodic review, which was shown through the implementation of national policies aimed at improving the standard of living of its population. It commended the State

for its legislative amendments that catered to human rights on all fronts, in order to protect all vulnerable groups and to ensure their enjoyment of human rights.

439. Mali welcomed the efforts made by Guinea to implement the recommendations it had accepted in its first review, particularly in the areas of education, justice and security. It encouraged the authorities to increase its actions to promote the well-being of all Guinean citizens. It called upon the international community to provide Guinea with technical assistance in implementing the reforms the State had begun.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

440. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Guinea four other stakeholders made statements.

441. Human Rights Watch referred to the progress the Government had made since 2010 to address serious human rights problems. It commended the authorities for having reduced abuses by security forces and for having made some gains in addressing long-standing impunity. Advances in addressing impunity included the opening by the judiciary of investigations into the killings of a large number of political demonstrators in 2007 and in 2013, the massacre and rapes of opposition supporters in 2009, and the killings in the village of Zoghota in 2012. However, progress in most of those cases had been hampered by inadequate resources and the failure of members of security forces to respond to judicial summons. It urged Guinea to intensify its efforts to ensure justice in those and other similar cases. Furthermore, it was concerned about the State's failure to provide equal protection to citizens of all ethnic groups, notably those supporting the political opposition, in advance of the 2015 elections. Human Rights Watch encouraged Guinea to implement swiftly the recommendations on ensuring investigations into violations by security forces. It was encouraged by the apparent reduction in cases of torture, the establishment of the Superior Council of Judges and the revision of key legal texts. However, striking deficiencies in the judiciary continued to undermine the rule of law. Prison detention centres operated below international standards and the cour d'assises failed to meet regularly. Lastly, Human Rights Watch supported the recommendations on the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

442. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues and l'Organisation guinéenne de défense des droits de l'homme et du citoyen commended Guinea for having accepted a large number of recommendations and for the commitment of the Ministry for Human Rights and Civil Liberties in that regard. They welcomed the measures taken to bring national legislation in line with the international conventions to which Guinea was a State party and commended Guinea for having criminalized female genital mutilation. They called upon Guinea to prohibit polygamy, criminalize conjugal rape and decriminalize abortion. Regarding military justice, they called upon the Government to review the draft Code and bring it in line with international standards. Concerning the fight against impunity, they welcomed the significant progress made with regard to the massacre of 28 September 2009 and hoped that a trial would take place in 2016. Concerned by the fact that the previous head of the junta, Moussa Dadis Camara, was running for presidential election, they stated that nobody presumed responsible was exempt from the obligation to answer for his actions in court.

443. Amnesty International was pleased with the efforts made by Guinea to protect and promote human rights despite the challenging conditions brought on by Ebola virus disease. It welcomed the acceptance by Guinea of key recommendations, including those on protecting the right to freedom of expression and assembly and on ensuring that perpetrators of human rights violations were brought to justice. However, it was extremely concerned about the ongoing violations committed by security forces ahead of the presidential elections in 2015. According to Amnesty International, over the past decade, at least 357 people had died and thousands had been wounded during demonstrations, and the security forces had been responsible for the vast majority of those violations. It urged the authorities to act immediately and to implement the recommendations the State had accepted to end the excessive use of force and impunity. That would include amending the laws that restricted the right to freedom of expression and assembly. It reiterated its call for

an independent complaints mechanism to investigate human rights violations by police officers. Lastly, it regretted the reluctance by Guinea to accept the recommendations on abolishing the death penalty and on decriminalizing same-sex sexual activities.

444. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme congratulated Guinea on its acceptance of the majority of the recommendations. It commended the State for its efforts to reform the justice and security sectors, and the penal and mining codes, and its efforts to combat drug trafficking and corruption. The opening of an OHCHR office and the establishment of the Ministry for Human Rights and Civil Liberties were also commended. However, it was concerned that political violence was becoming increasingly prevalent, and that it had given rise to social tensions, ethnic hatred and increased racism. It was concerned about hate speech made by extremist groups and some politicians in the media and on the web; those actions constituted a threat to peace, security and national cohesion. Moreover, despite the prosecution of some of those who had ordered the massacre of 28 September 2009, the main perpetrators of those crimes enjoyed impunity. It urged Guinea to respect the right to peaceful demonstration, to guarantee the security and freedom of the press, to step up its cooperation with the International Criminal Court, to combat impunity and to improve prison conditions.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

445. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, of the 194 recommendations received, Guinea had accepted 179 recommendations and noted 15.

446. The delegation of Guinea once again thanked the States Members of the Human Rights Council for their positive contributions.

447. The issue of human rights could not be understood without taking into account the reality of the Guinean institutions. The State was faced with a huge challenge in upholding democratic principles while at the same time building institutions that were able to deal with its constitutional and international obligations.

448. Guinea must work on structural challenges and on the situation that promoted violence, in particular against the most vulnerable people, including women and children.

449. In the struggle between modernity and tradition, Guinea had to fight against powers on the fringes that had a lot of social power when dealing with fragile public institutions.

450. The State had to take stock of its history through a process of reconciliation and transitional justice. It was necessary to invest heavily in the areas of education and training in order to build a society respectful of human rights. It was important to reverse the trend of violence and to fight against impunity.

451. To conclude, the delegation once again called upon the international community to assist Guinea to ensure that all its citizens enjoyed their rights, and reiterated the State's commitment to implement the recommendations from its review.

Lao People's Democratic Republic

452. The review of the Lao People's Democratic Republic was held on 20 January 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by the Lao People's Democratic Republic in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/LAO/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/LAO/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/LAO/3).

453. At its 27th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Lao People's Democratic Republic (see sect. C below).

454. The outcome of the review of the Lao People's Democratic Republic comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/7), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/29/7/Add.1).

1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

455. The delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic stated that the Government attached importance to the universal periodic review process as a useful mechanism to provide States with a good opportunity to highlight their efforts to promote human rights in their respective countries.

456. The delegation expressed its sincere thanks to the other delegations for their positive comments on the achievements in the national socioeconomic development of the Lao People's Democratic Republic and on its efforts to advance human rights for the multi-ethnic people of the country.

457. After its review, the National Steering Committee on Human Rights, comprising the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and key agencies, conducted debriefings, reviews and consultations with government agencies, mass organizations, representatives of the diplomatic community, civil society organizations, international non-governmental organizations on the review outcome and recommendations.

458. All the inputs, views and comments from the government agencies and other stakeholders were taken into account in the State's consideration of the recommendations. The ongoing process of amending the Constitution and the Penal Code, and the preparation of the eighth five-year national socioeconomic development plan (2016–2020) and other national action plans had economic, social, cultural, civil and political rights dimensions, including the recommendations from the universal periodic review.

459. Of the 196 recommendations received, the Lao People's Democratic Republic had fully supported 116 of them and noted the remainder. The noted recommendations had not enjoyed the full support of the State because some recommendations could be only partially supported or they were not in line with the State's Constitution and laws, they did not reflect the real situation in the country or the State had not been prepared to implement them due to certain factors, including a lack of human and financial resources. Most of the noted recommendations had been repetitive or had overlapped each other and could be clustered into fewer than 20 recommendations.

460. The Lao People's Democratic Republic would take into account those noted recommendations in its efforts to promote and protect human rights in the country.

461. The Lao People's Democratic Republic was a party to seven core human rights conventions, namely the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography. It was considering ratifying the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. Regarding other conventions and optional protocols, including the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, it

needed more time to study and create the conditions necessary for future accession. On the optional protocols allowing individual complaints, the State needed to concentrate its efforts on implementing the conventions it had ratified as its first priority, which included strengthening national procedures to address complaints.

462. The Lao People's Democratic Republic would extend an invitation to the Special Rapporteur on promoting the realization of the right to adequate housing and would maintain regular dialogue with other special rapporteurs. Invitations to other special rapporteurs would be studied and considered by the Government on a case-by-case basis.

463. Although the death penalty existed in the Penal Law, no death sentence had been carried out for a long time. Furthermore, the death penalty was not applicable to minors under 18 years of age or to pregnant women. While it was determined to consider revising the Penal Law so as to be fully in line with its obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Lao People's Democratic Republic needed more time to study further the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant.

464. All citizens had the right to express their opinions and to make comments on the State administration. No laws allowed for the suppression or obstruction of the exercise of fundamental rights. In 2014, the Government had issued a decree on Internet information management in order to manage and facilitate Internet use, which provided a legal basis for the enjoyment of the rights to access information and to the expression of opinion in a more responsible manner. The law on the mass media, the decrees on associations, foundations and international non-governmental organizations, and the guidelines on the implementation of the decree on international non-governmental organizations should provide a legal framework for the activities of those organizations.

465. Regarding the case of missing person Sombath Somphone, the Lao People's Democratic Republic emphasized the fact that, during its review in January 2015, the head of the delegation had provided clarification and explanations regarding that case. The authorities concerned had conducted and were still seriously conducting an investigation and would continue to do so to determine the truth and to bring the perpetrators to justice in accordance with the law. A missing person case was complex and difficult to solve quickly, and required more time.

466. The delegation expressed its sincere appreciation to the international community for its valuable support in the State's development and for the contributions, including through the universal periodic review process, to the State's efforts to better promote and protect human rights in the country.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

467. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, 17 delegations made statements.

468. Burkina Faso encouraged the Lao People's Democratic Republic to implement the recommendations it had accepted and hoped that support from the international community would enable the authorities to fulfil the commitments the State had made as a follow-up to its second review.

469. Cambodia stated that the Lao People's Democratic Republic had accepted the large majority of the recommendations made during its review, including two recommendations by Cambodia on efforts to promote and protect the cultural rights of the Lao people and on the implementation of the international human rights treaties to which it was a party and of the ASEAN Human Rights Declaration.

470. China welcomed the constructive engagement of the Lao People's Democratic Republic with the universal periodic review and its decision to accept most of the recommendations. It was pleased that the State had accepted the recommendations made by China on increasing input in education, on further raising the enrolment rate of girls, and on using legislation, policies, education and other means to enhance women's status in society.

471. Cuba was pleased with the work that the Government had done to reduce poverty. It commended the State for its public health and education reforms, which had improved health and education services for the whole population. Cuba was of the view that, by implementing its national, social and economic development policies, the State would be able to lift its people out of poverty.

472. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea was pleased with the commitments and positive efforts made by the Government to promote and protect human rights, which would contribute to the enjoyment by all people of their human rights, including economic, social and cultural rights, and particularly the right to development.

473. Djibouti referred to the great importance the Lao People's Democratic Republic had placed on the recommendations from its review of 2010, as evidenced by the subsequent distribution of materials that had been translated into the Lao language among government officials, stakeholders and the general public. Djibouti greatly appreciated the fact that the Government had accepted its recommendations from the review of 2010.

474. Egypt welcomed the efforts made by the State to promote human rights through positive policy and legislative reforms, such as the five-year plan, to strengthen anti-corruption measures and to step up the progress achieved in the eradication of extreme poverty. It reiterated its call upon the international community to assist the Government financially and technically in addressing the challenges of unexploded ordnances.

475. Kuwait commended the Lao People's Democratic Republic for its achievements in the field of human rights, despite obstacles and challenges, including underdeveloped infrastructure, natural disasters, the spread of disease, a lack of human resources and budgetary constraints. The State was focused on economic and social development and the fight against poverty. Kuwait encouraged the State in its continued efforts to enhance the right to work, education and health.

476. India commended the Lao People's Democratic Republic for its constructive participation in the universal periodic review mechanism and its acceptance of as many as 116 recommendations, including two of the three recommendations made by India. It believed that the State would continue its efforts to implement the accepted recommendations in the coming years.

477. Indonesia commended the Government for its continued commitment to advance the promotion and protection of human rights, demonstrated through its acceptance of many of the recommendations from its the second review. It was particularly pleased with the acceptance by the State of its own recommendation to speed up the drafting of the anti-human trafficking law.

478. Viet Nam was pleased with the continued efforts made by the Lao People's Democratic Republic and congratulated the State on its significant achievements in the promotion and protection of human rights. It commended the State on the acceptance of and commitment to implement many of the recommendations, including those made by Viet Nam. It reaffirmed that it would continue to work closely with the State and contribute to the national development of socioeconomic conditions in the country.

479. Malaysia noted with satisfaction that the Lao People's Democratic Republic had accepted its recommendations on the eradication of poverty and on capacity-building programmes for law enforcement officials dealing with issues relating to trafficking in persons. It commended the State for its continuous efforts to promote and protect human rights by strengthening the rule of law, governance and public administration.

480. Myanmar referred to the State's constructive participation in the universal periodic review mechanism and its acceptance of a large number of recommendations, including the three made by Myanmar.

481. The Philippines referred to the constructive engagement of the Lao People's Democratic Republic in the universal periodic review process. It was pleased that the State had taken measures to improve further the normative and institutional framework for the promotion and protection of human rights, such as implementing the master plan on the development of the rule of law.

482. Sierra Leone stated that many of the recommendations made during the second review of the Lao People's Democratic Republic had been integrated into national norms and policies, and into the national socioeconomic development plan for 2011–2015. It was hopeful that further recommendations, such as those relating to the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, would enjoy the support of the Government with a view to its future implementation.

483. Singapore welcomed the State's commitment to continue to investigate seriously the disappearance of Sombath Somphone. It hoped that the relevant authorities would resolve the case expeditiously and bring much needed relief to his family. Singapore remained committed to continuing cooperation with the State in order to attain its development goals.

484. Sri Lanka commended the Lao People's Democratic Republic on the progress it had made in promoting human rights. It referred to the adoption of the decree on persons with disabilities of 2014 and the allocation of approximately 75 million dollars for the development of the national prison system. It further commended the State for its efforts to ensure the rule of law and to reduce poverty.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

485. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, six other stakeholders made statements.

486. The Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development regretted that the Government had noted the recommendations on the protection of human rights defenders and on the freedom of peaceful assembly, association and expression. Despite having committed at its first review to work towards having an enabling environment for civil society and human rights defenders, the Government continued to restrict the activities of those groups. An example of such a restriction was the newly introduced decree on information management, which criminalized criticism of the Government online. Furthermore, it deplored the Government's unwillingness to investigate the enforced disappearance of Sombath Somphone effectively and reiterated its call for an immediate thorough and impartial investigation into his disappearance. It was concerned that existing laws continued to impose severe restrictions on the freedom of the media. It called upon the Government to set out a comprehensive action plan for the implementation of the recommendations.

487. Human Rights Watch stated that the review of the Lao People's Democratic Republic showed the serious gap between the Government's statements of intent and associated plans, laws and decrees, and the minimal progress made on human rights in the country since its previous review in 2010. The declaration that the State was considering ratifying the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance contrasted significantly with its failure to conduct a credible and impartial investigation into the enforced disappearance of renowned civil society leader Sombath Somphone. While the Government had claimed that it was open to views or suggestions to help the investigation, it had turned down multiple offers of technical assistance from other States. In addition, the Government had not provided an explanation as to why it had passed a decree on Internet information management, which contained provisions that accepted limits on free speech. The Lao People's Democratic Republic had failed to accept those recommendations that represented genuine, concrete commitments to progress.

488. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues regretted that the Lao People's Democratic Republic had not supported a number of recommendations in key human rights areas. It encouraged the Government to implement the recommendations relating to cases of arbitrary arrest and enforced disappearance. The judicial authorities should conduct an independent and thorough investigation into the disappearance of renowned civil society advocate Sombath Somphone with help from the international community. The Government had the obligation to respect the rights to the freedom of expression and the freedom of the media, including on the Internet, and since the adoption of Decree 327 in September 2014, the authorities had harassed and arrested a number of people for legitimate criticism of the Government. It demanded that the Government

establish an independent national human rights institution in conformity with the Paris Principles.

489. United Nations Watch was gravely concerned in particular about the numerous enforced disappearances and the continuing restrictions on the freedom of speech, association and peaceful assembly. It regretted that the Government had not supported the recommendations on conducting an independent and in-depth investigation into cases of disappearance or on amending the Prime Minister's Internet decree. It referred to the disappearance of Sombath Somphone, stating that the Government had failed to abide by its international obligation of transparency and accountability. It urged the Government to investigate all cases of enforced disappearance and to put an end to such practices. It was also concerned about the fact that the Government had adopted an extreme Internet decree restricting the freedom of speech in a manner that exceeded the limits set forth in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

490. The Jubilee Campaign referred to some improvements in the protection of the freedom of religion or belief, including a reduction in the number of long-term Christian prisoners of conscience. It was concerned, however, about the fact that religious minorities continued to be subjected to discrimination and harassment, including arrest, detention, eviction, fines and the forcible renunciation of their faith. It urged the Government to release all prisoners detained on religious grounds and, in cases of wrongful detention, to ensure full investigations. It also requested the Government to amend its legislation so that it conformed to the international agreements to which the Lao People's Democratic Republic was a party. The Government was reviewing Decree 92 on the governance and protection of religious activity, which was discriminatory and open to abuse as it used vague terms prohibiting religious believers from "dividing ethnic groups or religions in order to cause social disorder".

491. Amnesty International regretted that the Government had not supported many of the recommendations on the case of the enforced disappearance of Sombath Somphone, while pointing out that the Government had committed to undertaking a thorough and impartial investigation into his disappearance. It also pointed out that the Government was considering ratifying the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. However, it regretted that the Government had rejected calls to extend a standing invitation to special procedures and specifically a visit by the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances. In addition, the decision by the authorities to reject offers of technical assistance in the search for Sombath Somphone signalled a lack of genuine commitment to uphold the rule of law and to protect the rights of its citizens.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

492. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, of the 196 recommendations received, the Lao People's Democratic Republic had supported 116 recommendations and noted 77. Detailed clarifications were provided on three recommendations, along with an explanation on which part of those recommendations had been supported and which part had been noted.

493. The delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic reiterated its sincere thanks to the other delegations for their positive assessment of the State's achievements in the area of human rights and for their understanding of the constraints and challenges faced by the country in its national efforts to promote and protect human rights of the Lao people.

494. The Lao People's Democratic Republic had gained a lot of experience from the universal periodic review process, which had provided the State with an opportunity to move forward in its endeavours to promote and protect human rights at the national level and to cooperate further and share best practices with the international community in order to advance the cause of human rights globally.

495. As a State Member of the United Nations, the Lao People's Democratic Republic was committed to realizing the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations in the promotion and protection of human rights through the implementation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the human rights treaties to which it was a party and the universal periodic

review recommendations it had accepted. It looked forward to continuing cooperation and an exchange of experiences on human rights with the international community, including by implementing the recommendations.

Spain

496. The review of Spain was held on 21 January 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national reports submitted by Spain in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/ESP/1 and Corr.1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/ESP/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/ESP/3).

497. At its 27th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Spain (see sect. C below).

498. The outcome of the review of Spain comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/8), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/29/8/Add.1 and Corr.1).

1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

499. The delegation of Spain reiterated its gratitude to the States that had participated in the second review of Spain. It also recognized the role played by civil society and by the national human rights institution, the Defensor del Pueblo, in that exercise. The involvement of all stakeholders ensured that the universal periodic review would have the maximum impact on the promotion and protection of human rights in Spain.

500. Several ministries had analysed in detail the 189 recommendations received by Spain. Furthermore, in March 2015, the Government had held a productive meeting with civil society to hear the views of non-governmental organizations.

501. The addendum to the report of the Working Group submitted by Spain was the result of lengthy discussions between the ministries concerned that were carried out to ensure that the Government's position regarding each recommendation would be realistic and feasible. To that end, and following the model used by other States, Spain had classified the recommendations into three groups: accepted, partially accepted and noted.

502. Initially, the category of partially accepted recommendations was used for recommendations (a) that Spain had agreed with in spirit but could implement only partially, (b) that Spain was not in agreement with regarding the best way to implement them, or (c) part of which Spain could accept and the rest of which it could note. The Government had decided to reconsider its position on most of the partially accepted recommendations so that OHCHR could collect the exact number of recommendations supported and noted.

503. As a result of that review, Spain had accepted 169 recommendations, of which it had partially accepted five (131.45, 131.59, 131.61, 131.180 and 131.187). The State considered recommendation 131.45 to be implemented and did not feel that there was a need to adopt a comprehensive law on the subject. With regard to recommendations 131.59 and 131.61, Spain considered that the parts on ensuring the immediate access of detainees to legal assistance had already been implemented. Regarding recommendation 131.180, it

considered the part on amending the law on public security to be already implemented, since that norm, comprising an explicit provision on the respect of human rights law and obligations, had been reviewed during the latest parliamentary debate. With regard to recommendation 131.187, Spain considered that it already observed the principle of the best interest of the child through the adoption of a protocol concerning unaccompanied minors.

504. Spain had noted 20 recommendations, namely the 15 mentioned in a corrigendum to its addendum to the report of the Working Group and recommendations 131.37, 131.100, 131.184, 131.185 and 131.186.

505. The delegation would prepare the corrigendum to reflect the aforementioned changes with the assistance of the secretariat. Furthermore, the Government, as proof of its commitment to the process and its transparency, had prepared an annex explaining in detail the State's position on each recommendation; it would provide the secretariat with the annex in both Spanish and English.

506. Some of the recommendations received during its second review would have a particular impact on the promotion and protection of human rights in Spain.

507. The Government had accepted the recommendation on establishing an interministerial commission for human rights, which would, among other important responsibilities, develop indicators in the area of human rights that could improve those already existing in Spain, as also recommended during the review. The Spanish authorities had already started consultations on the ideal structure of the commission.

508. The delegation referred to the advanced legislation and measures adopted in the fight against discrimination, racism and xenophobia. Current legislation implied high standards of protection and there was no need for a comprehensive anti-discrimination law. Therefore, the Government could not accept the recommendations in that regard. The goal of the Government was to implement the above-mentioned legislation, while making all the necessary adjustments when needed.

509. Some recommendations addressed domestic violence figures. In that regard, Spain was one of the few countries in the world with a system of data collection on domestic violence, which was considered to be a model by other States. The delegation reiterated that Spain had a zero-tolerance policy vis-à-vis domestic violence with a wide range of measures, including legal, administrative, judicial, education and awareness-raising campaigns.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

510. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Spain, 16 delegations made statements.

511. Sierra Leone welcomed the delegation of Spain and thanked it for its oral update. It commended the State for its ongoing efforts to address hate crimes, discrimination and human trafficking effectively. It applauded the State for its ongoing reform of the Penal Code and its efforts to criminalize forced marriage. It also commended Spain for its intention to create a new national plan on human rights and encouraged it to enact national laws based on the recommendations it had accepted, and to continue to engage actively with the various human rights mechanisms.

512. The Sudan welcomed the delegation of Spain and thanked it for its presentation and oral update. The Sudan commended Spain for its acceptance of most of the recommendations, including one of the two recommendations made by the Sudan. It wished the Government and the people of Spain every success.

513. Togo thanked the delegation for the information it had shared during the adoption of the report. It referred to the commitment of Spain to implement the recommendations it had accepted, despite the severe constraints caused by the economic and financial crisis that had spared no country.

514. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela stated that Spain had shown great willingness during its review to provide information, which had allowed for a positive interactive dialogue on the State's achievements and challenges in the field of human rights. Spain had ratified most of the international human rights treaties and adopted the necessary legislative framework for their implementation. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was pleased with the efforts Spain had made to overcome obstacles to implement the recommendations it had accepted during its first review.

515. Albania welcomed the acceptance by Spain of most of the recommendations and commended the State for its commitment to implement those recommendations. It thanked Spain for having accepted all of the recommendations made by Albania. It encouraged the State's further efforts to implement the strategic plan on equal opportunities, the procedures for identifying trafficking victims and addressing the special needs of child victims, and the national strategy for the social inclusion of the Roma community. It also commended Spain for its high regard and appreciation for the suggestions from civil society.

516. Algeria welcomed the acceptance by Spain of the two recommendations it had made on the impact of austerity measures on the most vulnerable social groups and on the access of children belonging to vulnerable groups to health and education. It encouraged the State to continue its efforts to protect the rights of migrant workers, especially in the context of the recurring migrant tragedies in the Mediterranean and elsewhere. That was why the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families was highly recommended.

517. Angola was pleased that Spain had accepted many of the recommendations it had received, including one made by Angola. It welcomed the cooperation of the Government with the human rights mechanisms, the reform of the Penal Code and the adoption of the second strategic plan on citizenship and integration. Angola noted with satisfaction the qualitative improvements in the education system, which had contributed to the reduction of gender violence.

518. Bulgaria welcomed the adoption of the outcome of the review of Spain and was pleased that the State prioritized the promotion and protection of human rights. It was confident that Spain would further improve coordination between various national administrations and increase the effectiveness of the human rights office. It thanked the State for its commitment to continue to mainstream gender equality policies and to implement the law on comprehensive protection measures against gender-based violence.

519. Burkina Faso was pleased with the commitment of Spain to the promotion and protection of human rights, which was shown particularly in its exemplary cooperation with OHCHR and the Human Rights Council. Burkina Faso was also pleased that Spain had accepted many of the recommendations it had received and welcomed the commitment of the Government to submit a midterm report on their implementation.

520. Chad commended Spain for having ratified most of the human rights instruments, having submitted its reports to treaty bodies, having extended a standing invitation to the special procedures and having submitted a midterm report in 2012.

521. China welcomed the constructive engagement of Spain with the universal periodic review mechanism, and its acceptance of most of the recommendations. It was pleased that Spain had accepted the recommendations made by China on continuing to strengthen the fight against racial discrimination and intolerance, protecting the legal rights of migrants and minority groups and highlighting the employment issue, particularly the reduction of youth unemployment.

522. Côte d'Ivoire thanked Spain for the attention it had given to the recommendations it had received and for the answers it had provided during the adoption of the report. It reiterated its support for the State's efforts to ensure the respect, protection and enjoyment of human rights for all in Spanish territory and wished the State success in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

523. Cuba was pleased that Spain had accepted the two recommendations it had made on resuming measures of protection for those most affected by the economic crisis and on combating violence against women. It encouraged Spain to continue its efforts to address

the negative effects of the crisis comprehensively for the benefit of the most vulnerable. It hoped that the implementation of the recommendations accepted would help to improve the situation of human rights of all residents on Spanish territory.

524. Ghana thanked Spain for its efforts to improve its human rights situation. It was pleased that Spain had accepted most of the recommendations, including those made by Ghana. It referred to the recommendations on ensuring women's participation in decision-making, further combating violence against women and children, and ensuring the right to vote for persons with disabilities. It applauded the State for having accepted the recommendation of Ghana on ending ethnic and racial profiling and racial discrimination, and encouraged Spain to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

525. India thanked the delegation of Spain for the information provided, and its constructive engagement with the universal periodic review mechanism. It noted with satisfaction that Spain had accepted a number of recommendations, including four out of the five recommendations made by India. It was confident that Spain would further strengthen its efforts to implement the recommendations it had accepted.

526. The Islamic Republic of Iran hoped that Spain would implement a number of the recommendations from its review. It highlighted a number of issues of concern in Spain, including discrimination against migrants and ethnic minorities, discrimination against and the ill-treatment of unaccompanied migrant children, and the obstacles faced by immigrant children in access to education and health, the excessive use of force in border areas, the situation of migrant women and the lack of equality before the law for foreigners.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

527. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Spain, 11 other stakeholders made statements.¹⁶

528. The Council of Europe highlighted three challenges facing Spain, namely the deficient asylum procedure and illegal immigration issues, ethnic profiling by law enforcement authorities and unfavourable detention conditions. It welcomed the measures the State had taken to address those issues and commended it for having ratified the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention). It welcomed the signing of the Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Transfer of Sentenced Persons and encouraged Spain to ratify it.

529. The European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages stated that the report it had prepared for the review of Spain detailed cases of language discrimination against speakers of Catalan, Basque, Galician, Aragonese and Asturian. That discrimination included physical abuse by the police and humiliating treatment in the courts. In the report, it was concluded that it was impossible to obtain justice in Spain for that form of hate crime. Such discrimination was systematic and institutionalized. The Bureau recommended that the Government stop such discrimination and it asked the Human Rights Council to call Spain to account so that it would take measures to ensure the end of linguistic discrimination against speakers of indigenous languages.

530. Save the Children International highlighted the acceptance by Spain of a number of recommendations on child poverty and on education. Policy reforms and budget cuts had already had a negative impact on children's rights in the fields of education, health and social services. The sufficient allocation of resources was crucial to allow for an in-depth and comprehensive analysis of the impact of regulations on children's rights. It recommended resorting to the European Social Fund to counterbalance the decrease in the budget for education and the measures of Royal Decree Law 14/2012. It called upon Spain

¹⁶ The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Human Rights Council at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/29thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

to ensure the full access of minority children and migrant children to, and their integration in, the education system.

531. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues urged the Government to guarantee the right to justice, truth and reparations for crimes committed during the civil war and the Franco dictatorship. It asked Spain to ensure access to justice for crimes committed outside the country under the principle of universal justice and recalled that the amendment in 2014 of article 23.4 of the organic law of the judiciary had established requirements of territoriality and nationality contrary to international law. It urged Spain to amend those provisions, recognize the right to truth, justice and reparation for victims of the Franco dictatorship, cooperate with the judicial authorities of Argentina investigating those crimes and repeal the amnesty law.

532. Action Canada for Population and Development was pleased that Spain had accepted the recommendation relating to violence against women and recommendation 131.70 on ensuring sexual rights. It urged the State to guarantee the availability of contraceptives and the provision of sexual and reproductive health services in all autonomous regions and for all women. The implementation of those measures should be accompanied by legislative amendments incorporating sex education in schools from primary to high school; for that purpose the implementation of recommendation 131.141 was crucial. It urged the Government to take steps to ensure sex education in Spain.

533. The International Service for Human Rights was concerned about the new law on public security and the recent reforms of the Penal Code, in force from 1 July 2015, creating offences that criminalized the peaceful exercise of the freedom of expression, assembly and information. Five special rapporteurs had criticized those laws, which introduced vague and imprecise concepts that could be arbitrarily applied. The law on public security de facto authorized the Government to prevent persons from engaging in peaceful protest. The International Service for Human Rights also regretted the reform of the act on legal aid, which would mean that fewer people could benefit from a legal defence.

534. Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco stated that there was a great challenge regarding support for all families receiving the minimum income. The situation of young people was daunting owing to a lack of adequate jobs for the skills they possessed. It welcomed the ratification by Spain of the Istanbul Convention but regretted that there were still a large number of women, mostly illegal immigrants, who were victims of trafficking. It recommended that Spain continue its efforts to combat poverty and malnutrition, to promote and implement youth-friendly policies, and to ensure the holistic protection of women who were victims of trafficking.

535. Amnesty International welcomed the acceptance by Spain of the recommendations on guaranteeing the rights of the freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly. It was concerned that Spanish law did not recognize the right to hold spontaneous demonstrations. Though Spain had accepted the recommendations on ensuring access to effective asylum procedures and on respecting the principle of non-refoulement, it continued to prevent people facing human rights violations from accessing such procedures, especially at the border with Morocco. It called upon Spain to guarantee the right to justice and reparation for the victims of civil war and Francoism (1936–1975) and to criminalize torture and enforced disappearance as separate crimes in the Criminal Code.

536. The Center for Economic and Social Rights stated that the economic crisis had had a greater impact on the immigrant population. From 2012, immigrants in an irregular situation had been excluded from the national health system. Therefore, it supported the recommendations urging the Government to ensure access to the social rights and health of all people living in Spanish territory, without discrimination. To date, there was no change in legislation, beyond government public statements announcing them. It urged the Government to comply with its obligations regarding social rights.

537. Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities) drew attention to the recommendations on implementing the second national plan on human rights, on signing the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, on abolishing summary returns from

Ceuta and Melilla, on increasing the training of public agents to combat racial discrimination, on creating systems for the monitoring and observation of the law on public security, on fundamentally addressing the housing crisis, and on a law against trafficking in persons and on considering international cooperation as a public policy on which all stakeholders should be consulted.

538. Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos regretted that Spain had not accepted the recommendations on urging it to analyse the impact of austerity measures on the enjoyment of economic and social rights. There was a decline in the observance of civil liberties, as the law on public security would come into force in the near future. Lastly, it referred to the foreigners who crossed the fences of Ceuta and Melilla, cities that were like prisons, and regretted that new provisions had come into force severely limiting the right to asylum.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

539. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 189 recommendations received, Spain had supported 164 recommendations, provided additional clarification on another five recommendations, indicating which part of those recommendations it had supported and which part it had noted, and noted 20 recommendations.

540. The delegation of Spain thanked States and civil society for their remarks. It referred to some of the issues mentioned during their statements, recalling that detailed explanations of the national position on all the recommendations received would be available in the annex to the report, accessible on the OHCHR website. Regarding the impact of the economic crisis on the enjoyment of human rights, the Government had carried out regular impact assessments of the measures taken. Furthermore, the national action plan on social inclusion for 2013–2016 included more than 240 measures aimed at addressing the consequences of the crisis for society and specifically for the most vulnerable groups.

541. The International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families had not been ratified by State members of the European Union. However, Spain had at all times sought to guarantee the rights of foreign workers in the country, and its legislation provided ample protection for the rights of migrants in the Constitution, in the act passed in 2000 on the rights and freedoms of foreigners in Spain and their social integration, and in the implementing regulations. Any decision on the Convention would be made in coordination with other States members of the European Union.

542. As for the law on public security, there was no legal limitation to the freedom of expression, assembly and association. Moreover, the right to peaceful demonstration did not require prior authorization, but only a communication to the authorities, which could proscribe such demonstrations in exceptional cases specified by law, or change the time or itinerary, for example, to protect other fundamental rights.

543. The *Gitano* population in Spain was entitled to the same rights as the rest of the population, including working conditions and legal protection. Similarly, the national strategy for the social inclusion of the *Gitano* population for 2012–2020 was aimed at improving access to formal employment, reducing job insecurity and improving the professional qualifications of that vulnerable group.

544. Various ministries were reviewing the draft for the second national plan on human rights in order to adopt a long-term plan that would have a timespan beyond four years and would not be contingent on changes in the legislature. In the meantime, measures from the first national plan on human rights were still being implemented.

545. Spain was committed to presenting a midterm report to strengthen the follow-up to the recommendations it had supported or partially supported.

546. The universal periodic review had been a valuable and constructive exercise that, inter alia, had permitted Spain to assess the perception that other States had about the way in which it worked to promote and protect human rights, and it had encouraged dialogue between civil society and the Government. The delegation reiterated its appreciation for all

the participants in the process and thanked the secretariat for its permanent assistance and the interpreters for the quality of their work.

Lesotho

547. The review of Lesotho was held on 21 January 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Lesotho in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/LSO/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/LSO/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/LSO/3).

548. At its 27th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Lesotho (see sect. C below).

549. The outcome of the review of Lesotho comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/9), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/29/9/Add.1).

1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

550. The delegation of Lesotho stated that it had received 169 recommendations, of which it had supported 121 and rejected 24. A further 24 recommendations had been deferred to the current session, and the delegation apprised the Human Rights Council of the Government's position on those recommendations.

551. Lesotho had welcomed the recommendations on the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It also welcomed the recommendation on allowing visits by special rapporteurs to places of detention. The Government would endeavour to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture in the near future. With regard to recommendation 114.9, Lesotho had accepted the recommendation in part and had rejected the part of the recommendation on the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

552. Lesotho had welcomed the recommendations on the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Consultations with the stakeholders would be held in that regard.

553. The State had supported the recommendation on adopting legislative measures to address trafficking in women and girls. The Anti-Trafficking in Persons Act had been enacted in 2011 and the National Anti-Trafficking in Persons Strategic Framework and Action Plan for 2014–2016 had been launched in 2014. Trainings of stakeholders and public awareness campaigns were being held. Additionally, the Children's Protection and Welfare Act of 2011 had a dedicated chapter on child trafficking as a way to protect children. The Act had been simplified and translated into the local vernacular for easier dissemination and accessibility.

554. Lesotho had supported the recommendation on implementing the national anti-trafficking action plan of July 2014 and on enacting implementing regulations for the Anti-

Trafficking in Persons Act, including by making the changes necessary to ensure that the cases were prosecuted in the magistrate courts, not just in the High Court.

555. Lesotho had supported the recommendation to continue developing human rights indicators. The Government would continue to assess and monitor the promotion and implementation of human rights in all sectors. It would continue to evaluate policies such as the National Strategic Development Plan, Vision 2020 and other policy frameworks and national initiatives. A human rights policy was being developed to serve as a guiding tool for the coherent and coordinated fulfilment of human rights obligations.

556. The State had supported the recommendation on taking measures to ensure the universal registration of births, including through the simplification of the necessary requirements and the removal of costs. It clarified that the registration of births and deaths was free of charge throughout the country. Officers regularly held public gatherings and visited schools, churches and social gatherings, where registration took place.

557. Lesotho had welcomed the recommendation on investigating all cases of gender violence, punishing the perpetrators and compensating the victims. All cases of violence, including gender-based violence, that were reported to the police were investigated. Victims were offered temporary shelter. The State was yet to establish the compensation fund as provided for by various pieces of legislation. The fund would cover compensation for all victims of crime, including victims of gender-based violence.

558. Lesotho had supported the recommendation on meeting the target of allocating 15 per cent of government spending to health. However, due to limited resources, such an allocation was not possible at all times. Over the last three years, there had been an increase in budget allocation for the health sector.

559. The State had not supported the recommendations on the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Chapter 3 of the Constitution of Lesotho spelled out the principles of State policy, which entailed rights of a socioeconomic nature. It would therefore be paradoxical to ratify the Convention.

560. Lesotho had not supported the recommendation on acceding to the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity. The State's priority was to incorporate into national laws those conventions that it had already ratified.

561. Lesotho had not supported the recommendation on decriminalizing defamation and reviewing media-related laws. A draft media policy, which would soon be approved by the Cabinet, would set the bar and the old laws would be reviewed in conformity with the policy.

562. The State had not supported the recommendation on strengthening at the constitutional level and in a specific manner the provisions that prohibited discrimination against women. The Government had made strides in prohibiting discrimination against women. The issues relating to succession to the throne and chieftainship, which were the basis of the reservation to article 2 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, were yet to be addressed.

563. Lesotho had not supported the recommendation on reviewing and updating the laws that could lead to self-censorship, such as the Sedition Proclamation and the Internal Security (General) Act, to ensure compliance with international human rights obligations. Those laws ensured respect for the rights of citizens.

564. The State had not supported the recommendation on offering comprehensive sexuality education and ensuring access to sexual and reproductive health services, including legal and safe abortion. Family planning services and education on the use of a preferred contraceptive method were offered in most government health facilities. Abortion was generally illegal; however, the Penal Code of 2010 provided for circumstances under which legal and safe abortion may be performed.

565. Despite the challenges, Lesotho was committed to accelerating sustainable economic growth, continuing to work on the establishment of a national human rights commission,

improving access to justice for all, intensifying efforts to fight against corruption, and striving to achieve the objectives of Vision 2020 and the National Strategic Development Plan.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

566. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Lesotho, 17 delegations made statements.

567. Mali appreciated the positive efforts made by Lesotho to implement the recommendations it had accepted during its first review. Mali congratulated the State on the ratification of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. It noted with satisfaction the adoption of a public policy on human rights, an action plan against human trafficking, and the elaboration of a law on the protection and well-being of children.

568. The Niger welcomed the achievements of Lesotho in the area of human rights since its previous review. It acknowledged the multiple legislative and regulatory measures the State had taken to improve child welfare, to fight violence against women and to combat human trafficking. It further acknowledged the establishment of a national human rights commission.

569. Rwanda thanked Lesotho for the constructive manner in which it had participated in the universal periodic review process. It noted with appreciation the update it had provided on the developments it had made in promoting and protecting human rights since its previous review.

570. Sierra Leone commended Lesotho for having ratified several key human rights instruments and for the recent establishment of a national human rights commission. It was pleased that the State had supported all the recommendations made by Sierra Leone.

571. South Africa welcomed the positive development in Lesotho and congratulated the State on a successful review and its acceptance of a large number of recommendations. It also welcomed the State's efforts to implement the national action plan to end gender-based violence, the enactment of a draft national policy on social development and the Government's commitment to ratify outstanding international instruments.

572. The Sudan noted with satisfaction the positive engagement of Lesotho in the universal periodic review process and appreciated the State's acceptance of a large number of recommendations, including those made by the Sudan.

573. Togo thanked Lesotho in advance for the efforts that it would make to implement the recommendations, in particular those made by Togo on increasing access to water and sanitation, on overcoming disparities between rural and urban areas, and on implementing a more efficient strategy to prevent and combat HIV/AIDS.

574. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela stated that Lesotho had completely and openly cooperated with the universal periodic review, thereby confirming its commitment to human rights. It welcomed the State's responses relating to the establishment of a national human rights institution and the sixth amendment to the Constitution in that regard. It was pleased with the efforts the State had made to comply with the commitments it had made in the area of human rights and wished it success in the implementation of the recommendations.

575. Algeria congratulated Lesotho on its acceptance of the majority of the recommendations it had received during its second review. It congratulated the State on its acceptance of the recommendations on access to health care across the country and on guaranteeing universal primary education. It wished Lesotho success in the implementation of the recommendations.

576. Angola welcomed the acceptance by Lesotho of the majority of the recommendations it had received. It commended the State for the efforts it had made to promote and protect human rights, particularly through the ratification of international instruments. It also commended Lesotho for the progress it had made in the areas of

education and women's rights, and in the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals.

577. Botswana commended Lesotho for the efforts it had made to achieve democracy and the rule of law and congratulated the State on the successful formation of a government. Lesotho was affected by abject poverty and Botswana was pleased with the State's efforts to address inequality and poverty. The measures the State had put in place, such as agricultural subsidies and poverty reduction programmes and policies, were commendable.

578. Burkina Faso acknowledged the numerous resource- and capacity-based obstacles Lesotho faced in the endeavour to improve human rights. It welcomed the fact that Lesotho had accepted most of the recommendations and encouraged the State to make extensive efforts to implement those recommendations. It wished Lesotho success in establishing universal primary education.

579. China welcomed the constructive participation of Lesotho in the universal periodic review. It appreciated the State's comprehensive and positive response to the recommendations it had received. It was also pleased that Lesotho had accepted most of the recommendations, including those made by China.

580. Cuba congratulated Lesotho on the recommendations accepted, including the two recommendations Cuba had made. The commitment of the Government to continue to promote economic growth, which would generate productive jobs and alleviate poverty, and to provide all children with free and compulsory education was very encouraging. It called upon the international community to provide the State with technical and capacity-building assistance.

581. Djibouti commended Lesotho for the efforts it had made to submit various reports to the treaty bodies. It encouraged the authorities to pursue initiatives to reduce poverty by providing older persons, orphans and vulnerable children with benefits.

582. Ethiopia thanked Lesotho for having accepted a significant number of recommendations, including the recommendations Ethiopia had made. It referred to the comprehensive country review conducted as part of the African Peer Review Mechanism, and the State's engagement with the Human Rights Council, including the universal periodic review mechanism.

583. Ghana was pleased that a significant number of recommendations made during the review had enjoyed the support of Lesotho, including the recommendation made by Ghana on submitting reports to the treaty bodies and on issuing a standing invitation to the special procedures. It encouraged Lesotho to sustain the momentum in establishing a national human rights institution. It hoped that the media policy that was being drafted would decriminalize defamation.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

584. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Lesotho, two other stakeholders made statements.

585. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland stated that lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons faced discrimination and exclusion in all spheres of life, including in access to social protection schemes. Their right to privacy was infringed, and in the labour market they continued to hide their sexuality. Young lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons experienced estrangement from family and harassment at school. The impacts of marginalization relegated them to the margins of society. There could be no universality of rights, eradication of HIV or development if the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender community was excluded or left behind.

586. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme congratulated Lesotho on having held elections in 2015 and welcomed the progress it had made in promoting human rights since its first universal periodic review. Women were subjected to all forms of violence, particularly in rural areas. It was concerned by the increase in cases of sexual violence and rape of girls by teachers in schools. It called upon Lesotho to formulate a

strategy to end sexual, ethnic and domestic violence, and to take additional measures to combat female genital mutilation. It invited the State to abolish discriminatory laws, ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, decriminalize defamation and eliminate the death penalty.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

587. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, of the 169 recommendations received, Lesotho had supported 137 recommendations, provided additional clarification on one, and noted 31.

588. The delegation of Lesotho thanked the Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council for their constructive dialogue and engagement in the universal periodic review of Lesotho, which had culminated in a number of recommendations made to the Government.

589. The Government's priority was to ensure the observance of human rights, democracy, and respect for the rule of law and good governance, which was reflected in the degree of implementation of the recommendations made at its previous review and the number of recommendations accepted by the Government during its current review.

590. A workshop was held on 16 February 2015 to disseminate the outcome of the review and to prepare stakeholders so they could begin implementing the recommendations that were specific to their mandates. Consequently, a coordinating committee composed of government ministries, non-governmental organizations and civil society organizations was formed, with the mandate to oversee the implementation process.

591. Lesotho had used the universal periodic review process as an opportunity to take stock of its achievements and shortcomings and the challenges that lay ahead in promoting and protecting human rights.

592. The delegation concluded by reiterating the Government's commitment to the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council and by informing the Council that the Government held itself accountable with regard not only to the universal periodic review but also to the treaty bodies.

Kenya

593. The review of Kenya was held on 22 January 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Kenya in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KEN/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with, paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KEN/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KEN/3).

594. At its 29th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Kenya (see sect. C below).

595. The outcome of the review of Kenya comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/10), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group.

1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

596. The delegation of Kenya expressed its sincere appreciation to the members of the troika (China, Germany and Namibia) for their commitment and assistance during the State's second review. It acknowledged the delegations that had actively contributed to its review in January 2015 and stressed that their statements and recommendations would contribute immensely to the State's continued efforts to fulfil its human rights obligations.

597. Of the 253 recommendations made by State delegations during the review, Kenya had accepted 192. The acceptance of such a large number of recommendations bore testimony to the importance and commitment that Kenya attached to its human rights obligations and to the universal periodic review process in furthering the human rights agenda. Indeed, Kenya was already addressing most of the recommendations, in line with its constitutional imperatives and its development blueprint (Vision 2030). It was therefore confident that their full implementation would contribute to the formulation and development of effective public policies in the country.

598. During the January session, 61 recommendations, though pivotal to improving the human rights situation in Kenya, had been noted. Of those 61 recommendations, 33 were on ratifying various international instruments to which Kenya was not a party, seven were on abolishing the death penalty, and five were on laws relating to the freedom of expression and information, among others. About two thirds of the recommendations that had been noted were stated in absolute terms, which, in the State's view, amounted to limiting the Government's ability to prioritize, taking into account its resources and circumstances when determining the most effective way to fulfil its obligations.

599. The recommendations on ratifying international instruments were a case in point. The Constitution of Kenya of 2010 had introduced a more detailed procedure for the ratification of any treaty that would be binding on Kenya. All treaties were ratified on a case-by-case basis after extensive internal analysis, public participation and concurrence by Parliament. Those processes took time, and it was critical that all of the recommendations that Kenya accepted were implemented in a timely and comprehensive manner in accordance with constitutional provisions.

600. Another example related to the recommendations on budgetary increases to various sectors. Kenya had received a recommendation on increasing the budget allocation to the health sector to 15 per cent of GDP. While the Government was committed to providing quality health care in Kenya, it was not certain it would reach that percentage before its next universal periodic review, given the financial challenges the country was facing. That was also the case with regard to the recommendation on allocating at least 10 per cent of the State budget to agriculture development in line with the Maputo Declaration, and the recommendation on allocating more resources to the various national human rights institutions. The amount of resources allocated to those sectors would depend on the Government's overall ability to raise the necessary funds. However, Kenya was grateful to its development partners who provided it with budgetary support, and took the present opportunity to call upon them to continue to do so.

601. Although the recommendations on abolishing the death penalty in its absolute form had been noted, the Government continued to take steps towards its abolition. Since its review, the Attorney General had directed the Power of Mercy Advisory Committee to work with other stakeholders to initiate a national dialogue on abolishing the death penalty as a way to promote human worth and dignity.

602. Regarding some of the other recommendations noted relating to various outstanding bills and acts, such as the Kenya Information and Communications Act, the media laws, the freedom of information bill of 2014, the data protection bill of 2013 and the Public Benefit Organizations Act of 2013, the bills and acts were still undergoing consultations and analysis among stakeholders, with a view to improving their content and to securing consensus on the same. Kenya would update the Human Rights Council on the progress in due course.

603. The noting of recommendations did not imply a bar to their implementation. The Government recognized the importance of the universal periodic review process in improving the situation of human rights in Kenya. It would therefore take all the necessary and possible steps, taking into account budgetary considerations, public participation and the various processes taking place in the country, to ensure that all the recommendations were implemented effectively. The Constitution of Kenya embraced a comprehensive Bill of Rights that reflected international human rights standards. Based on constitutional provisions, the State's courts of law ensured that laws were interpreted in a way that complied with the rules of international law and the human rights instruments to which Kenya was a party.

604. Kenya had fully and unreservedly embraced the universal periodic review process as a most effective tool for policy development initiatives and programmatic interventions for the effective realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The review had helped to define the State's human rights priorities, and had facilitated the exchange of international experience and best practices to strengthen its laws, policies and institutions.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

605. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kenya, 15 delegations made statements.¹⁷

606. Botswana commended Kenya for having accepted the majority of the recommendations received during its review. It applauded the State for having adopted its new Constitution and in particular for having entrenched into its Constitution the National Gender and Equality Commission and the Commission on Administrative Justice. Botswana welcomed the enactment of the Prohibition of Female Genital Mutilation Act of 2011, which criminalized that practice. It encouraged Kenya to step up efforts to raise awareness of the Act. It noted with appreciation the reforms made in the justice sector, as an effective judicial system was key in the protection of human rights.

607. Burkina Faso congratulated Kenya on its exemplary cooperation with OHCHR and all the human rights mechanisms. It believed that the State would spare no effort to continue to meet the challenges it faced in achieving human rights. In the context of the recommendations accepted, it urged Kenya to focus its efforts on combating gender stereotyping, violence against women and girls, and female genital mutilation. The reform of the judicial system, the equality of treatment between citizens and the registration of children at birth deserved attention.

608. Chad congratulated Kenya on the adoption of its new Constitution through which legislative, general policy and institutional reform measures had been put in place to meet the State's international commitments. It regretted that the significant progress made had unfortunately been undermined by poverty, corruption, terrorism and disease. It urged Kenya to implement the recommendations it had accepted.

609. China commended Kenya for its constructive participation in the universal periodic review and its acceptance of a large number of recommendations, which demonstrated the State's willingness to continue to strengthen international cooperation in the field of human rights and to protect and promote its people's human rights. China was pleased that Kenya had accepted its recommendation on continuing to prioritize the reduction of poverty in its national development to improve the well-being of the people. It encouraged the State to continue to implement the recommendations accepted with the support of the international community and to achieve comprehensive progress in the human rights cause.

610. Cuba drew attention to the commitment of Kenya to reduce hunger and malnutrition, which should be seen in the context of the series of measures adopted to alleviate poverty. It was firmly convinced that, with the implementation of the recommendations accepted,

¹⁷ The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Human Rights Council at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/29thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

the State would continue to make progress in promoting and protecting human rights. It wished Kenya every success in implementing the 192 recommendations it had accepted.

611. Djibouti encouraged Kenya to continue its initiatives to promote human rights and its efforts to combat poverty.

612. Egypt congratulated Kenya on the many reforms and policies it had initiated after the adoption of its new Constitution, such as the reforms to the judiciary and police forces, and the elections held in March 2013. It thanked the State for having accepted the recommendations by Egypt, such as those on eliminating discriminatory practices against women, combating child labour and the enjoyment of education by all. It urged Kenya to continue its institutional reforms. It recognized that the State was facing many challenges, such as poverty, illness, corruption and terrorism, which were a threat to the gains achieved so far. Finally, Egypt called upon the international community to provide the assistance needed to promote and protect human rights in Kenya.

613. Ethiopia commended Kenya for having accepted a considerable number of recommendations from the second review, including those made by Ethiopia on strengthening the monitoring and evaluation efforts on the empowerment of women and the protection of children. Ethiopia was pleased with the State's visionary plan to become a middle-income country by 2030. It strongly believed that ensuring economic progress was the right way to boost the promotion and protection of human rights. Terrorism was an obstacle to the enjoyment of human rights and Kenya was playing a key role in combating it in all its forms and manifestations in the region. Ethiopia was pleased to work with Kenya and other stakeholders to weaken and eliminate terrorist elements in the Horn of Africa.

614. Gabon was pleased that Kenya had been fully cooperating with the United Nations mechanisms and procedures to promote and protect human rights. It was particularly impressed by the measures taken by the State to fight against all kind of gender-based discrimination and any violence against women. However, it regretted that the progress made was being undermined by poverty, corruption, terrorism and disease. It recommended that the international community continue to support Kenya in its efforts to restructure its system and to fight against terrorism.

615. Ghana assured Kenya of its continued support and solidarity in the fight against terrorism in the Horn of Africa, which threatened the enjoyment of the right to life and property. It was pleased that the recommendation it had made on respecting, protecting, promoting and fulfilling all the rights and fundamental freedoms as stipulated in the Bill of Rights had enjoyed the support of Kenya. It was also pleased that the State had accepted its recommendation on ensuring the full and continued implementation of various pieces of legislation put in place to safeguard the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all persons. Ghana encouraged Kenya to continue to ensure the full eradication of the harmful practice of female genital mutilation.

616. Kuwait welcomed the efforts made by Kenya to promote and protect human rights. It very much welcomed the steps the State had taken not only to accept the recommendations made but also to implement them, which indicated that it was willing and perfectly able to show fully its responsibilities in terms of respect for human rights. Kuwait wished Kenya every success in promoting human rights, well-being and prosperity.

617. Latvia welcomed the renewed commitment of Kenya to ensure an investigation into and accountability for post-election violence through its full cooperation with the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court. It was pleased with the State's willingness to address cases of torture and the use of excessive force by security forces in the country. It encouraged Kenya to ensure that terror was fought within the law and it welcomed the State's leadership in organizing a regional conference on violent extremism. It hoped that the conference participants could share good practices on how to ensure that measures aimed at addressing the terrorist threat were developed and implemented in full compliance with international law, particularly international human rights law.

618. Mali welcomed the great efforts made by Kenya to stabilize its situation, including through the organization of elections in 2013, which had taken place in a very peaceful environment. It congratulated the State on the adoption in 2010 of its new Constitution,

which gave a preeminent place to the promotion and protection of human rights. It welcomed the State's renewed commitment to continue to strengthen its cooperation with the United Nations human rights protection mechanisms and procedures. It also welcomed the initiatives by Kenya to follow up on the recommendations made at its first review. Mali was particularly pleased with the State's efforts to reform the judiciary and to draft a national gender policy.

619. The Niger referred to the efforts by Kenya to strengthen its legal and institutional framework, within which human rights could be promoted and protected. The Niger emphasized the State's adoption of several laws, including a law on Kenyan citizenship and immigration, a law on female genital mutilation, three specific laws on a human rights commission and a law on the protection of victims of violations. The recommendations received by Kenya would certainly help the country to further improve its framework for the respect and promotion of human rights.

620. Rwanda was pleased that Kenya had accepted the vast majority of the recommendations it had received. It was particularly pleased that the State had accepted the recommendations by Rwanda on continuing to strengthen counter-terrorism measures and on continuing efforts to abolish the death penalty.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

621. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kenya, 12 other stakeholders made statements.

622. The Kenya National Commission on Human Rights attested to the benefits of the universal periodic review process in Kenya and called upon the State to put in place measures to ensure the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted. The Commission further assured the State of its commitment to continued collaboration in implementing the human rights agenda, relating to such issues as the abolition of the death penalty. It called upon the State to intensify its collaboration with civil society organizations and urged development partners to offer technical and financial support to ensure that the recommendations were implemented.

623. Minority Rights Group stated that the adoption of the report of the Working Group on Kenya had come at a crucial time for its minorities and indigenous peoples, whose rights continued to be disrespected. There was a clear need for the recognition of indigenous peoples' rights over their ancestrally owned land. Those rights were repeatedly breached, despite being protected under domestic and international law. It also called for the implementation of judicial decisions, including the decision of the African Commission on the Endorois case, which, in the five years since its adoption, had still not been implemented. Lastly, it expressed concern regarding the persistent exclusion of indigenous peoples from decision-making.

624. The Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative was concerned about the Security Laws (Amendment) Act, which jeopardized the independence of the police and intelligence services from the executive. It was also concerned about the crackdown by the Government on civil society and pointed to the fact that the Public Benefit Organizations Act that had been used to refuse the registration of a lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender group. It was equally concerned about how cases involving Kenya at the International Criminal Court had been impeded. It urged the State to review the Security Laws (Amendment) Act to ensure that the State's constitutional and civil liberties safeguards were honoured, as well as to cooperate fully with the International Criminal Court.

625. The Center for Reproductive Rights emphasized the issues of inadequate access to quality maternity care and unsafe abortion in Kenya. It welcomed the State's commitment to ensure reproductive health and rights and urged the State to address barriers to access to reproductive health information. It was concerned that Kenya had not accepted the recommendations on allocating 15 per cent of its GDP to its health budget and on ensuring the effective implementation of reproductive health through an intersectoral policy and action plan. It regretted that Kenya had not accepted the recommendations on ensuring that women had access to legal and safe abortion.

626. Human Rights Watch stated that impunity for serious violations by police and other security forces was a profound concern. It referred to the acceptance by Kenya of certain important recommendations but it was concerned that there had been little tangible progress in many key areas. It stressed that some of the measures the State had listed as milestones had in fact not resulted in meaningful outcomes. It urged Kenya to make tangible efforts to set up a clear timeline for progress.

627. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues applauded Kenya for having supported 192 out of the 253 recommendations it had received. The State should put in place administrative and legislative measures to ensure equality and freedom from discrimination for all persons irrespective of their sexual orientation or gender identity. It also urged the State, inter alia, to eliminate extrajudicial killings and torture and to further align its counter terrorism and security measures with international standards. It was concerned that Kenya had not accepted 61 of the recommendations and referred to some of the recommendations urging Kenya to implement them with the support of the international community.

628. Action Canada for Population and Development was greatly concerned about the fact that Kenya had rejected a number of recommendations on decriminalizing sexual relations between consenting adults of the same sex. That clearly showed that human rights in Kenya applied to only certain individuals that the State approved of, even though such actions were against the State's own Constitution.

629. The International Service for Human Rights stated that, despite the commitment by Kenya to create a safe and enabling environment for human rights defenders, such activists continued to be murdered, arbitrarily arrested and threatened. Moreover, non-governmental organizations were targeted through the misuse of legislation, such as the Prevention of Terrorism Act, which was used to equate them to terrorist groups. It was also concerned about the criminalization of same-sex conduct, which put those who worked to protect lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons at great risk. It called upon Kenya to take serious steps to create a safe environment for human rights defenders.

630. Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship stated that there had been an increase in attacks against journalists in Kenya since the State's previous review. It welcomed the recommendations on abolishing criminal sanctions for media offences and on ensuring that journalists were able to practice in a free and safe environment. Furthermore, it stated that the harassment and intimidation of civil society organizations should cease. Lastly, it underlined the necessity for the enactment of the long overdue Access to Information Bill.

631. The International Lesbian and Gay Association was concerned that, despite legal protection in the Constitution, there was increasing violence towards persons owing to their sexual orientation or gender identity. Furthermore, there was an unwillingness on the part of the State to register organizations with the words "gay" or "lesbian" in their names. It urged Kenya to ensure the protection of gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons in the country, as they deserved the same protection as any other individual.

632. In a joint statement, Franciscans International, Pax Romana and Edmund Rice International Limited pointed out that, despite the commitment of Kenya to the transitional justice agenda, which was aimed at ensuring the right to truth, justice and reparation for the victims of gross human rights violations of the past, the independence of the judiciary was often questioned. They were pleased with the acceptance by the State of several recommendations on protecting economic, social and cultural rights. Nevertheless, the enjoyment of those rights was often not a reality for marginalized and vulnerable groups in society. They urged Kenya to empower anti-corruption institutions to ensure that finances were effectively transmitted and monitored.

633. Amnesty International stated that any responses by Kenya to terrorist attacks should not circumscribe human rights ostensibly with a view to protecting public security. The Security Laws (Amendment) Act of 2014 should not be used to excessively restrict the freedom of expression. The State should also refrain from listing human rights organizations as "specified entities", under the Prevention of Terrorism Act, which equated

them to terrorist groups. It further encouraged Kenya to strive, as recommended by several States, to cooperate with the International Criminal Court.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

634. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 253 recommendations received, Kenya had supported 192 recommendations and noted 61.

635. The delegation of Kenya thanked the President and all those who had taken the floor to provide it with constructive comments and remarks. It found the engagement since the beginning of that process very useful. It assured the other State delegations that the issues and comments they had conveyed would be the subject of serious reflection and attention. The State was firmly committed to the universal periodic review process, both in principle and in practice. That commitment would also be evidenced in the implementation process. It looked forward to sharing with the delegations its experience in terms of both progress and challenges during the sessions of the Human Rights Council. Lastly, it expressed hope that it could rely on the support of other States.

Armenia

636. The review of Armenia was held on 22 January 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Armenia in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/ARM/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/ARM/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/ARM/3 and Corr.1).

637. At its 29th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Armenia (see sect. C below).

638. The outcome of the review of Armenia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/11), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/29/11/Add.1).

1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

639. The head of the delegation of Armenia reported that the State supported the universal periodic review process as an effective tool to assess positive developments and human rights challenges. It referred to the practice of submitting midterm reports and stated that the format of the review provided an opportunity for consensus-building among Member States on the main principles of the protection and promotion of human rights. It expressed its appreciation to all the participants, especially those who had contributed to improvements and positive developments in Armenia and to the Government's human rights reform initiatives.

640. The recommendations received by Armenia had been thoroughly analysed and discussed by the relevant authorities and members of an interministerial working group. The State had received 189 recommendations, of which it had supported 155, partially supported 20, not supported 4 and rejected 10. Some recommendations had consisted of more than one part and if one part had been accepted but the other part had not, the

recommendation had been considered to be noted. The State requested that, in the future, each recommendation be clearly presented so as to avoid that practice.

641. The partially accepted recommendations had been supported by Armenia in principle. The Government had supported the idea and reasoning behind them; however, it had not been in a position to accept them.

642. The State's position on recommendations 120.1 to 120.4 had been based on article 15 of its Constitution: "Everyone shall have the right to life. No one may be sentenced or subjected to the death penalty." The death penalty had been eliminated from the general part of the Criminal Code, which had entered into force in 2003. The Constitutional Court had been systematically scrutinizing the State's legislation and studying the content of the international treaties to which Armenia was a party, and had found that the State rejected the death penalty as a sanction and provided for the abolition of the death penalty as a rule.

643. The process of incorporating the constitutional requirements for the respect for and protection of the right to life was underway, and many changes were reflected in the national laws regulating the activity of law enforcement and other State bodies within the framework of judicial reform. Therefore, the ratification of international treaties was linked to appropriate legislative changes and the finalization of judicial reform. Similarly, the implementation of recommendations 120.15 to 120.22 was linked to constitutional reform. The recognition of rights under legal norms, including those provided for in acts of supreme legal power, would be of a mere declarative nature in the absence of norms and guarantees called to assure the effective protection of those rights.

644. Regarding recommendations 120.6 and 120.23, there was a need to study them further and to have the opinions of various ministries and agencies.

645. The implementation of recommendation 120.14 would be possible after the enactment of legislative and practical changes enabling the full implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

646. Armenia had not supported the recommendations with inappropriate content or those that were factually inaccurate. It had rejected 10 recommendations and the reasons for their rejection had been presented in the report of the Working Group and its addendum.

647. Armenia recognized that the protection of human rights was a continuous process and that there was always room for improvement. It reiterated the fact that the Government attached great importance to the implementation of the judicial reforms.

648. Armenia highlighted the constitutional amendments of 2005, the strategic programme of 2012–2016 for legal and judicial reforms and the measures derived from that programme that were aimed at ensuring fair and efficient judicial power accountable to the public. In 2014, through legislative changes, a system of examinations in criminal, civil and administrative fields had been introduced, increasing fairness in the selection of judges. A system for the regular evaluation of judges, based on qualitative and quantitative criteria, had been introduced under the same legislation. The power of the relevant ethics and disciplinary commissions had been transferred to a commission of ethics under the general assembly of judges. A statute had been adopted to regulate the new commission's work and the rights of judges subject to disciplinary proceedings would be safeguarded under the Constitution and European treaties. All the above-mentioned legislative changes had been made to ensure the independence of judges and to provide more precise legal standards in their appointment, promotion and disciplinary procedures. An academy of justice had also been established for the education and training of judicial and prosecutorial staff, and a public reporting system for the judiciary with regard to its activities and the objective general criteria used in distributing cases among judges had been introduced.

649. The implementation of the principle of non-discrimination was another important area of the Government's agenda. In 2014, the Ministry for Justice had examined the compatibility of national legislation with international legal norms. Following public discussions in April 2015, it decided to begin the elaboration of standalone legislation. The relevant draft law would include the concepts of indirect discrimination, associated discrimination, persecution, incitement to discrimination and victimization. The constitutional norms on non-discrimination envisaged the establishment of appropriate

mechanisms for implementation. Another law, adopted in May 2013, ensured equality between women and men in all spheres, including legal protection from discrimination.

650. The State had adopted the strategic programme against gender violence of 2011–2015, which identified the core areas of early prevention, protection and prosecution. The further development of the programme required close cooperation between the Government and non-governmental organizations. As evidence of the importance it attached to the universal periodic review process, the Government had discussed the possibility of signing the Istanbul Convention.

651. Armenia stressed that, for the purpose of preventing torture, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, it had already implemented comprehensive legislative reforms aimed at bringing its national legislation fully into line with international best practices. The legal definition was being brought into compliance with the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and the amended draft legislation ensured that all officials found to have committed such acts would receive punishments reflecting the gravity of the act in accordance with the Convention. The new legislation provided for public prosecution in cases of torture with guarantees to ensure that criminal processes would be instituted in every case identified. The new legislation had passed its first reading in the National Assembly in May 2015.

652. A comprehensive national strategy for human rights, through which the State's obligations in the field of human rights were implemented, had been approved through a presidential decree in 2012. The strategy also defined the tasks and the relevant programmes for the further implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations. A plan of action was adopted in February 2014.

653. Armenia had already planned a joint discussion with civil society representatives on further actions to ensure the implementation of the recommendations accepted. During the discussion, they would be able to present their ideas on the implementation of the recommendations to the Government.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

654. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Armenia, 16 delegations made statements.

655. Kuwait welcomed the positive response of Armenia to most of the recommendations it had received, which underlined the importance that the State attached to the promotion and protection of human rights. It urged the Human Rights Council to adopt the report and wished Armenia success in strengthening human rights principles.

656. Rwanda recognized the positive engagement of Armenia with the Human Rights Council during the review process and commended the State for its acceptance of a significant number of recommendations, including those made by Rwanda. That showed the commitment of Armenia to the protection and promotion of human rights.

657. The Russian Federation pointed out that Armenia had accepted the majority of the recommendations it had received and it was pleased to see that measures were being taken to strengthen the legal instruments for the protection of human rights, especially the new legislation and the reforms to the administrative and judicial systems. It highlighted the positive effects of the measures that had been taken to protect the rights of the child. Those measures bore witness to the State's readiness to improve its national legal system in relation to the protection of human rights.

658. Sierra Leone was pleased that, since its first review, Armenia had ratified several core human rights instruments, including the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. It referred to the development of a strategic programme for the protection of the rights of the child, but encouraged Armenia to consider acceding to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure. It also encouraged the State to incorporate the outcome of its review into the appropriate national mechanisms in a systematic manner.

659. Tajikistan welcomed the activities of Armenia under its second review and referred to the Government's achievements in establishing a mechanism for cooperation with civil society and in adopting a plan of action for the protection of human rights, and its efforts to combat trafficking in persons. It also welcomed the State's definition of its priorities in the protection of human rights, one of which was the fight against corruption.

660. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela appreciated the commitment of Armenia to the implementation of the recommendations it had supported. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela highlighted the commencement of the implementation of the national strategy for human rights and its accompanying plan of action, as well as the State's strong efforts to fulfil its human rights commitments.

661. Albania commended Armenia for its commitment to implement the recommendations it had received. Albania appreciated the State's achievements in improving the legal framework and institutional capacities for the protection and promotion of human rights. It commended the State in particular for the measures it had taken to implement the strategic programme for the protection of the rights of the child for 2013–2016. It encouraged the Government to continue to implement the work relating to anti-trafficking.

662. Algeria congratulated Armenia on its acceptance of the majority of the recommendations made during its second review. It appreciated in particular the acceptance of the two recommendations that it had made on reducing gender inequality and on strengthening the training provided to officials responsible for dealing with minority rights.

663. Angola commended Armenia for the additional information it had provided. It noted with satisfaction the acceptance by the State of most of the recommendations, in particular those made by Angola. It welcomed the readiness of Armenia to continue its cooperation with the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council and supported the adoption of the report. It wished Armenia success in the implementation of the recommendations.

664. Belarus thanked Armenia for the comments it had provided on the recommendations received. The thorough attention given by the Government to all the recommendations demonstrated the high level of consideration the State gave towards fulfilling its international obligations in the field of human rights. It noted with satisfaction the State's acceptance of a large number of recommendations, including those made by Belarus on strengthening the protection of vulnerable children and on increasing the participation of women in political life.

665. Bulgaria appreciated the adoption by Armenia of several strategies and plans of action, including the strategic programme for legal and judicial reforms. It welcomed the measures taken by the State to promote and protect the rights of the child and encouraged the State, under the Optional Protocol to the Convention of the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, to establish mechanisms to identify and monitor children in vulnerable situations and at risk of becoming victims of violations. It appreciated the State's acceptance of its recommendation on protecting the rights of human rights defenders and journalists.

666. Burkina Faso was pleased that Armenia had taken measures of a legal, political and institutional nature to improve the protection of human rights. It referred to in particular the ratification of certain international human rights conventions, reforms to the legal system, measures to protect the most vulnerable groups in the population, namely children, migrants and members of ethnic minorities, and the establishment of an inter-agency commission to monitor the implementation of measures.

667. Chad was pleased with the legal and practical measures that Armenia had taken since its first review and its submission of a midterm report. It agreed with Armenia that one way to improve the system of human rights protection was to have better coordination between the State and civil society. It urged Armenia to implement the recommendations it had accepted during its review.

668. China appreciated the constructive participation of Armenia in the review and its decision to accept most of the recommendations, including those made by China. It also appreciated the commitment of Armenia to implement effectively the plan of action for the

protection of human rights. It was pleased with the State's efforts to submit reports to the treaty bodies, to strengthen anti-discrimination legislation and its implementation, to combat violence against women and girls, and to promote the rights to education and employment.

669. Ghana commended Armenia for its commitment to the universal periodic review mechanism. It looked forward to the adoption of the amendments to the Criminal Code, which would align the definition of torture with that contained in the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It hoped that the support expressed by Armenia for the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families would be translated into action and that the State would accede to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court as soon as possible.

670. The Islamic Republic of Iran appreciated the willingness of Armenia to consider many of the recommendations it had received, including all of those made by the Islamic Republic of Iran. It commended the State for the measures it had taken, including the adoption of the strategic programme for the protection of the rights of the child. It was encouraged by the State's efforts to address trafficking in persons and to eliminate domestic violence.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

671. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Armenia, six other stakeholders made statements.

672. The national human rights institution, the Human Rights Defender, stated that processes were underway to address several of the issues it had raised in its submission to the universal periodic review, but there were still serious challenges to be addressed. Although the legislation on the freedom of assembly was in line with international standards, there were still cases of the improper policing of assemblies. Aligning the definition of torture in the Criminal Code with international standards had been a positive development; nonetheless, the lack of effective investigation of cases of torture or ill-treatment remained a serious concern. The Human Rights Defender recommended that video recording equipment be provided in interrogation rooms as a potential tool for the prevention of ill-treatment at that stage. In a number of recorded cases, conditions of detention in penitentiary institutions could be considered as constituting inhuman and degrading treatment, and the provision of health care was inadequate. It was also concerned about child protection, including the high rates of child poverty, the ineffective deinstitutionalization of children in care institutions, and the inefficiency of custody and guardianship bodies. It was further concerned about the lack of comprehensive legislation to combat domestic violence effectively and to provide protection, including shelters, for victims.

673. Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik was pleased that Armenia was one of the few countries that had supported all of the recommendations during its first review, but regretted that that approach had changed in the State's second review. It referred to reports of the use of violence to oppress peaceful protests during recent weeks and of the arbitrary detention of journalists covering the protests. It called upon Armenia to stop violating the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and to respect the rights of its citizens to access legal representation upon arrest. It insisted upon the enforcement of legislation against hate speech and discrimination in all forms by State officials, and called upon the State to ensure that the courts investigated hate-based cases fairly, objectively and comprehensively. It regretted that Armenia had missed the opportunity to begin the process of adopting a standalone law to prohibit discrimination and violence based on sexual orientation.

674. The Council of Europe referred to some of the recommendations made to Armenia by the organization's monitoring bodies and to three challenges facing the State. Those challenges were: the use of excessive force by the police, ill-treatment in the armed forces and degrading treatment in custody combined with poor conditions of detention; corruption; and the lack of judicial independence. It welcomed the measures that Armenia had already taken in those fields and invited the State to ratify the Istanbul Convention.

675. The Human Rights House Foundation commented on the large number of repeated recommendations in the State's second review and pointed out that Armenia had taken insufficient steps to implement the recommendations from its review. It stated that, on 23 June 2015, excessive force had been used against peaceful demonstrators, journalists and human rights defenders in Yerevan and called upon the Government to investigate the excessive use of force by the police and to hold those responsible accountable. It emphasized the need to ensure the independence of the judiciary and to establish a system for the management of complaints of torture or ill-treatment by police and security forces. It called for the effective implementation of the recommendations accepted and the presentation of a midterm report. It also called upon the leaders in Armenia to publicly express support for the work of human rights defenders, especially when they were targets of violence or hate speech.

676. The International Catholic Child Bureau and Pax Romana pointed out that the recommendations on the rights of the child had not been fully implemented. As the draft law on domestic violence was in progress, they recalled the recommendation made by Thailand on taking measures to combat violence against children and on expediting the adoption of the draft law. They also urged Armenia to amend its strategic programme for the protection of the rights of the child to incorporate specific measures aimed at preventing, protecting and assisting children at risk of sexual abuse. They further urged the State to implement the recommendation from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in 2010 to make rape and sexual assault a criminal offence, to take steps to sensitize public opinion on child abuse issues and to ensure effective access to justice for victims.

677. Minority Rights Group welcomed the acceptance by Armenia of the recommendations that called upon the authorities to adopt a comprehensive anti-discrimination law, the need for which had been stressed by two treaty bodies. It called for immediate steps to be taken to design and adopt such a law, in cooperation with civil society organizations and representatives from marginalized groups. It welcomed the State's support for most of the recommendations relating to ethnic and national minorities but it was not encouraged by the rejection of a recommendation by Namibia with the claim that "there is no discriminatory treatment of ethnic minorities in Armenia". It stated that the authorities must accept and recognize that the discrimination of minorities was an issue in order to be able to combat it. It echoed the expressions of concern over the use of excessive force by the police in the repression of peaceful demonstrations in Yerevan.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

678. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 189 recommendations received, Armenia had supported 155, provided additional clarification on another two, and noted 32.

679. Armenia regarded the interest shown in the recent events in the country as evidence of its partners' interest in strengthening democracy in the country, an issue to which it remained committed. An inquiry was being undertaken by the competent authorities, the results of which would be shared with the State's partners. The steps required were being taken to address deficiencies, which the police had themselves already identified.

680. In conclusion, the head of the delegation of Armenia thanked all those who had participated in the discussions and assured them that their valuable contributions would be considered and appropriate measures would be taken. The State's positions were explained in more detail in the addendum it had provided. The majority of the recommendations were useful for the consolidation of efforts in the human rights agenda of Armenia. Work would continue in a collaborative manner, including civil society and international partners.

Guinea-Bissau

681. The review of Guinea-Bissau was held on 23 January 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Guinea-Bissau in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GNB/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GNB/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GNB/3).

682. At its 29th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Guinea-Bissau (see sect. C below).

683. The outcome of the review of Guinea-Bissau comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/12), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/29/12/Add.1).

1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

684. The delegation of Guinea Bissau recalled that, on 4 July 2015, the State would be celebrating the first anniversary of its return to constitutional order, after having once again undergone a period of political instability from 2012 to 2014.

685. Throughout the year, the national authorities, which had been chosen following the free, fair and transparent elections of 2014, worked to define the country's short-, medium- and long-term priorities for the period 2014–2015. They were reflected in the national strategy for development and poverty reduction and the strengthening of the rule of law.

686. The recommendations received during the universal periodic review that addressed those issues had been accepted by Guinea-Bissau. A number of those recommendations had already been implemented and others were in the process of being implemented, which reflected the State's commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights.

687. The delegation informed the Human Rights Council that Guinea-Bissau had accepted 147 of the 151 recommendations it had received during the review.

688. The delegation stressed the efforts made by the State regarding, among others, the effective implementation of the domestic law on female genital mutilation and violence against women, the promotion of measures aimed at attaining gender equality in all spheres of society, improving access to education and health care, speeding up the modernization and reform of the justice system, and strengthening the fight against impunity and transnational organized crime.

689. Additionally, Guinea-Bissau welcomed the positive role played by civil society organizations in raising awareness about the protection and promotion of human rights in the country.

690. Lastly, the delegation reaffirmed the determination of Guinea-Bissau to strengthen its cooperation with the treaty bodies and hoped that the State would be able to count on the assistance of the international community to support its national efforts in the field of human rights.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

691. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Guinea-Bissau, 19 delegations made statements.

692. The Niger welcomed the progress Guinea-Bissau had made since its previous review in the promotion and protection of human rights through the ratification of a large number

of international legal instruments. It also welcomed the adoption by the State of a number of legislative and regulatory texts to guarantee citizens' access to justice, including the decree law on the regulation of the organic law on the courts, the law against female genital mutilation, and the law against trafficking in persons, particularly women and children. It wished Guinea-Bissau every success in the implementation of the recommendations from its second review.

693. Portugal stated that the commitment of Guinea-Bissau to the universal periodic review had been demonstrated through the State's acceptance of 147 out of the 151 recommendations it had received. It was pleased that Guinea-Bissau had accepted its recommendation on finalizing the revision of the statutes of the national human rights commission, in compliance with the Lisbon Declaration and Protocol of 2013, which had created a network of national human rights institutions of States members of the Community of Portuguese Language Countries. It also referred to the State's acceptance of its recommendation on strengthening its fight against female genital mutilation and forced child marriages. Portugal reiterated its willingness to continue to work with Guinea-Bissau at all levels on the promotion and protection of human rights.

694. Rwanda welcomed the update given on the State's developments in promoting and protecting human rights. It noted with appreciation that Guinea-Bissau had accepted a large number of recommendations during its second review. It was pleased that the State had given due consideration to its recommendations on creating conditions for the most vulnerable to have access to basic education and health services, on improving detention conditions for all, particularly women and young persons, and on promoting gender equality and women's participation in public life. Rwanda wished Guinea-Bissau the best in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

695. Senegal referred to the progress that Guinea-Bissau had made in the promotion of political, economic and social rights. It congratulated the State on having accepted its recommendations on enhancing the fight against the discrimination of women, especially in rural areas, and on continuing cooperation with the international community. It praised the State for having ratified several international instruments, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, for having made important reforms in the field of defence and security, for having adopted the law on the family and for having strengthened the advancement of women. Senegal called for the adoption of the report of the Working Group and urged the international community to provide the State with technical and financial assistance.

696. Sierra Leone commended Guinea-Bissau for its efforts to implement norms to better protect the rights of its citizens despite the major political challenges it had faced in recent years. It highlighted the adoption of the law against female genital mutilation and the strategic plan for the elimination of gender-based violence. It encouraged the State to continue its efforts to consolidate democracy and the rule of law and to develop the infrastructure necessary to provide everyone, especially girls and members of the most vulnerable communities, with access to basic education free of charge.

697. The Sudan thanked Guinea-Bissau for its comprehensive presentation and oral update. It appreciated the State's positive engagement in the universal periodic review process and its acceptance of the recommendations. It wished Guinea-Bissau every success in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

698. Togo congratulated Guinea-Bissau on its commitment to respect its international obligations despite the challenges it faced in political and economic spheres. It praised the State for its acceptance of the majority of the recommendations from its second review. Togo invited the international community to provide the State with support in the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

699. Brazil expressed its appreciation for the efforts of Guinea-Bissau to ensure its constructive and fruitful participation in its second review. It was particularly pleased with the recent positive developments in different fields of the promotion and protection of human rights and congratulated the State for its acceptance of most of the recommendations from its second review. It reiterated its readiness to continue to cooperate with Guinea-Bissau through bilateral programmes, such as the one on the universalization of birth

registration. Brazil acknowledged the progress the State had made in promoting the rule of law and in fulfilling its human rights obligations.

700. Algeria welcomed the cooperation of Guinea-Bissau with the universal periodic review process, with its acceptance of 147 out of the 151 recommendations. It highlighted the acceptance by Guinea-Bissau of the two recommendations it had made relating to the justice sector and poverty reduction. It praised the State for its new national strategic plan on development and the reduction of poverty for the period 2015–2025. It recommended that the report on Guinea-Bissau be adopted.

701. Angola noted with satisfaction the normalization of the social and political situation in Guinea-Bissau, which had resulted in the realization of free and fair elections. The climate of stability should lead to the strengthening of democracy and the rule of law, as well as respect for fundamental rights. It appealed to the international community to continue to support the authorities of Guinea-Bissau in order for the State to carry out the current reforms successfully. Angola congratulated Guinea-Bissau for having accepted the majority of the recommendations received during its review and recommended that the report on Guinea-Bissau be adopted.

702. Botswana noted with appreciation the efforts made by Guinea-Bissau to make reforms in the areas of defence, justice and security, which were crucial to the provision of legal assistance to victims of violence and the most vulnerable. It commended the State for having adopted laws on domestic violence, female genital mutilation and trafficking in persons, and the national action plan on gender equality and equity.

703. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela expressed its appreciation for the efforts Guinea-Bissau had made to implement the recommendations it had accepted and for its full and open cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism. It welcomed the responses it had provided, particularly with regard to guaranteeing free health services for children under 5 years of age, pregnant women and persons over 60 years of age. Guinea-Bissau had successfully completed its second review and had demonstrated its work in the field of human rights, especially in favour of vulnerable groups.

704. Burkina Faso welcomed the efforts made by Guinea-Bissau despite the grave crisis the State had faced in 2012. It welcomed in particular the return to constitutional order with elections held in 2014 and encouraged the State to continue its efforts to create and strengthen democratic institutions. It congratulated Guinea-Bissau on having created centres for access to justice and on having established a fund in support of victims of violence. It appreciated the measures the State had taken to protect the rights of women and children, in particular through the adoption of a strategic plan for the elimination of gender-based violence and the adoption of laws on domestic violence, female genital mutilation and human trafficking. It encouraged Guinea-Bissau to implement the recommendations.

705. China welcomed the constructive engagement of Guinea-Bissau in the universal periodic review and the State's pledge to implement the recommendations it had accepted. China appreciated in particular the acceptance by the State of its recommendations on stepping up support for education and on including poverty reduction in its development strategy. It was hopeful that, after full consultation with Guinea-Bissau, the international community would provide the State with urgently needed technical assistance and capacity-building support.

706. Cuba stated that, despite the serious challenges Guinea-Bissau faced, it had demonstrated its serious commitment to make all possible efforts to promote and protect human rights. An important example was the State's fight against HIV/AIDS, and Cuba called upon the international community to continue to support Guinea-Bissau in its fight against that scourge. With the implementation of the recommendations accepted, the State would be in a better position to promote and protect human rights.

707. Djibouti welcomed the action taken by Guinea-Bissau to strengthen human rights protection, notably through its accession to most international and regional legal instruments. It encouraged the State to continue its efforts to fight against female genital mutilation, maternal and child mortality, and domestic violence.

708. Ethiopia was pleased that Guinea-Bissau had accepted a great number of the recommendations from its second review, including its own recommendation on further enhancing efforts to reduce child and maternal mortality. It appreciated the State's constructive engagement with the universal periodic review mechanism and its progressive implementation of the recommendations, noting in particular the national action plan on gender equality and equity to improve the social, cultural and political status and economic advancement of women.

709. Ghana commended Guinea-Bissau for its continued commitment to the universal periodic review mechanism. It congratulated the people of Guinea-Bissau on having celebrated the first anniversary of the return to constitutional order. The consolidation of the process of post-conflict peacebuilding and reconstruction would provide a conducive environment for the promotion and protection of human rights in the country. Ghana was pleased that Guinea-Bissau had accepted its recommendation on considering the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and on taking steps to adopt all the appropriate measures to combat the root causes of political instability in the country. It encouraged Guinea-Bissau to urgently consider the ratification of the Rome Statute as a part of its constitutional reform process.

710. Mali welcomed the positive cooperation of Guinea-Bissau with the mechanisms and procedures of the Human Rights Council. It congratulated the State on the progress it had achieved in re-establishing democracy and in strengthening the rule of law, and particularly on having held general elections in 2014. It further congratulated Guinea-Bissau on the efforts it had made to reform the justice system, especially the penitentiary system, and on the adoption of a strategic plan for the elimination of gender-based violence. It recommended that the report of Guinea-Bissau be adopted.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

711. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Guinea-Bissau, one other stakeholder made a statement.

712. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme transmitted a message from the widow of deceased President João Bernardo Vieira, who had been killed in 2009. In the message, she indicated that she could not return to her country as her children wanted to know the truth about the murder of her husband and of his comrades. She asked that States Members of the Human Rights Council, which defended the universal values of freedom and democracy, aid Guinea-Bissau to end the cycle of impunity in order to build a State based on justice. She hoped that Guinea-Bissau would cooperate effectively with the International Criminal Court and the special procedure mandate holders.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

713. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 151 recommendations received, Guinea-Bissau had supported 147 recommendations and noted four.

Sweden

714. The review of Sweden was held on 26 January 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Sweden in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/SWE/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/SWE/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/SWE/3).

715. At its 30th meeting, on 26 June 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Sweden (see sect. C below).

716. The outcome of the review of Sweden comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/13), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/29/13/Add.1).

1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

717. The delegation of Sweden stated that the consideration of the draft report of the universal periodic review of Sweden was an event of great significance to the Government's human rights work. It brought to a conclusion a period of hard work and active engagement with a process that had proved highly valuable.

718. Promoting and respecting human rights was a core value and priority for Sweden and a cornerstone of its foreign policy. It welcomed the opportunity given by the universal periodic review to engage in its human rights work with interested parties. The delegation underlined the fact that ensuring respect for its international human rights obligations was a continuing process and that dialogue and scrutiny contributed to furthering the values upon which Swedish society was based.

719. In preparing for the review, the Government had consulted civil society organizations, including those representing indigenous peoples and national minorities. Consultation meetings had been held with stakeholders, both in Sweden and in Geneva, and the draft national report had been posted on the Government's human rights website. Since the review in January, the Government had held a follow-up meeting with civil society. That dialogue with stakeholders would continue in the follow-up to the review.

720. Sweden had received 208 recommendations and accepted 154. It had wanted further time for the careful consideration of some of the issues raised in the review in January.

721. Several States had recommended that Sweden establish a national human rights institution. In that regard, the Government had announced in its budget bill for 2015 that it would deliver to Parliament a strategy for the systematic work for human rights. One aspect of that strategy was to set out how the independent monitoring of the implementation of human rights in Sweden could be organized. It would include vesting a national institution with the competencies to promote and protect human rights in accordance with the Paris Principles.

722. Several States had made recommendations relating to racism, intolerance and discrimination. The delegation highlighted the fact that the Government wanted Sweden to be an open and inclusive society, where people with roots in various parts of the world and of different religions could live side by side. The State sought to combat all forms of discrimination and crimes of a racist, xenophobic or homophobic nature, which ran contrary to its fundamental values. It would continue to counter such hate crimes.

723. The delegation stressed that Sweden had comprehensive legislation in place that prevented religious and racial profiling. It also had laws and regulations governing the use of personal data in both the public and the private sector. The police were not allowed to register data solely on grounds concerning race, ethnic origin, political view or religion.

724. The delegation recalled that Sweden had accepted the recommendation on adopting a national plan on combating crimes of hatred, racism, and xenophobia, and that the Government was paying continuous attention to those issues.

725. Concerning the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure, several questions needed to be further

analysed in order for the Government to take a final position. Concerning the recommendations on children in detention, the Government was considering setting up an inquiry to examine the legal framework on pretrial detention, such as alternative measures to pretrial detention and measures to counteract the isolation of detainees. Special attention should be given to the treatment of minors in pretrial detention.

726. Some States recommended that Sweden incorporate the crime of torture as a specific criminal offence. In that regard, in June 2014, the Government had commissioned an independent inquiry to consider whether a specific provision on torture should be introduced in Swedish penal law. The report was due on 1 September 2015 and the Government had therefore chosen not to accept the recommendations at this point.

727. More explanations relating to the 44 recommendations that had been postponed for consideration were provided in the addendum to the report of the Working Group. The Government saw the universal periodic review as part of its national endeavours to ensure systematic human rights work, and the recommendations received would be an important reference point in the continued work.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

728. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Sweden, 14 delegations made statements.

729. The Sudan commended Sweden for its engagement with the universal periodic review process. It was pleased that the State had accepted most of the recommendations made during its second review, including the recommendations made by the Sudan on raising public awareness, on including human rights education in school curricula, and on eliminating any remaining forms of discrimination and xenophobia.

730. Viet Nam welcomed the developments in promoting and protecting human rights in Sweden since the State's previous review. It was pleased that Sweden had accepted the majority of the recommendations received and it looked forward to the State's further efforts and determination in implementing all the feasible recommendations. Viet Nam expressed its firm belief that Sweden would make greater efforts to ensure the enjoyment of all human rights by all of its people.

731. Albania stated that the review outcome of Sweden had demonstrated that human rights were a core value and main priority of the Government, which also respected the role of civil society. Albania congratulated the State on having taken measures vis-à-vis organizations representing indigenous peoples and national minorities, particularly regarding the rights of the Sami people and the minerals act and ordinance that had been amended in 2014, which had been one of the recommendations of Albania. It complimented Sweden on its work against the discrimination of Roma through the approval of its national strategy, on the process to incorporate the Convention on the Rights of the Child into national legislation and on its continuing formulation of a third plan of action on human rights.

732. Algeria commended Sweden for having accepted most of the recommendations, including the three made by Algeria on reducing the gender pay gap, on combating hate speech and crimes committed on the grounds of religious hatred, and on combating racism, violence and discrimination against persons of African descent.

733. Angola congratulated Sweden on having accepted most of the recommendations made, in particular those from its delegation. It encouraged the State to continue its cooperation with human rights mechanisms and to incorporate the Convention on the Rights of the Child into national legislation.

734. Botswana commended Sweden for having accepted the majority of the recommendations made during its review. It was pleased that the State had accepted many recommendations on strengthening measures to address racial discrimination, xenophobia and hate speech. Botswana commended Sweden for its commitment to protect children's rights, and in particular for having put in place measures to grant residence permits to unaccompanied children seeking asylum.

735. Bulgaria encouraged Sweden to respect its international human rights commitments and to strengthen its efforts to combat discrimination, xenophobia and religious-based hate crimes and harassment, especially with regard to migrants. It was pleased that the State had accepted the recommendations on combating discrimination and hatred of foreigners, on promoting equal opportunities and on strengthening strategies to fight discrimination faced by immigrants, refugees and minority groups, both ethnic and religious.

736. Burkina Faso stressed that Sweden had made considerable efforts to strengthen human rights in the country, particularly regarding the situation of migrants and asylum seekers, the rights of minorities, gender equality and child protection. The State had taken steps to strengthen its legal, institutional and policy framework for the implementation of the recommendations from its first universal periodic review. Burkina Faso encouraged Sweden to continue to pursue the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

737. Chad welcomed the fact that Sweden had made the promotion of and respect for human rights for all a fundamental value and central priority. Chad noted with satisfaction that the Swedish authorities considered that there was no place for anti-Semitism, anti-ziganism, Islamophobia or Afrophobia, and that the police struggled tirelessly against hate crimes.

738. China commended Sweden for its active and constructive engagement with the second cycle of the universal periodic review and for its acceptance of most of the recommendations. It appreciated the fact that Sweden had accepted the recommendations of China on committing itself to the promotion and protection of the rights of vulnerable groups, on strengthening anti-discrimination awareness campaigns, and on adopting relevant national policies and laws. It hoped that Sweden could continue its efforts to provide vulnerable groups with more equal development opportunities.

739. Cuba was grateful to Sweden for its presentation and especially for its responses to the recommendations on which it had not taken a position during the consideration by the Working Group. Significant challenges remained, such as discrimination and incitement to racial hatred, despite all the measures Sweden had adopted to change the situation. It was pleased that Sweden had accepted its recommendations in that regard. However, Cuba deplored the fact that Sweden had not accepted its recommendation on taking concrete measures to guarantee access to evidence for persons deprived of any form of liberty. It hoped that, in implementing those recommendations, Sweden could counter those negative phenomena, which sadly were increasing in society, as the State had recognized in the universal periodic review report.

740. India commended Sweden for its receptive and constructive participation in the universal periodic review. It believed that Sweden had gained much from its participation in the review. It referred to the strong engagement of States, with as many as 89 delegations making statements and 208 recommendations, covering a range of issues. India was encouraged by the fact that Sweden had accepted as many as 154 recommendations, including all four made by India.

741. The Islamic Republic of Iran was concerned that the prohibition of engagement in racist activities was not being satisfactorily implemented, and that racist and xenophobic crimes against Roma and Sinti and hate crimes against minorities persisted. It was strongly concerned about Muslims being targeted with harassment, verbal threats, sabotage and vandalism, and stated that there were also discrepancies in the health care provided to persons with disabilities.

742. Sierra Leone commended Sweden for its ongoing efforts to more effectively address the high rate of suicide in the country. It encouraged the Government to incorporate the Convention on the Rights of the Child into national legislation. Similarly, ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the International Convention on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights would be beneficial and worthy of the future consideration of Sweden.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

743. During the adoption of the outcome of the review, five other stakeholders made statements.

744. The Council of Europe congratulated Sweden on its successful review. It referred to three challenges raised in the recommendations made to Sweden by its monitoring bodies. First, there was a need to ensure the protection of migrants expelled on account of national security without the right of appeal to an independent body. Second, reference had been made to the challenge of discrimination based on age, religion and ethnicity, particularly of Roma and Sami. Third, the extended isolation of prisoners and detainees should be an exceptional restriction rather than the rule.

745. Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik commended Sweden for its commitment to protect and promote human rights. However, it was concerned by reports of extremely long asylum procedures and by the fact that migration boards' caseworkers had insufficient training and made grave errors in asylum assessments. Political asylum seekers in grave danger of arrest or other persecution in their home countries were often denied asylum in Sweden, based on so-called evidentiary shortcomings. It strongly urged the Swedish authorities to abide by their obligations to the principle of non-refoulement. It recommended that the State strengthen measures to shorten the asylum process, and provide caseworkers with sufficient education and clear guidelines as to the standard of proof in asylum assessments and on the use of homeland reports to make correct evaluations and eliminate discretionary assessments. Its observations were extended especially to asylum seekers from a specific third country.

746. Save the Children International welcomed the Government's acceptance of the recommendations on incorporating the Convention on the Rights of the Child into national legislation, on prioritizing children's rights, on combating discrimination against children and on ensuring children's rights in judicial procedures. It regretted the Government's rejection of the recommendations on ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure. Children in Sweden had no possibility to receive redress for rights violations without their guardian's consent and were not seen as legal parties in cases that concerned them. Save the Children International called upon Sweden to provide the Ombudsman for Children with the mandate to receive individual complaints from children without the consent of the legal guardian. No recommendations had been made on the disparities between municipalities in terms of the support available to the most vulnerable children at the local level, which was a major driver of inequalities between children. It called upon the Government to accept the recommendation from the Committee on the Rights of the Child on establishing a high-level mechanism with a clear mandate and the authority to ensure equal access to all rights at the regional and local levels, including sufficient resources for its effective operation by the end of 2016.

747. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom welcomed the acceptance by Sweden of the recommendations on continuing its work to combat violence against women, while stating that, on average, 17 women and girls were killed each year by their partner, and women's shelters had denied women support due to a lack of resources. It welcomed the increased funding for local women's shelters, as announced in April 2015. It strongly urged Sweden to redistribute resources from the military sector to human security in order to work forcefully to prevent gender-based violence. Noting the recommendations on stopping racism and on strengthening the rights of minorities, indigenous people and migrants, it criticized and was worried about the opportunities for allegedly racist and fascist organizations to spread their ideology and hate through public manifestations. The law against hate speech was not adequately enforced and few people were convicted. It urged the Government to work to ensure people's sense of safety by not allowing racist manifestations in public places and by working actively against the increased influence of those movements within the democratic system. It also recommended that a clear gender perspective be applied in that work in order to address the underlying problem of violent and stereotypical norms around masculinity, which it believed were often at the centre of those movements.

748. The Swedish Federation of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights recognized the commitment of Sweden to combat discrimination, including multiple discrimination. It urged the Government to ensure especially that transgender persons were also protected by legal provisions on hate crimes and hate speech. While acknowledging the acceptance by Sweden of the recommendations on giving precedence to the principle of non-refoulement when considering the situation of asylum seekers, it was critical that the Government guaranteed that the principle apply also to grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity. It commended Sweden for the involvement of civil society in the universal periodic review process and hoped for the continuous, wide participation of such organizations in the implementation of the recommendations accepted, especially when they concerned lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex persons and sexual and reproductive health rights' issues. It welcomed the Government's acceptance of the recommendations, including those on establishing a national human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles, and stated that civil society would be closely following their implementation.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

749. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 208 recommendations received, Sweden had supported 154 recommendations and noted 54.

750. The delegation of Sweden concluded by thanking the participants, the troika and the secretariat. It was particularly grateful for the interventions by non-State stakeholders and stated that the participation of stakeholders, including in the universal periodic review process, was one of the true institutional strengths of the Human Rights Council.

751. The delegation listed ongoing inquiries and initiatives regarding the future work for human rights in Sweden and referred to the announcement in February 2015 of the development of a new strategy for human rights, democracy and the rule of law in Swedish foreign policy. The work had started and would be conducted in close cooperation with civil society.

752. The delegation underlined the fact that Sweden would closely consult with civil society and other stakeholders in the follow-up, which would be a central part of the mandate of the interministerial working group for human rights.

753. The following year, Sweden would begin preparations for the midterm report, and it looked forward to engaging with the Human Rights Council ahead of its next review, to take place in 2019. The Government intended to maintain a high level of ambition regarding the implementation of human rights issues at the national level, and the universal periodic review process constituted a vital part of that work.

Grenada

754. The review of Grenada was held on 26 January 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Grenada in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GRD/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GRD/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GRD/3).

755. At its 30th meeting, on 26 June 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Grenada (see sect. C below).

756. The outcome of the review of Grenada comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/14 and Corr.1), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/29/14/Add.1).

1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

757. The delegation of Grenada presented the State's response to the recommendations it had received during its second review. The delegation thanked the delegations that had participated in the review, including for their positive assessment of the achievements of the State in the area of human rights and for their recognition of the challenges faced by small island developing States such as Grenada.

758. Grenada also thanked the members of the troika – Japan, Mexico and the United States of America – for their assistance in compiling the recommendations, and OHCHR for its support.

759. Grenada welcomed the recommendations made during its second review, held in January 2015. Subsequent to the review, Grenada had met with a broad-based group of stakeholders, including the Grenada Human Rights Organization, with a view to conducting an evaluation of the 104 recommendations that it had received, including a four-year implementation plan to address the recommendations accepted.

760. Grenada was pleased to report that, of the 104 recommendations received, it had accepted 62 and noted 42. The State's responses to the recommendations were organized according to thematic areas.

761. The recommendations accepted included the establishment of a national human rights institution and in that regard, consultations had already begun on whether a national human rights institution should be established or whether the Office of the Ombudsman should be strengthened and expanded in accordance with the Paris Principles.

762. The Government had accepted the recommendations on the right to education and would continue to strengthen its ongoing initiatives in the education sector.

763. The recommendations accepted also included those under the thematic area of persons with disabilities. Grenada had ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2014 and would continue to address the concerns of persons with disabilities within its jurisdiction.

764. Grenada was not able to support some recommendations, such as those on abolishing the death penalty; however, it should be noted that a de facto moratorium on the death penalty had been in place in Grenada since 1978.

765. Grenada had not supported the recommendation on taking temporary measures (quotas) to guarantee the equal representation of women in Parliament and government, but was pleased to draw the attention of the Working Group to the fact that Grenada was currently ranked 23 out of 142 democracies in the Inter-Parliamentary Union world classification of women in national parliaments having 33.3 per cent of women participation in Parliament. On average, women in Grenada made up 28 per cent representation on public sector boards, 29 per cent on trade union boards and 54 per cent on non-governmental organization boards.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

766. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Grenada, four delegations made statements.

767. Sierra Leone commended Grenada for the legal measures it had taken to improve the promotion and protection of human rights nationally. It noted with appreciation the ongoing constitutional reform process and the creation of the new child protection act and the

education act. It would be most beneficial to incorporate into national law the proposals that best matched specific national concerns, such as policies to integrate measures on climate change, and Sierra Leone therefore encouraged international partners to collaborate with Grenada and support its efforts. It encouraged Grenada to take the steps necessary to implement the recommendations it had accepted.

768. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the commitment of Grenada to share information on the progress it had made in the area of human rights. It highlighted the fact that the State prioritized education and valued the social programmes that supported working parents. It recognized the efforts of the State in the field of human rights and its cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism.

769. China thanked Grenada for having provided the Human Rights Council with feedback on the recommendations and for its commitment to implement the recommendations it had accepted. It also thanked the State for having accepted its recommendations on further improving the standard of education so as to provide quality human resources for its economic and social development, and on further promoting poverty reduction in order to achieve balanced and inclusive growth. China was convinced that the commitment and efforts of Grenada would further contribute to the realization of all human rights, including economic, social and cultural rights and the right to development.

770. Cuba welcomed the delegation of Grenada and commended the State for its efforts to implement the recommendations from its first universal periodic review, which reflected the State's commitment to promote and protect human rights effectively in the country. Cuba recognized, *inter alia*, the State's work in the area of education, in addressing poverty and in improving the health-care system. The international community should continue to support Grenada in accordance with the State's national priorities. It encouraged Grenada to continue its efforts to improve the education system and the rights of persons with disabilities.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

771. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Grenada, no other stakeholders made statements.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

772. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 104 recommendations received, Grenada had supported 62 recommendations and noted 42.

773. In conclusion, Grenada reaffirmed its commitment to the protection and promotion of human rights through the implementation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the human rights treaties to which it was a party, and the review recommendations it had accepted. The State was proud of its human rights record and, with the support of the international community, it would continue to engage its citizens in a range of human rights issues.

774. On behalf of Grenada, the delegation expressed its appreciation to all the delegations for their interventions, the President of the Human Rights Council, the troika, namely Japan, Mexico and the United States of America, the secretariat, OHCHR, and all those who had contributed to the smooth conclusion of the second review of Grenada. Their participation in the process would greatly assist in the promotion and protection of human rights in Grenada.

Turkey

775. The review of Turkey was held on 27 January 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Turkey in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/TUR/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/TUR/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/TUR/3).

776. At its 30th meeting, on 26 June 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Turkey (see sect. C below).

777. The outcome of the review of Turkey comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/15), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/29/15/Add.1).

1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

778. Mehmet Ferden Çarıkçı, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations Office at Geneva, was pleased to address the Human Rights Council on the occasion of the adoption of the outcome of the second universal periodic review of Turkey. He stated that having the Deputy Prime Minister as head of the delegation demonstrated the strong commitment of the Government to the universal periodic review process at its second review, conducted on 27 January 2015.

779. The Ambassador underlined the fact that the review, conducted in a constructive spirit and non-politicized manner, presented a unique opportunity for the further improvement of human rights.

780. During the adoption of its Working Group report on 29 January, Turkey had accepted 199 out of the 278 recommendations made during the review, and stated that responses to 52 recommendations would be provided in due course. Following careful consideration by the relevant authorities, Turkey was pleased to announce that, out of the 278 recommendations, 215 had enjoyed its support, some of which were considered to be already implemented. Proportionally, that meant that Turkey had accepted approximately 80 per cent of the recommendations, which was proof of its strong commitment to the universal periodic review.

781. Immediately after its second review, Turkey had acted decisively to establish a sound follow-up mechanism for the recommendations in line with national human rights programmes. Accordingly, governmental consultations had been held and it was decided that the implementation of the recommendations would be followed by the Reform Action Group, which already played the leading role in the human rights reform process in Turkey. The State hoped that the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations would be reflected in its midterm follow-up report, to be presented to the Human Rights Council in 2017.

782. Turkey always considered the protection and promotion of human rights to be a priority for its own people. Its commitment to expand the scope of fundamental rights and freedoms and to uphold democracy and the rule of law continued unabated. Despite serious challenges endangering the stability in the region, Turkey had always opted for freedoms.

783. The fact that the recent parliamentary elections of 7 June had been characterized by high electoral participation demonstrated once again the State's commitment to democracy and to holding democratic elections.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

784. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Turkey, 17 delegations made statements.¹⁸

785. Honduras welcomed the transparent and constructive approach of Turkey throughout the universal periodic review process. It reiterated its recommendations, hoping that they would be accepted. It urged the State to redouble its efforts to improve the human rights situation and to maintain the same willingness and commitment it had shown in the implementation of the recommendations it had received during its first review.

786. India commended Turkey for the construction manner in which it had participated in the universal periodic review mechanism. The review had reflected the strong participation of peer States, which had made recommendations covering a range of issues relating to both the promotion and the protection of human rights. India was encouraged by the fact that Turkey had accepted as many as 215 recommendations, including those made by India, and it believed that, in the coming years, the State would continue its efforts to implement the recommendations it had accepted.

787. Kuwait thanked Turkey for its detailed report and welcomed the State's acceptance of most of the recommendations, which, together with the legislative measures it had taken, reflected its commitment to human rights. Kuwait welcomed the creation of a national human rights institution in 2012 and the State's accession to a number of human rights conventions. It also appreciated the efforts made by Turkey to host Syrian refugees and to grant them fundamental rights.

788. Oman welcomed the delegation of Turkey and appreciated its presentation, which showed the State's serious commitment to strengthen human rights in accordance with international mechanisms and standards. It commended Turkey for its acceptance of numerous recommendations, including those made by Oman.

789. Pakistan appreciated the steps Turkey had taken to implement its human rights obligations and acknowledged the efforts it had made to strengthen women's empowerment and to eliminate discrimination against women. It highly valued the State's commitment to the universal periodic review process, which was shown in its decision to accept the majority of the recommendations, including those of Pakistan. It wished Turkey success in the implementation of the recommendations by taking the necessary administrative and legislative measures.

790. Rwanda thanked the delegation of Turkey for its update on the recommendations it had received during its second review. Rwanda recognized the State's positive engagement with the Human Rights Council in the universal periodic review process and appreciated the fact that Turkey had accepted a significant number of recommendations, which demonstrated the State's strong commitment to promote and protect human rights.

791. Sierra Leone was pleased that Turkey intended to establish a new human rights mechanism as part of the Government's political commitment. It referred to the large number of recommendations that Turkey had accepted and it was especially pleased that all of the recommendations it had made had enjoyed the State's support. Sierra Leone encouraged Turkey to incorporate into national norms the recommendations it had accepted, and if possible, to integrate them into the judicial reform process.

792. The Sudan welcomed the delegation of Turkey and thanked it for the information provided. It noted with satisfaction the positive engagement of the State with the universal periodic review process. It was pleased that Turkey had accepted most of the recommendations, including those made by the Sudan. It wished the State success in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

¹⁸ The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Human Rights Council at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/29thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

793. The Syrian Arab Republic stated that, during the general debate under item 6, Turkey had stressed that the universal periodic review mechanism should not be used for the politicization of matters relating to human rights, while contrary to that and during its review, Turkey had rejected the recommendations made by the Syrian Arab Republic, which had been made in line with the relative documents. It regretted that Turkey had politicized the universal periodic review, as the recommendations had been rejected either because they had been made by a certain State or because of an unwillingness to comply with binding resolutions on countering terrorism, the language used in the recommendations made by the Syrian Arab Republic.

794. Tajikistan referred to the constructive participation of Turkey in the universal periodic review process, which demonstrated the State's readiness to fulfil its international commitments and to cooperate with international human rights mechanisms. It also referred to the implementation of significant measures relating to legislative reform, the protection of women and the promotion of education.

795. Togo commended Turkey for its commitment to the universal values of human rights and its full support for the universal periodic review mechanism. It welcomed the openness and transparency that had characterized the second review of Turkey and noted with satisfaction that the State had accepted the three recommendations made by Togo.

796. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland welcomed the acceptance by Turkey of a number of recommendations, and particularly its recommendation on ensuring the freedom of expression and assembly. It welcomed the steps that Turkey had taken to protect the rights of minority religious groups and it encouraged the State to make further efforts. It reiterated the importance of respecting fundamental rights and proceeding with legislative reforms. It commended Turkey for hosting about two million refugees from the Syrian Arab Republic and Iraq, and it expected to work closely with the new Government of Turkey.

797. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela appreciated the efforts made by Turkey to implement the recommendations it had received, with the establishment of new mechanisms for the protection of human rights, such as the office of the ombudsman, the national human rights institution in conformity with the Paris Principles and the system of constitutional appeal. It also appreciated the State's policies to guarantee the right to education and access to it through equal conditions and opportunities.

798. Afghanistan was encouraged by the fact that Turkey had accepted a significant number of recommendations and particularly by the constitutional amendments of September 2010, which had introduced positive changes for women, children, older persons and persons with disabilities, and which had brought the constitutional system into line with its international obligations. It referred to the progress the State had made in establishing a law enforcement oversight commission, which would function independently from law enforcement bodies to examine and investigate allegations of ill-treatment by law enforcement officials.

799. Albania commended Turkey for the successful measures it had taken in the field of the protection and promotion of human rights, and for considering them to be political priorities. It complimented the State on the "judicial reform packages", which had introduced substantial legislative amendments aimed at strengthening the freedom of expression. It appreciated the acceptance by Turkey of the recommendations made by Albania on adopting a law against different types of discrimination and on taking the measures required under the national strategy on children's rights and its plan of action, and on implementing the national plan of action for gender equality.

800. Azerbaijan was pleased with the acceptance by Turkey of the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Azerbaijan. It commended the State for its commitment to human rights, the establishment of the office of the ombudsman and the national human rights institution, and the adoption of the "judicial reform packages" and the "democratization package", which were aimed at, inter alia, strengthening the independence and impartiality of the judiciary and at providing a wide spectrum of human rights and freedoms. It appreciated the fact that Turkey had carried out legal and

administrative measures in order to provide a better understanding among all peoples and religions.

801. Qatar thanked Turkey for the information it had provided. The promotion and protection of human rights was part of the main objectives of the State. It welcomed the State's cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism to fulfil its obligations. A total of 215 recommendations had been accepted by Turkey, including the two made by Qatar. It appreciated the role played by the permanent representative of Turkey in the work of the Human Rights Council, and particularly the contribution made to Council resolution 16/18.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

802. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Turkey, 11 other stakeholders made statements.¹⁸

803. Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik regretted that Turkey had not supported the recommendations made by Cyprus. It referred to extensive reports on the grave situation of refugees and their asylum process and their living and working conditions. It appreciated the continued support of Turkey for Syrian refugees but referred to the State's failure to report on the rights of asylum seekers. It was concerned about the living and working conditions of Iranian refugees. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, political prisoners, and women victims of domestic violence and discrimination were especially vulnerable groups. Those minority groups were in danger of prosecution in their country of origin. It referred to reports of shortcomings regarding the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. Refugees did not enjoy the right to work or to health care, and child labour was an ongoing issue among refugees.

804. Minority Rights Group regretted that Turkey had a selective and discriminatory conception of minority rights. Based on the Lausanne Peace Treaty, Turkey recognized only Armenians, Jews and Greek Orthodox as minorities. Muslim minorities, including the large Kurdish community, were excluded from the definition. It also regretted that the State had rejected the recommendations calling for the ratification of the UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education and that it had maintained its reservation to article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. It regretted the State's rejection of the recommendation made by France on ending mandatory religion courses for Alevis and urged Turkey to remove compulsory religious classes from the curriculum. It called for more efforts to be made to ensure the right to education of the most disadvantaged communities, such as displaced Kurds and Roma.

805. In a joint statement, the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission and the International Lesbian and Gay Association welcomed the positive approach of Turkey to the recommendations relating to sexual orientation and gender identity. They urged Turkey to bring domestic laws into line with international conventions in order to protect lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender individuals. They were concerned that leading figures of a political party in Turkey had used homophobic discourse, and that a number of individuals had been killed due to their gender identity. They urged the State to support the initiatives of the Human Rights Council regarding the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender individuals.

806. Syriac Universal Alliance, Federation Syriaque International welcomed the acceptance by Turkey of the recommendations relating to human rights, minority rights and anti-discrimination measures and legislation to ensure the equality of all citizens. However, it was concerned about the fact that the report on Turkey did not address the struggle of the Aramean (Syriac) people. It called upon the Government to give the Aramean people legal status, to take measures to protect the Aramean people's cultural heritage, property rights and the Aramaic language, to increase investment in improving their living standards, and to preserve their habitat and population.

807. Action Canada for Population and Development made a statement in collaboration with the Sexual Rights Initiative. They regretted that Turkey had not accepted some of the recommendations. They welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendations on

ensuring gender equality and all women's access to safe abortion, on combating early marriage and on preventing gender violence. They urged Turkey to amend its law and to take a series of measures to guarantee women's right to abortion and to provide comprehensive sex education to promote gender equality.

808. Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship thanked the States that had made recommendations on the freedom of expression, including those on decriminalizing defamation and on amending the Internet law in order to end illegitimate censorship. It questioned the State's claim that Turkey enjoyed media pluralism, as there were cases of illegitimate arrests of journalists. It was particularly concerned about the arrest of an editor for having insulted the President of Turkey. It referred to the devastating effect of the harassment and prosecution of media workers and called upon Turkey to ensure the freedom of expression and the right to a fair trial.

809. Gazeteciler ve Yazarlar Vakfı referred to the commitment of Turkey to improve women's rights and to bring national law into line with international standards. Although Turkey was a signatory to the Istanbul Protocol, the increase in violence against women and femicide in recent years indicated that that phenomenon was part of a structural problem. It called upon Turkey to consider gender-sensitive education, to avoid having the media use discriminatory language against women, to avoid having senior State officials use discriminatory language against women, to implement effectively the international human rights conventions it had ratified and to avoid reduced sentences for perpetrators of violence against women.

810. Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale welcomed the initiatives of Turkey, including the review of the national plan of action on domestic violence against women of 2015, the project on the elimination of domestic violence against women in collaboration with the European Union of 2014, and the creation of a national council for surveying and coordinating women's employment. It was concerned about women's conditions and urged the State to adopt comprehensive legislation on discrimination against women and include a clear definition of that crime.

811. Africa Culture International Human Rights valued the initiatives taken by Turkey since 2010. More recently, in 2013, Turkey had adopted a "democratization package", introducing broad reforms to improve the enjoyment of civil and political rights. A plan of action for the prevention of human rights violations had been adopted in 2014, together with the law on the reinforcement of social integration. A number of measures had been taken to improve human rights training and awareness, and cooperation with international organizations. Africa Culture International Human Rights encouraged Turkey to continue its engagement in the various areas of development.

812. The Jubilee Campaign and Christian Solidarity Worldwide urged Turkey to implement the recommendations it had received during its review, especially those relating to the freedom of expression and the freedom of religion. While pointing out that Turkey had accepted a number of recommendations on the freedom of expression at its first universal periodic review, they were concerned about the situation of journalists and social media in the light of current legislation and practice, and they called for the removal of reservations to article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights with a view to protecting religious minority groups and removing a number of legislative measures penalizing them. They also encouraged Turkey to review the anti-terrorism law and to ensure a civilian alternative to military service with no discriminatory consequences.

813. Amnesty International pointed out that Turkey had accepted a number of general recommendations concerning human rights issues in the country; however, the more specific recommendations addressing those challenges had been rejected or considered "already implemented". That was also the case during the State's first review, where it had accepted a number of recommendations on the situation of human rights, which had since deteriorated. It was disappointed in the State's position on the recommendations on amending or abolishing laws that were used to limit the freedom of expression unfairly. It referred to hundreds of abusive prosecutions of journalists, activists and ordinary members of the public for having criticized the Government. Amnesty International urged Turkey to

bring its laws into line with international standards on the freedom of expression and to recognize the right to peaceful assembly. It was surprised that Turkey considered a recommendation on redrafting the law on meetings and demonstrations to be already implemented, as that stance directly contradicted the findings of the European Court of Human Rights.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

814. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 278 recommendations received, Turkey had supported 215 recommendations and noted 63.

815. The Ambassador thanked those who had made comments; nevertheless, he regretted the fact that there had been attempts to divert the focus of that very important discussion. Universal values such as democracy, human rights and fundamental freedoms were an inseparable part of the State's legislation, and perhaps more crucially, were deeply ingrained in its social fabric. Therefore, regarding the implementation of those universal values, any constructive advice or criticism was welcomed. However, Turkey expected critical advice coming from parties that had adopted the very same universal and common values as it had. Otherwise, the result could be an unwanted politicization of the universal periodic review process.

816. The scope of fundamental rights and freedoms in Turkey had expanded considerably. Minority rights were regulated in accordance with the Lausanne Peace Treaty, which recognized non-Muslim Turkish nationals as minorities. No other definition of minorities, based on ethnicity, race, language or other grounds, existed in Turkey. Turkish citizens belonging to non-Muslim minorities were entitled to the same rights and freedoms as other nationals and were also able to enjoy the minority rights accorded to them under the Lausanne Peace Treaty.

817. The Ambassador referred to the important achievements that had been made during the previous five years regarding education in different languages and dialects, and stated that literature institutes had been established at a number of universities. Restrictions on political propaganda in different languages and dialects had been lifted and the restoring of the old names of villages had been permitted. The State had taken positive steps in the areas of education and culture for non-Muslim citizens. Among other things, it had become possible to teach the Syriac language on certain days of the week at a kindergarten belonging to a Syriac community foundation in addition to the curriculum of the Ministry for National Education.

818. The Ambassador highlighted the progress made in recent years on the protection of the property rights of religious foundations, which was testimony to the State's goodwill and commitment to address the religious freedom and social requirements of various groups in Turkey.

819. Over recent years, developing democratic relations based on equality, regardless of one's identity, had been the State's basic philosophy. To that end, new efforts had been made to ensure equality in practice and to combat discrimination. No discriminatory provisions existed in Turkish law with regard to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. Equality before the law had been laid down in article 10 of the Constitution. The absence of specific provisions in respect of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons did not mean that the rights of that group were not legally guaranteed. Moreover, pursuant to article 90 of the Constitution, international agreements ratified by Turkey, such as the Istanbul Convention, which prohibited discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation, bore the force of law. Investigations were carried out in cases of killings and acts of violence against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons and for all kinds of hate crimes in order to identify perpetrators and bring them to justice. Turkey was vigilant in eliminating violence against women and domestic violence, and its efforts were guided by the Istanbul Convention.

820. In order to address the demands of the Alevite community, open debates were regularly organized with opinion leaders and community representatives, including debates on issues related to Cemevis.

821. The drafting process for the law commonly referred to as the “internal security package”, which had recently entered into force, complied with the universal principles. The utmost care had been taken to strike a balance between freedom and security. Some of the provisions were intended to ensure the effective implementation of laws, as in any State governed by the rule of law, to fight against crimes and offenders, to locate the offenders and bring them to justice, and to ensure public order and peace in the community.

822. The Ambassador addressed comments about the freedom of expression and the media, as Turkey had taken decisive steps in recent years both in law and in practice to expand its scope. The most important examples were the third and fourth “judicial reform packages”, adopted in 2012 and 2013, which had brought about the release of many detainees. With respect to media organizations, there was complete pluralism in Turkey. In addition to the national channels, there were a total of 221 private television channels. Of more than 4,000 newspapers, 66 were national. The imprisonment of journalists for their journalistic work should not be tolerated; at the same time, a person could not be considered immune from prosecution because of his or her profession if he or she was guilty of committing a crime. He underlined the fact that no journalist was prosecuted or imprisoned on account of journalistic work. All those referred to as “journalists in prison” had been charged with serious crimes. He reiterated that none of those persons had been prosecuted for his or her journalistic work, and the investigations could not be qualified as politically motivated; it was a purely judicial matter.

823. The Ambassador stressed that Turkey would continue to address challenges with courage and would try to find solutions based on goodwill. It would stand firm in pursuing its close cooperation with the United Nations, including through constructive engagement with the universal periodic review process.

824. Lastly, the Ambassador expressed his gratitude to the members of the troika, namely Cuba, Gabon and Saudi Arabia, the secretariat of OHCHR and the interpreters for their dedicated contribution to the review of Turkey.

Guyana

825. The review of Guyana was held on 28 January 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Guyana in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GUY/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GUY/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GUY/3).

826. At its 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Guyana (see sect. C below).

827. The outcome of the review of Guyana comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/16), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/29/16/Add.1).

1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

828. The delegation of Guyana expressed its gratitude to the Human Rights Council and its President for the opportunity to present its response to the remaining recommendations made on the presentation by Guyana.

829. The delegation referred to occurrences in Guyana that had preceded the current presentation. The State had held national and regional elections on 11 May 2015, which had seen the replacement of the incumbent Government of Guyana with a multiparty coalition. The elections had been free and fair, with a clear majority for the current Government, and international observers had viewed the process as having been transparent and successful. The new Government, which had been sworn into Parliament on 10 June 2015, was committed to all aspects of the human development of the Guyanese people, from political freedoms and empowerment to their sustainability and human security, and to endeavours to work fervently towards the improvement of the lives of the citizens of Guyana.

830. The Government of Guyana was ready to work with its international partners for the development of all Guyanese in pursuit of its national objectives and goals, and its international obligations and responsibilities.

831. Guyana was determined to refashion its society into one that promulgated social and economic advancement. In pursuit of that goal, the Government had undertaken to introduce measures to promote social cohesion and protect vulnerable groups, secure economic development, implement policies that would help the young people of Guyana to attain higher educational standards in order to ensure that their time and talents were not wasted but were spent instead on gainful employment. Guyana was also determined to build a society in which women and girl children could look forward to living in safety and to being protected from abuse and violent crime, and in which there was equal development for indigenous peoples, the freedom of the press and the freedom of access to information, in an atmosphere of national peace and security.

832. The Government was committed to working assiduously in the Eleventh Parliament on the issues that would have a positive impact on national development and on the welfare of the people of Guyana.

833. The delegation then responded to the recommendations, as described below and in the addendum to the report of the Working Group.

834. Guyana had noted the recommendations on the right to life and on the death penalty because the death penalty was still part of the law of Guyana. A de facto moratorium had been in place since 1997 and as a result over 15 prisoners on death row had had their sentences commuted to life imprisonment, and some of them would be able to apply for parole within the following three years. The death penalty was retained in limited cases, such as the murder of a police officer on duty or treason. It was anticipated that the matter would continue to engage the attention of the Parliamentary Special Select Committee.

835. Guyana had noted the recommendations relating to women's rights. The State was committed to the observance of women's rights as set out in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and incorporated into domestic law through the Constitution of Guyana. However, it was the view of the Government that the Women and Gender Equality Commission and other commissions relating to human rights established through the Constitution and the Supreme Court of Guyana provided easily accessible and timely relief where it was alleged that a right had or was being violated.

836. Regarding the American Convention on Human Rights, the delegation pointed out that the related recommendation had been noted, that Guyana was committed to the observance of human rights and the promulgation of the principles of the Charter of the Organization of American States, and that most of those rights were already enshrined in the State's Constitution. However, Guyana was not currently in a position to become a State party to the American Convention on Human Rights as outstanding issues, including positions on the death penalty and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons, needed to be resolved. Those issues were expected to engage the attention of the Eleventh Parliament.

Nevertheless, Guyana was confident that adequate safeguards existed to protect the fundamental and human rights of all Guyanese people.

837. Guyana had noted the recommendations relating to torture. The State strictly prohibited torture and the mistreatment of detainees and inmates. The Government had publicly gone on record and condemned any form of abuse or torture and repeatedly demanded that any allegation of torture or mistreatment of citizens, including prisoners, be expeditiously investigated and that action be taken against defaulting ranks. The Office of Professional Responsibility of the Police Force and the Criminal Investigation Department, along with the recently strengthened Police Complaints Authority and the Chambers of the Director of Public Prosecutions, had all been playing a pivotal role in the prevention of and prosecution for torture.

838. Guyana had noted the recommendation relating to enforced disappearance and stated that it had initiated the relevant consultation processes to accede to the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

839. Guyana had noted the recommendation relating to genocide and stated that it recognized that the crime of genocide was reprehensible and condemned by the civilized world. The delegation reiterated that Guyana was a party to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, which criminalized genocide.

840. Guyana had noted the recommendation relating to the International Criminal Court and, as a party to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, it was cognisant of the obligations arising therefrom and undertook to enact the relevant laws.

841. Guyana had accepted the recommendations relating to the national human rights institution. The Constitution of Guyana had established the Human Rights Commission, the Woman and Gender Equality Commission, the Indigenous Peoples Commission, the Rights of the Child Commission and the Office of the Ombudsman.

842. Guyana had noted the recommendations on cooperating with the special procedures. The State was willing to accommodate and cooperate with all United Nations bodies, but a commitment to the issuance of a standing invitation to all special procedures might not be within the capacity of the Government at the present time.

843. Guyana had accepted the recommendation relating to women, peace and security and would continue to make every effort to safeguard women and children from the effects of conflict and violence.

844. Guyana had noted the recommendations relating to discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons. The Government had undertaken to reconvene the Parliamentary Special Select Committee to receive and hear submissions on the attitude of the Guyanese public towards any changes in legislative provisions and criminal laws on consensual adult same-sex relationships and discrimination, perceived or real, against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons.

845. Guyana had noted the recommendations relating to children and corporal punishment, and undertook to reconvene the Parliamentary Special Select Committee to receive and hear submissions on the attitude of the Guyanese public towards any changes in legislative provisions permitting corporal punishment. Substantial public consultations on the issue had already been completed and there were guidelines in place for the maintenance of order and discipline in schools, which significantly curtailed the instances in which corporal punishment could be administered. The Training School (Amendment) Act of 2010 and the Juvenile Offenders (Amendment) Act of 2010 had abolished corporal punishment in juvenile correctional institutions, and the Child Care and Development Services Act of 2011 also prohibited corporal punishment in institutional residences.

846. Guyana had noted the recommendation on the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure and wished to reiterate that the protection of children was given the highest priority. The Protection of Children Act of 2009 provided several avenues for the protection of children. Furthermore, the Childcare and Protection Agency within the Ministry for Social Protection and the Schools Welfare

Department within the Ministry for Education oversaw the best interests of children in Guyana.

847. Guyana had accepted the recommendation on having an independent organ investigate complaints of abuses by members of the security forces. The Security Sectoral Committee provided parliamentary oversight. The Office of Professional Responsibility and the Police Complaints Authority were also independent organs that investigated complaints of wrongdoing by members of the Guyana Police Force. Reports of all investigations were forwarded to the Director of Public Prosecutions for legal advice.

848. Guyana had noted the recommendations relating to the age of criminal responsibility. A draft legislative instrument addressing juvenile justice was under consultative review by the Government, after which definitive consideration would be given to those matters.

849. Guyana had noted the recommendation relating to the freedom of expression online and to defamation, and reiterated that the freedom of expression was enshrined in article 146 of the Constitution. The Government acknowledged that the modernization of local laws was required and stated that it would explore that area in due course.

850. Guyana had accepted the recommendations relating to the quality of education and dropout rates. The Government would continue to engage various stakeholders, including parents, to significantly reduce the school dropout rate and to improve the quality of education, as set out in the strategic action plan for 2014–2018 of the Ministry for Education.

851. Lastly, Guyana had accepted the recommendation relating to the quality of life of indigenous people. The State had initiated the relevant consultation processes to sign and ratify the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169). The Amerindian Act of 2006 relied on the Convention, and there were several ongoing programmes to improve the lives of the indigenous peoples of Guyana.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

852. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Guyana, six delegations made statements.

853. Brazil recognized the advances that had taken place in the country. It was particularly pleased that Guyana had filled the vacant position of constitutional Ombudsman and had enacted the Amerindian Act of 2006, which was an important tool for the empowerment of the indigenous peoples of the country. It congratulated Guyana for having accepted the majority of the recommendations it had received, and reiterated that their implementation was important guidance in stepping up progress in the realization of human rights in the country. Brazil reiterated its commitment to support Guyana in the implementation of the recommendations received, both in the multilateral field and in the framework of regional and bilateral cooperation mechanisms.

854. China welcomed the constructive engagement of Guyana with the universal periodic review process. It appreciated the State's timely feedback and acceptance of most of the recommendations made during the process. It thanked the State for having accepted its recommendation on continuing to increase the inputs of financial and human resources into education so as to improve the quality of education and to reduce dropout rates, and its recommendation on continuing to strengthen the construction of drinking water and basic sanitation facilities to provide its people with better basic services. China encouraged Guyana, in accordance with its national development plans, to gradually implement the recommendations it had accepted, and it called upon the international community to provide, in full consultation with Guyana, the necessary support.

855. Cuba thanked Guyana for the information it had provided on its position on the recommendations and for its acceptance of the two recommendations made by Cuba, which had been made with a view to increasing the advancement of the country in the fight against poverty and to bringing about gender equality.

856. Ghana was pleased that Guyana had supported its recommendations on ratifying the Convention against Discrimination in Education and on implementing measures aimed at building an all-inclusive society. It commended Guyana for having initiated steps to ratify and accede to several conventions, including the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its Protocol. Those achievements demonstrated the State's commitment to promote and protect the fundamental freedoms and rights of its people. Ghana looked forward to the abolition of corporal punishment in Guyana soon, in keeping with the letter and spirit of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. It reiterated its call for Guyana to favourably consider ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, to establish a national human rights institution in full compliance with the Paris Principles and to issue a standing invitation to all special procedures.

857. India was pleased with the receptive and constructive manner in which Guyana had participated in the universal periodic review. The review reflected the intense participation and engagement of peer countries, with as many as 54 interventions delivered from the floor and 143 recommendations made. It trusted that, in the coming years, Guyana would further intensify its efforts to implement the recommendations accepted.

858. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela highlighted the efforts made by Guyana in the fight against poverty, with the implementation of its programme on poverty reduction for 2011–2015, which had facilitated equal access to goods and services for those in greater need, thereby increasing the quality of life of its people. It also highlighted the fact that Guyana had accepted the recommendation on eliminating gender disparity in education, which was free of charge from the preschool level. The open participation of the Government in its review confirmed its commitment to move towards the full realization of the fundamental rights of its people.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

859. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Guyana, four other stakeholders made statements.

860. The Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative was pleased that Guyana would consider establishing a national human rights institution. It encouraged the State to seek support from the Commonwealth secretariat, which had previously helped countries in the Caribbean and Americas region regarding the same matter. A national human rights institution would also help the State to keep closer track of its engagement with United Nations human rights mechanisms and hopefully avoid delays in complying with reporting obligations. For instance, Guyana was scheduled to submit a report the following year to the Committee against Torture and, to comply with that obligation, it needed to take measures to empower the institution with independent investigative authority and to issue a standing invitation to special rapporteurs. It referred to the Government's efforts to hold consultations on issues concerning sexual orientation and gender identity, and stated that, earlier that year, the Government had confirmed that the designated parliamentary committee was facing challenges in reaching consensus over the issue of decriminalizing same-sex relations. The Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative requested that the appropriate United Nations agencies and offices support Guyana in order to address the intricacies and reach positive outcomes on that subject. Lastly, it congratulated Guyana for having ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities the previous year and it hoped that it would ratify other conventions, such as the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, and the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment before the next universal periodic review cycle.

861. Action Canada for Population and Development was deeply concerned about the failure of the Government to provide an addendum report that responded to recommendations on decriminalizing adult consensual same-gender sexual activity. It was pleased that Guyana had supported recommendations 130.25 to 130.27 on strengthening protection measures for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons, and on investigating hate crimes and discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity. However, measures to implement those recommendations would not be effective as long as

homophobia was State-sponsored through legislation and the criminalization of same-gender sexual activity. It underscored the fact that the lack of respect for the right to equality and for non-discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons in Guyana reinforced stigma and discrimination, and deterred lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons from reporting acts of abuse and violence to the relevant authorities. It urged the Government of Guyana to adopt a holistic approach when dealing with violations of human rights and to repeal laws that criminalized the consensual sexual activity of persons based on their gender or sexual orientation, and to affirm the rights of persons marginalized based on sexual and gender norms. It further urged the Government to take a strong stand towards equality and non-discrimination by making a suitable amendment to the Constitution.

862. Amnesty International was concerned about the fact that death sentences continued to be imposed in Guyana and that at least five people had been sentenced to death in 2013 and, as of June 2014, there were reportedly 14 people on death row. A large number of recommendations from the review of Guyana had called for the abolition of the death penalty. Amnesty International referred to the State's remarks during the session and welcomed its acceptance of some of the recommendations. It urged Guyana to implement all of the recommendations relating to the death penalty in full and without delay. It also welcomed the acceptance by Guyana of the recommendations on strengthening the protection of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, including by taking measures to ensure that hate crimes and discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity were vigorously investigated and appropriately prosecuted. Currently, national legislation did not provide protection from discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. Moreover, Guyana continued to criminalize consensual same-sex conduct, and legislation created a discriminatory environment in which lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons were not able to enjoy their human rights fully. It urged the Government to implement with immediate effect the numerous recommendations on repealing all provisions that discriminated against persons on the basis of their sexual orientation or gender identity, including those that criminalized consensual same-sex relations among adults. Lastly, Amnesty International continued to receive allegations of the excessive use of force by the Guyana Police Force during arrests and detentions. It also welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendations on increasing the capacity and strengthening the independence of the Police Complaints Authority to undertake prompt and impartial investigations of police abuse. It urged the Government to implement those recommendations as a matter of priority.

863. UNICEF welcomed the initiatives taken by the Government to review the issue of corporal punishment, to review the draft juvenile justice bill, and to continue investments in health, education, housing and water as a means of ensuring the bridge in income and other inequality ratios. It commended Guyana for having prioritized the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and it looked forward to joint efforts in the implementation of that Convention, the Convention on the Rights of the Child and other human rights treaties relating to children. To accelerate progress for the children of Guyana, UNICEF reiterated its commitment to the legal removal of corporal punishment in all settings, the parliamentary approval of juvenile justice legislation compliant with the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the implementation of the Sexual Offences Act and the Domestic Violence Act as part of action to systematically prevent and treat the issue of violence (especially against children and women), the articulation and implementation of child-sensitive and pro-poor policies that would offer a better chance of ensuring equity for all, the full implementation of the maternal, perinatal and integrated child health strategy, and the prevention of vector-borne and other communicable diseases. It also referred to such emerging issues as the possible exploitation of children in the natural resources and business sectors, issues surrounding participation rights, especially those of youth, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer youth, and those matters raised in the concluding observations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child in 2013.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

864. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 143 recommendations received, Guyana had supported 88 recommendations and noted 55.

865. In conclusion, the delegation of Guyana thanked OHCHR and all the speakers, States and international organizations that had supported Guyana in the universal periodic review process. It underscored the fact that the current Government, which had been sworn into office on June 10, was committed to all aspects of the human development of all Guyanese, working towards ensuring political freedom and the empowerment of all citizens.

Kuwait

866. The review of Kuwait was held on 28 January 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Kuwait in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KWT/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KWT/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KWT/3).

867. At its 31st meeting, on 26 June 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Kuwait (see sect. C below).

868. The outcome of the review of Kuwait comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/17), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/29/17/Add.1).

1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

869. The delegation of Kuwait expressed its appreciation for the universal periodic review mechanism and its role in the development of the human rights system. Kuwait was convinced of the importance of working and cooperating with regional and international mechanisms for the promotion and protection of human rights. For that reason, Kuwait had made annual voluntary contributions to OHCHR to support the universal periodic review mechanism. In that regard, the delegation expressed its appreciation for the fruitful interactive dialogue at the second review of Kuwait, which had taken place on 28 January 2015 and had resulted in a significant number of recommendations.

870. The delegation highlighted the fact that Kuwait had created a national standing committee comprising all government agencies and institutions. Its task was to study and follow up on the recommendations and to determine a position on them, leading to their implementation. The committee and non-governmental organizations had held consultations in March and June 2015. What had been reached the present day was the fruit of a joint effort.

871. Out of the 278 recommendations received, Kuwait had accepted 178, noted 25 and partially accepted four. It had rejected 71 recommendations, as some of them were in conflict with the provisions of Islamic law, the Constitution and the laws of the State, while others contained elements incompatible with the national identity and values of the society

and culture of Kuwait. It had therefore divided some of those recommendations into different categories.

872. There were 11 recommendations relating to the freedom of expression and peaceful assembly, and Kuwait had accepted nine, noted two and rejected none.

873. With regard to employment, Kuwait had accepted 14 recommendations, noted four and rejected none. The delegation highlighted the recent adoption of a law governing the use of domestic labour in Kuwait.

874. Kuwait had accepted all 21 recommendations relating to a legal framework for human rights.

875. Kuwait had accepted all 14 recommendations relating to cooperation with human rights mechanisms.

876. Kuwait had accepted all six recommendations relating to anti-trafficking. The delegation underscored the State's adoption of a law on combating human trafficking.

877. Kuwait had accepted all five recommendations relating to the area of women's participation in public life. It had declared 16 May of each year to be national women's day in the country in order to pay tribute to the contribution of women to public life.

878. Kuwait had accepted all 11 recommendations relating to development.

879. Kuwait had received and accepted fully 14 recommendations relating to the rights of persons with disabilities and older persons. That was separate from the recent adoption of the law on children.

880. Kuwait had received nine recommendations relating to the field of humanitarian aid and had accepted all of them. The delegation confirmed that Kuwait would continue its humanitarian efforts worldwide.

881. Some of the 178 recommendations accepted had already been implemented or were in the process of being implemented, including those on establishing a national human rights institution. The Executive branch had submitted a proposal for the establishment of a national human rights institution, and it was at the second stage of deliberation in Parliament.

882. Kuwait was a country blessed with peace, security, serenity, the rule of law, justice, and economic and social welfare and as a result it attracted many expatriates to work there. More than 180 different nationalities resided in Kuwait. Under that demographic reality, Kuwait placed the utmost importance on human rights, the rule of law, the promotion of and respect for justice, and respect for the rights and dignity of others and their religions, and that explained why Kuwait had accepted a large number of recommendations.

883. The ambition of Kuwait went beyond what the State had already achieved at national and international levels, and it was driven to continue to increase its efforts to overcome the challenges that remained. Kuwait still had not reached the perfection to which it aspired because perfection belonged only to Almighty God. Nevertheless, it was making efforts to overcome challenges, despite the fact that Kuwait was a relatively young country.

884. The complex regional context and instability surrounding Kuwait could have a negative impact on its national context. For example, within the previous three hours, there had been a terrorist attack on a mosque in Kuwait and it had happened during Ramadan, a sacred month, and on a Friday, a sacred day. The attack had resulted in the loss of innocent lives and in injuries. It was clearly a terrorist attack, which had nothing to do with Islam.

885. Kuwait considered that the present forum provided an opportunity for the State to benefit from experiences, observations and opinions and that it would welcome comments and statements from States and stakeholders.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

886. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kuwait, 17 delegations made statements.¹⁹

887. Morocco referred to the important efforts that Kuwait had made to ensure the effective exercise of human rights. It appreciated the positive cooperation of Kuwait with the Human Rights Council and its mechanisms and the State's renewed commitment to establish the foundations of the rule of law and respect for human rights.

888. Myanmar appreciated the constructive engagement of Kuwait in the universal periodic review process. It was pleased that the State had accepted certain recommendations, including those made by Myanmar.

889. Nepal referred to the remarkable socioeconomic development of Kuwait in recent years. It encouraged the State to continue its efforts to ensure the safety, security and dignity of migrant workers in the country, including women domestic workers, and the protection of their interests through institutional and legislative measures.

890. The Niger welcomed the progress made by Kuwait to promote and protect human rights through the adoption of several legislative and regulatory texts, including the law of 2013 on combating trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants and the law of 2014 on the residence of foreigners. The State had put in place national policies and strategies for human rights advocacy and taken regulatory measures on the creation of a health services department for older persons and health teams to protect children from abuse.

891. Oman welcomed the creation of national mechanisms for the protection of the rights of children and the establishment of a development plan to strengthen the capacities of the women of Kuwait. It appreciated the unique role played by Kuwait in the provision of aid and relief internationally, particularly in areas with tension and conflict.

892. Pakistan commended Kuwait for its humanitarian and development work and relief operations around the world, which reflected the State's commitment to protect and promote human rights and to alleviate human suffering. It appreciated the constructive engagement of Kuwait with human rights mechanisms, including the treaty bodies and the universal periodic review.

893. The Philippines pointed out that Kuwait had made significant advances in the realization of the socioeconomic rights of its people and had taken steps to promote the rights of women and migrant workers. It believed that Kuwait could choose to take the lead in the region in pursuing the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. It congratulated the State on having enhanced protection mechanisms for domestic workers and it hoped that that would pave the way for the State's future ratification of the ILO Domestic Workers Convention (No. 189).

894. Qatar stated that the review of Kuwait had demonstrated the State's commitment to promote and protect human rights. It referred to the global humanitarian role that Kuwait played by providing countries in need around the world with aid. The State did so in the belief that democracy, development, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms were interdependent and mutually reinforcing.

895. Rwanda applauded Kuwait for having accepted the recommendations on establishing a national human rights institution and on having adopted a comprehensive national plan of action to achieve gender equality. It commended Kuwait for having taken significant steps to promote and protect human rights.

896. Saudi Arabia appreciated the attention that Kuwait had paid to the promotion and protection of human rights through numerous efforts, including the ratification of the

¹⁹ The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Human Rights Council at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/29thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the creation of national mechanisms to promote human rights, such as a committee for the defence of human rights within the National Assembly, and the development of social welfare and health initiatives for all children.

897. Senegal welcomed the measures taken by Kuwait, particularly the presentation of national reports to the treaty bodies and the establishment of a national human rights institution in conformity with the Paris Principles. It referred to the State's commitment to promote the rights of women and migrants and its agreement to receive the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery and the Special Rapporteur on the right to freedom of opinion and expression.

898. Sierra Leone commended Kuwait for having created a committee for the defence of human rights within the National Assembly and for planning to establish a human rights institution in conformity with the Paris Principles. It referred to the State's endeavours with regard to international humanitarian assistance and the creation of various mechanisms to address its human rights obligations nationally. It encouraged Kuwait to give due consideration to ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

899. Singapore welcomed the commitment of Kuwait to the full protection of women's rights and to the implementation of practical measures to eliminate discrimination against women. It commended Kuwait for its consistent approach to providing those affected by natural and human-caused disasters with impactful humanitarian assistance.

900. Somalia referred to the significant advances in the promotion and protection of human rights in Kuwait. It welcomed the laws, policies and programmes to address discrimination and violence against the most vulnerable, particularly women, older persons, children and foreign migrants.

901. South Sudan applauded the efforts of Kuwait to provide official development assistance worldwide, in particular to developing countries. It also commended Kuwait for its efforts to strengthen the promotion and protection of human rights.

902. Sri Lanka was encouraged by the efforts made by Kuwait to strengthen its policies and to review its legislation to enhance women's empowerment and equality through, for example, the establishment of the principle of equal pay between men and women for work of equal value in the private sector and the approval of the employment of women in the judiciary.

903. The State of Palestine welcomed the acceptance by Kuwait of the overwhelming majority of the recommendations, including its own, which reflected the commitment of Kuwait to the promotion and protection of human rights. It also welcomed the establishment of the national standing committee, which would prepare national reports on human rights and oversee their follow-up.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

904. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kuwait, 10 other stakeholders made statements.¹⁹

905. Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik was disappointed about the rejection by Kuwait of recommendations on ratifying the ILO Domestic Workers Convention (No. 189), on abandoning the Kafala sponsorship system, and on adopting legislation criminalizing domestic and sexual violence, including marital rape. The recommendations on establishing a formal moratorium on the use of the death penalty had also been rejected. The State's efforts to combat trafficking were far from sufficient. Kuwait had rejected the recommendation on recognizing the right to nationality, resulting in thousands of stateless persons facing severe restrictions in access to employment, health care and education. Kuwait continued to restrict the freedoms of expression, the press and belief, and the freedom to criticize the State. In May 2014, the National Assembly had passed a new telecommunications law allowing the authorities to monitor, block and censor online material. Same-sex relationships were still punishable in accordance with the Penal Code.

906. Human Rights Watch stated that, in 2015, Kuwait had prosecuted at least six people for twitter posts critical of Saudi Arabia. On 16 June, the National Assembly of Kuwait had adopted a new cybercrime law that would further criminalize political speech on the Internet. On 7 May, the Ministry for Social Affairs had issued a decree that dissolved the board of the Kuwait chapter of Transparency International and replaced board members with governmental appointees. The previous year, the authorities had stripped 33 Kuwaitis of their nationality. The State had made no significant progress during the previous year in addressing the nationality claims of at least 105,000 stateless Bidoon. Human Rights Watch called upon Kuwait to put an immediate end to its ongoing crackdown on free speech and to make a genuine effort to carry out much needed reforms to guarantee the rights of the Bidoon population.

907. The Alsalam Foundation stated that many recommendations had been made relating to the freedom of expression, which was severely curtailed in Kuwait. Many bloggers were victimized by controls and restrictions on the freedom of expression on the Internet. Furthermore, people were still being imprisoned for criticizing the Governments of neighbouring countries. It hoped that Kuwait would implement the recommendations from the Czech Republic, Estonia, France and Uruguay by releasing political prisoners, who had purely been exercising their freedom of expression, and dropping charges against them, and by respecting the international agreements and treaties to which Kuwait was a party. It also pointed out that, just recently, an activist had been arrested after he had returned to Kuwait for having cooperated with the Human Rights Council.

908. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues welcomed the acceptance by Kuwait of the recommendations on eliminating discrimination against women and on combating violence against women. However, it remained concerned about the rejection of the recommendations on withdrawing its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and on abolishing the death penalty. While Kuwait had accepted the recommendations on guaranteeing the freedom of expression, bloggers and activists continued to be sentenced and arbitrarily detained. It urged Kuwait to immediately release them. The State had also rejected the recommendations on improving the status of the Bidoon. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues urged Kuwait to launch a vast naturalization programme and to guarantee respect for their fundamental rights in cases of a refusal of their applications for citizenship. It welcomed the adoption of a law on domestic work and the acceptance of the recommendations on protecting the rights of migrants. However, it regretted the State's rejection of the recommendations on ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

909. The International Service for Human Rights urged Kuwait to implement the recommendations on respecting and protecting journalists, defenders and demonstrators and on repealing or amending the law on public gatherings, the Penal Code, the national security laws, press regulations, and the *lèse-majesté* and blasphemy laws. Kuwait had also received recommendations on cooperating with international human rights mechanisms. However, the International Service for Human Rights was deeply concerned about reprisals against human rights defenders, such as Nawaf al-Hendal, that had been made in retaliation for their advocacy for the universal periodic review and for peacefully exercising their rights to the freedom of expression, association and assembly. It called upon Kuwait to desist from reprisals and to ensure accountability where reprisals occurred. It also encouraged the State in its efforts to establish a national human rights institution in conformity with the Paris Principles.

910. The International Lesbian and Gay Association stated that the Criminal Code in Kuwait punished consensual homosexual relationships between men over 21 years of age by imprisonment for up to seven years. Parliament had also added restrictions to the right to privacy and the freedom of expression in choosing what to wear by criminalizing under article 198 the "imitation of the appearance of the opposite sex" with punishment by imprisonment of up to one year and a fine of up to US\$ 3,500. Since then, a large number of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons were reported to have been arrested, humiliated or forced to stay in the country by court order. They had suffered from discrimination, stigma and inaccessibility to almost all services, including necessary health

services. It urged the Human Rights Council to fulfil its obligation to protect the human rights of everyone, including lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons in the Middle East and North Africa.

911. The Indian Council of South America commended Kuwait for its humanitarian assistance to developing countries. It recommended that Kuwait continue its efforts to advance the life of women in society, improve the situation of the Bidoons and move towards ratifying the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness, continue to develop its human rights by working with the special procedures and by developing human rights institutions in accordance with the Paris Principles with the participation of civil society, continue to work with the Special Rapporteur on the right to freedom of opinion and expression and invite other independent experts, and move towards reviewing the juvenile justice system so that it fell in line with international standards. It also called upon Kuwait to assist in convening a conference on the issue of the death penalty.

912. Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale commended Kuwait for having placed importance on the rights of women. The development indicators for 2010–2013 showed an increase in the proportion of Kuwaiti women in the labour market. The reduction in the gap between girls and boys (the enrolment rate of girls in general and in higher education exceeded that of boys) contributed to ensuring gender equality in education before 2015, the deadline set for the Millennium Development Goals. OCAPROCE Internationale encouraged Kuwait to redouble its efforts to create a law of general scope to punish discrimination, especially discrimination against women, and a law prohibiting early marriage and the forced marriage of girls.

913. Africa Culture International Human Rights referred to the significant efforts made by Kuwait in different areas of development and regulations, including the struggle against poverty, respect for laws and regulations, social rights, the employment of women, the fight against trafficking, including the trafficking of migrants, the creation of a law relating to the stay of foreigners, the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the protection of the environment. The provisions in the Constitution relating to fundamental rights and liberty would be interpreted in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the international treaties and agreements ratified by Kuwait. Africa Culture International Human Rights urged human rights organizations to better consider the progress made by Kuwait in social and economic areas at national and international levels.

914. The African Development Association welcomed the constant efforts made by Kuwait in support of developing countries and the reforms it had made in various areas of human rights. It referred to a draft law on the establishment of an independent national human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles, the creation of the Public Authority for Manpower, and the establishment of the Central Agency for the Regularization of the Status of Illegal Residents. The development plan for 2015–2020 foresaw a revision of the legislation to accelerate the emancipation of women and the abolition of discriminatory provisions. It encouraged Kuwait to continue its ongoing legislative reforms to improve the legal and social situation of foreign workers.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

915. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 278 recommendations received, Kuwait had supported 178 recommendations, provided additional clarification on four recommendations and noted 96.

916. The delegation of Kuwait once again thanked all of those who had participated in the session. Kuwait was keen to take advantage of all the remarks and constructive interventions. It had benefited from best practices at the international level, taking into account the fact it did not live on an isolated island, but rather in a regional and international environment. A war against Daesh, the situation in Iraq, the conflict with the Houthis, the repercussions of the Arab Spring in the region, the spread of terrorism and extremism, and the situation in Libya, the Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen, the State of

Palestine and other States had had negative repercussions at the national level, but that would not prevent Kuwait from facing and addressing those repercussions through sovereignty and the rule of law. The State would further promote human rights and overall international humanitarian action.

917. The delegation also thanked the non-governmental organizations for their views and constructive criticism, which Kuwait would carefully study. However, there had been shortcomings in some of their comments on the laws and regulations in Kuwait. The State urged the organizations to study those laws and regulations carefully and objectively to know the facts. The delegation stressed that the doors of Kuwait had always been and would remain open to the views aimed at the defence of human rights, at not only the national level but also the international level. The Permanent Mission of Kuwait at Geneva was ready to provide any clarifications with regard to human rights.

918. The promotion and protection of human rights was a strategic choice for Kuwait and its approach was an integrated one, inclusive of economic, social and cultural issues. The State's efforts to protect human rights in Kuwait revealed its eagerness to lay the foundations at the national level and to support those efforts at the regional and international levels, bearing in mind the values, cultures, customs and traditions of society. The cooperation of Kuwait with the universal periodic review mechanism, its support for most of the recommendations and its eagerness to put them into practice clearly reflected the State's commitment to the principles contained in resolution 5/1.

919. The delegation reiterated its appreciation for the great trust and esteem shown in the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kuwait. The State considered that the unanimity and words of praise were a tribute to the achievements of Kuwait not only in the field of human rights but also in its overall humanitarian work.

B. General debate on agenda item 6

920. At its 32nd meeting, on 26 June 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 6, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), China, India, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Maldives, Montenegro, Morocco, Paraguay, Tunisia²⁰ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Burkina Faso, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Trinidad and Tobago;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Colombian Commission of Jurists, Human Rights Commission of Pakistan, Indian Council of South America, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Service for Human Rights, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Maarif Foundation for Peace and Development, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme; UPR Info, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

921. At the same meeting, the representative of Maldives made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

²⁰ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Kyrgyzstan

922. At its 26th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/101 without a vote.

Guinea

923. At its 26th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/102 without a vote.

Lao People's Democratic Republic

924. At its 27th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/103 without a vote.

Spain

925. At its 27th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/104 without a vote.

Lesotho

926. At its 27th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/105 without a vote.

Kenya

927. At its 29th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/106 without a vote.

Armenia

928. At its 29th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/107 without a vote.

Guinea-Bissau

929. At its 29th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/108 without a vote.

Sweden

930. At its 30th meeting, on 26 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/109 without a vote.

Grenada

931. At its 30th meeting, on 26 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/110 without a vote.

Turkey

932. At its 30th meeting, on 26 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/111 without a vote.

Kuwait

933. At its 31st meeting, on 26 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/112 without a vote.

Kiribati

934. At its 41st meeting, on 1 July 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/113 without a vote.

Guyana

935. At its 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/114 without a vote.

VII. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories

A. Interactive dialogue with the independent international commission of inquiry to investigate all violations of international humanitarian law and international human rights law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, particularly in the occupied Gaza Strip, in the context of the military operations conducted since 13 June 2014

936. At the 33rd meeting, on 29 June 2015, the Chair of the independent international commission of inquiry to investigate all violations of international humanitarian law and international human rights law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, particularly in the occupied Gaza Strip, in the context of the military operations conducted since 13 June 2014, Mary McGowan Davis, presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-21/1, the report of the commission (A/HRC/29/52).

937. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as the State concerned.

938. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Chair questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Cuba, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)²¹ (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Tunisia²¹ (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Chile, Egypt, Iceland, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Senegal, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (also on behalf of the Independent Commission for Human Rights of the State of Palestine);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Adalah – Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel, Al Mezan Center for Human Rights (also on behalf of the BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights), Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, American Association of Jurists, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies (also on behalf of the Al Mezan Center for Human Rights, Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man and the BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights), International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Medical Aid for Palestinians, Touro Law Center.

939. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made final remarks as the State concerned.

940. Also at the same meeting, the Chair answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

²¹ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

B. General debate on agenda item 7

941. At its 34th meeting, on 29 June 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 7, during which the following made statements:

(a) The representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and the State of Palestine, as the States concerned;

(b) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Cuba, El Salvador, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)²¹ (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia²¹ (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(c) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Chile, Ecuador, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Oman, Senegal, Turkey, Uruguay, Yemen;

(d) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: African Union;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, Al Mezan Center for Human Rights, American Association of Jurists, Amnesty International, Amuta for NGO Responsibility, Arab Commission for Human Rights, BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, B'nai B'rith, Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World – Council of Churches, Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations, Defence for Children International, European Union of Jewish Students, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Human Rights Watch, Ingénieurs du monde (also on behalf of United Nations Watch), International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Federation of Journalists, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Medical Aid for Palestinians, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, World Barua Organization, World Jewish Congress.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem

942. At the 46th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.35, sponsored by Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Namibia, Nicaragua, Tunisia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Slovenia, South Africa and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

943. At the same meeting, the representative of Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) orally revised the draft resolution.

944. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Israel and the State of Palestine made statements as the States concerned.

945. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

946. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia made general comments and the representatives of France, Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Paraguay, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

947. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Paraguay, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

948. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised by 41 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions (resolution 29/25).

949. At the same meeting, the representatives of India and Kazakhstan made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

VIII. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

General debate on agenda item 8

950. At its 34th and 35th meetings, on 29 June 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 8, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Colombia²² (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam), Ireland, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Morocco, Netherlands, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Slovenia²² (also on behalf of Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Uruguay, Zimbabwe and the State of Palestine), Tajikistan²² (on behalf of States members of the Collective Security Treaty Organization), United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Croatia, Israel, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, Agence internationale pour le développement, Alliance Defending Freedom, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Association of World Citizens, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Global Network for Rights and Development, Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant, Indian Council of South America, Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'homme, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission (also on

²² Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association), International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of Allied Rainbow Communities International, Amnesty International, Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship, FOKUS – Forum for Women and Development, Human Rights Watch, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission, the International HIV/AIDS Alliance, the International Humanist and Ethical Union, the International Service for Human Rights, the United Nations Association of the United States of America and Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik), International Muslim Women's Union, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life Education Fund, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Servas International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Muslim Congress.

951. At the 35th meeting, on the same day, the representative of Maldives made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

IX. Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action

A. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders

Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

952. At the 35th meeting, on 29 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, Mutuma Ruteere, presented his reports (A/HRC/29/46 and Add.1, and A/HRC/29/47).

953. At the same meeting, the representative of the Republic of Korea made a statement as the State concerned.

954. Also at the same meeting, the National Human Rights Commission of Korea made a statement.

955. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 35th meeting, on 29 June 2015, and at the 36th meeting, on 30 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Cuba, Ecuador²³ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Estonia, France, India, Morocco, Nigeria, Russian Federation, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belgium, Burkina Faso, Chile, Egypt, Fiji, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Spain, Turkey;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, Jubilee Campaign, Minority Rights Group, Society for Threatened Peoples, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

956. At the 36th meeting, on 30 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

B. General debate on agenda item 9

957. At its 36th meeting, on 30 June 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 9, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Cuba, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Russian Federation, Tunisia²³ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Belgium, Egypt, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Turkey;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: Council of Europe;

²³ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, Agence internationale pour le développement, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Fraternité Notre Dame, Global Network for Rights and Development, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Muslim Women's Union, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Liberation, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, MINBYUN – Lawyers for a Democratic Society, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Servas International, Society for Threatened Peoples, United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

The incompatibility between democracy and racism

958. At the 44th meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Brazil (also on behalf of Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.1, sponsored by Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Colombia, Cyprus, France, Georgia, Greece, Honduras, Luxembourg, Mali, Montenegro, Peru, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Spain, Thailand, Turkey and the United States of America. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Madagascar, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

959. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution.

960. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 29/20).

X. Technical assistance and capacity-building

A. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders

Interactive dialogue in the presence of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic and other stakeholders

961. At its 38th meeting, on 30 June 2015, the Human Rights Council held an interactive dialogue in the presence of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, Marie-Thérèse Keita Bocoum, and other stakeholders, to assess developments in the human rights situation on the ground, with a particular focus on the fight against impunity.

962. The Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic made a statement.

963. At the same meeting, the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Deputy Head of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic made a statement.

964. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Central African Republic Interfaith Platform, Kobine Layama, made a statement.

965. At the same meeting, the Minister for Justice of the Central African Republic, Aristide Sokambi, made a statement.

966. Also at the same meeting, the Minister for National Reconciliation of the Central African Republic, Jeannette Dethoua, made a statement.

967. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert and other stakeholders questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Canada²⁴ (on behalf of member and observer States of the International Organization of la Francophonie), China, Congo, Estonia, France, Gabon, Ghana, Ireland, Morocco, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Belgium, Benin, Chad, Egypt, Luxembourg, Mali, Niger, Norway, Rwanda, Senegal, Spain, Switzerland, Togo;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues.

968. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert and the other stakeholders answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

Independent Expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights

969. At the 38th meeting, on 30 June 2015, the Independent Expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights, Mohammed Ayat, presented his report (A/HRC/29/49).

970. At the same meeting, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made a statement as the State concerned.

971. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 38th meeting, on 30 June 2015, and at the 39th meeting, on 1 July, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

²⁴ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Canada²⁴ (on behalf of member and observer States of the International Organization of la Francophonie), China, Congo, France, Gabon, Ghana, Ireland, Morocco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belgium, Benin, Chad, Egypt, Mali, Mozambique, New Zealand, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Togo;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Human Rights Watch, International Catholic Child Bureau (also on behalf of the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers, Mouvement international d’apostolat des milieux sociaux indépendants and Pax Romana) International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Service for Human Rights, United Nations Watch.

972. At the 39th meeting, on 1 July 2015, the representative of Côte d’Ivoire made final remarks as the State concerned.

973. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

B. General debate on agenda item 10

974. At the 40th meeting, on 1 July 2015, the Director of the Field Operations and Technical Cooperation Division of OHCHR made, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 18/18, the annual oral presentation on the overview of and successes, best practices and challenges in technical assistance and capacity-building efforts, particularly those provided by OHCHR and the relevant United Nations agencies.

975. At the same meeting, the Chair of the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Technical Cooperation in the Field of Human Rights, Mariclaire Acosta Urquidi, presented the report of the Board of Trustees (A/HRC/29/48).

976. At its 41st meeting, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 10, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Cuba (also on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe), Estonia, France, India, Ireland, Latvia, Luxembourg²⁴ (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Sierra Leone, Tunisia²⁴ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Georgia, Guatemala, Libya, Lithuania, Sudan, Thailand, Ukraine, Holy See;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: Council of Europe;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Human Rights Watch, Indian Council of South America, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins

avancés, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization.

977. At the same meeting, the representatives of Burundi, Maldives and the Russian Federation made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights

978. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of Ukraine introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.9, sponsored by Ukraine and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Before the Human Rights Council started taking action on the draft resolution, Ireland and the United States of America withdrew their co-sponsorship (see also para. 980). Subsequently, Andorra, Côte d'Ivoire, Ireland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Panama, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

979. At the same meeting, the representative of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made general comments on the draft resolution.

980. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil, China, Cuba, Indonesia, Ireland, Paraguay, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

981. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the Russian Federation, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Albania, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Qatar, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

982. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 21 votes to 6, with 20 abstentions (resolution 29/23).

Capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights

983. At the 46th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.13/Rev.1, sponsored by Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States) and co-sponsored by Croatia, Georgia, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Maldives, New Zealand, Poland and Turkey. Subsequently, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, France, Germany, Monaco, the Netherlands, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine,

the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

984. At the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

985. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made a statement as the State concerned.

986. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution.

987. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 29/24).

Report of the High Commissioner on technical cooperation and capacity-building for South Sudan in the field of human rights

988. As notified to the secretariat, draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.22, sponsored by Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), was withdrawn by the sponsors prior to its consideration by the Human Rights Council.

Annex I

Attendance

Members

Albania	Germany	Paraguay
Algeria	Ghana	Portugal
Argentina	India	Qatar
Bangladesh	Indonesia	Republic of Korea
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Ireland	Russian Federation
Botswana	Japan	Saudi Arabia
Brazil	Kazakhstan	Sierra Leone
China	Kenya	South Africa
Congo	Latvia	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Côte d'Ivoire	Maldives	United Arab Emirates
Cuba	Mexico	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
El Salvador	Montenegro	United States of America
Estonia	Morocco	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Ethiopia	Namibia	Viet Nam
France	Netherlands	
Gabon	Nigeria	
	Pakistan	

States Members of the United Nations represented by observers

Andorra	Denmark	Lesotho
Angola	Djibouti	Liberia
Armenia	Dominican Republic	Libya
Australia	Ecuador	Liechtenstein
Austria	Egypt	Lithuania
Azerbaijan	Eritrea	Luxembourg
Bahrain	Fiji	Madagascar
Belarus	Finland	Malaysia
Belgium	Georgia	Mali
Benin	Greece	Malta
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Grenada	Mauritania
Bulgaria	Guatemala	Monaco
Burkina Faso	Guinea	Mongolia
Burundi	Haiti	Mozambique
Cameroon	Honduras	Myanmar
Canada	Hungary	Nepal
Central African Republic	Iceland	New Zealand
Chad	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Niger
Chile	Iraq	Norway
Colombia	Israel	Oman
Costa Rica	Italy	Panama
Croatia	Jordan	Philippines
Cyprus	Kuwait	Poland
Czech Republic	Kyrgyzstan	Republic of Moldova
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Romania
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Lebanon	Rwanda
		Senegal
		Serbia
		Singapore
		Slovakia

Slovenia
Somalia
South Sudan
Spain
Sri Lanka
Sudan
Sweden
Switzerland

Syrian Arab
Republic
Tajikistan
Thailand
Togo
Trinidad and
Tobago
Tunisia

Turkey
Turkmenistan
Uruguay
Uzbekistan
Yemen
Zimbabwe

Non-Member States represented by observers

Holy See
State of Palestine

United Nations

Joint United Nations Programme on
HIV/AIDS
United Nations Children's Fund
United Nations Development Programme –
Malaysia

United Nations Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization
United Nations Research Institute for Social
Development

Specialized agencies and related organizations

International Labour Organisation
International Organization for Migration

International Telecommunication Union
World Health Organization

Intergovernmental organizations

African Union
Collective Security Treaty Organization
Council of Europe
European Union
Gulf Cooperation Council
International Development Law
Organization

International Organization of la
Francophonie
Movement of Non-Aligned Countries
Organization of Islamic Cooperation
South Centre

Other entities

International Committee of the Red Cross
Sovereign Military Order of Malta

National human rights institutions, international coordinating committees and regional groups of national institutions

Afghanistan Independent Human Rights
Commission
Conseil des droits de l'homme de la
Mauritanie
Conseil national des droits de l'homme
du Maroc
Equality and Human Rights Commission
of Great Britain
Human Rights Commission of Malaysia
Human Rights Defender of Armenia
Independent Commission for Human

Rights of the State of Palestine
International Coordinating Committee of
National Institutions for the Promotion
and Protection of Human Rights
Kenya National Commission on Human
Rights
National Human Rights Commission of the
Republic of Korea
Northern Ireland Human Rights
Commission

Office of the Commissioner for
Fundamental Rights of Hungary
Office of the Ombudsman (Provedoria de
Justiça) of Portugal

Scottish Human Rights Commission
Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for
Human Rights

Non-governmental organizations

Action Canada for Population and
Development
Action internationale pour la paix et le
développement dans la région des
Grands Lacs
Adalah – Legal Center for Arab Minority
Rights in Israel
Africa Culture Internationale Human Rights
African-American Society for
Humanitarian Aid and Development
African Association of Education for
Development
African Commission of Health and Human
Rights Promoters
African Development Association
Agence internationale pour le
développement
Al-Hakim Foundation
Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man
Aliran Kesedaran Negara National
Consciousness Movement
Al-Khoei Foundation
All China Women's Federation
Alliance Creative Community Project
Alliance Defending Freedom
Allied Rainbow Communities International
All Russian Public Organization "Russian
Public Institute of Electoral Law"
Al Mezan Center for Human Rights
Alsalam Foundation
Alulbayt Foundation
Al-Zubair Charity Foundation
American Association of Jurists
Americans for Democracy and Human
Rights in Bahrain
Amman Center for Human Rights Studies
Amnesty International
Amuta for NGO Responsibility
Arab Commission for Human Rights
Arab Organization for Human Rights
Arab Penal Reform Organization
Arigatou International
Article 19 – The International Centre
against Censorship
Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum
Asian Forum for Human Rights and
Development
Asian Indigenous and Tribal Peoples
Network
Asian Legal Resource Centre

Association burkinabé pour la survie de
l'enfance
Association Dunenyo
Association for Progressive
Communications
Association for the Prevention of Torture
Association mauritanienne pour la
promotion du droit
Association of World Citizens
Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la
contrainte et l'injustice
Association Points-Coeur
Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni
XXIII
BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian
Residency and Refugee Rights
Baha'i International Community
B'nai B'rith
Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual
University
British Humanist Association
Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies
Cameroun terre nouvelle
CAPAJ – Comisión Jurídica para el
Autodesarrollo de los Pueblos Originarios
Andinos
Caritas Internationalis (International
Confederation of Catholic Charities)
Catholic International Education Office
Center for Economic and Social Rights
Center for Global Nonkilling
Center for Inquiry
Center for International Environmental Law
Center for Organizational Research and
Education
Center for Reproductive Rights
Centre de formation et de recherche pour
le développement
Centre Europe-Tiers Monde – Europe-Third
World Centre
Centre for Human Rights and Peace
Advocacy
Centre indépendant de recherches et
d'initiatives pour le dialogue
Centre for Socio-Economic Development
Centre pour les droits civils et
politiques – Centre CCPR
Centrist Democratic International
Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales
Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y
Justicia de Género

Child Development Foundation
 China Society for Human Rights Studies
 Christian Solidarity Worldwide
 CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation
 Colombian Commission of Jurists
 Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos
 Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World – Council of Churches
 Commission to Study the Organization of Peace
 Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative
 Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul
 Conectas Direitos Humanos
 Congregation of our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd
 Conscience and Peace Tax International
 Consortium for Street Children
 Coordinadora Andina de Organizaciones Indígenas
 Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations
 Defence for Children International
 Development Innovations and Networks
 Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers
 Earthjustice
 East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project
 Edmund Rice International Limited
 Espace Afrique International
 European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages
 European Disability Forum
 European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Association
 European Union of Jewish Students
 Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos
 Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland
 Federation of Environmental and Ecological Diversity for Agricultural Revampment and Human Rights
 Femmes solidaires
 FOKUS – Forum for Women and Development
 Fondazione Marista per la Solidarietà Internazionale ONLUS
 Foodfirst Information and Action Network
 Foundation ECPAT International (End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Trafficking in Children for Sexual Purposes)
 Foundation for GAIA
 France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand
 Franciscans International
 Fraternité Notre Dame
 Friedrich Ebert Foundation
 Friends of the Earth International
 Friends World Committee for Consultation
 Gazeteciler ve Yazarlar Vakfı
 Geneva for Human Rights – Global Training
 Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
 Global Network for Rights and Development
 Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant
 Hawa Society for Women
 Helios Life Association
 Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights
 Human Rights Commission of Pakistan
 Human Rights House Foundation
 Human Rights Information and Training Center
 Human Rights Law Centre
 Human Rights Now
 Human Rights Watch
 Il Cenacolo
 Indian Council of South America
 Indian Law Resource Center
 Ingénieurs du monde
 Institute for Planetary Synthesis
 Institute of Global Education
 Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'homme
 International Association of Democratic Lawyers
 International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists
 International Buddhist Relief Organisation
 International Catholic Child Bureau
 International Federation for Human Rights Leagues
 International Federation of Business and Professional Women
 International Federation of Journalists
 International Fellowship of Reconciliation
 International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission
 International HIV/AIDS Alliance
 International Humanist and Ethical Union
 International Human Rights Association of American Minorities
 International Lesbian and Gay Association
 International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association
 International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism
 International Movement ATD Fourth World

International Movement for Fraternal Union among Races and Peoples	Ordem dos Advogados do Brasil Conselho Federal
International Muslim Women's Union	Organisation guinéenne de défense des droits de l'homme et du citoyen
International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination	Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés
International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education	Organisation marocaine des droits humains
International Peace Bureau	Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale
International Planned Parenthood Federation	Organization for Defending Victims of Violence
International Service for Human Rights	Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation
International Women Bond	Pax Christi International – International Catholic Peace Movement
International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations	Pax Romana
Iranian Elite Research Center	Peace Brigades International Switzerland
Islamic Relief	Peivande Gole Narges Organization
Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco	Penal Reform International
Ius Primi Viri International Association	People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy
Jossour Forum des Femmes Marocaines	Plan International
Journalists and Writers Foundation	Planetary Association for Clean Energy
Jubilee Campaign	Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants
Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture	Presse Emblème Campagne
Korea Center for United Nations Human Rights Policy	Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme
La Brique	Reporters Sans Frontiers International – Reporters without Borders International
Le Collectif des Femmes Africaines du Hainaut	Réseau International des Droits Humains
Liberal International (World Liberal Union)	Save a Child's Heart in Memory of Dr. Ami Cohen
Liberation	Save the Children International
L'Observatoire Mauritanien des Droits de l'Homme et de la Démocratie	Servas International
Lutheran World Federation	Sexual Rights Initiative
Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development	Shia Rights Watch
Marist International Solidarity Foundation	Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany
Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association	Society for Development and Community Empowerment
Medical Aid for Palestinians	Society for Threatened Peoples
Medical Care Development International	Solidarité pour un monde meilleur
Mexican Environmental Law Center	Solidarité Suisse-Guinée
Migrants Rights International	Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem
MINBYUN – Lawyers for a Democratic Society	Sudan Council of Voluntary Agencies
Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life Inc. Education Fund	Swedish Federation of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights
Minority Rights Group	Syriac Universal Alliance, Federation
Mouvement international d'apostolat des milieux sociaux indépendants	Syriaque International
Nazra for Feminist Studies	Tandem Project
New Humanity	Terre des Hommes Federation International
Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational and Transparty	Touro Law Center
Nord-Sud XXI	Transparency International
Norwegian Refugee Council	Union of Arab Jurists
ONG Hope International	
Open Society Institute	

United Nations Association of the United
States of America
United Nations Watch
UPR Info
Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik
Victorious Youths Movement
VIVAT International
Wales Assembly of Women
Washington Office on Latin America
Women's Board Educational Cooperation
Society Women's Consortium of Nigeria
Women's Division of the General Board of
Global Ministries of the United Methodist
Church
Women's Human Rights International
Association

Women's International League for Peace
and Freedom
World Association for the School as an
Instrument of Peace
World Barua Organization
World Blind Union
World Environment and Resources Council
World Jewish Congress
World Medical Association
World Muslim Congress
World Organization Against Torture
World Vision International
World Young Women's Christian
Association

Annex II

Agenda

- Item 1. Organizational and procedural matters.
- Item 2. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General.
- Item 3. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development.
- Item 4. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention.
- Item 5. Human rights bodies and mechanisms.
- Item 6. Universal periodic review.
- Item 7. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories.
- Item 8. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action.
- Item 9. Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action.
- Item 10. Technical assistance and capacity-building.

Annex III

[English, French and Spanish only]

Documents issued for the twenty-ninth session

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/1	1	Annotations to the agenda for the twenty-ninth session of the Human Rights Council: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/29/1/Corr.1	1	Corrigendum
A/HRC/29/2	1	Report of the Human Rights Council on its twenty-ninth session
A/HRC/29/3 – E/CN.6/2015/6	2	Report of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women on the activities of the United Nations Trust Fund in Support of Actions to Eliminate Violence against Women
A/HRC/29/4	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Kyrgyzstan
A/HRC/29/4/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/29/5	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Kiribati
A/HRC/29/5/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/29/6	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Guinea
A/HRC/29/6/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/29/7	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Lao People's Democratic Republic
A/HRC/29/7/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/29/8	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Spain
A/HRC/29/8/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/8/Add.1/Corr.1	6	Corrigendum
A/HRC/29/9	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Lesotho
A/HRC/29/9/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/29/10	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic review: Kenya
A/HRC/29/11	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Armenia
A/HRC/29/11/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/29/12	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Guinea-Bissau
A/HRC/29/12/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/29/13	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Sweden
A/HRC/29/13/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/29/14	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Grenada
A/HRC/29/14/Corr.1	6	Corrigendum
A/HRC/29/14/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/29/15	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Turkey
A/HRC/29/15/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/29/16	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Guyana
A/HRC/29/16/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/17	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Kuwait
A/HRC/29/17/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/29/18	2, 3	Feasibility of a global fund to enhance the capacity of stakeholders to implement the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/29/19	2, 3	Summary report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the outcome of the full-day discussion on specific themes relating to human rights and climate change
A/HRC/29/20	2, 3	Good practices and major challenges in preventing and eliminating female genital mutilation: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/29/20/Corr.1	2, 3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/29/21	2, 6	Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the operations of the Voluntary Fund for Participation in the Universal Periodic Review
A/HRC/29/22	2, 6	Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the operations of the Voluntary Fund for Financial and Technical Assistance in the Implementation of the Universal Periodic Review
A/HRC/29/23	2, 8	Discrimination and violence against individuals based on their sexual orientation and gender identity: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/29/24	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Rita Izsák: Comprehensive study of the human rights situation of Roma worldwide, with a particular focus on the phenomenon of anti-Gypsyism
A/HRC/29/25	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, Maina Kiai
A/HRC/29/25/Add.1	3	Mission to Oman
A/HRC/29/25/Add.2	3	Mission to Kazakhstan

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/25/Add.3	3	Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received
A/HRC/29/25/Add.4	3	Mission to Oman: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur
A/HRC/29/25/Add.5	3	Mission to Kazakhstan: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur
A/HRC/29/26	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers, Gabriela Knaul
A/HRC/29/26/Corr.1	3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/29/26/Add.1	3	Mission to Qatar
A/HRC/29/26/Add.2	3	Mission to the United Arab Emirates
A/HRC/29/26/Add.3	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers on her mission: Tunisia
A/HRC/29/26/Add.4	3	Mission to Portugal
A/HRC/29/26/Add.5	3	Mission to Qatar: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur
A/HRC/29/26/Add.6	3	Mission to United Arab Emirates: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur
A/HRC/29/26/Add.7	3	Mission to Portugal: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur
A/HRC/29/27	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, Rashida Manjoo
A/HRC/29/27/Add.1	3	Mission to Honduras
A/HRC/29/27/Add.2	3	Mission to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
A/HRC/29/27/Add.3	3	Mission to Afghanistan
A/HRC/29/27/Add.4	3	Addendum
A/HRC/29/28	3	Report of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises
A/HRC/29/28/Add.1	3	Visit to Azerbaijan
A/HRC/29/28/Add.2	3	Report on the First African Regional Forum on Business and Human Rights
A/HRC/29/28/Add.3	3	Identifying emerging approaches and lessons learned in corporate respect for human rights: reflections from discussions held at the 2014 Forum on Business and Human Rights
A/HRC/29/28/Add.4	3	Comments by Azerbaijan

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/29	3, 5	Summary of discussions of the Forum on Business and Human Rights: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/29/30	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to education, Kishore Singh: Protecting the right to education against commercialization
A/HRC/29/30/Add.1	3	Mission to Bhutan
A/HRC/29/30/Add.2	3	Mission to Algeria
A/HRC/29/30/Add.3	3	Visite en Algérie: commentaires de l'état sur le rapport du Rapporteur spécial
A/HRC/29/31	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, Philip Alston
A/HRC/29/31/Add.1	3	Mission to Guinea-Bissau (23 February–1 March 2014)
A/HRC/29/32	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, David Kaye
A/HRC/29/33	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, Dainius Pūras
A/HRC/29/33/Add.1	3	Visit to Malaysia (19 November–2 December 2014)
A/HRC/29/34	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons, Chaloka Beyani
A/HRC/29/34/Add.1	3	Follow-up mission to Azerbaijan
A/HRC/29/34/Add.2	3	Mission to Haiti
A/HRC/29/34/Add.3	3	Mission to Ukraine
A/HRC/29/35	3	Report of the Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity, Virginia Dandan
A/HRC/29/36	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants, François Crépeau: Banking on mobility over a generation: follow-up to the regional study on the management of the external borders of the European Union and its impact on the human rights of migrants
A/HRC/29/36/Add.1	3	Mission to Sri Lanka
A/HRC/29/36/Add.2	3	Follow-up mission to Italy (2–6 December 2014)
A/HRC/29/36/Add.3	3	Mission to Malta (6–10 December 2014)

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/36/Add.4	3	Mission to Sri Lanka: comments by the State on the human rights of migrants
A/HRC/29/36/Add.5	3	Mission to Malta: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants
A/HRC/29/36/Add.6	3	Follow-up mission to Italy (2-6 December 2014)
A/HRC/29/37	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Christof Heyns: Use of information and communications technologies to secure the right to life
A/HRC/29/37/Add.1	3	Mission to Papua New Guinea (3 to 14 March 2014)
A/HRC/29/37/Add.2	3	Mission to the Gambia
A/HRC/29/37/Add.3	3	Follow-up to country recommendations: India
A/HRC/29/37/Add.4	3	Follow-up to country recommendations: Turkey
A/HRC/29/37/Add.5	3	Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received
A/HRC/29/37/Add.6	3	Mission to the Gambia: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions
A/HRC/29/37/Add.7	3	Comments by Turkey
A/HRC/29/38	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children, Maria Grazia Giammarinaro
A/HRC/29/38/Add.1	3	Mission to Malaysia
A/HRC/29/38/Add.2	3	Second consultative meeting on strengthening partnerships with national rapporteurs on trafficking in persons and equivalent mechanisms
A/HRC/29/39	2, 3	Progress report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on legal options and practical measures to improve access to remedy for victims of business-related human rights abuses
A/HRC/29/40	3	Report of the Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice
A/HRC/29/40/Add.1	3	Mission to Chile
A/HRC/29/40/Add.2	3	Mission to Peru
A/HRC/29/40/Add.3	3	Mission to Spain

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/40/Add.4	3	Comentarios del Estado relativos al informe sobre la visita del Grupo de Trabajo a Chile del 1 al 9 de septiembre de 2014
A/HRC/29/40/Add.5	3	Comentarios del Estado relativos al informe sobre la visita del Grupo de Trabajo a Perú del 11 al 19 de septiembre de 2014
A/HRC/29/40/Add.6	3	Comentarios del Estado relativos al informe sobre la visita del Grupo de Trabajo a España del 9 al 19 de diciembre de 2014
A/HRC/29/41	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea, Sheila B. Keetharuth
A/HRC/29/42	4	Report of the commission of inquiry on human rights in Eritrea
A/HRC/29/43	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus, Miklós Haraszti
A/HRC/29/44	5	Report of the 2015 Social Forum (Geneva, 18–20 February 2015)
A/HRC/29/45	5	Report of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the right to peace on its third session
A/HRC/29/46	9	Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, Mutuma Ruteere
A/HRC/29/46/Add.1	9	Visit to the Republic of Korea
A/HRC/29/47	9	Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 69/160
A/HRC/29/48	10	Report of the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Technical Cooperation in the Field of Human Rights
A/HRC/29/49	10	Report of the Independent Expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights, Mohammed Ayat
A/HRC/29/50	3, 4, 7, 9, 10	Communications report of Special Procedures
A/HRC/29/51	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, Ben Emmerson

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/52	7	Report of the independent commission of inquiry established pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-21/1
A/HRC/29/53	2	Measures taken to implement Human Rights Council resolution 9/8 and obstacles to its implementation, including recommendations for further improving the effectiveness, harmonization and reform of the treaty body system: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/29/54	9	Group of independent eminent experts on the implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action: note by the Secretariat

Documents issued in the conference room papers series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/CRP.1	4	Detailed findings of the Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in Eritrea
A/HRC/29/CRP.2	2, 3	Initiatives taken to raise awareness and promote the protection of the rights of persons with albinism: conference room paper of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/29/CRP.3	4	Oral update of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/29/CRP.4	7	Detailed findings of the independent commission of inquiry established pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-21/1

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/L.1	9	The incompatibility between democracy and racism
A/HRC/29/L.2	3	The fiftieth anniversary of the adoption and the fortieth anniversary of the entry into force of the International Covenants on Human Rights
A/HRC/29/L.3	3	Protection of the human rights of migrants: migrants in transit
A/HRC/29/L.4	4	The grave and deteriorating human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/29/L.5 and Rev.1	5	The Social Forum
A/HRC/29/L.6	3	Human rights and international solidarity
A/HRC/29/L.7 and Rev.1	3	Elimination of discrimination against women

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/L.8	2	Fact-finding mission to improve human rights, accountability and reconciliation for South Sudan
A/HRC/29/L.9	10	Cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights
A/HRC/29/L.10	3	Elimination of discrimination against persons affected by leprosy and their family members
A/HRC/29/L.11	3	Independence and impartiality of the judiciary, jurors and assessors, and the independence of lawyers
A/HRC/29/L.12	4	Situation of human rights in Belarus
A/HRC/29/L.13 and Rev.1	10	Capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights
A/HRC/29/L.14 and Rev.1	3	The right to education
A/HRC/29/L.15	3	Strengthening efforts to prevent and eliminate child, early and forced marriage
A/HRC/29/L.16 and Rev.1	3	Accelerating efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women: eliminating domestic violence
A/HRC/29/L.17 and Rev.1	3	Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism
A/HRC/29/L.18	3	Human rights and the regulation of civilian acquisition, possession and use of firearms
A/HRC/29/L.19	3	The negative impact of corruption on the enjoyment of human rights
A/HRC/29/L.20	3	The right to freedom of expression, including in the form of art
A/HRC/29/L.21	3	Human rights and climate change
A/HRC/29/L.22	10	Report of the High Commissioner on technical cooperation and capacity-building for South Sudan in the field of Human Rights
A/HRC/29/L.23	4	Situation of human rights in Eritrea
A/HRC/29/L.24	3	Unaccompanied migrant children and adolescents and human rights
A/HRC/29/L.25	3	Protection of the family: contribution of the family to the realization of the right to an adequate standard of living for its members, particularly through its role in poverty eradication and achieving sustainable development
A/HRC/29/L.26	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/L.27	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16
A/HRC/29/L.28	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16
A/HRC/29/L.29	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16
A/HRC/29/L.30	2	Situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar
A/HRC/29/L.31	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.14
A/HRC/29/L.32	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.20
A/HRC/29/L.33	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.20
A/HRC/29/L.34	1	Enhancing the efficiency of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/29/L.35	7	Ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem
A/HRC/29/L.36	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25
A/HRC/29/L.37	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.2
A/HRC/29/L.38	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25
A/HRC/29/L.39	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25
A/HRC/29/L.40	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25
A/HRC/29/L.41	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25

Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/G/1	6	Letter dated 20 January 2015 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/29/G/2	7	Note verbale dated 8 May 2015 from the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations Office and Other International Organizations at Geneva addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council

Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/G/3	4	Letter dated 5 June 2014 from the Permanent Representative of Georgia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/29/G/4	6	Note verbale dated 3 June 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/29/G/5	4	Note verbale dated 19 May 2015 from the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/29/G/6	4	Note verbale dated 19 June 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Eritrea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/29/G/7	4	Letter dated 23 June 2015 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/29/G/8	4	Note verbale dated 1 July 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Eritrea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/29/G/9	3	Note verbale dated 30 June 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Malaysia to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/29/G/10	3	Note verbale dated 7 July 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/29/G/11	1	Letter dated 6 July 2015 from the Permanent Representative of Haiti to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/NGO/1	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/2	4	Written statement submitted by the Alsalam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/3	4	Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/4	3	Written statement submitted by the International Federation of University Women, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/5	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/29/NGO/6	3	Exposé écrit présenté par la Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/29/NGO/7	3	Written statement submitted by the Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/8	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/29/NGO/9	9	Exposición escrita presentada por la Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/29/NGO/10	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/11	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/12	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/13	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/NGO/14	3	Written statement submitted by Terre Des Hommes Federation Internationale, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/15	3	Written statement submitted by Reporters Sans Frontieres International: Reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/16	3	Written statement submitted by Reporters Sans Frontieres International – Reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/17	3	Exposición conjunta escrita presentada por France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, American Association of Jurists, Cultural Survival, Emmaus International Association, Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples (NCIV), organizaciones no gubernamentales reconocidas como entidades consultivas especiales, Indian Council of South America (CISA), Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, organizaciones no gubernamentales reconocidas en la Lista
A/HRC/29/NGO/18	3	Exposición conjunta escrita presentada por France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, American Association of Jurists, Emmaus International Association, organizaciones no gubernamentales reconocidas como entidades consultivas especiales, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, organización no gubernamental reconocida en la Lista
A/HRC/29/NGO/19	3	Joint written statement submitted by France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, the American Association of Jurists and Emmaus International Association, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, and Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/29/NGO/20	3	Exposición conjunta escrita presentada por France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, American Association of Jurists, Emmaus International Association, organizaciones no gubernamentales reconocidas como entidades consultivas especiales, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, organización no gubernamental reconocida en la Lista

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/NGO/21	3	Exposé écrit présenté par France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/29/NGO/22	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/23	3	Written statement submitted by the Europe-Third World Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/24	3	Joint written statement submitted by France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, the American Association of Jurists, Cultural Survival, Emmaus International Association, the Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples (NCIV) and the Stichting Forest Peoples Programme, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, and the Indian Council of South America (CISA) and Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/29/NGO/25	7	Written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/26	3	Written statement submitted by the Association for Progressive Communications (APC), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/27	3	Joint written statement submitted by the National Congress of American Indians and the Native American Rights Fund, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, and the Indian Law Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/29/NGO/28	3	Joint written statement submitted by the National Congress of American Indians and the Native American Rights Fund, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, and the Indian Law Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/29/NGO/29	4	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/NGO/30	4	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/31	4	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/32	4	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/33	3	Written statement submitted by Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/34	4	Written statement submitted by Reporters Sans Frontières International: Reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/35	2	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/36	2	Written statement submitted by Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/37	3	Written statement submitted by Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/38	5	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/39	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/40	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/41	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/42	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/NGO/43	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/44	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/45	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/46	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/47	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/48	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/49	3	Written statement submitted by the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/50	4	Joint written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, and Odhikar: Coalition for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/51	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/52	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/53	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/54	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/55	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/56	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/NGO/57	7	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/58	7	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/59	7	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/60	8	Exposición escrita presentada por la Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/29/NGO/61	3	Written statement submitted by the Arab NGO Network for Development, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/29/NGO/62	3	Joint written statement submitted by Organisation Internationale pour le droit à l'éducation et la liberté d'enseignement (OIDE), Association Points-Coeur, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, the Catholic International Education Office (OIEC), the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers, the International Catholic Child Bureau (BICE), Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale (OCAPROCE Internationale) and the Women's Board Educational Cooperation Society, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/63	3	Written statement submitted by the Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/29/NGO/64	3	Written statement submitted by Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/65	7	Written statement submitted by Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/66	7	Written statement submitted by Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/NGO/67	7	Written statement submitted by Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/68	4	Written statement submitted by Nazra for Feminist Studies, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/69	4	Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/70	3	Written statement submitted by the Marangopoulos Foundation for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/71	3	Joint written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development and the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/72	6	Written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/73	3	Written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/74	3	Written statement submitted by Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'homme : IIPJDH, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/75	3	Written statement submitted by the Alulbayt Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/76	3	Written statement submitted by the Alulbayt Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/77	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/78	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/79	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/NGO/80	7	Joint written statement submitted by the Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights, ADALAH: Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel, Al-Haq, and Law in the Service of Man, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/81	3	Written statement submitted by the Alulbayt Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/82	7	Written statement submitted by the Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/83	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/84	3	Joint written statement submitted by the Franciscans International, Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, Union of Arab Jurists, General Arab Women Federation, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/29/NGO/85	3	Written statement submitted by the Liberal International (World Liberal Union), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/86	4	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights House Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/87	3	Written statement submitted by the Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/29/NGO/88	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/89	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/NGO/90	5	<p>Joint written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, Asociación Española para el Derecho Internacional de los Derechos Humanos AEDIDH, the American Association of Jurists, the Armenian Constitutional Right-Protective Centre, the Armenian Young Lawyers Association, the Association “For Sustainable Human Development”, the Association of War-Affected Women, Autre Vie, the Center for Development of Civil Society, the Foundation for Human Horizon, the International Association of Peace Messenger Cities, the International Institute for Child Protection, the International Network for the Prevention of Elder Abuse, the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, the Lama Gangchen World Peace Foundation (LGWPF), Lawyers’ Rights Watch Canada, the MiRA Resource Center for Black Immigrant and Refugee Women, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés (OIPMA), Pax Christi International, the International Catholic Peace Movement, the Shirley Ann Sullivan Educational Foundation, the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, the Women Environmental Programme, the Women’s World Summit Foundation, the World Association for Psychosocial Rehabilitation and Yayasan Pendidikan Indonesia, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, and the Dzeno Association, the International Peace Bureau and the International Society for Human Rights, non-governmental organizations on the roster</p>
A/HRC/29/NGO/90/Corr.1	5	Corrigendum
A/HRC/29/NGO/91	5	<p>Joint written statement submitted by Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII and the United Network of Young Peacebuilders (UNOY Peacebuilders), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status</p>
A/HRC/29/NGO/92	3	<p>Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status</p>

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/NGO/93	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/94	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/95	4	Written statement submitted by the Al-khoei Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/96	3	Written statement submitted by Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/97	9	Written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/98	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/99	7	Joint written statement submitted by the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, the Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights, Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, the BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, and Medical Aid for Palestinians (MAP), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/100	3	Written statement submitted by the Planetary Association for Clean Energy, Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/101	4	Written statement submitted by the International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/102	4	Written statement submitted by the International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/103	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/104	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/NGO/105	7	Written statement submitted by Defence for Children International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/106	2	Written statement submitted by Article 19: International Centre Against Censorship, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/29/NGO/107	4	Exposición escrita presentada por la Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/29/NGO/108	6	Written statement submitted by the European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages (EBLUL), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/109	5	Joint written statement submitted by Freemuse: The World Forum on Music and Censorship, and International PEN, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, and Article 19: International Centre Against Censorship, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/29/NGO/110	3	Exposé écrit présenté par International Catholic Child Bureau, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif special
A/HRC/29/NGO/111	3	Written statement submitted by the Arab Association for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/112	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/113	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/114	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/115	3	Written statement submitted by the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/116	3	Written statement submitted by the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/117	4	Exposé écrit présenté par Libération, organisation non gouvernementale inscrite sur la liste

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/NGO/118	2, 8	Joint written statement submitted by Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/29/NGO/119	4	Joint written statement submitted by the American Civil Liberties Union, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil, Conectas Direitos Humanos, the Washington Office on Latin America, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues and the World Organisation against Torture, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status

Documents issued in the national institutions series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/29/NI/1	3	Information presented by the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights of Hungary: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/29/NI/2	3	Written submission by the Greek National Commission for Human Rights: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/29/NI/3	3	Information provided by the National Human Rights Council of Morocco: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/29/NI/4	3	Information presented by the National Human Rights Council of Morocco: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/29/NI/5	3	Information presented by the National Human Rights Council of Morocco: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/29/NI/6	6	Information presented by the Argentine Office of the Ombudsperson: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/29/NI/7	6	Information presented by the Guatemalan Human Rights Ombudsman's Office: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/29/NI/8	3	Information presented by the Commissioner for Human Rights (Ombudsman) of Azerbaijan: note by the Secretariat

Annex IV

Special procedures mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-ninth session

Independent Expert on the enjoyment of human rights by persons with albinism

Ikponwosa Ero (Nigeria)

Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers

Mónica Pinto (Argentina)

Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy

Joseph Cannataci (Malta)

Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences

Dubravka Šimonović (Croatia)

Working Group on Arbitrary Detention (member from Western European and other States)

Leigh Toomey (Australia)

Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances (member from Asia-Pacific States)

Tae-Ung Baik (Republic of Korea)
