



General Assembly

Distr.: General
16 December 2020

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Thirty-eighth session
18 June–6 July 2018
Agenda item 1
Organizational and procedural matters

Report of the Human Rights Council on its thirty-eighth session

Vice-President and Rapporteur: Juan Eduardo **Eguiguren** (Chile)

* Reissued for technical reasons on 23 March 2023.



Contents

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
Part One	
Resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-eighth session	4
I. Resolutions	4
II. Decisions	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. Membership	6
E. Organization of work	6
F. Meetings and documentation	7
G. Visits.....	7
H. Decision on the reports of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee	8
I. Selection and appointment of mandate holders	8
J. Adoption of the report on the session	8
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.....	9
A. Update by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights	9
B. Reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General.....	10
C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	11
III. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development.....	12
A. Panel discussions	12
B. Interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders	15
C. General debate on agenda item 3	24
D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	26
IV. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention	37
A. Interactive dialogue with the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic	37
B. Interactive dialogue with the Commission of Inquiry on Burundi.....	37
C. Interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders	38
D. General debate on agenda item 4	39
E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	40
V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms	45
A. Forum on Business and Human Rights.....	45
B. General debate on agenda item 5	45
C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	46

VI.	Universal periodic review	49
A.	Consideration of universal periodic review outcomes	49
B.	General debate on agenda item 6	109
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	110
VII.	Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories	112
	General debate on agenda item 7	112
VIII.	Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action	113
	General debate on agenda item 8	113
IX.	Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action	115
A.	Interactive dialogue with a special procedure mandate holder	115
B.	General debate on agenda item 9	115
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	116
X.	Technical assistance and capacity-building	117
A.	Annual thematic discussion on technical cooperation in the promotion and protection of human rights	117
B.	Enhanced interactive dialogue on the report of the High Commissioner on the situation in the Kasai region of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the oral update	118
C.	Interactive dialogue on the report of the High Commissioner on the development of a national plan of action to implement recommendations of human rights mechanisms in Haiti	119
D.	Interactive dialogue on the oral presentation by the High Commissioner on Ukraine	119
E.	Interactive dialogue on the oral update by the High Commissioner on the human rights situation of Rohingya people	120
F.	Interactive dialogue with a special procedure mandate holder	120
G.	General debate on agenda item 10	121
H.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	122
Annexes		
I.	Attendance	123
II.	Agenda	129
III.	Documents issued for the thirty-eighth session	130
IV.	Special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-eighth session	153

Part One

Resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-eighth session

I. Resolutions

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
38/1	Elimination of all forms of discrimination against women and girls	5 July 2018
38/2	Human rights and international solidarity	5 July 2018
38/3	Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights	5 July 2018
38/4	Human rights and climate change	5 July 2018
38/5	Accelerating efforts to eliminate violence against women and girls: preventing and responding to violence against women and girls in digital contexts	5 July 2018
38/6	Elimination of female genital mutilation	5 July 2018
38/7	The promotion, protection and enjoyment of human rights on the Internet	5 July 2018
38/8	Human rights in the context of HIV and AIDS	5 July 2018
38/9	The right to education: follow-up to Human Rights Council resolution 8/4	5 July 2018
38/10	Human rights and the regulation of civilian acquisition, possession and use of firearms	5 July 2018
38/11	The promotion and protection of human rights in the context of peaceful protests	6 July 2018
38/12	Civil society space: engagement with international and regional organizations	6 July 2018
38/13	Business and human rights: improving accountability and access to remedy	6 July 2018
38/14	Situation of human rights in Belarus	6 July 2018
38/15	Situation of human rights in Eritrea	6 July 2018
38/16	The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic	6 July 2018
38/17	The Social Forum	6 July 2018
38/18	The contribution of the Human Rights Council to the prevention of human rights violations	6 July 2018
38/19	The incompatibility between democracy and racism	6 July 2018
38/20	Technical assistance to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and accountability concerning the events in the Kasai region	6 July 2018

II. Decisions

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
38/101	Outcome of the universal periodic review: France	28 June 2018
38/102	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Tonga	28 June 2018
38/103	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Romania	28 June 2018
38/104	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Mali	28 June 2018
38/105	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Botswana	28 June 2018
38/106	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Bahamas	28 June 2018
38/107	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Burundi	28 June 2018
38/108	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Luxembourg	29 June 2018
38/109	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Barbados	29 June 2018
38/110	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Montenegro	29 June 2018
38/111	Outcome of the universal periodic review: United Arab Emirates	29 June 2018
38/112	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Israel	29 June 2018
38/113	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Liechtenstein	29 June 2018
38/114	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Serbia	29 June 2018

Part Two

Summary of proceedings

I. Organizational and procedural matters

A. Opening and duration of the session

1. The Human Rights Council held its thirty-eighth session at the United Nations Office at Geneva from 18 June to 6 July 2018. 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 thirty-eighth session was held on 4 June 2018.
3. The thirty-eighth session consisted of 40 meetings over 15 days (see para. 15 below).

B. Attendance

4. 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, as well as 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

5. At its 1st meeting, on 18 June 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted the agenda and programme of work of the thirty-eighth session.

D. Membership

6. At the 8th meeting, on 20 June 2018, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that the United States of America had withdrawn its membership from the Council effective 5 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time on 19 June 2018.¹
7. At the same meeting, Australia, Bulgaria (on behalf of the European Union) and China made statements on the announcement.

E. Organization of work

8. At the 1st meeting, on 18 June 2018, the President referred to the online system for inscription on the lists of speakers for all general debates and all interactive dialogues. He also referred to the modalities and schedule of the online inscription, which had been launched on 13 June 2018.
9. At the same meeting, the President referred to the modalities for the tabling of draft proposals after the tabling deadline. At the organizational meeting of the thirty-third session, the Human Rights Council had agreed that an extension of the deadline for the submission of draft proposals would be granted only once, under exceptional circumstances, for a maximum of 24 hours.
10. Also at the same meeting, the President outlined the speaking time limits applied during the thirty-seventh session of the Human Rights Council, which would also be applied during the thirty-eighth session. The speaking time limits for interactive dialogues with

¹ Diplomatic note dated 19 June 2018 from the Permanent Mission of the United States of America addressed to the Secretary-General.

special procedure mandate holders under agenda item 3 would be two minutes for States members of the Council, observer States and other observers.

11. At the 4th meeting, on 19 June 2018, the President outlined the speaking time limits for the general debates, which would be 2 minutes and 30 seconds for States members of the Human Rights Council and 1 minute and 30 seconds for observer States and other observers.

12. At the 11th meeting, on 21 June 2018, the President outlined the speaking time limits for the panel discussions, which would be two minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

13. At the 16th meeting, on 25 June 2018, the President outlined the speaking time limits for the individual interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders on agenda item 4, which would be two minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

14. At the 23rd meeting, on 28 June 2018, the President outlined the speaking time limits for the consideration of the outcomes of the universal periodic review under agenda item 6, 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 resolution 16/21; and up to 20 minutes for stakeholders, with a speaking time limit of 2 minutes each, to make general comments on the outcome of the review.

F. Meetings and documentation

15. The Human Rights Council held 40 fully serviced meetings during its thirty-eighth session.²

16. The list of the resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council is contained in part one of the present report.

G. Visits

17. At the 1st meeting, on 18 June 2018, the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Boris Johnson, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

18. At the same meeting, the Secretary-General of the Supreme Committee for Delivery and Legacy of Qatar, Hassan al-Thawadi, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

19. At the 7th meeting, on 20 June 2018, the Attorney General of Afghanistan, Mohammad Farid Hamidi, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

20. At the 8th meeting, on the same day, the President of Slovenia, Borut Pahor, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

21. At the 13th meeting, on 22 June 2018, the Minister, Private Secretary for National Policy of Nicaragua, Paul Oquist, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

22. At the 17th meeting, on 26 June 2018, the Federal Minister for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs of Austria, Karin Kneissl, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

² The proceedings of the thirty-eighth session of the Human Rights Council can be followed through the archived webcasts of the Council sessions at <http://webtv.un.org>.

H. Decision on the reports of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee

23. At its 40th meeting, on 6 July 2018, the Human Rights Council decided to endorse the request of the Advisory Committee to extend the deadline for the submission of the reports of the Committee, respectively, on the negative impact of the non-repatriation of funds of illicit origin to the countries of origin on the enjoyment of human rights, mandated by Council resolution 34/11, and on the negative effects of terrorism on the enjoyment of all human rights, mandated by Council resolution 34/8, until the forty-second session of the Council.

I. Selection and appointment of mandate holders

24. At its 40th meeting, on 6 July 2018, the Human Rights Council appointed, pursuant to Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21 and decision 6/102, five special procedure mandate holders (see annex IV).

J. Adoption of the report on the session

25. At the 40th meeting, on 6 July 2018, the representatives of Djibouti, France, India and the Russian Federation made statements as observer States on adopted resolutions.

26. At the same meeting, the Vice-President and Rapporteur of the Human Rights Council made a statement on the draft report of the Council on its thirty-eighth session.

27. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted ad referendum the draft report (A/HRC/38/2) and entrusted the Rapporteur with its finalization.

28. At the same meeting, the following made statements on the session:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil, Pakistan;

(b) Representative of an observer State: Canada (also on behalf of Iceland, Liechtenstein and New Zealand);

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Centre Europe-tiers monde (also on behalf of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers), International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, the Association for Progressive Communications, the Center for Reproductive Rights, the East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, the Human Rights House Foundation, the International Commission of Jurists and the International Lesbian and Gay Association).

29. Also 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

30. At the 1st meeting, on 18 June 2018, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement providing an update of the activities of his Office.

31. During the ensuing general debate, at the 4th and 5th meetings, on 19 June 2018, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Argentina³ (also on behalf of Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay and Peru), Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria³ (on behalf of the European Union), Chile, China, China (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe), Croatia, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland³ (also on behalf of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America), Iraq, Japan, Mexico, Morocco³ (also on behalf of Bahrain, Burundi, the Central African Republic, the Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Guinea, Jordan, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal and the United Arab Emirates), Nepal, Netherlands³ (also on behalf of the European Union, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Hungary, Italy, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay), New Zealand³ (also on behalf of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America), Nigeria, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay³ (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico and Paraguay), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Armenia, Bahrain, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Greece, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mauritius, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Sudan, Syrian

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

Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ABC Tamil Oli, Action of Human Movement, African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, Alliance Creative Community Project, Al Mezan Center for Human Rights, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association Dunenyo, Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights, Association of World Citizens, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Coordination des associations et des particuliers pour la liberté de conscience, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand (also on behalf of the American Association of Jurists, Asociación Española para el Derecho Internacional de los Derechos Humanos and the International Fellowship of Reconciliation), Franciscans International (also on behalf of the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, the International Commission of Jurists, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, the International Service for Human Rights and the World Organization against Torture), Global Action on Aging (also on behalf of the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations), Global Welfare Association, Human Rights Watch, Il Cenacolo, Indian Council of South America, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Federation of Journalists, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, International Muslim Women's Union, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Service for Human Rights, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Iraqi Development Organization, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Ma'arij Foundation for Peace and Development, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Tourner la page, United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Victorious Youths Movement, Villages unis, Women's Human Rights International Association, World Muslim Congress, World Organization against Torture (also on behalf of the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development and the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues).

32. At the 6th meeting, on 19 June 2018, the representatives of Bahrain, Cambodia, China, Egypt, Gabon, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Maldives, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

33. At the same meeting, the representatives of India and Pakistan made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

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

34. At the 15th meeting, on 25 June 2018, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented the thematic reports prepared by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2, 3, 5 and 6.

35. At the 15th and 16th meetings, on 25 June 2018, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on the thematic reports under agenda items 2 and 3 presented by the Deputy High Commissioner (see chap. III, sect. C).

36. At its 21st meeting, on 27 June 2018, and at its 22nd meeting, on 28 June, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 5, and at the 27th meeting, on 29 June, the Council held a general debate on agenda item 6, including on the thematic reports under

agenda items 2, 5 and 6 presented by the Deputy High Commissioner (see chap. V, sect. B, and chap. VI, sect. C).

37. At the 31st and 32nd meetings, on 3 July 2018, and at the 34th meeting, on 4 July, the High Commissioner and the Deputy High Commissioner presented the reports of OHCHR submitted under agenda items 2 and 10.

38. At its 34th meeting, on 4 July 2018, and at its 35th meeting, on 5 July, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 10, including on the reports presented by the High Commissioner under agenda items 2 and 10 (see chap. X, sect. G).

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Technical assistance to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and follow-up to the report of the team of international experts on the Kasai region

39. As notified to the secretariat, draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.22, sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, 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, was withdrawn by its sponsors on 5 July 2018, prior to its consideration by the Human Rights Council.

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

A. Panel discussions

Annual full-day discussion on the human rights of women

40. An annual full-day discussion on the human rights of women was held on 21 and 22 June 2018, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 6/30. The meeting was divided into two panel discussions.

41. At the 11th meeting, on 21 June 2018, the Human Rights Council held the first panel discussion, on the theme “The impact of violence against women human rights defenders and women’s organizations in digital spaces”.

42. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, Dubravka Šimonović, moderated the discussion for the panel.

43. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Founder and Director of GlitchUK, Seyi Akiwowo; Executive Director of Digital Rights Foundation, Nighat Dad; Director of Digital Safety and Privacy at Tactical Technology Collective, Matt Mitchell.

44. The ensuing panel discussion was divided into two slots, which were held at the same meeting. During the first speaking slot, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Brazil (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries), China, Liechtenstein³ (also on behalf of Austria, Slovenia and Switzerland), Spain, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the League of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Canada, Estonia (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden), Ireland;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women);

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

(e) Observer for a national human rights institution: Australian Human Rights Commission (by video message);

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of Amnesty International, the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, the Association for Progressive Communications, the Association for Women’s Rights in Development, Front Line: International Foundation for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders and the World Organization against Torture), Plan International (also on behalf of Defence for Children International, Foundation ECPAT International and Terre des hommes fédération internationale).

45. At the end of the first speaking slot, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

46. During the second speaking slot for the first panel discussion, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Germany, Iraq, Pakistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Argentina, Denmark, France, Greece, Lesotho, Netherlands, Serbia, Sudan;

(c) Observer for a national human rights institution: Equality and Human Rights Commission (England, Scotland and Wales) (also on behalf of the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission and the Scottish Human Rights Commission) (by video message);

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development (also on behalf of the Youth Coalition for Sexual and Reproductive Rights), Espace Afrique International.

47. Also at the same meeting, the panellists of the first panel discussion answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

48. At the 12th meeting, on 22 June 2018, the Human Rights Council held the second panel discussion, on the theme “Advancing women’s rights in the economic sphere through access and participation in information and communication technologies (ICTs)”.

49. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Minister for Fisheries and Equal Opportunities and Minister for Nordic Cooperation of Denmark, Eva Kjer Hansen, gave the keynote address. The Programme Officer and Partnerships Manager at the International Trade Centre’s SheTrades initiative, Anna Mori, moderated the discussion for the panel.

50. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Researcher and Communications and Evaluations Manager at Research ICT Africa, Chennai Chair; Coordinator for Asia at Alliance for Affordable Internet, World Wide Web Foundation, Basheerhamad Shadrach; Head of Digital Ecosystem Relations at Sonatel, Rokhaya Solange Ndir.

51. The ensuing panel discussion was divided into two slots, which were held at the same meeting. During the first speaking slot, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Australia (also on behalf of the Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, New Zealand, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu), Belgium (also on behalf of Luxembourg and the Netherlands), Central African Republic³ (on behalf of States members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Chile (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay), Kuwait³ (on behalf of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf), Slovenia (also on behalf of Austria and Croatia), Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Canada, Denmark, Estonia (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden);

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Haq, Association for Progressive Communications, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco.

52. At the end of the first speaking slot, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

53. During the second speaking slot for the second panel discussion, the following made statements:

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bulgaria, Czechia, Italy, Madagascar, Malaysia, Romania, Russian Federation, Thailand, Viet Nam;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Plan International.

54. Also at the same meeting, the panellists of the second panel discussion answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

Panel discussion on the human rights of internally displaced persons in commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement

55. At the 18th meeting, on 26 June 2018, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council decision 35/101, a panel discussion on the human rights of internally displaced persons in commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement.

56. The Director of the Human Rights Council and Treaty Mechanisms Division at OHCHR and the Assistant High Commissioner for Protection at the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) made opening statements. The Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons, Cecilia Jimenez-Damary, moderated the discussion.

57. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: member of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights and African Union Special Rapporteur on Refugees, Asylum Seekers, Migrants and Internally Displaced Persons in Africa, Maya Sahli Fadel; Undersecretary for Human Rights of Honduras, Alba Marcela Castañeda; Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Fiji to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Nazhat Shameem Khan.

58. The ensuing panel discussion was divided into two slots, which were held at the same meeting. During the first speaking slot, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: China, Ecuador, Iraq, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the League of Arab States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Colombia, Denmark, Russian Federation, Serbia;

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

(d) Observer for national human rights institutions: Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Christian Aid, Franciscans International.

59. During the second speaking slot, the following made statements:

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Austria, Botswana, Ireland, Kuwait, Lesotho, Norway, Syrian Arab Republic;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP);

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Haq (also on behalf of the Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights), Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

60. Also at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

B. Interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders

Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity

61. At the 1st meeting, on 18 June 2018, the Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity, Victor Madrigal-Borloz, presented his reports (A/HRC/38/43 and Add.1).

62. At the same meeting, the representative of Argentina made a statement as the State concerned.

63. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 1st and 2nd meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Belgium, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Mexico, Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay), Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Austria, Canada, Colombia, Czechia, Denmark (also on behalf of Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden), France, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Thailand;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Allied Rainbow Communities International, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, British Humanist Association, Human Rights Law Centre, International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of Asistencia Legal por los Derechos Humanos), International Service for Human Rights, Swedish Association for Sexuality Education (also on behalf of the International Planned Parenthood Federation), Swedish Federation of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights.

64. At the 2nd meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

65. At the 1st meeting, on 18 June 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, Clément Nyaletsossi Voule, presented his report (A/HRC/38/34).

66. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 1st and 2nd 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: Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Iraq, Nigeria, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Armenia, Botswana, Czechia, France, Ireland, Israel, Maldives, Morocco, Netherlands, Portugal, Russian Federation, Sudan, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al Mezan Center for Human Rights, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Ensemble contre la peine de mort, Human Rights House Foundation, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (also on behalf of the IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association).

67. At the 2nd meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

68. At the 3rd meeting, on the same day, the representative of the Russian Federation made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

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

69. At the 2nd meeting, on 18 June 2018, 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/38/36 and Add.1–2).

70. At the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia and Indonesia made statements as the States concerned.

71. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 2nd and the 3rd 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: Brazil, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Egypt, Georgia, Iraq, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Ukraine;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Djibouti, France, Haiti, India, Lithuania, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Paraguay, Portugal, Russian Federation, Sudan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, State of Palestine;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF);

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Association of World Citizens, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Center for Reproductive Rights, Defence for Children International, European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Federation, Franciscans International (also on behalf of Genève pour les droits de l'homme: formation internationale, the Minority Rights Group and VIVAT International), International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Catholic Child Bureau, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Minority Rights Group, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

72. At the 3rd meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the elimination of discrimination against persons affected by leprosy and their family members

73. At the 2nd meeting, on 18 June 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the elimination of discrimination against persons affected by leprosy and their family members, Alice Cruz, presented her report (A/HRC/38/42).

74. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 2nd and the 3rd 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: Brazil, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Japan, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, Slovenia, South Africa, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Djibouti, Fiji, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Malaysia, Morocco, Portugal, Russian Federation, Trinidad and Tobago;

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

(d) Observer for the Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of St. John of Jerusalem, of Rhodes and of Malta;

(e) Observer for a non-governmental organization: Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII.

75. At the 3rd meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity

76. At the 3rd meeting, on 18 June 2018, the Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity, Obiora C. Okafor, presented his reports (A/HRC/38/40 and Add.1).

77. At the 5th meeting, on 19 June 2018, the representative of Cuba made a statement as the State concerned.

78. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 5th and 6th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola, China, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, South Africa, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Djibouti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Russian Federation, Sudan, Sweden;

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

(d) Observer for a non-governmental organization: Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, the International Confederation of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, the International Movement of Apostolate in the Independent Social Milieus, the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education, New Humanity, Passionists International and the World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations).

79. At the 6th meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the right to education

80. At the 3rd meeting, on 18 June 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the right to education, Koumbou Boly Barry, presented her reports (A/HRC/38/32 and Add.1).

81. At the 5th meeting, on 19 June 2018, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made a statement as the State concerned.

82. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 5th and 6th 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: Afghanistan, Australia, China, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Slovakia, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Denmark, Djibouti, France, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Kuwait, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Russian Federation, Sudan, Holy See;

(c) Observers for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UNICEF, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO);

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights, Association of World Citizens, Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi, Catholic International Education Office, Center for Organisation Research and Education, Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom

of Education, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Prahar, World Barua Organization.

83. At the 6th meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions

84. At the 6th meeting, on 19 June 2018, the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Agnès Callamard, presented her reports (A/HRC/38/44 and Add.1-3).

85. At the 7th meeting, on 20 June 2018, the representatives of El Salvador and Iraq made statements as the States concerned.

86. At the same meeting, the Office of the Human Rights Advocate (El Salvador), the national human rights institution, made a statement (by video message).

87. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 7th and 8th 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: Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, China, Cuba, Egypt, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, South Africa, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, France, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Latvia (also on behalf of Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden), Montenegro, Russian Federation, Sudan;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Centro de Derechos Humanos Miguel Agustín Pro Juárez, Front Line: International Foundation for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders (also on behalf of Amnesty International, the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development and the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues), International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Women's Human Rights International Association, World Organization against Torture (also on behalf of the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development).

88. At the 7th and 8th meetings, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

89. At the 6th meeting, on 19 June 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, David Kaye, presented his reports (A/HRC/38/35, Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1-2, and Add.2-3).

90. At the 7th meeting, on 20 June 2018, the representative of Mexico made a statement as the State concerned.

91. At the same meeting, the National Human Rights Commission (Mexico), the national human rights institution, made a statement (by video message).

92. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 7th and 8th 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: Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, China, Croatia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Germany (also on behalf of Austria, Brazil, Liechtenstein and Mexico), Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay and Uruguay), Philippines, Switzerland, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), South

Africa, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burkina Faso, France, Greece, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Latvia, Latvia (also on behalf of Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden), Maldives, Montenegro, Myanmar, Netherlands, Paraguay, Poland, Russian Federation, Sudan, Uruguay;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UNESCO;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alliance Defending Freedom, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, British Humanist Association, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, International Commission of Jurists, International Federation of Journalists, Lutheran World Federation (also on behalf of ACT Alliance – Action by Churches Together), Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

93. At the 7th and 8th meetings, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences

94. At the 8th meeting, on 20 June 2018, the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, Dubravka Šimonović, presented her reports (A/HRC/38/47 and Add.1-2).

95. At the same meeting, the representatives of Australia and the Bahamas made statements as the States concerned.

96. Also at the same meeting, the national human rights institution Australian Human Rights Commission made a statement.

97. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 8th and 9th 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: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, Croatia, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Japan, Nigeria, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Canada, Colombia, Djibouti, El Salvador, Finland (also on behalf of Denmark, Estonia, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden), France, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Malaysia, Maldives, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Paraguay, Portugal, Russian Federation, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UN-Women;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Association for Progressive Communications, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Espace Afrique International, Human Rights Law Centre, International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland), United Nations Watch.

98. At the 8th and 9th meetings, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

99. At the 9th meeting, the representative of China made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants

100. At the 8th meeting, on 20 June 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants, Felipe González Morales, presented his reports (A/HRC/38/41 and Add.1).

101. At the same meeting, the representative of Nepal made a statement as the State concerned.

102. Also at the same meeting, the National Human Rights Commission (Nepal), a national human rights institution, made a statement (by video message).

103. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 8th and 9th 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: Afghanistan, Brazil, Chile, China, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Mexico, Mexico (also on behalf of Brazil, Chile, Guatemala, Peru and Uruguay), Nigeria, Philippines, Senegal, Switzerland, Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Djibouti, El Salvador, France, Haiti, Honduras, Italy, Jordan, Malaysia, Malta, Morocco, Paraguay, Portugal, Russian Federation, Sudan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Viet Nam, Holy See;

(c) Observers for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UNICEF, UN-Women;

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

(e) Observer for the Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of St. John of Jerusalem, of Rhodes and of Malta;

(f) Observer for a national human rights institution: National Human Rights Council (Morocco);

(g) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of Association Points-Cœur, the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, the Foundation for GAIA, the International Confederation of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, the International Movement ATD Fourth World, the International Movement of Apostolate in the Independent Social Milieus, New Humanity, Passionists International and the World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations), Centro de Derechos Humanos Miguel Agustín Pro Juárez, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers (also on behalf of Franciscans International), Foundation ECPAT International, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, Ma'arij Foundation for Peace and Development, Make Mothers Matter, Terre des hommes fédération internationale (also on behalf of Save the Children International).

104. At the 8th and 9th meetings, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

105. At the 9th meeting, on 20 June 2018, the Chair of the Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice, Ivana Radačić, presented the reports of the Working Group (A/HRC/38/46 and Add.1-2).

106. At the same meeting, the representatives of Chad and Samoa made statements as the States concerned.

107. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 10th and 11th meetings, on 21 June 2018, the following made statements and asked the Chair of the Working Group questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iraq, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand⁴ (also on behalf of Australia, Canada, Iceland and Mexico), Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, South Africa, Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Djibouti, France, Greece, Honduras, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Lithuania, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Norway (also on behalf of Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia and Sweden), Paraguay, Poland, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Thailand;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UN-Women;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Al-Khoei Foundation, Alulbayt Foundation, Association for Women's Rights in Development, Center for Reproductive Rights (also on behalf of the Association for Women's Rights in Development, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, the International Planned Parenthood Federation and Plan International), Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales, Espace Afrique International, European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Federation (also on behalf of Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland and the International Lesbian and Gay Association), Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, Make Mothers Matter, Youth Coalition for Sexual and Reproductive Rights.

108. At the 10th and 11th meetings, the Chair of the Working Group answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children

109. At the 9th meeting, on 20 June 2018, the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children, Maria Grazia Giammarinaro, presented her reports (A/HRC/38/45 and Add.1).

110. At the same meeting, the representative of Cuba made a statement as the State concerned.

111. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 10th and 11th meetings, on 21 June 2018, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Belarus⁴ (also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, 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)), Belgium, Brazil, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Georgia, Germany, Iraq, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Slovakia, South Africa, Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Botswana, Bulgaria, Colombia, Djibouti, France, Greece, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Myanmar, Paraguay, Portugal, Russian Federation, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Viet Nam, Holy See;

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

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UN-Women;

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

(e) Observer for the Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of St. John of Jerusalem, of Rhodes and of Malta;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Caritas Internationalis, Foundation ECPAT International, VIVAT International (also on behalf of Franciscans International).

112. At the 10th and 11th meetings, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights

113. At the 12th meeting, on 22 June 2018, the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, Philip Alston, presented his reports (A/HRC/38/33 and Add.1–2).

114. At the same meeting, the representative of Ghana made a statement as the State concerned.

115. 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: China, Cuba, Egypt, France⁴ (also on behalf of Albania, Belgium, Chile, Morocco, Peru, Romania and Senegal), Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Colombia, France, Honduras, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Paraguay, Russian Federation;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UNICEF;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: American Civil Liberties Union, Center for Reproductive Rights, Conectas Direitos Humanos, Conselho Indigenista Missionário (also on behalf of Franciscans International), Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

116. At the 13th meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons

117. At the 12th meeting, on 22 June 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons, Cecilia Jimenez-Damary, presented her reports (A/HRC/38/39 and Add.1-3).

118. At the same meeting, the representatives of El Salvador, Libya and the Niger made statements as the States concerned.

119. Also at the same meeting, the Office of the Human Rights Advocate (El Salvador), the national human rights institution, made a statement (by video message).

120. 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: Australia, China, Croatia, Egypt, Georgia, Iraq, Kenya, Nigeria, Philippines, Senegal, Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Ukraine, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Austria (also on behalf of Honduras and Uganda), Azerbaijan, Estonia, France, Honduras, Malaysia, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Russian Federation, Serbia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation, Association of World Citizens, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, European Centre for Law and Justice, Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Prahar, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation.

121. At the 13th meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

122. At the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Brazil made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

123. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia and Azerbaijan made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

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

124. At the 14th meeting, on 25 June 2018, the Chair of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, Anita Ramasastry, presented the reports of the Working Group (A/HRC/38/48 and Add.1–2).

125. At the same meeting, the representatives of Canada and Peru made statements as the States concerned.

126. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Chair of the Working Group questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Belgium, Brazil, Chile, China, Ecuador, Egypt, Germany, Kenya, Pakistan, Spain, Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, France, India, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, Norway, Thailand, Russian Federation, Holy See, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Conectas Direitos Humanos, Human Rights Law Centre, Human Rights Now, International Service for Human Rights, Sikh Human Rights Group.

127. Also at the same meeting, the Chair of the Working Group answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers

128. At the 14th meeting, on 25 June 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers, Diego García-Sayán, presented his reports (A/HRC/38/38 and Add.1).

129. At the same meeting, the representative of Poland made a statement as the State concerned.

130. Also at the same meeting, the national human rights institution Commissioner for Human Rights (Poland) made a statement.

131. 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: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, Egypt, Hungary, Iraq, Kenya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru (also on behalf

of Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay and Uruguay), Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Ukraine, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Estonia, France, Greece, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Russian Federation, Sudan;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, European Centre for Law and Justice, Human Rights House Foundation, International Bar Association (also on behalf of Lawyers for Lawyers, Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada, The Law Society and Union internationale des avocats), International Commission of Jurists, International Federation for the Protection of the Rights of Ethnic, Religious, Linguistic and Other Minorities, Iraqi Development Organization, Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational and Transparty.

132. At the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

C. General debate on agenda item 3

133. At its 15th and 16th meetings, on 25 June 2018, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on the thematic reports under agenda items 2 and 3, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia (also on behalf of Argentina, Austria, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechia, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Mongolia, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Australia (also on behalf of Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Canada, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Montenegro, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Norway, Malta, Mexico, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay), Austria⁴ (also on behalf of Argentina, Australia, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, France, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Morocco, the Netherlands, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Sweden and Tunisia), Belgium, Brazil (also on behalf of France, Indonesia, Norway, Senegal and South Africa), Bulgaria⁴ (on behalf of the European Union), Côte d'Ivoire (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, China, the Comoros, the Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, the Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, the Sudan, Suriname, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe and the State of Palestine), Cuba, Georgia, Japan, Kuwait⁴ (on behalf of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf), Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal⁴ (also on behalf of Brazil, Mozambique, Paraguay and Thailand), Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation⁴ (also on behalf of Belarus, Brazil, China, Pakistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe), Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Turkmenistan⁴ (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Armenia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Cambodia, Canada, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Georgia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mali, Monaco, Mongolia, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, San Marino, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab

Republic, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, the Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Zambia and Zimbabwe), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Greece, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Libya, Maldives, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Russian Federation, Singapore, Tonga, United Republic of Tanzania, Holy See;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: Inter-Parliamentary Union;

(d) Observer for national human rights institutions: Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (also on behalf of the national human rights institutions of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cameroon, Denmark, Ecuador, Germany, India, Ireland, Morocco and the Philippines);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action of Human Movement, African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, African Development Association, Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association d'entraide médicale Guinée, Association Dunenyo, Association for Progressive Communications, Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights, Association of World Citizens, Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Association Thendral, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco and the World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations), Center for International Environmental Law, Centre d'action pour le développement rural, Centre Europe-tiers monde, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, China Society for Human Rights Studies, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, Conectas Direitos Humanos, Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Coordination des associations et des particuliers pour la liberté de conscience, "Coup de pousse" Chaîne de l'espoir Nord-Sud, European Centre for Law and Justice, FIAN International, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Franciscans International (also on behalf of VIVAT International), Global Welfare Association, Graduate Women International, Human Rights Law Centre, Human Security Initiative Organization, Il Cenacolo, Indian Council of South America, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, International Career Support Association, International Commission of Jurists (also on behalf of CIDSE and Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers), International Educational Development, International Federation for the Protection of the Rights of Ethnic, Religious, Linguistic and Other Minorities, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International-Lawyers.org, International Muslim Women's Union, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination,

International Service for Human Rights, Iraqi Development Organization, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Ma'arij Foundation for Peace and Development, Make Mothers Matter, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Palestinian Center for Development and Media Freedoms "MADA", Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Prahar, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Save the Children International, Sikh Human Rights Group, Society for Threatened Peoples, Solidarité Suisse-Guinée, Stichting International Center for Ethnobotanical Education, Research and Service, Tamil Uzhagam, Tourner la page, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Victorious Youths Movement, Villages unis, World Barua Organization, World Evangelical Alliance, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

134. At the 16th meeting, the representatives of Brazil, China, India, Japan, Pakistan, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Thailand and the United Republic of Tanzania made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

135. At the same meeting, the representatives of India and Pakistan made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Elimination of all forms of discrimination against women and girls

136. At the 36th meeting, on 5 July 2018, the representative of Mexico, also on behalf of Colombia, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.1/Rev.1, sponsored by Colombia and Mexico, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay. Subsequently, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Monaco, Mongolia, Nepal, the Republic of Korea, Serbia and Slovakia joined the sponsors.

137. At the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.1/Rev.1 had been orally revised.

138. Also at the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that amendments A/HRC/38/L.23, A/HRC/38/L.25 and A/HRC/38/L.34 to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.1/Rev.1 as orally revised had been withdrawn by their sponsors.

139. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendment A/HRC/38/L.24 to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.1/Rev.1 as orally revised.

140. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia introduced amendment A/HRC/38/L.35 to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.1/Rev.1 as orally revised.

141. Amendments A/HRC/38/L.23 and A/HRC/38/L.25 were sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Egypt and Saudi Arabia. Amendment A/HRC/38/L.24 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Egypt and Saudi Arabia. Subsequently, Indonesia joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/38/L.34 was sponsored by Egypt, the Russian Federation and Saudi Arabia. Amendment A/HRC/38/L.35 was sponsored by Egypt, the Russian Federation and Saudi Arabia. Subsequently, Indonesia joined the sponsors.

142. At the same meeting, the representative of Mexico made a statement on the proposed amendments to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.1/Rev.1 as orally revised.

143. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments on draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.1/Rev.1 as orally revised and on the proposed amendments.

144. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council took action on amendments A/HRC/38/L.24 and A/HRC/38/L.35 to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.1/Rev.1 as orally revised.

145. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Australia made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/38/L.24.

146. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Australia, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/38/L.24. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Burundi, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Kenya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Croatia, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Mongolia, Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, Senegal, Togo

147. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/38/L.24 by 24 votes to 12, with 7 abstentions.⁵

148. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/38/L.35. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Burundi, China, Egypt, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, United Arab Emirates

Against:

Angola, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Croatia, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Mongolia, Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nepal, Philippines, Togo

149. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/38/L.35 by 24 votes to 11, with 7 abstentions.⁶

150. At the same meeting, the representatives of Egypt, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar and Saudi Arabia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.1/Rev.1 as orally revised. In their statements, the representatives of Egypt, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar and Saudi Arabia disassociated the respective member States from the consensus on the nineteenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 4 (d) of the draft resolution as orally revised. In its statement, the representative of Pakistan disassociated the member State from the consensus on paragraph 7 of the draft resolution as orally revised. In its statement, the representative of Saudi Arabia disassociated the member State from the consensus on the twelfth, fifteenth and twenty-first preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution as orally revised. In its statement, the representative of Qatar disassociated the

⁵ The delegations of Cuba, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) did not cast a vote.

⁶ The delegations of Cuba, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) did not cast a vote.

member State from the consensus on the twelfth, fifteenth and twenty-first preambular paragraphs and on paragraph 7 of the draft resolution as orally revised. In its statement, the representative of Iraq disassociated the member State from the consensus on the sixth, twelfth, fifteenth, sixteenth and nineteenth preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 4, 6 (a) and 7 of the draft resolution as orally revised.

151. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.1/Rev.1 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 38/1).

152. At the 38th meeting, on 6 July 2018, the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Senegal and Slovakia made statements in explanation of vote after the vote and general comments in relation to all of the draft proposals adopted under agenda item 3. In its statement, the representative of Senegal disassociated the member State from the consensus on the nineteenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution as orally revised.

Human rights and international solidarity

153. At the 37th meeting, on 5 July 2018, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.3, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Nicaragua, the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, China, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka and the United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

154. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico and Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

155. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Slovakia, 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:

Afghanistan, Angola, Brazil, Burundi, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Mexico

156. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 31 votes to 14, with 1 abstention (resolution 38/2).

Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights

157. At the 37th meeting, on 5 July 2018, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Group of Arab States, China and the Russian Federation) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.4, sponsored by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. Subsequently, China, El Salvador, Paraguay and the Russian Federation joined the sponsors.

158. At the same meeting, the representative of Australia made a general comment on the draft resolution.

159. 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.

160. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Japan, Mexico, Peru and Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

161. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Australia, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Angola, Burundi, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Brazil, Mexico

162. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 28 votes to 14, with 3 abstentions (resolution 38/3).⁷

Human rights and climate change

163. At the 37th meeting, on 5 July 2018, the representatives of Viet Nam, the Philippines and Bangladesh introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.5, sponsored by Bangladesh, the Philippines and Viet Nam, and co-sponsored by Algeria, Andorra, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Fiji, Maldives, Mexico, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, San Marino, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Uruguay and Zambia. Subsequently, Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Benin, Botswana, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, France, Georgia, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iraq, Malawi, Mauritius, Nepal, Panama, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Switzerland and the United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

164. At the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that the draft resolution had been orally revised.

165. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Slovakia (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 as orally revised.

166. 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.

167. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 38/4).

Accelerating efforts to eliminate violence against women and girls: preventing and responding to violence against women and girls in digital contexts

168. At the 37th meeting, on 5 July 2018, the representative of Canada introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.6, sponsored by Canada and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Hungary,

⁷ The delegation of Panama did not cast a vote.

Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine and Uruguay. Subsequently, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Fiji, Guatemala, Honduras, Kazakhstan, Malawi, Mali, Mongolia, the Republic of Korea, Serbia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Zambia joined the sponsors.

169. At the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that amendment A/HRC/38/L.33 to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.6 had been withdrawn by its sponsor.

170. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendment A/HRC/38/L.32 to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.6.

171. Amendment A/HRC/38/L.32 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Egypt and Saudi Arabia. Subsequently, Indonesia joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/38/L.33 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

172. At the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium, Chile, Georgia, Japan and Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made general comments on draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.6 and on the proposed amendment.

173. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council took action on amendment A/HRC/38/L.32 to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.6.

174. At the same meeting, the representative of Australia made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/38/L.32.

175. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Georgia, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/38/L.32. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Burundi, China, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Kenya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Croatia, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Mongolia, Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, Nepal, Philippines, Senegal, Togo

176. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/38/L.32 by 25 votes to 13, with 6 abstentions.⁸

177. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Egypt, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and South Africa made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.6. In their statements, the representatives of Egypt, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar and Saudi Arabia disassociated the respective member States from the consensus on paragraph 10 (f) of the draft resolution. In their statements, the representatives of Iraq, Qatar and Saudi Arabia disassociated the respective member States from the consensus on paragraphs 5 and 11 (d) of the draft resolution.

178. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.6 without a vote (resolution 38/5).

⁸ The delegations of Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) did not cast a vote.

Elimination of female genital mutilation

179. At the 37th meeting, on 5 July 2018, the representative of Togo, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.9, sponsored by Togo, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Canada, El Salvador, Honduras, Japan, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

180. At the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that the draft resolution had been orally revised.

181. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Australia, Belgium and Slovakia (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.

182. 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.

183. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 38/6).

The promotion, protection and enjoyment of human rights on the Internet

184. At the 37th meeting, on 5 July 2018, the representatives of Sweden (on behalf of Brazil, Nigeria and Tunisia) and Brazil introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.10/Rev.1, sponsored by Brazil, Nigeria, Sweden and Tunisia, and co-sponsored by Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Benin, Bulgaria, Chile, the Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Canada, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Georgia, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Japan, Maldives, Mongolia, New Zealand, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Timor-Leste joined the sponsors.

185. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Egypt, Iraq, Peru (also on behalf of Chile and Panama), Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), South Africa and Tunisia made general comments on the draft resolution.

186. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 38/7).

Human rights in the context of HIV and AIDS

187. At the 37th meeting, on 5 July 2018, the representative of Brazil (on behalf of Colombia, Mozambique, Portugal and Thailand) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.12, sponsored by Brazil, Colombia, Mozambique, Portugal and Thailand, and co-sponsored by Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Uruguay. Subsequently, Honduras withdrew its original co-sponsorship of the draft resolution. Subsequently, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Canada, Czechia, El Salvador,

France, Germany, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Malawi, New Zealand, Panama, the Philippines, Senegal, Slovenia, Spain, Timor-Leste, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

188. At the same meeting, the representatives of Egypt, Mexico and Qatar (also on behalf of Indonesia, Iraq, Kuwait, Oman, Pakistan and the Sudan) made general comments on the draft resolution. In its statement, the representative of Qatar disassociated the respective member States from the consensus on the twenty-second preambular paragraph and paragraphs 4, 16 and 22 of the draft resolution.

189. 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.

190. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 38/8).

The right to education: follow-up to Human Rights Council resolution 8/4

191. At the 37th meeting, on 5 July 2018, the representative of Portugal introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.13, sponsored by Portugal and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Ukraine and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Czechia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, France, Georgia, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Latvia, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, the Netherlands, Panama, Qatar, San Marino, Sri Lanka, Switzerland and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

192. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 38/9).

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

193. At the 37th meeting, on 5 July 2018, the representatives of Ecuador and Peru introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.14, sponsored by Ecuador and Peru, and co-sponsored by Australia, Azerbaijan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Cyprus, Cuba, Greece, Honduras, Liechtenstein, Paraguay, the Philippines, Switzerland and Uruguay. Subsequently, Honduras withdrew its original co-sponsorship of the draft resolution. Subsequently, Brazil, the Congo, Egypt, El Salvador, Haiti, Ireland, Jamaica, Maldives, Mexico, Nigeria, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Singapore, Thailand and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

194. 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.

195. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 38/10).

The promotion and protection of human rights in the context of peaceful protests

196. At the 38th meeting, on 6 July 2018, the representative of Switzerland, also on behalf of Costa Rica, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.16, sponsored by Costa Rica and Switzerland, and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Honduras, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Canada, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Georgia, Greece,

Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Panama, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Sweden and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

197. At the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.16 had been orally revised.

198. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendment A/HRC/38/L.26 to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.16 as orally revised.

199. Amendment A/HRC/38/L.26 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Indonesia joined the sponsors.

200. At the same meeting, the representative of Switzerland made a statement on the proposed amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.16 as orally revised.

201. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium, China, Egypt, Pakistan, Panama and Slovakia (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 and on the proposed amendment. In its statement, the representative of China disassociated the respective member State from the consensus on the draft resolution as orally revised.

202. 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.

203. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council took action on amendment A/HRC/38/L.26 to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.16 as orally revised.

204. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Australia, Georgia and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/38/L.26.

205. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/38/L.26. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Croatia, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iraq, Kenya, Nepal, Nigeria, Senegal

206. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/38/L.26 by 23 votes to 14, with 8 abstentions.⁹

207. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.6 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 38/11).

Civil society space: engagement with international and regional organizations

208. At the 38th meeting, on 6 July 2018, the representatives of Ireland (also on behalf of Chile, Japan, Sierra Leone and Tunisia) and Tunisia introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.17/Rev.1, sponsored by Chile, Ireland, Japan, Sierra Leone and Tunisia, and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France,

⁹ The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine and Uruguay. Subsequently, Argentina, Colombia, the Congo, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

209. At the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.17/Rev.1 had been orally revised.

210. Also at the same meeting, the representative of China (also on behalf of Cuba, Pakistan and the Russian Federation) introduced amendments A/HRC/38/L.36, A/HRC/38/L.37 and A/HRC/38/L.38 to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.17/Rev.1 as orally revised. The representative of China (also on behalf of Cuba and the Russian Federation) introduced amendment A/HRC/38/L.39 to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.17/Rev.1 as orally revised.

211. At the same meeting, China withdrew amendment A/HRC/38/L.36 to draft resolution A/HRC/L.17/Rev.1 as orally revised.

212. Amendment A/HRC/38/L.36 was sponsored by China and co-sponsored by Pakistan and the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Cuba joined the sponsors. Amendments A/HRC/38/L.37 and A/HRC/38/L.38 were sponsored by China and co-sponsored by Pakistan and the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Cuba, Indonesia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/38/L.39 was sponsored by China and co-sponsored by the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

213. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Chile made a statement on the proposed amendments to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.17/Rev.1 as orally revised.

214. At the same meeting, the representatives of Pakistan, Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and Switzerland made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised and on the proposed amendments.

215. 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.

216. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council took action on amendments A/HRC/38/L.37, A/HRC/38/L.38 and A/HRC/38/L.39 to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.17/Rev.1 as orally revised.

217. At the same meeting, the representatives of Germany and Peru made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/38/L.37.

218. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/38/L.37. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Chile, Croatia, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Angola, Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mongolia, Nepal, Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Togo

219. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/38/L.37 by 22 votes to 14, with 10 abstentions.

220. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Australia and Chile made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/38/L.38.

221. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/38/L.38. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Mongolia, Nepal, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Togo

222. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/38/L.38 by 21 votes to 15, with 10 abstentions.

223. At the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium and Tunisia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/38/L.39.

224. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/38/L.39. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Croatia, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iraq, Kenya, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa

225. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/38/L.39 by 24 votes to 12, with 10 abstentions.

226. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of China, Egypt, Iraq, Panama and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.17/Rev.1 as orally revised.

227. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.17/Rev.1 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 38/12).

Business and human rights: improving accountability and access to remedy

228. At the 38th meeting, on 6 July 2018, the representative of Norway introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.18, sponsored by Argentina, Ghana, Norway and the Russian Federation, and co-sponsored by Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, the Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the Niger, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia and Turkey. Subsequently, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, the Dominican Republic,

France, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, New Zealand, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

229. At the same meeting, the representatives of Ecuador, Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), South Africa and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments on the draft resolution.

230. 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.

231. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 38/13).

232. At the same meeting, the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Senegal and Slovakia made statements in explanation of vote after the vote and general comments in relation to all of the draft proposals adopted under agenda item 3.

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

233. At the 17th meeting, on 26 June 2018, the Chair of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro, provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 31/17 and 37/29, an oral update.

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

235. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 17th and 18th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the members of the Commission of Inquiry questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, China, Croatia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Georgia, Germany, Iraq, Japan, Mexico, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, Canada, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark (also on behalf of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), Estonia, France, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Maldives, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (also on behalf of Action Canada for Population and Development), World Council of Arameans (Syriacs).

236. At the 18th meeting, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made final remarks as the State concerned.

237. At the 17th and 18th meetings, the Chair and members of the Commission of Inquiry, Karen Koning Abuzayad and Hanny Megally, answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

B. Interactive dialogue with the Commission of Inquiry on Burundi

238. At the 19th meeting, on 27 June 2018, the Chair of the Commission of Inquiry on Burundi, Doudou Diène, provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 36/19, an oral briefing.

239. At the same meeting, members of the Commission of Inquiry on Burundi, Françoise Hampson and Lucy Asuagbor, made statements.

240. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Burundi made a statement as the State concerned.

241. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Chair and the members of the Commission of Inquiry questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Belgium, China, Georgia, Germany, Mexico, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Denmark, Eritrea, France, Ireland, Luxembourg, Myanmar, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Sudan;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Espace Afrique International, Human Rights Watch, International Federation of ACAT (also on behalf of Centre pour les droits civils et politiques, the East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project and the World Organization against Torture), International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Tourner la page.

242. At the same meeting, the Chair of the Commission of Inquiry on Burundi answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

C. Interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus

243. At the 16th meeting, on 25 June 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus, Miklós Haraszti, presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 35/27, his report (A/HRC/38/51).

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

245. 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: Australia, Belgium, Slovakia, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Czechia, Estonia, Finland, France, Ireland, Lithuania, Poland;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, United Nations Watch.

246. 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

247. At the 17th meeting, on 26 June 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea, Sheila Keetharuth, presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 35/35, her report (A/HRC/38/50).

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

249. 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: Australia, Belgium, China, Cuba, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Belarus, Djibouti, France, Greece, Netherlands, Norway, Russian Federation, Sudan;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Association mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, Center for Global Nonkilling, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen

Participation, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights Watch, International Fellowship of Reconciliation.

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

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar

251. At the 19th meeting, on 27 June 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, Yanghee Lee, presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 37/32, an oral progress report.

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

253. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 19th and 20th 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: Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, China, Germany, Iraq, Japan, Mexico, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bangladesh, Belarus, Canada, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, France, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Maldives, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Russian Federation, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Viet Nam;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alliance Defending Freedom, Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, Human Rights Now, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International-Lawyers.org, Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada.

254. At the 20th meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

D. General debate on agenda item 4

255. At its 20th and 21st meetings, on 27 June 2018, 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: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria¹⁰ (on behalf of the European Union), China, Cuba, Egypt, Georgia, Germany, Japan, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (also on behalf of Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, the Sudan and Zimbabwe);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Canada, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Maldives, Netherlands, Norway, Russian Federation;

(c) Observer for a national human rights institution: Office of the Human Rights Advocate (Nicaragua);

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ABC Tamil Oli, Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Africa culture

¹⁰ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

internationale, African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, African Development Association, Agir ensemble pour les droits de l'homme, Alliance Creative Community Project, Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship (also on behalf of the Committee to Protect Journalists, Freedom House and International PEN), Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association culturelle des Tamouls en France, Association d'entraide médicale Guinée, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association Dunenyo, Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights, Association of World Citizens, Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi, Association Thendral, Baha'i International Community, B'nai B'rith, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Center for Inquiry, Center for Organisation Research and Education, Centre d'action pour le développement rural, Centre Europe-tiers monde, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, China Society for Human Rights Studies, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Conectas Direitos Humanos, Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, "Coup de pousse" Chaîne de l'espoir Nord-Sud, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Ensemble contre la peine de mort, European Centre for Law and Justice, European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Federation, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Global Institute for Water, Environment and Health, Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, Human Rights Law Centre, Human Rights Now, Human Rights Watch, Human Security Initiative Organization, Indian Council of South America, Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, Institut international pour les droits et le développement, International Career Support Association, International Commission of Jurists, International Educational Development, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Humanist and Ethical Union (also on behalf of Ensemble contre la peine de mort and Freedom Now), International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, International-Lawyers.org, International Lesbian and Gay Association, International Muslim Women's Union, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Service for Human Rights, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Iraqi Development Organization, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Jssor Youth Organization, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Le pont, Liberation, Ma'arij Foundation for Peace and Development, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Minority Rights Group, Nouveaux droits de l'homme, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Presse emblème campagne, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Réseau international des droits humains, Society for Development and Community Empowerment, Solidarité Suisse-Guinée, Tamil Uzhagam, United Nations Watch, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Victorious Youths Movement, Villages unis, VIVAT International (also on behalf of Franciscans International), World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council, World Evangelical Alliance, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

256. At the 21st meeting, on 27 June 2018, the representatives of Brazil, Cambodia, China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Greece, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Japan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, the Sudan, Turkey and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Situation of human rights in Belarus

258. At the 38th meeting, on 6 July 2018, the representative of Austria, on behalf of the European Union, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.7, sponsored by Austria, Belgium,

Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, 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, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, San Marino and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Subsequently, Switzerland joined the sponsors.

259. At the same meeting, the representatives of Australia and Switzerland (also on behalf of Iceland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand and Norway) made general comments on the draft resolution.

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

261. 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.

262. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba, Egypt, Pakistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

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

In favour:

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Against:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Egypt, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Georgia, Iraq, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia

264. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 19 votes to 6, with 21 abstentions (resolution 38/14).

Situation of human rights in Eritrea

265. At the 38th meeting, on 6 July 2018, the representatives of Djibouti and Somalia introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.15/Rev.1, sponsored by Djibouti and Somalia. Subsequently, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Czechia, France, Greece, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

266. At the same meeting, the representative of Slovakia, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made a general comment on the draft resolution.

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

268. 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.

269. At the same meeting, the representatives of China and Egypt made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution. In their statements, the representatives of China and Egypt disassociated their respective member States from the consensus on the draft resolution.

270. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 38/15).

271. At the 39th meeting, on 6 July 2018, the representatives of Brazil, Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote after the vote and general comments in relation to all of the draft proposals adopted under agenda item 4. In its statement, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela disassociated the respective member State from the consensus on the draft resolution.

The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic

272. At the 39th meeting, on 6 July 2018, 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 and Turkey) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.20, sponsored by France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine. Subsequently, Botswana, Monaco, Norway, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Slovakia, Switzerland and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

273. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendments A/HRC/38/L.28, A/HRC/38/L.29, A/HRC/38/L.30 and A/HRC/38/L.31 to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.20.

274. Amendments A/HRC/38/L.28, A/HRC/38/L.29, A/HRC/38/L.30 and A/HRC/38/L.31 were sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela joined the sponsors.

275. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a statement on the proposed amendments to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.20.

276. At the same meeting, the representatives of Australia, Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Switzerland and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments on draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.20 and on the proposed amendments.

277. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council took action on amendments A/HRC/38/L.28, A/HRC/38/L.29, A/HRC/38/L.30 and A/HRC/38/L.31 to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.20.

278. At the same meeting, the representatives of Germany and Mexico made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/38/L.28.

279. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/38/L.28. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Brazil, Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Pakistan, Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Chile, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Togo

280. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/38/L.28 by 21 votes to 10, with 15 abstentions.

281. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Australia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/38/L.29.

282. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/38/L.29. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Burundi, China, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Chile, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Togo, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa

283. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/38/L.29 by 22 votes to 7, with 16 abstentions.¹¹

284. At the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium and Qatar made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/38/L.30.

285. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/38/L.30. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Brazil, Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Pakistan, Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Chile, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Togo

286. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/38/L.30 by 21 votes to 10, with 15 abstentions.

287. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia and Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/38/L.31.

288. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/38/L.31. The voting was as follows:

¹¹ The delegation of Cuba did not cast a vote.

In favour:

Brazil, Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Iraq, Pakistan, Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Chile, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Togo

289. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/38/L.31 by 21 votes to 9, with 16 abstentions.

290. At the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Mexico and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.20.

291. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representatives of China and Cuba, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.20. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Togo, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Against:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Iraq, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia

292. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.20 by 26 votes to 5, with 15 abstentions (resolution 38/16).

293. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil, Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote after the vote and general comments in relation to all of the draft proposals adopted under agenda item 4.

V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms

A. Forum on Business and Human Rights

294. At the 21st meeting, on 27 June 2018, the Chair of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, Anita Ramasastry, presented the report of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises on the sixth session of the Forum on Business and Human Rights, held from 27 to 29 November 2017 (A/HRC/38/49).

B. General debate on agenda item 5

295. At its 21st meeting, on 27 June 2018, and at its 22nd meeting, on 28 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: Azerbaijan¹² (also on behalf of Georgia, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries)), Belgium, Brazil (also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine and Uruguay), Bulgaria¹² (on behalf of the European Union), Chile, China, Ecuador, France¹² (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Czechia, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay), Luxembourg¹² (also on behalf of Belgium and the Netherlands), Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Morocco¹² (also on behalf of Ecuador, Italy, Maldives, the Philippines, Romania and Spain), Switzerland, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the League of Arab States), Uruguay¹² (also on behalf of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Botswana, Colombia, Fiji, India, Ireland, Malawi, Maldives, Montenegro, Sudan;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf;

(d) Observer for the Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of St. John of Jerusalem, of Rhodes and of Malta;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ABC Tamil Oli, African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association culturelle des Tamouls en France, Association d'entraide médicale Guinée, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights, Association of World Citizens, Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique,

¹² Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

Center for Organisation Research and Education, Centre Europe-tiers monde, Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, FIAN International, Global Institute for Water, Environment and Health, Indian Council of South America, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, Institute for NGO Research, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, International-Lawyers.org, International Muslim Women's Union, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Service for Human Rights, Iraqi Development Organization, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Le pont, Liberation, Nouveaux droits de l'homme, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Prahar, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Solidarité Suisse-Guinée, Tamil Uzhagam, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Villages unis, World Barua Organization, World Muslim Congress.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

The Social Forum

296. At the 39th meeting, on 6 July 2018, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.2, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Nicaragua, the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Argentina, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand and the United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

297. At the same meeting, the representative of Slovakia, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

298. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 38/17).

The contribution of the Human Rights Council to the prevention of human rights violations

299. At the 39th meeting, on 6 July 2018, the representatives of Norway (also on behalf of Colombia, Sierra Leone and Switzerland) and Switzerland introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.19/Rev.1, sponsored by Colombia, Norway, Sierra Leone and Switzerland, and co-sponsored by Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Croatia, Czechia, El Salvador, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Zambia. Subsequently, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland withdrew its original co-sponsorship of the draft resolution. Subsequently, Argentina, Canada, the Congo, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Fiji, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iraq, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Mozambique, New Zealand, Panama, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, Slovenia, Sweden, Thailand, Togo and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

300. At the same meeting, the representative of Norway orally revised the draft resolution.

301. Also at the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that amendment A/HRC/38/L.40 to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.19/Rev.1 as orally revised had been withdrawn by its sponsors.

302. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendment A/HRC/38/L.27 to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.19/Rev.1 as orally revised.

303. Amendment A/HRC/38/L.27 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by China and Egypt. Subsequently, Cuba, Indonesia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/38/L.40 was sponsored by Egypt and South Africa. Subsequently, Cuba joined the sponsors.

304. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Switzerland made a statement on the proposed amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.19/Rev.1 as orally revised.

305. At the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil, Georgia, Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Tunisia and the United Arab Emirates (also on behalf of Bahrain, Egypt and Saudi Arabia) made general comments on draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.19/Rev.1 as orally revised and on the proposed amendment.

306. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council took action on amendment A/HRC/38/L.27 to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.19/Rev.1 as orally revised.

307. At the same meeting, the representatives of Croatia and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/38/L.27.

308. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/38/L.27. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Togo, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Angola, Brazil, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iraq, Kenya, Mongolia, Nepal, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Senegal, Tunisia

309. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/38/L.27 by 19 votes to 13, with 14 abstentions.

310. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of China, Egypt, South Africa, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.19/Rev.1 as orally revised.

311. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.19/Rev.1 as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iraq, Japan, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Against:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Egypt, Kyrgyzstan, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Angola, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines

312. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.19/Rev.1 as orally revised by 28 votes to 9, with 8 abstentions (resolution 38/18).¹³

¹³ The delegation of Ukraine did not cast a vote.

VI. Universal periodic review

313. 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-ninth session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, held from 15 to 26 January 2018.

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

A. Consideration of universal periodic review outcomes

315. In accordance with paragraph 14 of President's statement PRST/8/1, the following section contains a summary of the views expressed on the outcomes by States under review, 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. The statements of the delegations or other stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Council.¹⁴

France

316. The review of France was held on 15 January 2018 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 France 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.6/29/FRA/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.6/29/FRA/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.6/29/FRA/3).

317. At its 22nd meeting, on 28 June 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of France (see sect. C below).

318. The outcome of the review of France comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/38/4), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein, as well as the State's voluntary commitments and its replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also A/HRC/38/4/Add.1).

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

319. The head of the delegation of France stated that France had carefully examined the 297 recommendations made at its review on 15 January 2018. The decision to accept or not to accept, or only partially accept, the recommendations had been the subject of extensive interdepartmental consultations and had seen the welcome involvement of the National

¹⁴ See <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/38thSession/Pages/default.aspx>.

Consultative Commission on Human Rights. For the sake of clarity, France had drafted an annex to the official document that set out the position of France on each recommendation.

320. France had ultimately accepted 238 recommendations, that is, 80 per cent of those made. It had partially accepted 34 recommendations because it could not implement them in full or because of legal or constitutional obstacles hindering their full implementation. Only 25 recommendations had been noted, as France had felt unable to implement them, either for legal or constitutional reasons, or because France did not endorse them on their merits.

321. France, determined to continue to strengthen its fight against discrimination, racism, antisemitism, xenophobia and intolerance, had accepted 60 of the 70 or so recommendations it had received on those subjects. In order to deepen the previous national action plan to combat racism and antisemitism, in accordance with the recommendations made to France during the third cycle of the universal periodic review, the Prime Minister had presented on 19 March 2018 the main measures of the third national action plan to combat racism and antisemitism, for the period 2018–2020.

322. France had accepted the recommendations concerning the fight against “ethnic profiling” by the police and the gendarmerie. In fact, any measure of ethnic profiling was contrary to the Republican principle of equality, which was included in the code of ethics of the police and the national gendarmerie. Any control deviating from those rules would be sanctioned by the authorities and the justice system.

323. Equality between women and men was considered as a major national matter by the present five-year Administration and French authorities; measures to combat sexual and gender-based violence, part of a five-year strategy, were oriented around education and support for the victims.

324. In 2018, the Government had sought to strengthen legislation to combat sexual and gender-based violence. Street harassment, mass sexual harassment on the Internet and sexist harassment in all its forms were penalized. The prescription period had been extended from 20 to 30 years for sexual and violent crimes, while the legal arsenal to punish rape and sexual assault against minors under 15 years of age had been strengthened.

325. The fight for equal wages was at the heart of public policy action, and a plan to reduce the pay gap between women and men had been announced in January 2018. Of course, France had also accepted the recommendations on discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. A plan to combat discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, which had received a 1.5 million euro investment, had been adopted in January 2017.

326. France had accepted several recommendations on the rights of persons with disabilities. In October 2017, France had hosted the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities for an official visit. Her remarks, which had been in line with the public policy of the Government, had contributed to the development of several plans, particularly those on access to apprenticeship, work and education.

327. The commitment of France to fight terrorism in accordance with the rule of law and rights and freedoms had been emphasized through the State’s acceptance of more than 20 recommendations on that matter. Facing a long-lasting terrorist threat, France had strengthened its ordinary law on criminal procedures, intelligence and the administrative police. The measures provided for through the law of 30 October 2017 were exclusively related to the purpose of preventing and combating terrorism. By welcoming in May 2018 the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, the French authorities had shown transparency in addressing that subject.

328. France was also determined to ensure respect for human rights by the security forces and it had therefore accepted the recommendations in that regard. Indeed, France had institutions and procedures capable of ensuring the right to effective recourse to persons who were allegedly victims of police violence, who could lodge a complaint, take legal action and turn to the Defender of Rights.

329. Regarding the protection of human rights in places of imprisonment, a number of States had called upon France to improve conditions of detention. Since 2013, France had changed its penal policy by having encouraged the use of alternative sentences to the deprivation of liberty, and by having developed different forms of penalties and sentences. The Government had launched an extensive reform project through the reform bill for 2018–2022. In the same spirit, in October 2017 the President of the Republic had reaffirmed before the European Court of Human Rights his wish to develop the use of community services. The improvement of the material conditions of detention was the main objective of the reconstruction programme.

330. Several States had recommended that France strengthen its policy against trafficking in persons. In fact, since 2012, France had been implementing a public policy dedicated to the fight against trafficking in persons in all its forms, which had resulted in the strengthening of legislation, the creation of an interministerial commission to protect women against violence and to fight against trafficking in persons, and the adoption in 2014 of the first national action plan against trafficking. Following a broad consultation process, the second action plan should be finalized by the end of 2018.

331. Several recommendations were on the fight against poverty, particularly in terms of housing. In addition to general emergency shelters, a priority of the Government, 80,000 places were dedicated to asylum seekers. That number had been reinforced in 2018 with 4,000 additional places. Ten thousand temporary emergency accommodation places for migrants were available in Île-de-France. The Government was also committed to improving housing conditions for disadvantaged people: the “housing first” plan 2018–2022 set out structural reforms to significantly reduce the number of homeless people over five years and to develop sustainable solutions to return to housing.

332. Regarding shantytowns, the action of the public authorities had been focused mainly on the dismantling of those camps, following a court decision or a decision by the administrative police. Long-term solutions had been found. An instruction, signed by eight ministers, to give new impetus to the elimination of shantytowns and illegal encampments had been published in January 2018, with the goal of upgrading the shantytowns.

333. Children’s rights were the subject of several recommendations. France was developing a comprehensive policy aimed at the complete development of the child, including the protection of childhood, support for parents and a family policy. France was also determined to continue its fight against poverty and the exclusion of children, families and young people between the ages of 18 and 25 years. Moreover, France had a body of criminal legislation severely repressing any form of violence, including psychological violence, committed against minors.

334. The presence in 2017 of 15,000 persons declared unaccompanied minors had been the motivation behind several recommendations, which France had obviously accepted. France had put in place a system for the protection of unaccompanied minors present on its territory regardless of nationality or legal status. An isolated foreign minor could apply for asylum and, under French law, an unaccompanied foreign minor child could not in any way be removed and could not be detained. Furthermore, France educated all children present on its territory, without distinction of any kind.

335. France had accepted 16 recommendations on the rights of migrants and refugees. Asylum was, in accordance with French tradition and the international and European commitments of France, an imprescriptible right guaranteed by the Constitution. The French authorities intended to build a balanced and controlled migration policy through the reinforcement of the human resources of the French Office for the Protection of Refugees and Stateless Persons and the National Court of Asylum, and legislative provisions currently being debated by Parliament. Improving reception conditions and orientation guidance for asylum seekers would involve the creation of 7,500 places in 2018.

336. France had been unable to accept the recommendations to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families because of the non-distinction between legal migrant workers and migrant workers in an irregular situation, which was problematic under French law.

337. France could not accept the recommendations to ratify the Amendments to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court on the crime of aggression, because the vague definition of the crime had created an unfortunate legal uncertainty. Moreover, the conditions for the exercise of the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court could lead to divergent positions between the International Criminal Court and the United Nations Security Council, or the International Court of Justice, on the characterization of an act of aggression.

338. France had not accepted certain recommendations that had implied the recognition of the concepts of minority and indigenous peoples. Indeed, French law was based on two essential principles enshrined in article 1 of the Constitution: the equal rights of citizens “without distinction as to origin, race or religion”; and the unity and indivisibility of the nation. Thus, France did not recognize collective rights to groups that would be defined by a community of origin, culture, language or belief. Consequently, the production of statistics disaggregated by racial or ethnic origin, mentioned in certain recommendations, was not practiced in France. And it was by virtue of that same constitutional tradition that France could not guarantee collective cultural rights to particular groups on an identity basis. Similarly, France could not recognize the concept of indigenous peoples, and that was why it did not envisage ratifying the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169).

339. Furthermore, France had not accepted recommendations that might call into question the implementation of the principle of secularism [*laïcité*]. France did not plan to review the law of 15 March 2004 governing the wearing of religious signs or outfits in public schools, colleges and high schools. Similarly, France did not plan to revisit the law of 11 October 2010 prohibiting any clothing intended to hide one’s face in public spaces.

340. France held the obligation of the neutrality of the civil service, requiring that the behaviour of public officials and those who carried out public service missions, acts or decisions was dictated solely by the interest of the civil service. That obligation of neutrality applied only to the civil service. The Labour Code prohibited religious discrimination at any stage of working life.

341. Freedom of religion or belief was enshrined in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen of 1789, and it was within those principles of constitutional value that the French Republic guaranteed the free exercise of religion without distinction.

342. Although Islamophobia, mentioned in some recommendations, was not recognized as a particular legal category in French law, all forms of discrimination based on origin or religion were condemned and fought vigorously. France published each year a statistical summary of the penal response to racist offences, including all those motivated by xenophobia or the rejection of any religion.

343. France would submit a midterm report on the effective implementation of the recommendations in January 2018. All relevant independent authorities, including the National Consultative Commission on Human Rights, would be involved in that monitoring exercise. France had also undertaken to share its experience of the universal periodic review with other States and to promote that unique mechanism that strengthened the indivisibility and universality of human rights.

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

344. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of France, 14 delegations made statements.

345. Egypt appreciated the efforts to combat racism and discrimination, counter poverty and terrorism, pursue social solidarity, and provide redress and justice for victims of police violence. It urged France to respect human rights in the counter-terrorism context, and to assist and protect migrants and asylum seekers. It also urged France to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

346. Haiti appreciated the acceptance of recommendations to increase development assistance, implement the act on real equality overseas and guarantee freedom of expression on the Internet.

347. Honduras appreciated the efforts to combat discrimination and trafficking in persons, and to guarantee education, regardless of children's migration status. It encouraged France to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

348. The Islamic Republic of Iran expressed concerns about Roma people, practices impeding justice for racist offences, living conditions of detainees, trafficking in persons, discrimination against migrants, including Muslim women, and allegations of French involvement in the genocide against the Tutsis in Rwanda.

349. Iraq wished for continued progress in the promotion and protection of human rights.

350. The Lao People's Democratic Republic commended the promotion of gender equality and the fight against gender-based violence.

351. Libya welcomed the ratification of the Protocol to the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29).

352. Madagascar noted the measures to address prison overcrowding and to combat discrimination in the field of education. It encouraged further efforts to promote and protect human rights.

353. Pakistan commended the efforts to combat discrimination in the education sphere.

354. The Philippines commended the legislation ensuring accountability for human rights violations committed abroad by French enterprises. It urged France to adopt policies aimed at implementing recommendations on the rights of women, children and migrants. It welcomed the acceptance of recommendations on human rights and counter-terrorism, and on considering the ratification of the Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189).

355. Rwanda regretted that some recommendations relating to the genocide of 1994 against the Tutsis had been partially accepted, and it hoped that France would address its shortcomings regarding its response to the genocide.

356. Senegal saluted the measures adopted for vulnerable groups, migrants and refugees, and those to combat racism, sexism, intolerance and discrimination.

357. Sri Lanka noted the measures on women's rights, particularly on gender equality. It encouraged France to continue to combat racism, xenophobia and antisemitism.

358. The Sudan noted the growing xenophobia, intolerance and racism towards migrants. It urged France to fight discrimination and implement the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, fight trafficking in persons and withdraw the ban on wearing religious clothing in public.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

359. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of France, 10 other stakeholders made statements.

360. The National Consultative Commission on Human Rights expressed appreciation to the Government for having involved the Commission in all stages of the review. The adoption of the first action plan on business and human rights and the progress made on the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons were welcomed developments. The Commission was concerned about the lack of an independent mechanism for the monitoring of anti-terrorist measures and about restrictions relating to migrant policies and the right to asylum.

361. The World Evangelical Alliance noted that respect for the freedom of conscience of mayors, caregivers, and pupils and parents in the national education system, and the protection of the freedom of religion of asylum seekers, were issues of concern. It invited France to extend the mandate entrusted to the interministerial delegation for the fight against racism, antisemitism and anti-LGBT hate to include also the fight against hatred against people by virtue of their opinions, beliefs or religion in general.

362. The Open Society Institute supported the creation of an independent body to supervise the activities of security forces in the fight against terrorism, as it felt that the present

parliamentarian control on the protection of human rights in the fight against terrorism was not sufficient. The Institute suggested that that role could be played by the National Consultative Commission on Human Rights. It also indicated that the Muslim community in France was the main target of racial profiling and that Muslims were frequently subjected to allegations of being Islamists.

363. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom urged France to implement the recommendation contained in paragraph 145.31 and to stop arms transfers to countries where there was a substantial risk that they would be used to violate international human rights law and/or international humanitarian law. France should also take into account the recommendations in the report of OHCHR on the impact of arms transfers on the enjoyment of human rights (A/HRC/35/8), as well as those by other United Nations human rights bodies, to ensure the transparent and gender-sensitive human rights impact assessment of arms exports.

364. Caritas Internationalis drew attention to the need to establish a national reference mechanism to identify and support victims of trafficking in persons and to provide them with compensation and equal access to their rights. France should apply the principle of the non-prosecution of victims who had committed an offence in the course of their exploitation. France should set up at its border crossings an information system on the right of asylum and the identification of families, minors and adults, and a dignified welcome prohibiting any form of the deprivation of liberty outside the legal framework.

365. Amnesty International stated that asylum seekers suffered significant waiting times before being able to lodge an asylum application and to benefit from related rights, including access to temporary accommodation. The legal registration period of three days was rarely respected, exposing asylum seekers to removal. Amnesty International was also concerned about the number of people returned without a thorough and individual examination of the risks of torture in their country of origin. It called upon France to ensure that the rights of migrants and refugees were respected, especially with regard to unaccompanied minors. It expected the Government to fully implement the recommendations accepted.

366. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues was concerned about the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the law of 30 October 2017 and the circular of 31 October 2017 introducing new anti-terrorism measures; and about the new legislation on asylum and immigration, which was being finalized in Parliament, in the absence of any in-depth reflection on how to improve the conditions for asylum applications in the long term. It asked France to make the texts in force on equality between women and men fully effective.

367. Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII suggested measures to better fulfil the human rights of persons with disabilities in France, namely: make greater efforts in training, sensitization and education on the culture of diversity and disability; proceed quickly in including in ordinary schools the too many disabled children that were still excluded; guarantee in every social or medical residential structure the valorization and development of the autonomy and self-determination of persons with disabilities; and put at the centre of business policies the dignity of persons with disabilities.

368. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation was concerned by the recent introduction of a new national security and counter-terrorism law, which effectively made permanent the extraordinary powers that had been given to the French security forces since the state of emergency of November 2015. It also noted with concern the use of disproportionate force against protestors by the police, and the risks eroding the right to freedom of expression in France, including the use of legal proceedings to compel the media to release their sources.

369. Africa culture internationale encouraged France to give priority to the development of the principle of equality between women and men in practice, to advance the protection of migrants' rights and in particular those of stateless children, to make progress in the fight against racism targeting refugees and asylum seekers, and to guarantee their right to movement.

370. Human Rights Watch, in a joint statement with the International Service for Human Rights, urged France to ensure that police stops were based on individualized reasonable

suspicion and to introduce “stop forms”, a simple yet effective way to measure and monitor stops, promote accountability and improve relations between security forces and citizens. France should hold police accountable for harassment and attacks against migrants and those assisting them and cease the judicial harassment of individuals and organizations providing assistance to people on the move.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

371. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 297 recommendations received, 238 had enjoyed the support of France and 25 had been noted. Additional clarification had been provided on another 34 recommendations, indicating which part of the recommendations had been supported and which part had been noted.

Tonga

372. The review of Tonga was held on 15 January 2018 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 Tonga 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.6/29/TON/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.6/29/TON/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.6/29/TON/3).

373. At its 23rd meeting, on 28 June 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Tonga (see sect. C below).

374. The outcome of the review of Tonga comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/38/5), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State’s voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also A/HRC/38/5/Add.1).

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

375. The delegation of Tonga extended the appreciation of the Government of Tonga to the Human Rights Council, the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review and the troika, composed of Angola, Slovakia and the United Arab Emirates, for having considered the third universal periodic review report of Tonga, as well as to member and observer States and non-government organizations for their participation and their constructive and cooperative engagement in the review of Tonga on 15 January 2018.

376. Out of the 110 recommendations received, 52 had been supported in January and 58 recommendations had required further consideration.

377. The delegation emphasized that, as with many small island developing States, Tonga continued to grapple with the ever-increasing threats of climate change that had recently brought an onslaught of more severe and more frequent natural disasters.

378. Following its third universal periodic review, held in January, Tonga had been hit by the severe Category 4 Tropical Cyclone Gita, the strongest in its history. The cyclone had destroyed almost 2,000 homes, damaged 85 per cent of schools, caused the evacuation of over 4,500 people and left more than 80 per cent of homes in Tonga without power.

379. The devastation caused by Tropical Cyclone Gita had meant that the Government's immediate priority and already limited resources were redirected towards the recovery and rebuilding of the country, which was anticipated to take years. That presented a challenge for the Government of Tonga in its domestic engagement processes in addressing the recommendations from the third universal periodic review of Tonga.

380. Tonga had noted all of the 58 recommendations deferred from January 2018.

381. Regarding the recommendations relating to the ratification of international treaties, Tonga was committed to ensuring that it ratified all core international human rights conventions to protect and promote the rights of its citizens. Tonga would consider acceding to the conventions in accordance with its domestic processes. Notwithstanding the fact that Tonga was not yet a member of those conventions, many of the underlying human rights principles enshrined in core human rights conventions already formed the basis for many Tongan laws. Regarding the recommendation contained in paragraph 94.3, the delegation highlighted the fact that Tonga had acceded to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on 6 November 1995.

382. The delegation of Tonga also highlighted the fact that, in June 2017, His Majesty's Cabinet had established a committee comprised of relevant ministries, departments and agencies to consider the ratification of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and to review relevant legislation. The Office of the Attorney General and the Ministry of Police continued to take the lead in the assessment of accession by Tonga.

383. With respect to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the delegation of Tonga emphasized that, although Tonga had not yet ratified the Convention, it was not in a position to reconsider all potential reservations at the present time. Careful consideration needed to be given following targeted and strategic consultations by revisiting its domestic treaty examination processes.

384. Tonga was considering the ratification of the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182). The Cabinet had appointed the Tonga National Tripartite Consultation Committee, which had been mandated with taking the necessary measures towards the ratification in 2018 of two conventions of the International Labour Organization (ILO), one of which was the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182). Those efforts reflected the commitment of Tonga to protect children, including from the worst forms of labour, also in line with its obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

385. Since Tonga had become a member of ILO in 2016, the Tonga National Tripartite Consultation Committee, together with the Ministry for Commerce, Consumer, Trade, Innovation and Labour, had prioritized the domestic treaty examination process for the ratification of the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182). That included the completion of a legal review by the Office of the Attorney General and the engagement of a consultant to translate the conventions. Stakeholder consultation on the ratification of that convention was scheduled to take place within the coming weeks, before the constitutional process of ratification, under clause 39 of the Constitution of Tonga, was undertaken.

386. The delegation emphasized that, moreover, due to limited capacity, the ratification by Tonga of all of the other conventions of ILO had been delayed. Before ratification, Tonga wished to ensure that it would have the capacity to implement the core conventions of ILO effectively, so they became meaningful tools for development. Tonga would also need significant technical assistance in order to do so.

387. With respect to the recommendations relating to the national human rights institution, Tonga did not have the resources necessary at the present point to establish a national human rights institution in accordance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles). The establishment of a national human rights institution continued to be a challenge for Tonga given its limited financial and human resources.

388. The functions of the Office of the Ombudsman operated within the standards of the Paris Principles, providing an important, impartial and effective complaints resolution mechanism. It also worked to promote best practices in public administration, providing guidance and advice in order to ensure people were treated fairly. The Office of the Ombudsman continued to actively conduct outreach programmes to all of the major island groups of Tonga to raise public awareness.

389. Regarding the recommendations relating to sexual equality and discrimination, the main recommendations under that theme were to eliminate all discriminatory treatment relating to sexual orientation or gender identity, and to decriminalize same-sex consensual sex. The delegation highlighted the fact that Tonga had no national policies or regulations that condoned discrimination against sexual orientation and gender identity.

390. The Government continued to support the work of the Tonga Leitis Association, which advocated for the rights of people with different sexual orientation or gender identity and celebrated their contribution to Tongan society in entertainment, sport and business. Through government grants, the Association had received assistance for the refurbishment of its office space and the provision of a vehicle to help it to improve public awareness and advocacy outreach.

391. The decriminalization of consensual sex between same-sex adults was an issue that Tonga still wished to consider further. It required thorough, robust and comprehensive dialogue against the backdrop of cultural sensitivities and conservative Christian values of Tongan society.

392. With respect to the recommendations on capital punishment, Tonga reiterated its position taken during the second cycle of the universal periodic review, in that Tonga would continue to retain the death penalty as the ultimate criminal sanction under its criminal justice system for the crimes of murder and treason. The Tongan courts had already set the guiding policy that the death penalty would only be used, in the context of murder, “in the rarest of rare cases when the alternative option is unquestionably foreclosed”.

393. Tonga might be seen as a de facto abolitionist of the death penalty; however, in reality, it reserved its position on the utilization of the death penalty only in the “rarest of rare cases”, where violence had been at its most abhorrent, the victim at its most vulnerable, the impact universally and emotionally devastating, and the alternative sentences did not qualify as appropriate or acceptable alternatives.

394. On the recommendations relating to legislative frameworks, the delegation stated that, in accordance with the State’s domestic laws and processes and available resources, Tonga would work towards ensuring that human rights were featured in its legislative frameworks. With regard to the recommendation contained in paragraph 94.58 to prioritize work to eliminate violence against women, improve gender equality, including in relation to property and employment, the Family Protection Act Coordinator had been established to focus on the successful implementation of the Family Protection Act of 2013. The “Families free of violence” programme was further focused on responses to violence in supporting the implementation of the Family Protection Act.

395. In close collaboration with its external partners, the Government of Tonga supported initiatives such as the programmes of UN-Women on the prevention of violence against women. Through the “Pacific women shaping Pacific development” programme of the Government of Australia, specific resources had been provided to assist in the implementation of the Family Protection Act and the Revised National Policy on Gender and Development 2014–2018. The current review of the Policy was scheduled for September 2018.

396. The delegation also highlighted the fact that the Government of Tonga had further committed, in the Revised National Policy on Gender and Development, under Outcome 2 on equitable access to economic assets and employment, to enabling women to have increased access to income-generating business and employment opportunities, to have access to resources, markets and jobs, and to have access to increased incomes, assets and life choices. The Government of Tonga was also committed to increasing women’s

participation in labour mobility schemes through the development of a women's strategy for labour mobility.

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

397. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Tonga, five delegations made statements.

398. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland understood the difficulties faced by Tonga in ratifying core human rights conventions. It welcomed the intention of the Government of Tonga to ratify the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. It was also encouraged by the consideration of Tonga to ratify the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It also welcomed the progress made by Tonga to ensure gender balance and awareness in schools, and the significant drop in child marriages following the "Let girls be girls" campaign. It continued to encourage Tonga to ratify the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. It further welcomed the decision of Tonga to establish a national human rights institution while appreciating the fact that a lack of resource made it difficult to ensure that it complied with the Paris Principles. In that regard, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland urged Tonga to look at measures to strengthen the institution so it would be in compliance in the course of the next cycle of the universal periodic review.

399. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela appreciated the efforts made by Tonga to implement the recommendations supported during the second cycle of the universal periodic review. It noted the continued commitments of Tonga at international, regional and national levels to increase the participation of women in public life. It was also pleased with the progress towards the ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. It congratulated Tonga on having become a member of ILO in 2016 and it encouraged Tonga to continue to consolidate its social policies, especially in the area of economic, social and cultural rights, in favour of the most vulnerable sectors of the population. It reiterated its call for the international community to provide the cooperation and assistance that Tonga required to finance and implement those social policies and to implement the recommendations accepted and other commitments in the field of human rights.

400. Angola commended Tonga for the measures taken and policies made to promote and protect human rights, and for its engagement with international human rights mechanisms. It also commended Tonga for the efforts made in the implementation of the recommendations from the previous cycle of the universal periodic review, and it encouraged Tonga to continue the same commitment to implementing the recommendations from the third cycle.

401. China commended Tonga for its constructive engagement with the universal periodic review and it appreciated the acceptance by Tonga of recommendations made by China. It expressed the hope that Tonga would continue its socioeconomic development and the further creation of jobs in order to raise living standards. It also expressed the hope that Tonga would continue to take legislative and administrative measures to advance gender equality and to further protect the rights of vulnerable groups, such as women, children and persons with disabilities. It welcomed the renewed commitment of Tonga to the protection and promotion of human rights.

402. Honduras appreciated the acceptance by Tonga of the recommendations made by Honduras to adopt legislative measures and political measures to combat discrimination against women and guarantee gender equality in the public and private spheres, and to criminalize all forms of violence against women, including domestic sexual violence. Honduras expressed its hope that Tonga would have the opportunity to: ratify the main human rights instruments to which it was not yet a party, as well as the fundamental conventions of ILO; decriminalize consensual sexual relations between adults of the same sex; abolish the death penalty; eliminate from its legal system gender discriminatory provisions; and redouble its efforts to combat any discriminatory practice against women, in particular their right to property.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

403. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Tonga, no other stakeholders made statements.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

404. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 110 recommendations received, 52 had enjoyed the support of Tonga and 58 had been noted.

405. The delegation of Tonga stated that Tonga was fully committed to the work of the Human Rights Council. Tonga viewed the universal periodic review as a valuable opportunity for the State to reflect on and review its human rights obligations.

406. Tonga appreciated the support from the voluntary trust fund for the purpose of assisting developing countries, in particular the least developed countries, landlocked developing States and small island developing States, which had enabled Tonga to participate in the thirty-eighth session of the Human Rights Council and to provide its formal responses to the recommendations received during its review.

407. The delegation emphasized that Tonga continued to be constrained by limited financial and human resources. As witnessed by the nationwide devastation caused by Tropical Cyclone Gita, the strongest in the history of Tonga, climate change exacerbated those challenges. In that regard, Tonga continued to look to international partners for their continued support in addressing the State's capacity constraints through technical assistance and training. If strengthened, the capacities would accelerate the efforts of Tonga to achieve and advance its human rights obligations.

Romania

408. The review of Romania was held on 16 January 2018 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 Romania 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.6/29/ROU/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.6/29/ROU/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.6/29/ROU/3).

409. At its 23rd meeting, on 28 June 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Romania (see sect. C below).

410. The outcome of the review of Romania comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/38/6), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also A/HRC/38/6/Add.1).

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

411. The delegation of Romania noted with appreciation the participation of the States Members of the United Nations in the interactive dialogue of the universal periodic review of Romania, which had been held in a spirit of cooperation in January 2018, and it welcomed the recommendations made during the interactive dialogue.

412. The delegation had informed the Human Rights Council that the Government had supported 163 recommendations and had noted 37, out of a total of 203 recommendations. It had also partially noted three recommendations, indicating which parts of the recommendations it had noted and which parts it had supported.

413. The delegation presented some clarifications regarding the position of the Government on some of the recommendations that had been noted. With regard to the recommendation contained in paragraph 114.101, the Government was of the view that the legislation concerning the enforcement of sentences and detention measures had provided for sufficient safeguards to ensure respect for human dignity, to prevent torture and inhuman treatment, and to punish such offences.

414. Regarding the recommendations contained in paragraphs 114.174, 114.175 and 177–181, relating to national minorities, Romania had managed to develop, with the substantial contribution of members of the 20 national minorities, a system for the protection of the ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious identity of members of minority groups. The legal and institutional system designed to guarantee respect for and promotion of the rights of persons belonging to national minorities had proven to be efficient in protecting and promoting their cultural, linguistic and religious identity.

415. In particular, Romania had ensured the right of persons belonging to a national minority to use their mother tongue when dealing with public authorities and the judiciary, to be taught in their mother tongue at all levels of education, to have religious services and access to media in their mother tongue, to be involved in public life and public decision-making concerning the entire society, including but not limited to issues of interest for the minority groups they belonged to. Moreover, Romania had promoted cultural activities for minority communities to develop their identity by having made substantial financial allocations through representative organizations of the national minorities.

416. Regarding the recommendation contained in paragraph 114.177, Romania had a specific law regulating property restitution to ethnic minorities and religious denominations. Regarding the recommendation contained in paragraph 114.179, the right of peaceful assembly was ensured to all individuals with no exception within the requirements of the law. Furthermore, Romania had supported the recommendations contained in paragraphs 114.176 and 114.199, and it would continue to implement legislation and policies in order to protect and promote the rights of persons belonging to national minorities.

417. The delegation explained that some of the recommendations had been noted because the Government considered that they had already been complied with. For example, the recommendations contained in paragraphs 114.55, 114.157, 114.188 and 114.194 on the inclusion of Roma and their equal access to education, health care, housing and employment, fell under that category. Legislation provided for equal rights and unhindered access to services for all citizens, and it prohibited and sanctioned all forms of discrimination, including on the ground of ethnicity. Furthermore, the authorities had taken positive measures and implemented targeted programmes to ensure equal and non-discriminatory access to, inter alia, quality education, housing, health and employment for all citizens and particularly for members of the Roma community.

418. Romania had supported the recommendations contained in paragraphs 114.53, 114.54 and 114.56–114.59 to combat discrimination against Roma. The national point of contact for Roma had been carrying out an assessment of the implementation of legal provisions and policies on non-discrimination and equal opportunities, sustainable development, non-segregation, and access to housing and education. The Government had also supported the recommendations contained in paragraphs 114.182–114.187, 114.189–114.193, 114.195 and 114.197 and it would continue to implement the Strategy of the Government of Romania for the Inclusion of Romanian Citizens Belonging to the Roma Minority 2015–2020. An annual report would be submitted to the European Commission and the Strategy would be further improved based on the evaluation carried out.

419. Regarding the recommendation contained in paragraph 114.200 to adopt a national strategy to promote gender equality, three strategic documents had been adopted and implemented since 2006. A new national strategy on gender equality for 2018–2021 was in the process of adoption. In June 2018, Parliament had adopted two laws aimed at preventing

and combating domestic violence. The delegation reiterated the commitment of Romania to promote gender equality.

420. Romania had partially noted three recommendations. It had noted the part of the recommendation contained in paragraph 114.21 to ratify the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and it had supported the rest of the recommendation. The part of the recommendation contained in paragraph 114.66 calling for measures to prevent discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons had been noted, as Government Ordinance No. 137/2000 on preventing and sanctioning all acts of discrimination already contained an open list of grounds of discrimination. The other part of the recommendation, to legalize same-sex marriage and partnership, had been supported even though the Government was of the view that there was no legal obligation to legalize same-sex marriage. Two draft laws on legally recognized partnership, including for same-sex couples, were pending for adoption.

421. Bearing in mind the above-mentioned information, Romania had also partially noted the recommendation contained in paragraph 114.67. It had supported the part of the recommendation to introduce legal civil partnership between same-sex couples. However, it had noted the part of the recommendation to refrain from a referendum on constitutional changes prohibiting same-sex couples from marrying. A constitutional referendum fell under the sovereign right of Parliament. Additionally, such a referendum would not have a negative impact on the legal partnership of same-sex couples due to the recent broad interpretation of the Constitutional Court on the right to family life.

422. Romania considered that some of the recommendations supported had already been implemented. For example, regarding the recommendations contained in paragraphs 114.71 and 114.74 to apply the law prohibiting incitement to hatred to all political figures using racist, homophobic and xenophobic rhetoric, the delegation noted that the respective law was applicable to all persons with no exception. The codes of conduct for members of Government and of Parliament had been adopted in 2017.

423. The Government considered that the recommendation contained in paragraph 114.100 on access to justice for vulnerable groups had been partially implemented. The Strategy for the Development of the Judiciary for the period 2015–2020 was aimed at making the judiciary more efficient and accessible.

424. The delegation provided additional information on those recommendations that Romania had supported. In April 2018, Ioan Gânfălean had been appointed Ombudsman for Children for a five-year term. The annual budget of the new Ombudsman had been approved, along with the allocation of 18 positions in its central and territorial structures.

425. Regarding the recommendations contained in paragraphs 114.36 and 114.97–114.99, the delegation reiterated that amendments to the justice laws and Criminal Codes would ensure respect for human rights and European democratic values, including the standards of the European Commission for Democracy through Law. Regarding the recommendations contained in paragraphs 114.82, 114.83 and 114.96 on the independence of the judiciary, the National Anti-Corruption Strategy for the period 2016–2020 included the specific objective of strengthening integrity and reducing vulnerabilities and corruption risks in the judiciary.

426. Regarding the recommendation contained in paragraph 114.68, under the Criminal Procedure Code victims of hate crimes and discrimination were entitled to special protection measures under the law. The Romanian Police investigated cases of hate crimes and hate speech and applied fines or launched criminal proceedings.

427. In respect of the recommendations contained in paragraphs 114.137–114.140, an increase in State funding for education was a priority and the national strategies on education had targeted specific issues such as early school leaving and lifelong education.

428. Concerning the recommendations contained in paragraphs 114.133–114.135, the National Health Strategy for 2014–2020 had a separate chapter relating to HIV and AIDS, with a focus on policies, legislation, prevention measures, monitoring and treatment. The national programme on HIV had been implemented nationwide since 2001.

429. Having been fully aware of the challenges that persons with disabilities had been facing in various areas, the Government had adopted a series of normative acts to improve respect for the rights of persons with disabilities. The national strategy for the period 2016–2020, entitled “A society without barriers for persons with disabilities”, was aimed at ensuring the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and embraced the vision of the European strategy for persons with disabilities for 2010–2020, entitled “A renewed commitment to a barrier-free Europe”. The national strategy underlined the institutional commitment of the authorities to effectively improve the quality of life of persons with disabilities and thus allow the full and effective exercise by persons with disabilities of their rights and fundamental freedoms.

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

430. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Romania, 10 delegations made statements.

431. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted with appreciation the commitment of Romania to human rights, which had been demonstrated through the State’s cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism. It noted the efforts of Romania to implement the recommendations received during its second review. It commended Romania for its efforts to prevent and punish all forms of discrimination and to improve its legal system in order to combat trafficking in persons and prevent domestic violence effectively.

432. Afghanistan commended Romania for having supported a large number of recommendations from the universal periodic review. It regretted, however, that Romania had not supported the recommendations made by Afghanistan to create favourable conditions for national minorities to express and develop their culture and traditions in their own language, and to take additional measures in the field of education for various minority groups. Therefore, Afghanistan urged Romania to consider again the above-mentioned recommendation.

433. Azerbaijan commended Romania for its constructive participation in its third universal periodic review. It noted with appreciation that Romania had accepted the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Azerbaijan. It reiterated its appreciation for the consistent policy pursued by Romania aimed at increasing quality, efficiency and accountability in public and private institutions.

434. Chad noted with satisfaction that Romania had supported a large number of recommendations in order to ensure the well-being of its population.

435. China noted with appreciation the constructive engagement of Romania with the universal periodic review. It thanked Romania for having supported recommendations made by China and it hoped that Romania would continue its efforts to promote socioeconomic development, increase the level of employment, further improve the living standards of its population and effectively combat trafficking in persons.

436. Egypt noted the continuous efforts of Romania to promote human rights. It encouraged Romania to pursue its efforts to combat trafficking in persons and child abuse. It also encouraged Romania to take the measures necessary to protect the family as a vital part of society. Egypt called upon Romania to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

437. Iraq noted with appreciation the positive engagement of Romania during the universal periodic review and the State’s acceptance of many recommendations, including those made by Iraq.

438. The Republic of Moldova noted with appreciation the commitment of Romania to the protection of human rights and the measures taken to implement the outcome of the universal periodic review. It welcomed in particular the measures taken to ensure the functioning of the Ombudsman for Children and the adoption of the law on domestic violence. The Republic of Moldova commended Romania for its active engagement with the universal periodic review, which was reflected in the acceptance of the majority of the recommendations, including those made by the Republic of Moldova.

439. Honduras noted with satisfaction the acceptance by Romania of several recommendations made by Honduras during the review, including those concerning anti-discrimination legislation and efforts to combat trafficking in persons. At the same time, Honduras encouraged Romania to reconsider its position on those recommendations that had called for the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and a comprehensive review of the national human rights system in order to correct existing duplications, and the recommendations to combat discrimination against Roma and guarantee their access to health, education, housing and employment.

440. Albania commended Romania for having taken measures and having adopted new strategies aimed at protecting the rights of members of the Roma community and providing them with access to health care and education, and for having developed measures designed to improve their inclusion in society. Albania noted with appreciation that Romania had accepted the majority of the recommendations during its third review, including three recommendations made by Albania.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

441. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Romania, three other stakeholders made statements.

442. Centrul de Resurse Juridice noted the high rate of teenage pregnancy and stated that the Government had failed to introduce mandatory sexual and reproductive health education in the school curricula. Romania had not supported recommendations on the inclusion of Roma in society by having considered that those recommendations had been complied with. It noted, however, the persisting socioeconomic gaps between the Roma and non-Roma populations and the decrease in enrolment of Roma children in early childhood education. It also referred to the high percentage of Roma living in households without tap water, and the social exclusion of and racism against Roma.

443. The European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Federation, in a joint statement with the International Lesbian and Gay Association, commended Romania for having supported 13 recommendations on sexual orientation and gender identity issues, but it regretted that Romania had partially noted two recommendations on same-sex civil partnership and marriage. It noted the widespread intolerance towards lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons. It highlighted the need for the authorities to ensure that awareness-raising campaigns on equality and non-discrimination, as well as educational and continuous learning programmes, were available and implemented in schools and training centres for civil servants and other professionals. Romania needed to update legal gender recognition procedures in order to respect human rights standards.

444. The Association of World Citizens noted that the justice system of Romania had been under attack since the beginning of 2017 and that Parliament had adopted laws to increase political influence on the administration of justice. It noted that the new Penal Code made it difficult for judges and prosecutors to bring the perpetrators of corruption cases to justice. It hoped that the acceptance by Romania of the recommendations on anti-corruption measures would lead to ending those developments.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

445. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 203 recommendations received, 163 had enjoyed the support of Romania and 37 had been noted. Additional clarification had been provided on three recommendations, indicating which part of the recommendations had been supported and which part had been noted.

446. In conclusion, the delegation of Romania thanked the States Members of the United Nations and the non-governmental organizations that had participated in the review process. It reassured the Human Rights Council that all comments, observations and concerns expressed would be given due consideration in the follow-up process and that Romania would continue to make every effort to implement the highest standards in human rights and fully comply with its international and European commitments. The delegation expressed the

full determination of the Government of Romania to make the best use of the universal periodic review process in order to further strengthen its national system of human rights.

Mali

447. The review of Mali was held on 16 January 2018 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 Mali 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.6/29/MLI/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.6/29/MLI/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.6/29/MLI/3).

448. At its 23rd meeting, on 28 June 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Mali (see sect. C below).

449. The outcome of the review of Mali comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/38/7), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also A/HRC/38/7/Add.1).

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

450. The delegation recalled that 78 speakers had acknowledged the progress made by Mali in promoting and protecting human rights and the major challenges that Mali had faced since 2012, including insecurity and subsequent violations of human rights. Mali was going through difficult times relating to terrorism.

451. Mali had received 194 recommendations, of which 133 had been accepted, 54 had been postponed for a future decision and 7 had been noted. In the end, Mali had accepted 175 recommendations and noted 19.

452. Taking a position on the recommendations received had resulted from a participatory approach. In that regard, the Ministry for Human Rights had initiated an interactive dialogue at the national level on the third universal periodic review of Mali, including the organization of a round table, which had brought together different ministerial departments, national institutions and representatives of civil society, as well as international partners, including the Human Rights and Protection Division of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali.

453. Mali had accepted the recommendations that it believed could be implemented by the next cycle of the universal periodic review. It had also accepted the recommendations concerning measures already in place. In some cases, by having accepted a recommendation, Mali had committed to continuing efforts or continuing with measures already in place.

454. In terms of peace and security, the implementation of the Agreement on Peace and Reconciliation in Mali was being pursued through stabilization and security efforts in the centre and the north of the country, as well as through the deployment of administrative and judicial services in the localities where they were absent due to the situation of insecurity. In that respect, convincing results had already been obtained in the Ségou and Mopti regions through the implementation of the integrated security plan. With regard to security sector reform, the National Security Council had been established and the process of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration was ongoing.

455. In the area of the fight against impunity, the Government had taken steps to investigate and prosecute members of the armed and security forces involved in cases of human rights abuses and violations of international humanitarian law. In addition, the delegation referred to the creation of an international commission of inquiry to investigate war crimes, crimes against humanity, sexual crimes and other serious violations of international human rights law and international humanitarian law.

456. With regard to the rights of women and children, two bills were being drafted: the first one concerned gender-based violence; and the second one was for the protection of the child. The adoption of those two draft texts would make it possible to eliminate existing discriminatory provisions in the Code of Persons and the Family and to criminalize all forms of gender-based violence. In addition, a ministerial decree prohibited the practice of female genital mutilation in health facilities and sanctions were provided for that purpose.

457. With respect to recommendations on the use of child soldiers, according to the delegation, the State did not use militias. National security was provided by a republican army that did not use child soldiers. As a result, Mali had noted those recommendations.

458. Moreover, as previously mentioned, Mali was making enormous efforts in the area of traditional and harmful practices. However, Mali had noted the recommendation contained in paragraph 116.5 because of the reference to polygamy, which was inscribed in the Code of Persons and the Family and remained an option for spouses and not an obligation.

459. The third cycle of the universal periodic review had provided Mali with a framework for dialogue on human rights. Despite the difficult context of conflict-related human rights abuses and violations, Mali would make a point of taking ownership of the task force report and making all the arrangements necessary to implement the recommendations accepted.

460. Lastly, Mali was ready to cooperate fully with all the special procedure mandate holders, and the delegation reiterated the commitment of Mali to examine expeditiously any request for a visit by a mandate holder.

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

461. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Mali, 12 delegations made statements.

462. Chad welcomed the updated information provided by Mali in its report, which reflected the importance that Mali attached to the universal periodic review. It noted with satisfaction that Mali had accepted most of the recommendations and it called upon bilateral and international partners to support Mali in the implementation of those recommendations.

463. China thanked Mali for having accepted its recommendations and it hoped that Mali would continue to promote the peace and reconciliation process to achieve stability and security, continue to promote social and economic development, and raise the standard of living of the population so as to lay a solid foundation for human rights. China welcomed the reiteration by Mali of its commitment to human rights.

464. The Congo welcomed the support of Mali for most of the recommendations received, and it strongly appreciated the State's efforts to build on the promotion and protection of human rights and its cooperation with the United Nations mechanisms, despite the difficult context. The Congo wished Mali success in the implementation of the recommendations.

465. Côte d'Ivoire congratulated Mali on its interest in the recommendations received, which would contribute to improving the human rights situation in the country. It appreciated the efforts of Mali to strengthen the rule of law and it encouraged Mali to continue full cooperation with the United Nations human rights mechanisms.

466. Egypt thanked Mali for the explanations regarding its recommendations, and it paid tribute to Mali for having established the Ministry for Human Rights and for having reviewed the provisions on human rights in the Constitution. Egypt encouraged Mali to pursue cooperation with the Human Rights Council and it invited the Council to provide Mali with technical cooperation.

467. Ethiopia commended Mali for having accepted many recommendations, and it welcomed the adoption of the national policy on human rights and the establishment of the Ministry for Human Rights. Ethiopia reiterated its call for the international community to strengthen support to Mali for the capacities of State and non-State actors working in the human rights field, and it encouraged Mali to take all the measures necessary to implement the recommendations.

468. Honduras congratulated Mali for having accepted its recommendations. In order to improve the enjoyment of the rights of women and girls, and to eliminate discrimination and gender violence, it hoped that Mali would reconsider its position regarding the recommendation of Honduras to redouble efforts to put an end to traditional and harmful practices, such as child and forced marriage, polygamy, humiliating and degrading practices, and forced feeding.

469. The Lao People's Democratic Republic appreciated the fact that Mali had accepted a large number of recommendations, including two made by the Lao People's Democratic Republic. It welcomed the Strategic Framework for Economic Recovery and Sustainable Development, which was to promote inclusive and sustainable development in order to reduce poverty and inequality in a unified and peaceful Mali on the basis of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

470. Lesotho noted that, despite a very difficult security situation, Mali had taken steps to inculcate respect for human rights and the rule of law in the country. It noted progress in the implementation of the Agreement on Peace and Reconciliation in Mali and the legislative measures taken. It commended Mali for the establishment of the Ministry for Human Rights and for its cooperation with the United Nations human rights mechanisms. According to Lesotho, Mali required support from the international community in order to consolidate peace and reconciliation.

471. Senegal thanked Mali for the pertinent additional information provided. It paid tribute to the inclusive process to produce the national report and the measures taken to strengthen the security situation in the country. In view of the commitment of the Malian authorities to continue to promote human rights, Senegal invited the Human Rights Council to adopt the report on Mali.

472. South Africa appreciated the acceptance by Mali of its recommendations to implement the Agreement on Peace and Reconciliation in Mali, to continue efforts to provide people living with HIV/AIDS with State assistance, and to strengthen measures to protect women's rights and ensure equal pay for equal work. It encouraged Mali to continue to address the challenges of insecurity, terrorism and transnational organized crime. It reiterated its support for the transitional justice programme of Mali, and its commitment to economic recovery and sustainable development.

473. The Sudan commended the efforts of Mali during the period under review, particularly the State's commitment to the universal periodic review process in order to protect human rights. It also welcomed the country's acceptance of the majority of the recommendations and the fact that Mali had taken a number of measures based on those recommendations. The Sudan was pleased to note that Mali had accepted the recommendation to strengthen the national human rights commission and to continue to implement the national development programme.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

474. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Mali, nine other stakeholders made statements.

475. Amnesty International was concerned about the gross violations of human rights by all parties, including extrajudicial killings, forced disappearances, acts of torture and arbitrary arrests. The critical security situation in the crisis-affected regions had had a negative impact on the right to education. More than 200,000 students were out of school in the central and northern parts of the country because of threats from armed groups. More than 400 schools were closed. Amnesty International was pleased that Mali had accepted the recommendations to guarantee the right to education, including in conflict situations. However, it regretted the

rejection of the recommendation from 12 States calling for the ratification of the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.

476. The International Service for Human Rights welcomed the recent adoption of a specific law on the protection of human rights defenders, and it encouraged the Government to further the work done during a workshop organized jointly by civil society and the national human rights commission and to adopt the implementation decree. It called upon Mali to: investigate and prosecute all attacks and false accusations against journalists; develop and support a two-year strategic plan for the national human rights commission aiming to build its institutional capacity and independence in order for it to be fully compliant with the Paris Principles; and provide the national human rights commission with the resources necessary for it to be fully functional and able to fulfil its mandate as a defender protection mechanism.

477. Human Rights Watch urged the Government to swiftly and fully implement the recommendations aimed at addressing ongoing concerns about the weak rule of law and the dramatic increase in reports of human rights abuses within the context of counter-terrorism operations and combating communal violence. It was concerned about persistent intercommunal conflicts in central and northern Mali, exacerbated by ethnic tension over banditry and access to land and water, which had left several hundred people dead and thousands displaced. The conflicts around Ménaka and in the Mopti region had dramatically worsened in 2018, having resulted in dozens of deaths. Human Rights Watch urged the Government to take all measures necessary to protect the population at risk from communal violence.

478. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme stated that the human rights situation in the country was worsening and that the authorities in the central part of the country were losing effective control of the territory. A climate of insecurity reigned in the country and there was a multiplication of attacks in the north. According to Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, the coming presidential elections could raise concerns about the heightened potential for the escalation of violence and the deterioration of the already deplorable human rights situation in the country. It urged Mali to ensure the holding of peaceful presidential elections.

479. The International Catholic Child Bureau stated that an action plan for the implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations should be adopted together with the participation of civil society. It called upon Mali to give priority to alternative measures to the deprivation of liberty; to network public and private vocational training centres to provide the re-education and professional reintegration of children; to strengthen the practice of penal mediation by training the actors of justice in the effective implementation of the decree of 13 April 2006 on penal mediation; and to remove all obstacles to the use of mediation, including the settlement of financial matters relating to mediation, the formality of acceptance in writing and the specialized training of criminal officials or mediators.

480. The Association of World Citizens stated that women in Mali had been training in peace education with the objective of continuing their studies to become active members of society. It urged Mali to provide women in the country with training in first aid so they could provide trainings on health issues in remote villages.

481. The International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination commended Mali for the moratorium on the death penalty and it encouraged Mali to combat impunity and end the worst forms of child labour, including child soldiers. It congratulated Mali on its endorsement of Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) and its commitment to protecting human rights defenders. It was concerned about intercommunal violence, which had resulted in deaths and casualties. It urged Mali to commit to peaceful resolutions of conflicts.

482. The United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation stated that, despite the presence of Malian security forces, according to its investigations, non-State actors were the main perpetrators of human rights violations in the country. Terrorist attacks targeted the civilian population, religious minorities and foreign troops. The persistence of the security situation in Mali had paralysed the local economy, social services, and access to education,

justice and health care. More than 700 schools had been forced to close, leaving 190,000 pupils without education.

483. Fondation d'Auteuil welcomed the acceptance of the recommendation to promote the socioeconomic reintegration of children in street situations. It stated that civil society organizations accompanied children in street situations in their reintegration journey. It invited Mali to collaborate closely with the decentralized services of the State, so they would be able to offer proposals to help the children identify and implement solutions adapted to each of those children. Efforts would also have to be made in terms of prevention and awareness-raising in the communities, especially regarding the quality of learning in Koranic schools, from which many children and young people in street situations came, as well as regarding the care of those children and young people.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

484. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 194 recommendations received, 175 had enjoyed the support of Mali and 19 had been noted.

485. The delegation stated that the recommendations from the third cycle would be given priority attention by the Government. They would be presented to the various institutions of the Republic and would then be translated into an action plan. A mechanism to monitor the implementation of that action plan would be put in place. The consultation with all of the actors involved in the implementation of the recommendations would continue under the aegis of the Government. A midterm report would be submitted to the Human Rights Council.

486. Mali was also consolidating progress on human rights. In order to address persistent challenges, Mali would seek support through international cooperation, and the delegation affirmed that the political will to implement all human rights was unshakeable.

487. In conclusion, the delegation reiterated the commitment of Mali to the universal periodic review mechanism and expressed its deep gratitude to the Human Rights Council.

Botswana

488. The review of Botswana was held on 17 January 2018 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 Botswana 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.6/29/BWA/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.6/29/BWA/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.6/29/BWA/3).

489. At its 24th meeting, on 28 June 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Botswana (see sect. C below).

490. The outcome of the review of Botswana comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/38/8), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also A/HRC/38/8/Add.1).

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

491. The delegation of Botswana recalled that, during its universal periodic review, Botswana had received 207 recommendations, of which 76 recommendations had been deferred for further consideration. All 76 recommendations had been assessed and responded to within the stipulated time frame.

492. Botswana had supported 93 of the 207 recommendations it had received. The remaining recommendations could not be supported for various reasons. Most of the unsupported recommendations had been related to the ratification of various human rights instruments, and the abolition of the death penalty and the issuance of a moratorium on executions.

493. Botswana had supported all of the recommendations that had called for the extension of a standing invitation to all special procedure mandate holders of the Human Rights Council. Support for those recommendations affirmed and renewed the commitment of Botswana to the work of all special procedure mandate holders. Botswana had never declined a request for a country visit by any special procedure mandate holder. Requests for visits from the Special Rapporteur on minority issues, the Special Rapporteur on the right to food and the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities were currently being processed, with the visits expected to take place in 2018. Three other visits were expected in 2019.

494. With regard to the recommendations to ratify the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, internal consultations had begun with a view to ratifying the Convention within the reporting period.

495. Although Botswana had noted the recommendations to ratify the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the Government had decided to ratify the Convention. The Convention should be ratified by December 2018.

496. While it was of paramount importance to ratify international instruments, including all human rights treaties, the rationale for such ratification should always be accompanied by a firm commitment and readiness to domesticate and implement the treaties. It is for that reason that Botswana had supported the recommendations relating to the ratification of only two treaties. However, despite capacity constraints, Botswana would continue to strive towards ensuring that mechanisms were in place to support the ratification, as well as the implementation, of the remaining treaties.

497. Recommendations calling for a moratorium on, or abolition of, the death penalty had not been supported. The position of Botswana on the death penalty remained unchanged. The Government respected the different views on the issue but it was convinced that the death penalty was a criminal justice matter, defined by sovereign States in accordance with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The delegation reiterated that the death penalty was a competent sentence in the laws and Constitution of Botswana and was applied only after a fair trial and due process of law administered by an independent judicial system.

498. Botswana had supported almost all of the recommendations relating to women and children who were the most vulnerable and therefore deserved special consideration. Botswana would appear before the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women in February 2019 and would constructively engage with the Committee, with a view to addressing all the challenges faced by the women of Botswana, and implement the recommendations stemming from that review.

499. With a view to addressing the high rate of sexual abuse of children, as exposed in the survey on violence against children, a response plan would be finalized and disseminated by September 2018.

500. Internal consultations had commenced with a view to lifting the reservations to article 1 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and article 2 of the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child. In the interim, several laws that had a bearing on the definition of the child, including the Penal Code and the Adoption of Children Act, continued to be reviewed.

501. Botswana was preparing to embark on the fifth Botswana AIDS impact survey, which was expected to be rolled out in September 2018. Its aim was to update the existing data on HIV and AIDS, and would be combined with the first ever tuberculosis prevalence survey.

502. The Anti-Human Trafficking Act had entered into force on 1 January 2015, and since then Botswana had made great strides in preventing, suppressing and combating the crime. The Anti-Human Trafficking National Action Plan was expected to be launched and operational before the end of 2018.

503. The delegation conveyed the gratitude and appreciation of the Government to all of the States that had participated in the review. It also thanked the civil society organizations for their contributions.

504. Botswana was committed to the universal periodic review process and through its national Interministerial Committee on Treaties, Conventions and Protocols and other relevant structures it would ensure the implementation of recommendations, as well as prepare and submit a comprehensive midterm report.

2. Views expressed by member and observer States of the Human Rights Council and by United Nations entities on the review outcome

505. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Botswana, 13 delegations made statements.

506. Senegal welcomed the adoption in December 2016 of the eleventh national development plan to ensure that the economic development in Botswana was consistent with the objectives of “Vision 2036”. It congratulated Botswana on having supported some recommendations from the review, including those made by Senegal.

507. South Africa congratulated Botswana on notable milestones, including the launching of “Vision 2036” and its national development plan. Progress had also been made in improving the lives of members of communities located in remote areas under the Affirmative Action Framework for Remote Area Communities.

508. The Sudan welcomed the resolute commitment of Botswana to adhere to the principles of the universal periodic review and to bolster the protection of human rights in the country. It welcomed the efforts of the Government to find solutions to the concerns that had been expressed.

509. UNICEF regretted that Botswana was not ready to accede to the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness or to provide nationality if a child would otherwise remain stateless. It also regretted that Botswana was not ready to ratify the Convention against Discrimination in Education. It stood ready to provide Botswana with technical assistance with regard to amending the Children’s Act to include a definition of child trafficking and to criminalize the worst forms of child labour. It noted the reluctance to take appropriate measures to provide quality education, including mother tongue instruction.

510. UNDP noted the absence of legal aid for indigent people involved in most criminal cases and it welcomed the commitment of the Government to extend legal aid for serious cases. It was concerned by the limited progress Botswana had made in establishing a national human rights institution in line with the Paris Principles.

511. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recognized the efforts made by Botswana to follow up on its human rights commitments. It noted the importance of the poverty reduction initiatives that had been undertaken, including the development programme for remote areas to guarantee access to social programmes. It was pleased by the efforts to improve the quality of education for children. It urged Botswana to continue to promote its social plans and programmes.

512. Zambia applauded Botswana for the dedication and commitment exhibited in its work in the Human Rights Council, the universal periodic review and other mechanisms promoting and protecting human rights. It congratulated Botswana on a successful review.

513. Zimbabwe stated that Botswana had taken its human rights obligations seriously, as evident by its open and constructive engagement. Botswana had continued to implement

initiatives aimed at improving the lives of all its citizens, and had continued to cooperate with special procedures and treaty bodies.

514. Afghanistan urged Botswana to consider the full incorporation of the provisions of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women into its national legislation.

515. Algeria noted with satisfaction the commendable progress made by Botswana in implementing development policy and poverty reduction programmes. It noted the initiatives taken in the areas of conservation and development, which recognized the rights of local populations to manage and utilize natural resources.

516. Angola encouraged Botswana to continue to implement necessary and effective measures to reduce the prevalence of HIV, which undermined the socioeconomic development of the country. It wished Botswana success in implementing the recommendations supported.

517. Belgium noted the commitment of Botswana to the universal periodic review. It appreciated the efforts made by Botswana to implement recommendations from the previous review, as well as its leadership in the promotion of human rights in the region. It noted that the recommendation made by Belgium to address gender-based violence had been supported by Botswana and it asked about the impact of implementing the recommendation. Two other recommendations relating to issuing a moratorium on executions and aligning the law on nationality with the Convention on the Rights of the Child had not been supported. Belgium invited Botswana to reconsider its position on those recommendations. It hoped that a national debate could be held to lay down the foundation for the abolition of the death penalty.

518. Chad noted the acceptance of recommendations by Botswana and it requested that the international community provide assistance in their implementation.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

519. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Botswana, five other stakeholders made statements.

520. The Center for Global Nonkilling stated that, in the two previous reviews, Botswana had accepted recommendations to hold a public debate on the death penalty. The Government must show to its people that it valued life more than killing, and the people would learn from the guiding authority of the Government.

521. Amnesty International welcomed the acceptance by Botswana of a range of recommendations, but it regretted that Botswana had rejected the majority of the recommendations. It also regretted that Botswana had rejected recommendations relating to the rights of journalists to freedom of expression. Journalists had continued to be intimidated and harassed by the authorities. Amnesty International also regretted the rejection by Botswana of recommendations to ratify certain conventions and to establish an official moratorium on the death penalty.

522. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, in a joint statement with the International Lesbian and Gay Association, regretted that Botswana had rejected 13 of the 15 recommendations relating to sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, and sex characteristics. It commended the Government for having upheld court rulings on the registration of lesbians, gays and bisexuals in Botswana and legal gender recognition. It urged Botswana to accept all of the recommendations and to continue the law reform process, including by revising the Penal Code to decriminalize consensual same-sex conduct.

523. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed the issuance of a standing invitation to the special procedures, but it was concerned by the unwillingness to put in place guarantees for civil society participation and space. It called upon Botswana to accept the recommendations to adopt legislation to protect victims of violence and other human rights

violations, and to incorporate into domestic law the international conventions ratified by Botswana.

524. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme congratulated Botswana on its progress in improving its human rights situation, and it acknowledged the work done in the areas of economic development to achieve socioeconomic progress. It noted the importance of intensifying efforts to prevent gender-based violence. It called for the strengthening of the rights of women and girls, the prevention and investigation of the trafficking of women and girls, and increased efforts to implement policies on the eradication of poverty and to ensure gender equality.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

525. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 207 recommendations received, 93 had enjoyed the support of Botswana and 114 had been noted.

526. In addressing some the issues that had been raised, the delegation expressed its appreciation to UNICEF for its continued work with Botswana in relation to children's rights. Government consultations were ongoing on the sensitive issues relating to nationality and statelessness.

527. The legal aid programme was relatively new and it had commenced modestly by offering legal aid services only for cases involving capital crimes. However, with the passage of time and inspiration from the principle that had led to the establishment of the legal aid programme, it was hoped that legal aid would be extended to indigent persons accused in all cases.

528. Botswana was committed to establishing a national human rights institution and the establishment of such an institution was in progress.

529. The process of incorporating international conventions into national law varied from one country to another. In Botswana, that process was quite involved, and it was not for the lack of will that some ratified conventions had not been incorporated into national law. Botswana had ratified conventions with the serious intention of implementing them. Incorporating those conventions into national law could take some time while the institutions were put in place to ensure the implementation of the conventions.

530. With regard to the impact of the recent training of police officers, the delegation stated that it took a while to assess the impact of any intervention. However, there were promising signs.

531. With regard to the allegations of the harassment of journalists, Botswana was open to the work of journalists and had no intention of harassing them. However, all journalists must respect the law.

532. Botswana was fully committed to implementing all the recommendations supported. The implementation process would be informed by the same multi-stakeholder and participatory approach that had informed the preparation of the national report.

Bahamas

533. The review of the Bahamas was held on 17 January 2018 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 Bahamas 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.6/29/BHS/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.6/29/BHS/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.6/29/BHS/3).

534. At its 24th meeting, on 28 June 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Bahamas (see sect. C below).

535. The outcome of the review of the Bahamas comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/38/9), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also A/HRC/38/9/Add.1).

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

536. The delegation of the Bahamas recognized that the attainment of human rights was a progressive and continuous effort, and it highlighted the fact that the State would continue to be fully engaged with the Human Rights Council and the international community on that journey.

537. Addressing issues that, due to time constraints, the Bahamas had not reported on before, the delegation referred to the issues of correctional facilities, statelessness and trafficking in persons. On correctional facilities, the delegation emphasized that the Bahamas Department of Correctional Services, formerly Her Majesty's Prison, had been renamed to divert from a penal approach to a correctional approach, and to provide for the modernization of the law governing the custody and rehabilitation of inmates, in line with international standards.

538. On the issue of statelessness, the Migration Working Group was presently reviewing the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons and the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness and was engaging in a benchmarking exercise on a standard operational determination for statelessness.

539. The Government had introduced an independent review committee, chaired by a retired chief justice, to review all pending applications for citizenship in an effort to clear the existing backlog. The committee would make recommendations in all cases to the Immigration Board and the Minister. Those recommendations would ordinarily be followed unless there were compelling reasons, usually of public safety or national security, to refuse to follow the recommendation.

540. In November 2014, the Government had implemented a policy providing for all children up to 18 years of age to obtain a "Belonger's permit", intended to give some form of status or documentation to children who were born in the Bahamas to immigrant parents. The Government was considering extending the age limit to apply for a Belonger's permit. The plan was to extend the time so that the permit would subsist pending the outcome of an application for citizenship pursuant to the Constitution.

541. The Bahamas was a destination and transit country for men, women and children from other Caribbean countries, South and Central America, and Asia seeking a better life or subjected to sex trafficking and forced labour. Vulnerable populations included migrant workers who arrived voluntarily to work as domestic employees and labourers, but might be recruited or deceived by traffickers. Despite that challenge, the Bahamas had maintained a Tier 1 ranking for the third year in the *Trafficking in Persons Report* released by the Department of State of the United States of America on 27 June 2017.

542. On 31 March 2017, the Government had enacted amendments to the Criminal Procedure Code and the Trafficking in Persons (Prevention and Suppression) Act to allow prosecutors the option to prosecute trafficking cases directly before the Supreme Court without the necessity of going first to a lower magistrate's court, and to create a new offence that criminalized the organizing of, engagement in, or directing another to engage in, trafficking in persons.

543. Regarding the 141 universal periodic review recommendations received by the Bahamas, the Government was pleased to report that it had been able to accept nearly 70 per cent of those recommendations. That affirmed its commitment to implementing international norms to give effect to human rights in an effective and sustainable manner.

544. In addition to a general commitment to strengthening human rights by acceding to additional conventions and improving domestic processes for implementation and monitoring, among the recommendations accepted were those dealing with gender equality, domestic violence, children, detention conditions, a national human rights institution, freedom of information, access to justice, access to education, persons with disabilities, trafficking in persons and migrants.

545. With respect to the accession to human rights instruments, the Bahamas was pleased to report that it had ratified the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment in May 2018.

546. On gender discrimination, the delegation underscored the fact that the eradication of discrimination was a slow process and that public awareness and education were the fundamental building blocks for ensuring meaningful attitudinal changes towards gender discrimination. After further consultation, an amendment to the Sexual Offences Act, which provided for the offence of “aggravated spousal sexual abuse”, had been redrafted to a “spousal sexual abuse bill”, based on replies from civil society and social partners. The bill would be taken to Cabinet for approval in July. Although the proposed offence was not labelled “marital rape”, it still had all of the elements of the offence of rape.

547. The Bahamas was in the process of drafting an amendment to the Bahamas Nationality Act to provide for all minor children of Bahamian males or females, born anywhere in the world, regardless of their parents’ marital status, to be granted Bahamian nationality upon application to the extent that the same did not derogate from the existing constitutional provisions, which did not confer an automatic right to citizenship without the need for application.

548. With respect to domestic violence, the Government continued its efforts to promote awareness of the avenues to seek redress and the protection available to victims of domestic violence under the relevant legislation.

549. The national strategic plan for the management, prevention and elimination of family violence would be implemented within the next year.

550. The Bahamas had tabled the ombudsman bill of 2017. The Office of the Ombudsman was designed to provide a direct source of relief wherever people had legitimate grievances due to the actions or inactions of the Government or any agency thereof. Since the review in January 2018, the Government had committed to reviewing the bill to determine if it could incorporate the Paris Principle.

551. The Freedom of Information Act had been enacted in 2017.

552. Regarding the recommendations that had been noted, the delegation asserted that the Government had been unable to support several of the recommendations that had generally fallen under the following categories: the death penalty, corporal punishment, the ratification of some of the conventions and discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

553. The Government of the Bahamas was aware of the long-standing recommendation to establish a moratorium on executions and/or to abolish the death penalty in the Bahamas. It underscored the fact that, *inter alia*: the imposition of the death penalty on a discretionary basis continued to be recognized as lawful, subject to the principles laid down by the highest court of the country (the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council), as a punishment for the crimes of murder and treason; there was no international consensus on the abolition of the death penalty; even in the absence of a formal moratorium, the last execution in the Bahamas had taken place 12 years before; and every State had an inalienable right to choose its political, legal, economic, social and cultural systems, and had prescriptive jurisdiction to make and enforce laws that were not in violation of peremptory norms of international law.

554. In the Bahamas, it was legal for a parent to physically discipline a child and for corporal punishment to be administered in schools in certain clearly defined and limited

circumstances. Strict procedures were in place, however, to ensure that the application of corporal punishment, particularly within the school system, was used only as a last resort to positively modify behaviour. The physical abuse of a child was punishable under the laws of the Bahamas.

555. Since the review in January 2018, the Attorney General had met with various alternative lifestyle groups that represented gay, lesbian and transgender persons and men having sex with men to listen to their concerns and to remind them of their rights and the relief and remedies available in the case of violations.

556. Because of its limited resources and its vulnerability to illegal migration, the Bahamas was not in a position to accede to and give effect to all of the conventions dealing with migrants or statelessness. It continued to work very closely with the International Organization for Migration and UNHCR to assess and evaluate persons who claimed refugee status and to respect the principle of non-refoulement.

557. The Bahamas would continue to put great effort into the role of its national reporting cooperation mechanism to ensure that its reports were submitted on time and that the recommendations that had been accepted were implemented.

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

558. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Bahamas, seven delegations made statements.

559. Afghanistan commended the Bahamas for its continued commitment to the universal periodic review and it appreciated the fact that the Bahamas had accepted the recommendation of Afghanistan to ratify the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

560. Belgium welcomed efforts on the implementation of recommendations from previous cycles and the acceptance of the recommendation made by Belgium to ratify the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It had taken note that its recommendation to ratify the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights had not been accepted, and it invited the Bahamian authorities to re-examine their position. Belgium hoped that a national debate on the subject would be carried out in order to lay the groundwork for the complete abolition of the death penalty following the moratorium on executions that had already been in place for 17 years. It encouraged the authorities to promptly finalize the consultation process on the ratification of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

561. China thanked the Bahamas for having accepted its recommendations and it expressed hope that the Government would take further positive measures to continue to promote sustainable economic and social development, improve people's living standards, further strengthen the public health system and protect the right of the people to health. China welcomed the reiteration by the Bahamas of its commitment to the protection and promotion of human rights.

562. Cuba recognized the wide consultations that had taken place and the careful evaluation of each recommendation in order to take a position on them. It expressed satisfaction about the acceptance of the recommendation made by Cuba to continue to work to implement and present the reports regarding the conventions and treaties to which the Bahamas was a State party.

563. Haiti welcomed the acceptance by the Bahamas of the recommendation contained in paragraph 105.33 to ensure the follow-up to the recommendations of the United Nations human rights mechanisms, the recommendation contained in paragraph 105.49 on climate change and the recommendation contained in paragraph 105.135 to put in place a simplified naturalization procedure for children with foreign parents born in the Bahamas. It regretted that the recommendations contained in paragraphs 105.18 and 105.25 on the ratification of certain international human rights conventions, particularly the statelessness conventions, had not been accepted.

564. Honduras welcomed the support of the Bahamas for recommendations on, inter alia, the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, and the establishment of a national plan of action with a human rights-based approach. It encouraged the Bahamas to reconsider its position regarding: the ratification of the Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families; the modification of the law on persons with disabilities to incorporate a rights-based and integrated approach to the education of those persons, recognizing their right to education; and the revision of national legislation in order to apply alternative measures to the deprivation of liberty in managing migration.

565. Chile highlighted the commitment of the Bahamas to the universal human rights system and its efforts to implement recommendations from the second cycle of the universal periodic review. It underscored, as a step forward, the ratification of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, a strong message in the region to eradicate torture. It invited the Bahamas to continue to work regarding the Convention with the objective of implementing it.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

566. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Bahamas, four other stakeholders made statements.

567. Villages unis appreciated the change in administration on 7 May 2017 by a national general election carried out in accordance with the Constitution of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, underscoring the strength of the democratic process. It was commendable that the Bahamas participated in various international and regional institutions, such as the United Nations, the Caribbean Community and the Organization of American States, to contribute to the development of international standards on human rights. It highlighted the fact that the Bahamas had worked hard to formulate a comprehensive approach to address asylum and refugee issues.

568. The Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative was deeply concerned about inhumane prison conditions in the Bahamas, which had reportedly led to a series of inmate deaths. It urged the Government to address overcrowding, unhealthy conditions, the poor availability of resources and high rates of crime in prisons. Reportedly over 700 irregular migrants and asylum seekers were being held in inhumane conditions at the Carmichael Road Detention Center. It called upon the Bahamas to address the mistreatment of undocumented migrants and to ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

569. The United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation stated that it was alarmed by the discriminatory use of new Bahamian laws on migration. Since 1 November, with the application of new provisions by the Bahamas, the State had increased arrests and incarceration in bad conditions of migrants. The new provisions of the Department of Immigration of the Bahamas and its new policy meant that thousands of children lived in fear of detention or arbitrary expulsion. The Bahamas should comply with its obligation of protecting children, regardless of their status or their ethnic origin. The United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation condemned the increase in arrests and detentions in bad conditions of Haitian migrants in the Bahamas. It called upon the international community to take urgent and practical measures to end the discriminatory use of those new measures.

570. Africa culture internationale welcomed the progress in the development of infrastructure to improve the situation of economic, social and cultural rights. It also highlighted the implementation of capacity-building measures and institutional conferences on the judiciary system. It underscored the progress stemming from the bill on penitentiary services of 2014 and the fact that the norms on the imposition of corporal punishment of inmates as a disciplinary measure had been repealed. Lastly, it underscored the regulations relating to the management of early childhood, particularly regarding freedom of expression and assembly and the measures taken to improve the situation of children.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

571. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 141 recommendations received, 78 had enjoyed the support of the Bahamas and 57 had been noted. Additional clarification had been provided on another six recommendations, indicating which part of the recommendations had been supported and which part had been noted.

572. In its final statement, the delegation thanked the member States, other stakeholders and the members of the troika. It reaffirmed the commitment of the Government to the universal periodic review and to work with other States and civil society organizations towards the application of human rights for all.

Burundi

573. The review of Burundi was held on 18 January 2018 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 Burundi 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.6/29/BDI/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.6/29/BDI/2 and Corr.1);

(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.6/29/BDI/3).

574. At its 24th meeting, on 28 June 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Burundi (see sect. C below).

575. The outcome of the review of Burundi comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/38/10), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also A/HRC/38/10/Add.1).

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

576. The delegation stressed that Burundi attached great importance to the universal periodic review mechanism as a unique process, allowing for the equal treatment of all countries, a constructive dialogue between States and a sharing of best practices between States and other stakeholders for the sole purpose of improving the situation of human rights in the world.

577. Since 7 June 2018, Burundi had had a new fundamental law, better adapted to the current sociopolitical context, with the ultimate goal of establishing and sustaining institutional stability and social cohesion in the spirit of the Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement for Burundi, signed on 28 August 2000.

578. The delegation asserted that the citizens of Burundi were committed to reconciliation and sustainable development. The voluntary participation by all sections of the population in the elections in 2020 showed the will of the people bruised by the effects of colonization and dependency to take control of their own destiny.

579. The universal periodic review of 18 January 2018 had been an opportunity to listen, with great attention, to relevant recommendations to strengthen the respect for human rights but also to capture the concerns of some members of the Human Rights Council.

580. During the universal periodic review, the Government was represented by a large delegation led by the Minister for Human Rights, Social Affairs and Gender, showing the importance that Burundi gave to the mechanism.

581. On that occasion, Burundi had provided some replies, and a promise had been made to follow up on the many recommendations. There had been 242 in total, made by 96 delegations. A multisectoral team had been set up to analyse them, and the Government had accepted a set of recommendations that were not in contradiction with the laws of the country, the international instruments that Burundi had ratified, the social and cultural values of the culture of Burundi and its economic development.

582. Of the 242 recommendations received, 125 had been accepted, while the remaining 117 had been noted. The details of the recommendations accepted and those noted were contained in the addendum transmitted by the Government of Burundi.

583. As was the case for the recommendations made during the second cycle of the universal periodic review of Burundi, the Government had undertaken to implement the recommendations accepted and had requested the cooperation of everyone in that context.

584. As for the recommendations that had been noted, the Government would not hesitate to implement them if the conditions were met.

585. Burundi praised the hard work of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, the secretariat, the troika and all of the other persons who had worked tirelessly in that process. It thanked all the different teams who had dedicated their time to prepare the report on the universal periodic review to make it available for adoption. The relevant advice and expertise they had provided was the pride of the Human Rights Council and Burundi in particular.

586. Notwithstanding the fact that the universal periodic review allowed for a constructive dialogue between States with a view to improving human rights in countries, it was regrettable to note that some United Nations experts in some countries had redoubled their efforts to tarnish the image of Burundi through an apocalyptic presentation of the facts.

587. The delegation referred to the alleged expulsion of United Nations experts by the Government of Burundi in the context of the implementation of Human Rights Council resolution 36/2, adopted by the Council during its session in September 2017. Burundi regretted that some delegations, relying on false information, had accused Burundi of refusing to cooperate with United Nations human rights mechanisms, OHCHR and the Human Rights Council.

588. The people whose visas had been revoked at that time had been experts who had come as part of OHCHR in Burundi. OHCHR had asked Burundi to grant them entry visas as international civil servants who had come for a short duration as United Nations experts, without any other details. Burundi had authorized their entry into its territory in that capacity. The letters for their visa requests had had no reference to Human Rights Council resolution 36/2.

589. Upon their arrival in Burundi, the mission for which the visas had been granted to them had changed, and their visas had therefore been cancelled. Moreover, on 21 March 2018, during the general debate on country reports, including the situation in Burundi, the Government had publicly lamented the fact that OHCHR had not contacted the State regarding the implementation of Council resolution 36/2. Burundi wished to reiterate its full support for resolution 36/2.

590. In conclusion, the delegation asked the Human Rights Council to adopt by consensus the outcome of the universal periodic review of Burundi. The delegation reiterated the readiness of the State to make the adopted report a road map for the preparation of the fourth cycle of the universal periodic review of Burundi, and it reaffirmed the determination of Burundi to spare no effort to better promote and protect human rights for all.

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

591. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Burundi, 13 delegations made statements.

592. Egypt welcomed the legislative reforms in the field of human rights, the establishment of the national council for reconciliation, the improvement of detention facilities and the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. It called upon Burundi to cooperate further with OHCHR and to combat violence against women.

593. Ethiopia commended Burundi for having accepted many recommendations, including the recommendation of Ethiopia to continue to ensure girls' education by abolishing school fees in basic education and to continue its efforts to reintegrate disaster victims by putting in place the national reintegration strategy. Ethiopia encouraged Burundi to take all the measures necessary in advance for the full implementation of the recommendations accepted.

594. Haiti thanked the delegation of Burundi for having taken into account the recommendations on the implementation of a strategy to reduce the length of custody, the constitutional referendum that had taken place in May 2018 and the significant reduction in the rate of chronic malnutrition throughout the country. Haiti encouraged the Government and the people of Burundi to continue to fight for peace, justice and reconciliation.

595. Honduras thanked Burundi for having accepted its recommendations on the ratification of the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty, and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrants Workers and Members of Their Families, and for all its efforts to combat violence against women. However, Honduras urged Burundi to ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and to renew its cooperation with OHCHR and to continue to work with the International Criminal Court.

596. Pakistan welcomed the steps taken by the Government of Burundi to empower women. In that regard, Pakistan appreciated the political commitment of the Government to end gender-based violence.

597. Senegal commended the commitment of Burundi to the promotion of human rights, which had been materialized in the ratification of several international instruments, and it congratulated the Burundian authorities on the acceptance of most of the recommendations received.

598. South Africa appreciated the acceptance by Burundi of its recommendations. South Africa commended Burundi for its legislation to prevent trafficking in persons and gender-based violence. It further welcomed the setting up of gender units in various ministries, as well as the new centres at various hospitals to counter gender-based violence. South Africa acknowledged the efforts of Burundi to step up the training of judges and police officers to prevent torture. It highlighted the setting up of a national commission for dialogue among Burundians, the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and the strengthening of the national independent human rights commission.

599. Sri Lanka congratulated Burundi on the acceptance of 125 out of 242 recommendations received from member and observer States of the Human Rights Council, including the two recommendations made by Sri Lanka. It had taken note of the efforts made by Burundi to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Sri Lanka appreciated the efforts made by Burundi to eliminate discrimination in girls' education by identifying school dropouts and girls who had never been to school and enrolling them in State schools, and extending free primary education to nine years to keep girls in school for a longer period. Lastly, Sri Lanka expressed its hope that the Government of Burundi would continue to implement the national gender policy action plan 2012–2016 and to improve access to health through the national health policy 2016–2025.

600. The Sudan welcomed the acceptance by Burundi of the recommendations made during the previous cycle of the universal periodic review, which had included guaranteeing the Truth and Reconciliation Commission the exercise of its functions, and continuing the ongoing training of judges and law enforcement officials to ensure the strengthening of justice, while urging the international community to provide financial and technical support.

601. The United Republic of Tanzania applauded the progress made since the previous universal periodic review and it called upon all political groups and parties in Burundi to spare no effort to support the peace process in their country. It commended the commitment of the Government of Burundi to facilitate the planned repatriation and settlement of Burundian refugees from refugee camps in the United Republic of Tanzania in a voluntary manner and under the supervision of UNHCR. It encouraged Burundi to expedite and finalize the repatriation exercise. Lastly, it called upon partners and stakeholders to honour their commitments in that endeavor.

602. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted with satisfaction the cooperation of Burundi with the universal periodic review mechanism and it applauded the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It commended the efforts of Burundi to fight against gender violence with the entry into force of the law on the prevention and protection of victims and the establishment of specialized centres.

603. Afghanistan appreciated the acceptance by Burundi of most of the recommendations, including both of the recommendations made by Afghanistan, and it wished Burundi every success in the process of implementing the recommendations.

604. Angola encouraged Burundi to strengthen its policies and measures in the field of the protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

605. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Burundi, nine other stakeholders made statements.

606. Amnesty International welcomed the acceptance by Burundi of 125 recommendations, but it regretted that the Government had rejected almost as many. It also regretted that, while Burundi had agreed to implement a number of recommendations on important points of principle, such as the need for accountability, the State had not accepted recommendations on the practical steps needed to ensure that those principles were realized. Burundi needed to guarantee the full exercise of the rights to freedom of expression and association, ensure a safe environment conducive to the work of human right defenders and civil society organizations, and undertake immediate and independent investigations into allegations of extrajudicial executions, the excessive use of force by security forces, forced disappearances and arbitrary detention. Burundi had accepted the recommendation to establish a national preventive mechanism in line with the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment but had rejected recommendations to conduct effective investigations into allegations of acts of torture in detention centres. Amnesty International urged Burundi to reconsider its position on those recommendations, including its cooperation with the Commission of Inquiry to improve the human rights situation for everybody in Burundi.

607. The International Lesbian and Gay Association noted with disappointment that, despite the recently revised article 567 of the Penal Code, which contained criminal provisions against those who engaged in “same-sex sexual intercourse”, the new Penal Code upheld the same disposition under article 590. It urged Burundi to respect its human rights obligations to protect the human rights of all individuals regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity. Burundi had made progress in ending sexual and gender-based violence. However, despite its international obligations, which were part of the Constitution of Burundi, gender and sexual minorities continued to be victims of human rights violations, such as arbitrary arrests and illegal detention. In addition, Burundi did not guarantee freedom of association and assembly for sexual minority groups based on the Penal Code provisions. It called upon Burundi to leverage its efforts in ending HIV among the most at-risk populations,

including sexual minorities, by ensuring discrimination-free access to health care, and to ensure that human rights were for all, including lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans persons.

608. Article 19: International Centre against Censorship deeply regretted that gross violations of the rights to freedom of expression, assembly and association continued unabated and with near total impunity. Since the peaceful protests after the President's decision to seek a third term, human rights defenders, journalists and political opponents had been repressed and risked arbitrary arrest and detention, enforced disappearance, extrajudicial execution, torture, inhuman treatment and sexual violence simply for speaking out. Legal attacks also continued against journalists and human rights defenders. Article 19 urged the Government of Burundi to reconsider its approach to recommendations on the rights of freedom of expression, assembly and association, and to seek the support of the international community to ensure their prompt and full implementation.

609. The East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project took note of the responses of Burundi to the recommendations received. It regretted the lack of willingness of the Government to ratify key international instruments, such as the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the Rome Statute, from which the Government had withdrawn to evade its responsibilities for the international crimes committed. It highlighted the need for cooperation with OHCHR and the Commission of Inquiry. Lastly, it condemned the reprisals against human rights defenders cooperating with the United Nations.

610. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues noted that extrajudicial executions, torture, abductions, and arbitrary arrests and detentions were continuing in Burundi with impunity and the authorities had not accepted the recommendations urging them to put an immediate end to them and to open without delay independent, effective and impartial investigations. Harassment and attacks against civil society and defenders continued. Lastly, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues doubted the political will of the Burundian authorities despite the commitment they had made to implement the recommendations.

611. The International Service for Human Rights stressed that, despite the violations of human rights perpetrated in Burundi, during its universal periodic review on 18 January 2018, the Government had rejected allegations that it had persecuted human rights defenders. Burundi claimed that defenders were prosecuted under the country's legal framework and were not targeted for legitimate human rights activities. The International Service for Human Rights urged the Government of Burundi to repeal all laws restricting the activities of human rights defenders and to investigate the abuses committed against them. It called upon Burundi to further allow civil society organizations and individual defenders to interact with special rapporteurs without fear of reprisal and to refrain from stigmatizing defenders, and to condemn and prosecute all acts of intimidation and reprisals against defenders. It invited Burundi to work with civil society to implement the universal periodic review recommendations.

612. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation stated that, since its previous review, Burundi had not fully implemented any of the recommendations it had accepted. Since April 2015, the Burundian authorities had used violence against peaceful protesters and were responsible for the human rights violations largely carried out by security forces, intelligence services and the armed wing of the ruling party, including crimes amounting to crimes against humanity, with utmost impunity. The legal restrictions adopted had increased government control of the activities of and funding for national and international non-governmental organizations and permitted the ban of some civil society organizations. In addition, the violence against representatives of civil society had forced many human rights organizations to close down and operate from abroad.

613. United Nations Watch highlighted the fact that Burundi continued to commit grave violations of human rights against its own people, including summary executions, disappearances, arbitrary arrests and torture. Women and children in Burundi were victims of sexual abuse on a daily basis and women were vastly underrepresented at all levels of government decision-making. It further declared that the recent referendum campaign had

been marred by violence and intimidation, committed by forces loyal to the Government, with people abducted or executed for having supported the opposition, or for having refused to join the ruling party. United Nations Watch objected to the adoption of the report of Burundi.

614. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme stressed that Burundi was unwilling to take meaningful efforts, including cooperation with the United Nations mechanisms, to improve the appalling human rights situation in the country. It called upon the Government of Burundi to put an end to the assassination of political opponents, journalists and human rights activists. It exhorted the Government to create a better atmosphere of inclusive dialogue for national reconciliation, and to strengthen cooperation with regional institutions and United Nations mechanisms.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

615. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 242 recommendations received, 125 had enjoyed the support of Burundi and 117 had been noted.

Luxembourg

616. The review of Luxembourg was held on 18 January 2018 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 Luxembourg 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.6/29/LUX/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.6/29/LUX/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.6/29/LUX/3).

617. At its 25th meeting, on 29 June 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Luxembourg (see sect. C below).

618. The outcome of the review of Luxembourg comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/38/11), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also A/HRC/38/11/Add.1).

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

619. The delegation of Luxembourg, led by the Permanent Representative of Luxembourg to the United Nations Office at Geneva, thanked the member States that had spoken during the third universal periodic review of Luxembourg to make recommendations. It also thanked the delegations of Brazil, Czechia, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for their questions made in advance.

620. Luxembourg had presented all of the recommendations to national stakeholders within the context of the Interministerial Committee on Human Rights. During the consultations with the representatives of various concerned ministries and administrations, there had been an agreement to accept 135 out of the 149 recommendations made to Luxembourg.

621. In the addendum to the report of the Working Group, Luxembourg had responded to most of the recommendations accepted.

622. The delegation addressed the recommendations that had been noted and offered some new information concerning the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

623. Regarding the recommendations contained in paragraphs 106.1, 106.2 and 106.10, made by Mexico, Burkina Faso and Honduras, respectively, on the withdrawal of the reservations to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the delegation stated that the reform of the legal framework was still under discussion in Parliament.

624. Regarding the recommendations contained in paragraphs 106.3, made by Indonesia, 106.4, made by the Philippines, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), 106.6, made by Togo, 106.7, made by Cabo Verde, 106.8, made by Egypt and Honduras, and 106.9, made by El Salvador, on the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, the delegation stated that Luxembourg was not legally able to ratify that Convention, as the other States members of the European Union. The Convention did not create rights that migrants were not already enjoying under the law of Luxembourg and European law, whether they were in a regular or an irregular situation.

625. In light of the recommendations contained in paragraph 106.40, made by the Philippines, and 106.41, made by Greece, on the introduction of an aggravating circumstance for racially motivated crimes, the law of Luxembourg did not provide for such an aggravating factor, but prohibited and punished racial discrimination as a separate crime.

626. Regarding the recommendation contained in paragraph 106.42, made by the Syrian Arab Republic, Luxembourg was implementing a policy of targeted sanctions in accordance with the decisions of the Security Council and of the European Union, in full compliance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. The measures were designed to minimize the negative consequences for those who were not responsible for the policies or actions that had led to the adoption of sanctions.

627. Regarding the recommendation contained in paragraph 106.44, made by Honduras, Luxembourg was not in a position to implement that recommendation now. The law of 7 November 2017, which had reformed the Centre for Equal Treatment, did not provide the additional means required to sue. The consultative commission on human rights was not responsible for investigating or settling complaints regarding specific cases of discrimination.

628. Regarding the recommendation contained in paragraph 106.52, made by the Syrian Arab Republic, Luxembourg did not have the intention at the present time to amend the Constitution accordingly, also in view of the constitutional reforms in progress that should meet the concerns expressed in the recommendation.

629. With regard to new points of information, the delegation confirmed that the draft law on the integration into domestic law of the provisions of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance would soon be examined by the Government and would subsequently be transmitted to the Chamber of Deputies with a view to the ratification of the Convention.

630. On the acceleration of the preparation of reports to treaty bodies, Luxembourg was in contact with the secretariats of the treaty bodies concerned, and it would soon strengthen the capacity in the Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs.

631. Regarding the recommendation contained in paragraph 106.92, made by the Netherlands, to take additional measures for the protection of human rights defenders, the Minister for Foreign and European Affairs had announced concrete support measures and the inclusion of the protection of human rights defenders in the voluntary commitments that Luxembourg would make in the context of its candidacy for the Human Rights Council for the term 2022–2024.

632. Luxembourg had also approved, on 22 June 2018, its national action plan for the implementation of the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations “Protect, Respect and Remedy” Framework. The action plan had been developed by a working group that included State and non-State entities, including human rights and development non-governmental organizations, trade unions and private sector organizations.

633. Luxembourg saw the universal periodic review as an essential opportunity for accountability to the international community on its efforts to protect and promote the rights of all people. The delegation welcomed the comments to be made by the consultative commission on human rights.

634. Luxembourg, together with the consultative commission on human rights, civil society and State entities represented in the Interministerial Committee on Human Rights, would focus on the implementation of the recommendations accepted in light of its next universal periodic review. It was ready to submit once again a midterm review.

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

635. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Luxembourg, 10 delegations made statements.

636. The Islamic Republic of Iran stated that it was looking forward to the full implementation of the recommendations it had made. There was a need for an accurate definition of child pornography to ensure the criminalization of pictures of children that fell outside the definition in the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography. It also expressed concern about the access to the job market for persons with migration backgrounds with a low level of education.

637. Iraq thanked Luxembourg for the acceptance of a large number of recommendations, including those made by Iraq and it wished the State success in protecting and reinforcing human rights at the national level.

638. The Lao People's Democratic Republic noted that Luxembourg had accepted two of its recommendations and it commended the State for its efforts to protect and promote human rights in the country. It welcomed the national action plan to combat trafficking in persons, which was focused on the protection of victims and the pursuit and prosecution of traffickers.

639. Madagascar noted with satisfaction the recent ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, as well as the implementation of the national action plan to combat trafficking in persons.

640. Pakistan commended Luxembourg for having accepted the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Pakistan, and for the efforts on the new multi-annual national action plan on integration of 2018. Pakistan hoped that the plan would strengthen the employability of non-Luxembourgers.

641. Senegal welcomed the measures taken by Luxembourg to ratify several human rights instruments and its willingness to continue to promote human rights, in particular by combating hate speech and racism.

642. Armenia welcomed the acceptance by Luxembourg of the majority of the recommendations received, including those made by Armenia. It praised Luxembourg for the progress made in the area of the strengthening of equality between men and women, and the commitment to continue to implement measures that would ensure the participation of women in political and economic life. It also welcomed the commitment of Luxembourg to protect and promote human rights at the national and international levels.

643. Chad commended Luxembourg for having accepted the majority of the recommendations made.

644. Egypt stated that it was important to combat hate speech, especially in the media, and facilitate the entrance of migrants into the labour market. It was important to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. It commended Luxembourg for the establishment of an interministerial commission to implement the universal periodic review recommendations.

645. Honduras welcomed the acceptance by Luxembourg of its recommendations. It invited Luxembourg to reconsider its position regarding the ratification of the International

Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, the withdrawal of the reservation to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and the guarantee that the consultative commission on human rights and the Centre for Equality had the judicial authority necessary to process and decide upon complaints regarding multiple discrimination in the private sector.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

646. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Luxembourg, one other stakeholder made a statement.

647. The Consultative Commission on Human Rights welcomed the progress made since the previous two cycles of the universal periodic review. However, the Commission was concerned that Luxembourg had still not ratified the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the Protocol to the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29). The Commission regretted that no developments had been observed regarding the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

648. In terms of the institutional architecture of human rights, the Commission stressed the importance of providing various national institutions with the competences and resources necessary so that they could carry out their respective mandates. Those competences should also include the possibility of legal action.

649. Juvenile justice was a long-standing grievance. The Commission welcomed the recent opening of the juvenile safety unit and it called upon the Government to respect its previous commitment that no juveniles would be imprisoned in the prison for adults. A reform of the act on the protection of young people should be considered a priority.

650. With regard to the rights of persons with disabilities, the Commission invited the Government to reflect on the establishment of a single independent structure that would bring together all the mandates concerning the promotion and protection of the rights of persons with disabilities.

651. The Commission, as the national rapporteur on trafficking in persons, insisted that the Government follow up on its recommendations for the collection of accurate and consistent statistical data. It also called for greater attention to be given to trafficking for labour exploitation purposes and trafficking in the context of immigration.

652. The Commission welcomed the development of a national action plan on business and human rights in cooperation with civil society. However, that national plan did not include a deadline or binding power for its implementation. The Commission would carefully monitor the impact of the plan on corporate practices and policies.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

653. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 149 recommendations received, 135 had enjoyed the support of Luxembourg and 14 had been noted.

654. The delegation thanked the civil society organizations and the Consultative Commission on Human Rights for their cooperation in the third universal periodic review of Luxembourg. It thanked the member States for their substantive comments and encouragement, which Luxembourg had taken note of for the implementation of the recommendations accepted, and emphasized the importance of collaboration with all of the national and international stakeholders concerned. Lastly, the delegation thanked the troika and OHCHR for their dedication during the review.

Barbados

655. The review of Barbados was held on 19 January 2018 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 Barbados 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.6/29/BRB/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.6/29/BRB/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.6/29/BRB/3).

656. At its 25th meeting, on 29 June 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Barbados (see sect. C below).

657. The outcome of the review of Barbados comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/38/12), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also A/HRC/38/12/Add.1).

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

658. The delegation, led by the Permanent Representative of Barbados to the United Nations Office at Geneva, thanked the Human Rights Council for the opportunity to formally present the response of Barbados to the 137 recommendations received on 19 January 2018.

659. The Permanent Representative noted that the delegation of Barbados, led by the then Minister for Social Care, Constituency Empowerment and Community Development, had been able to engage in a very constructive interactive dialogue with the 52 delegations that had made statements and recommendations.

660. On that occasion, the delegation had reiterated the commitment of Barbados to the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, as well as its respect for the dignity of all persons. Those priorities were reflected in the level of investment that the Government had made in the areas of education, social services and social security, which had accounted for approximately two thirds of the national budget.

661. Barbados had a long-standing reputation of being a vibrant democracy, and of protecting and promoting its human rights in keeping with national law and international obligations. Barbados continued to be a staunch supporter of the rule of law at home as much as it was an advocate of a rules-based international system that sought equity and justice for individuals and States.

662. Barbados, as a small State, was committed to the work pursued by multilateral institutions such as the United Nations. It was particularly interested in the human rights mechanisms and it commended those small States that would contribute to the multilateral process as members of the Human Rights Council. Barbados firmly believed that the added voice of small States in the deliberations of the Council would promote a more inclusive approach to human rights, as the concerns, development interests and priorities of that special group were more fully recognized.

663. The delegation reiterated the importance that the human rights mechanisms held for Barbados, as they promoted the right to development and the universal ratification and implementation of the major human rights treaties.

664. Barbados supported the work of the treaty bodies and regarded them as essential to the broader human rights system. Indeed, it viewed the effective functioning of the treaty body system as essential to achieving improvements in the human rights situation throughout the world.

665. Barbados welcomed the positive changes that the universal periodic review process had promoted for the advancement of human cooperation among States. It believed that mechanism to be an effective tool for ensuring that every State was called to account for its human rights performance. Each of the three assessments of Barbados had enabled the Government to take stock of where it was in its human rights journey. Due to the information obtained through research, consultation and the statements and recommendations received, Barbados was now better able to chart a path for the future.

666. During its third universal periodic review, held in January 2018, the delegation had listened with interest to the views expressed during the session. Every effort had been made to respond to the views presented and comments made then, along with those contained in the series of advance questions.

667. Following the session in January, the Government of Barbados had reserved its position on the 137 recommendations it had received. That had enabled the careful review of the recommendations through consultation across the Government, as spearheaded by the work of the National Human Rights Coordinating Committee. Consultations were also held with some non-governmental stakeholders to receive feedback on the recommendations. Considerable thought had been given to each recommendation, and the concluding positions that had been the result of the process of consultation had been submitted for the consideration of the Cabinet. The decisions of the Cabinet responding to the recommendations had been transmitted to the secretariat in March 2018.

668. Barbados had used the agreed upon terminology in responding to the recommendations. That, in summary, demonstrated the support of Barbados for 64 recommendations. That meant that the Government of Barbados had fully implemented them or intended to do so. Barbados had noted 73 recommendations, which indicated that the Government of Barbados might have implemented them partially but was not fully implementing them at the present time.

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

669. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Barbados, seven delegations made statements.

670. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland recognized the positive steps taken by the previous Government of Barbados, including the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the establishment of the Employment Sexual Harassment Prevention Act of 2017 and the establishment of the Trafficking in Persons Prevention Act of 2016. It hoped that the new Government of Barbados would accept its recommendation to develop a national action plan to combat trafficking in persons. It welcomed the confirmation of the previous Government that a national human rights institution would be established in the near future, as well as the introduction by Barbados of legislation to abolish the mandatory imposition of the death penalty for murder. It urged the new Government to amend the legislation to completely abolish the death penalty. It was concerned that discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons was still common and it hoped that Barbados would accept its recommendation to repeal all legal provisions that discriminated against persons on the grounds of their sexual orientation and gender identity.

671. Belgium noted positively the engagement of Barbados with the universal periodic review and the State's efforts to implement the recommendations received during the previous cycles of the universal periodic review. Belgium appreciated the fact that Barbados had accepted one recommendation made by Belgium regarding the draft law on juvenile justice, and Belgium would like to know the plan of Barbados aimed at the implementation of that recommendation. Belgium had also observed that two other recommendations it had made on the ratification of international human rights treaties had been noted by Barbados, and it invited the State to review its position in that regard. Belgium hoped that the death penalty could be completely abolished after a broad national debate in Barbados. Regarding the ratification of other international instruments, Belgium recognized the limited capacity

of Barbados for reporting, but it noted that it should not be an obstacle to the ratification of those international instruments.

672. Chile valued the advances made by Barbados to further promote and protect human rights. It recognized the compromise of Barbados with the universal human rights system and the efforts made by the country aimed at implementing the recommendations received during the second cycle of the universal periodic review. Chile acknowledged that there were multiples challenges, but it noted that Barbados had established priorities in order to be more equal, particularly in the areas of education, social services and social security. In that context, Chile understood the position of Barbados regarding the 137 recommendations received during the third review. Lastly, Chile encouraged Barbados to maintain its cooperation with the universal human rights mechanisms in order to create further space for dialogue between the authorities and civil society.

673. China commended Barbados for its constructive participation in the universal periodic review process. It thanked Barbados for having accepted the recommendations made by China. It hoped that Barbados would continue to promote gender equality and economic and social sustainable development to lay a solid foundation for the enjoyment of all human rights by all people. China welcomed the commitment of Barbados to promote and protect all human rights and it wished the State even more achievements in the area of human rights.

674. Cuba thanked the delegation of Barbados for the information provided on the position of the country in relation to the 137 recommendations received during the review. Cuba was satisfied that the recommendation made by Cuba to maintain the State's commitment to respect human rights, in particular through legislative measures, had been accepted by Barbados. Cuba noted that Barbados had demonstrated its commitment to the universal periodic review mechanism during its presentation before the Working Group. That was an example of the high value that Barbados placed on the promotion and protection of human rights. Lastly, Cuba wished Barbados every success in the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

675. Haiti thanked the delegation of Barbados for the information provided on the position of the country in relation to the 137 recommendations received during its third review. Haiti also thanked Barbados for having accepted the recommendations contained in paragraph 96.37 to establish a national human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles, and paragraph 96.128 regarding the review of certain traditional social attitudes, in particular corporal punishment, both recommendations made by Haiti. Haiti took the opportunity to congratulate Mia Amor Mottley, the first female Prime Minister of Barbados, who had taken office in May 2018, and thanked her for the decision to abolish the visa requirement for Haitian citizens visiting Barbados.

676. Honduras expressed its satisfaction that Barbados had supported the recommendations made by Honduras to establish a national human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles and to adopt legislation to prevent and combat sexual harassment in all settings. Honduras hoped that Barbados would reconsider its position regarding the ratification of international human rights treaties, such as the optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and its Optional Protocol, and the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

677. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Barbados, one other stakeholder made a statement.

678. The United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation stated that the death penalty was the cruelest, most inhuman and degrading punishment, which violated the right to life, as recognized by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Over the years and decades, one State after another had abolished the application of the death penalty, so that only a minority of States around the world still applied that sentence, contrary to human rights.

Barbados had continued to present the death penalty as a solution to crime without addressing the root causes of the increase in violent crime or reforming the inadequate criminal justice system. Thirteen men, including one foreigner, were under sentence of death in Barbados; however, the sentence was no longer applicable for six of them because they had been on death row for more than five years, the maximum period set by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, beyond which an execution would constitute inhuman or degrading treatment. The United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation opposed the death penalty in all circumstances and called upon the authorities of Barbados to enforce the bills already submitted to Parliament aimed at abolishing the systematic imposition of the death penalty for murder, and to make mandatory the psychiatric examination of all persons accused of that crime.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

679. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 137 recommendations received, 64 had enjoyed the support of Barbados and 73 had been noted.

680. The delegation stated that, on behalf of the Government and people of Barbados, it wished to thank all of the member States that had participated in the review of Barbados through words of support and encouragement. Barbados was grateful for the recommendations received; they reflected the diversity of views present in Barbados and the international community. The delegation believed that, taken together, the comments and recommendations highlighted the firm foundation of freedom, justice and respect for human rights.

681. Barbados was of the view that participation in the universal periodic review provided an opportunity to show how the State had successfully secured its social safety net and the protection of human rights even during a period of economic downturn. Barbados recognized that, clearly, work remained to be done. It would continue, in consultation with key stakeholders and the public in general, to develop, modify or create the public policies and legislative frameworks necessary for the full development of the individual and the public good.

682. It was the fervent belief of Barbados that the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms enabled the country to enjoy its diversity of views, talents and abilities, while at the same time recognizing its common humanity.

683. Barbados was committed to ensuring that every Barbadian had a life of dignity and the opportunity to realize his or her potential. Every boy, every girl, every man and every woman must be provided with the requisite opportunities to excel, irrespective of birth, class, race or gender, or if he or she were differently abled.

684. The social policy of the country was predicated on ending poverty and building new national partnerships in which Barbadians worked together to achieve the goals of national and personal prosperity. As Barbados reflected on the process of the third review and looked forward to implementing the recommendations accepted, it intended, in collaboration with willing member States and other likeminded partners, to build an even better future.

685. As it strived to strengthen the observance of human rights, the Government of Barbados was committed to doing so in consultation with the will of the people. Barbados was cognisant that some issues might require broad-based and comprehensive consultation above and beyond what would have been previously obtained. Whatever form such a dialogue would take must be characterized by patience by all participants and an overriding desire to provide an environment in which differences were acknowledged and respected, while the inherent rights of the individual were observed as sacrosanct.

686. The intent going forward was to ensure that the social policy architecture was well integrated and the delivery of social services became even more caring, people-centred and efficient.

687. The social development strategy of Barbados, as demonstrated during the recent review, had addressed several challenges over the years. As the country set out to surmount

remaining obstacles, the social development strategy would be required to meet needs, solve problems and create opportunities for the advancement of Barbadians.

Montenegro

688. The review of Montenegro was held on 22 January 2018 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 Montenegro 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.6/29/MNE/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.6/29/MNE/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.6/29/MNE/3).

689. At its 25th meeting, on 29 June 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Montenegro (see sect. C below).

690. The outcome of the review of Montenegro comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/38/13), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also A/HRC/38/13/Add.1).

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

691. The delegation of Montenegro, led by the Minister for Human and Minority Rights, was honoured to address the Human Rights Council on the adoption of the outcome of the universal periodic review of Montenegro. It recalled that, during the interactive dialogue, Montenegro had reaffirmed its unequivocal commitment to the values of democracy and the principles of human rights. Montenegro had accepted 159 out of the 169 recommendations it had received, and it considered them as an additional incentive to improve human rights in the country.

692. In addition to ensuring the effective implementation of the existing institutional and normative framework, during the next period Montenegro would prioritize the full implementation of the strategies and action plans aimed at the elimination of all forms of discrimination and the promotion of minority rights and freedoms. Montenegro would also continue its work to improve conditions in detention facilities and focus on ensuring the greater protection of the rights of persons deprived of liberty in cases of possible abuse.

693. The delegation emphasized that the efficient implementation of the existing anti-corruption legislative and institutional framework was a strategic priority for Montenegro. In addition to the increased efficiency of the judiciary and the rule of law, Montenegro would pay particular attention to the protection of the rights of vulnerable groups, primarily children, persons with disabilities, older persons and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. Montenegro would also continue to work to improve the situation of national minorities, especially the Roma and Egyptian populations, and to implement the existing strategic and legislative framework to provide a permanent solution for the issue of refugees and displaced and internally displaced persons in Montenegro.

694. Regarding the rights of persons with disabilities, Montenegro would implement priority strategic measures to improve the situation of persons with disabilities in all segments of life, including regarding accessibility, participation, employment, education, and social and health care.

695. Despite the results achieved in improving the system of the protection and promotion of civil and political rights, Montenegro was aware of the existing challenges to the enjoyment of freedom of expression and freedom of the press in the country. Montenegro was working intensively on further improving the normative framework in that regard through amendments to the law on the national public broadcaster and the law on the electronic media. The delegation also noted that additional effort was required to overcome the polarization of the media scene and it emphasized the need to strengthen media self-regulation.

696. The delegation reaffirmed that Montenegro respected the principles of the independence of the media, freedom of expression and objective information for the public and it strongly condemned attacks on journalists and media property. In that regard, the delegation indicated that the work of the competent State authorities to identify the perpetrators of acts of violence against journalists and to prevent impunity had intensified, and it highlighted the fact that the upcoming period would be marked by the introduction of a stricter sanctionatory policy for perpetrators of acts of violence.

697. Regarding the fight against all forms of violence against women and girls, Montenegro was working to improve its multisectoral response, including by implementing further measures aimed at protecting victims and sanctioning perpetrators, such as the establishment of a single database and the improvement of victim support services. In order to fully realize the policy of equal opportunities, Montenegro would continue to implement the third action plan for gender equality, which included measures in the areas of the political and economic empowerment of women, health care, education, the elimination of multiple discrimination and protection against all forms of violence. Activities had been initiated to amend electoral legislation in order to enable 40 per cent women's participation in the legislative power. Lastly, the delegation acknowledged that the fight against trafficking in persons was another area that required additional attention and the strong implementation of the existing national policy.

698. At the international level, Montenegro would continue to support fully the work of OHCHR and to cooperate intensively with the Human Rights Council, the universal periodic review mechanism, special procedures and other mechanisms, with the aim to improve the overall human rights protection and promotion system in Montenegro.

699. To conclude, the delegation thanked all States for their participation in the discussion and it expressed particular appreciation for the engagement of non-governmental organizations and of the Protector of Human Rights and Freedoms in the drafting of both the national report and the addendum.

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

700. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Montenegro, nine delegations made statements.

701. Libya thanked Montenegro for its active participation in the universal periodic review and for its commitment to the protection of human rights. It expressed satisfaction regarding the adoption of a law prohibiting discrimination against persons with disabilities.

702. Nepal appreciated the spirit of constructive engagement shown by Montenegro and it noted the high number of recommendations accepted, including the recommendations made by Nepal to combat discrimination against women and to address domestic violence. It noted the measures taken by Montenegro to strengthen the independence and efficiency of the judiciary, and its efforts to fight corruption and protect the rights of women, children and persons with disabilities. It encouraged Montenegro to continue in its endeavours, including by strengthening the national human rights institution.

703. Pakistan thanked Montenegro for its presentation and commended the State for having accepted the majority of the recommendations received during the review in January 2018 and for its ongoing efforts to strengthen the independence of the judiciary.

704. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the openness shown by Montenegro during its review process, the concrete answers given to the questions received and the State's

acceptance of the majority of the recommendations. It highlighted the new legal framework of Montenegro aimed at combating discrimination, including the criminalization of hate speech, and it encouraged Montenegro to continue to strengthen its social policies, with a particular emphasis on the most vulnerable sectors.

705. Albania thanked Montenegro for its presentation and noted with appreciation the State's continued efforts to promote and protect human rights. Albania was pleased that Montenegro had accepted a high number of recommendations, including the two made by Albania on minority rights and on tackling gender-based violence through education. It commended the Government of Montenegro for having established national plans to counter domestic violence and violence against women and to achieve gender equality in accordance with international norms.

706. China commended Montenegro for its constructive engagement with the universal periodic review and thanked the State for having accepted the recommendations made by China. It welcomed the commitment of Montenegro to the promotion and protection of human rights and it hoped that Montenegro would continue to take measures to better protect the rights of vulnerable groups, such as women, children and persons with disabilities.

707. Egypt welcomed the amendments made by Montenegro to its national legislation in the area of discrimination, the adoption of a national strategy to combat trafficking in persons and the revision of laws to protect children from sexual exploitation. Egypt also noted the reform aimed at strengthening the independence of the judiciary and it invited Montenegro to pursue its positive efforts with a view to combating the exclusion of persons with disabilities and to find a solution to the issue of stateless persons.

708. Honduras expressed its satisfaction that Montenegro had supported its recommendations to protect the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons and to fight against trafficking in persons. It hoped that Montenegro would reconsider its position regarding the ratification of both the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and the Marrakesh Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works for Persons Who Are Blind, Visually Impaired or Otherwise Print Disabled.

709. The Islamic Republic of Iran commended the active participation of Montenegro in the universal periodic review mechanism and its progress in implementing the recommendations received during previous cycles. It urged Montenegro to boost its efforts to, inter alia, ensure the independence of the Judicial Council and develop a disciplinary framework for judges and prosecutors, seriously consider the situation of overcrowding in detention centres, minimize the negative stereotypes and prejudices against persons belonging to the Roma minority, and enhance supervisory mechanisms to monitor police behaviour.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

710. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Montenegro, two other stakeholders made statements.

711. Amnesty International welcomed the acceptance by Montenegro of recommendations to strengthen measures to bring perpetrators of war crimes to justice, including by providing the office of the State prosecutor for war crimes with additional resources and training. However, Amnesty International was concerned about the persistent impunity of those responsible for war crimes and the slow pace of domestic prosecution of such crimes. The few judicial decisions reached so far demonstrated inconsistencies and an erroneous application of international humanitarian law and jurisprudence. In addition, since the previous universal periodic review of Montenegro, over 20 cases of attacks against journalists and media outlets had been documented annually, including assaults, intimidation, threats and damage to property. Journalists who were critical of the Government, as well as human rights defenders and non-governmental organizations, continued to be subjected to smear campaigns. Amnesty International therefore welcomed the acceptance by Montenegro of recommendations to take effective action to safeguard freedom of expression and step up efforts to investigate all reported threats and attacks against journalists.

712. The United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation noted that corruption was a widespread practice in Montenegro despite the efforts to establish effective legal and policy frameworks to combat it. Public procurement contracts in the sectors of construction, trade, agriculture and information technology were frequently considered as rigged, and the weakness of the mechanisms to combat corruption hampered efforts to improve transparency and strengthen the control of public procurement processes. The United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation called upon the international community, civil society and the private sector to implement special procedures of due diligence to counter the threat of corruption in the procurement process and to redouble efforts to establish constructive, fair and impartial governance.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

713. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 169 recommendations received, 159 had enjoyed the support of Montenegro and 10 had been noted.

714. The delegation of Montenegro recognized the importance of the universal periodic review process, which allowed each country to present national achievements and challenges in the field of human rights in a constructive and transparent manner. It concluded by emphasizing that Montenegro was the country that had progressed the most in the region in the integration process with the European Union and that it would continue to be a responsible partner in further promoting the values of the European Union and the United Nations in the western Balkans.

United Arab Emirates

715. The review of the United Arab Emirates was held on 22 January 2018 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 United Arab Emirates 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.6/29/ARE/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.6/29/ARE/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.6/29/ARE/3).

716. At its 25th meeting, on 29 June 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the United Arab Emirates (see sect. C below).

717. The outcome of the review of the United Arab Emirates comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/38/14), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also A/HRC/38/14/Add.1).

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

718. The delegation, led by the Assistant Minister for Human Rights and International Law at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, expressed its gratitude for the constructive comments made by the delegations of States during the review. On many occasions, the United Arab Emirates had stressed the importance of the universal periodic review mechanism for human rights, which allowed member States to exchange experiences and best practices in the field of human rights.

719. The delegation underlined the fact that the United Arab Emirates was continuously working to strengthen its human rights record and to contribute positively to international practices in that regard. That national concern stemmed from the values and cultural heritage of the country, which promoted justice, tolerance and equality. Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms was an essential element of the country's principles, and the United Arab Emirates was proud of the progress made in that regard.

720. The delegation stressed that the standing committee to follow up on the universal periodic review on human rights had studied the recommendations carefully, taking into account national legislation and the international conventions to which the country was a party. A large number of those recommendations had already been implemented on the ground. As for the other recommendations, the United Arab Emirates would implement them within four and a half years.

721. Many of the recommendations noted required further study, and there was a need to prepare the national legal and legislative environment before adopting them to make sure that they were compatible with international standards and conventions and in line with the provisions of Islamic law and national legislation.

722. Most of the recommendations accepted were related to a wide range of thematic issues, fundamental rights and freedoms, and the development of legislation. Those recommendations included the establishment of an independent national human rights commission in accordance with the Paris Principles. A draft law on the establishment of the commission in line with the Paris Principles was currently under consideration. Regarding cooperation with treaty bodies and other United Nations human rights mechanisms, the United Arab Emirates had invited both the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities and the Special Rapporteur on the right to education to visit the United Arab Emirates. The State would subsequently coordinate with the two special rapporteurs on the dates of visits and programmes of action. The country had also submitted the first periodic report to the Committee against Torture.

723. Concerning the thematic recommendations, the United Arab Emirates had continued its vigorous efforts to combat trafficking in persons. In that context, the national committee against trafficking in persons had launched its report in 2017, which included an in-depth article on the efforts made by the State to combat that serious crime, including awareness campaigns, strengthening the role of law enforcement agencies in preventing and investigating the crime, and signing a number of bilateral agreements with States.

724. Several recommendations had also been made in the area of labour rights. In that context, the United Arab Emirates continued its efforts to promote the rights of contract workers in the country. The promulgation of Federal Law No. 10 of 2017 guaranteed workers full rights and provided them with decent working and living conditions.

725. In May 2018, the State had also launched the annual report on labour rights for 2017/18 in conjunction with the celebration of International Workers' Day. The report included the package of policies and programmes adopted by the State in the framework of the promotion of labour rights and the best practices in that regard. The report was rich in figures and statistics that supported the efforts of the State to protect workers' rights.

726. The United Arab Emirates had taken steady steps towards enhancing women's empowerment and gender equality. Women in the United Arab Emirates held the highest political, executive and legislative positions and were in the top leadership positions relating to strategy and decision-making in the armed forces, police, judiciary and diplomatic corps. Women had also made strides in the economic, financial and business sectors and had become key partners in leading sustainable development.

727. Concerning the implementation of the national policy to empower persons with disabilities, which was aimed at building a society free of barriers, the country had adopted a strategy that included areas such as health, education, vocational rehabilitation, employment, social protection, family empowerment, public life, culture, sport and access. The United Arab Emirates had continued its efforts to develop the capabilities of persons with disabilities to facilitate their integration into society, to involve them in the process of building and developing the country, and to guarantee their future of living a decent life with

full rights. The State had also launched a package of programmes and initiatives that served persons with disabilities, including early intervention, quality criteria and a centre to provide technical assistance and advanced means and technologies to enable them to connect with the world of technology and communications.

728. In March 2018, Abu Dhabi had hosted the ninth Special Olympics Games for the Middle East and North Africa Region, with 1,200 players from 32 countries, and it would host in March 2019 the Special Olympics World Games. Those efforts were part of “Vision 2021” of the United Arab Emirates, which supported the integration of persons with disabilities in society.

729. The standing committee would follow up on the universal periodic review report in cooperation with all governmental bodies and relevant civil society organizations to ensure the implementation of the recommendations accepted by the State. The committee would begin to prepare a national plan for the implementation of those recommendations and other recommendations of the treaty bodies. The standing committee would provide a central database containing the measures taken on the recommendations accepted.

730. The United Arab Emirates looked forward to informing the Human Rights Council about the progress made within the framework of the next review of the United Arab Emirates and it reaffirmed the importance of the review and the State’s keenness to strengthen cooperation with the United Nations human rights mechanisms.

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

731. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the United Arab Emirates, 13 delegations made statements.

732. Iraq commended the Government for having accepted a large number of the recommendations, including those made by Iraq to improve legislation and practices in the media sector to promote the right to freedom of expression, and to continue efforts to empower women in social, economic and cultural life.

733. Kuwait commended the measures adopted by the United Arab Emirates to implement universal periodic review recommendations and to improve human rights in various sectors, which had resulted in concrete progress in many human rights fields.

734. Lebanon commended the United Arab Emirates for its promotion and protection of human rights, especially to strengthen the role of women, to counter trafficking and to cooperate with mechanisms relating to OHCHR. Lebanon had made a recommendation to strengthen freedom of expression in line with international standards, and to combat trafficking in persons.

735. Lesotho commended the progress achieved in the promotion of women’s rights, which had led to several women occupying numerous strategic positions. It applauded the initiatives to protect workers’ rights, including migrant workers. It recognized the measures aimed at combating trafficking, including through the amendment of the counter-trafficking law. It appreciated the efforts made by the United Arab Emirates to instill values of tolerance, peace and coexistence in the country, thus having made history through the adoption of the first tolerance charter in the world.

736. Libya commended the adoption of a law to fight all types of discrimination, including on grounds of religion, race and ethnicity. It also commended the adoption in 2017 of the law that gave protection to domestic workers and improved the human rights situation in the country.

737. Pakistan commended the Government of the United Arab Emirates for having accepted the majority of the recommendations made during the review in January 2018. It also welcomed the steps taken by the Government relating to the empowerment of women, in particular regarding their inclusion on the governing boards of all government bodies, institutions and companies.

738. The Philippines commended the efforts that provided victims of trafficking with protection and assistance, as well as the State’s continued implementation of labour and

migration policies responsive to the needs of foreign workers. It supported the United Arab Emirates in its commitment to continuing to work on the promotion and protection of the human rights of its people, in particular women and children.

739. Qatar expressed concern that the United Arab Emirates had not accepted most of the recommendations made by Qatar, and it encouraged the Government to take into account those recommendations, especially those relating to the inhuman and degrading treatment of those detained for political issues. It called upon the Government to end the practice of random and arbitrary detentions and enforced disappearances. It expressed concern about the refusal of the United Arab Emirates to implement two recommendations to end arbitrary detention and solitary confinement.

740. The Russian Federation welcomed the activities of the Government to support and strengthen national human rights institutions and mechanisms, and it noted the State's efforts to reduce the gender gap and to guarantee gender equality.

741. Singapore welcomed the positive response of the United Arab Emirates to the recommendations received during the review, including two recommendations made by Singapore to provide persons with disabilities with better services, and to ensure the effective implementation of the law on child rights, known as Wadeema's Law, and the national strategy for motherhood and childhood.

742. Sri Lanka took note of the progressive efforts of the Government to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, in particular the establishment of the Gender Balance Council in 2015, the national strategy for the empowerment and advancement of Emirati women (2015–2021) and the launching in May 2016 of the programme on innovation in labour market governance. It welcomed the efforts to combat trafficking in persons, especially through partnerships with the private sector. It encouraged the United Arab Emirates to continue to improve measures to protect the rights of foreign migrant workers and to combat trafficking in persons, including victim assistance.

743. The Sudan welcomed the creation of an independent national human rights institution and the creation of an information centre for workers in their countries of origin. It commended the efforts taken to combat trafficking in persons, the adoption in 2015 of the counter-trafficking law and the progress made to improve women's rights.

744. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela commended the implementation of the national strategy for the empowerment and advancement of Emirati women (2015–2021) and the creation of the Gender Balance Council.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

745. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the United Arab Emirates, 10 other stakeholders made statements.

746. The Victorious Youths Movement commended the United Arab Emirates for its commitment to cooperating with the United Nations mechanisms for the promotion of human rights and to implement the commitments made during previous universal periodic review cycles. It encouraged the United Arab Emirates to continue its efforts, in particular to combat trafficking in persons, to promote gender parity in the public and private sectors, to implement "Vision 2021", to strengthen the rights of women and of foreign and domestic workers, to outlaw all forms of discrimination based on religion, race or ethnic origin, as well as incitement to religious hatred.

747. Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale welcomed the measures taken by the country, including the decision adopted by the Council of Ministers in 2014 to impose the participation of women at all levels of the council of administration, public institutions and enterprises; the adoption of a five-year national strategy for the empowerment of women; and steps taken to combat trafficking in persons. However, it expressed concern about the juvenile justice system.

748. Africa culture internationale welcomed the remarkable progress in the protection of human rights, including freedom of expression and of assembly, and the appropriate measures taken to improve the situation of women. It noted that the department to combat

trafficking in persons monitored the labour market and reports of inspection visits and work-related complaints, looking for possible indications of cases of forced labour or trafficking.

749. Amnesty International noted that torture and other ill-treatment remained common in the United Arab Emirates, including through the denial of medical care to detainees. It called upon the Government to prohibit and prevent all forms of torture and other ill-treatment, and to ensure that all allegations of torture or other ill-treatment were promptly and thoroughly investigated and those responsible were held to account. The practice of secret detention must also be prohibited. The United Arab Emirates must urgently ensure that no one was arbitrarily arrested or detained, that individuals were held only on the basis of internationally recognizable offences and were brought promptly before an independent court, and that they must have immediate access to their lawyer and family and to adequate medical care when required. Amnesty International was concerned that the United Arab Emirates had resumed executions in 2017, the first executions since 2015, and it called upon the State to immediately establish an official moratorium on executions, pending the full abolition of the death penalty.

750. Villages unis welcomed the measures taken by the United Arab Emirates to establish numerous units and committees concerning the protection and promotion of human rights, including the juvenile welfare department, the Ministry of the Interior centre for the rehabilitation and employment of persons with disabilities, the office to promote a culture of respect for the law, the federal social assistance department and the Ministry of the Interior federal centre for child protection.

751. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation stressed that, since its last review, the United Arab Emirates had not implemented any of the 17 recommendations relating to civic space, and it regretted that no recommendations pertaining to the full protection of the rights to freedom of expression, association and assembly had been accepted by the Government. It expressed concern that the United Arab Emirates continued to use anti-terror laws to punish human rights defenders. The “UAE94” – a group of political activists, human rights defenders, lawyers, academics, teachers and students – were still serving heavy sentences handed down in 2013 on spurious charges of attempting to overthrow the Government.

752. Human Rights Watch noted that the treatment by the United Arab Emirates of Ahmed Mansoor was a stark reminder that the United Arab Emirates remained committed more to repression than to reform. Just a month before, Ahmed Mansoor, an award-winning Emirati rights defender, had been sentenced to 10 years in prison for charges relating to his activism. Others in the United Arab Emirates who spoke out about human rights abuses were at serious risk of arbitrary detention, imprisonment and torture, and many were serving long prison terms or had felt compelled to leave the country.

753. Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l’homme was deeply concerned by the numerous cases of human rights violations that continued to be carried out by the United Arab Emirates both nationally and internationally. The coalition war led by Saudi Arabia in Yemen had officially entered its fourth year and so far had been met by a deafening silence by the international community. In that environment of total impunity, the United Arab Emirates, as the main ally to that coalition, continued to carry out a devastating air bombardment campaign in Yemen, amounting to war crimes. Indiscriminate airstrike attacks against civilian infrastructure, including medical facilities and schools, were a clear violation of the laws and customs of war.

754. International-Lawyers.org welcomed the efforts made by the United Arab Emirates to balance security concerns with its international human rights obligations. It called upon the State to establish a moratorium on the death penalty as a step towards the complete abolition of that practice and to take concrete measures to protect the right to freedom of expression and to develop specific operational policies to protect children from the risk of sexual harassment and abuse.

755. Association Dunenyo welcomed the efforts seeking to boost the legal arsenal relating to children, women, persons with disabilities and migrant workers.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

756. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 232 recommendations received, 132 had enjoyed the support of the United Arab Emirates and 100 had been noted.

757. The delegation of the United Arab Emirates reaffirmed the importance that the country attached to the universal periodic review and it reiterated the State's attachment to the protection of fundamental rights and freedoms, and particularly the human rights treaties of the United Nations. The delegation denounced the false allegation regarding the role of the United Arab Emirates in Yemen and stressed that the country was rolling out a campaign to encourage the Houthis to accept the peace plan promoted by the Secretary-General.

Israel

758. The review of Israel was held on 23 January 2018 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 Israel 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.6/29/ISR/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.6/29/ISR/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.6/29/ISR/3).

759. At its 26th meeting, on 29 June 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Israel (see sect. C below).

760. The outcome of the review of Israel comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/38/15), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also A/HRC/38/15/Add.1).

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

761. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that Israel had informed him that it would not be present for the adoption of its universal periodic review outcome by the Council. He noted, however, that Israel had presented its position on recommendations in the addendum to the report of the Working Group. In accordance with precedents, the Council would therefore proceed with the consideration and adoption of the outcome of Israel.

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

762. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Israel, eight delegations made statements.

763. The Islamic Republic of Iran stated that, as indicated by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in various reports, the transfer of a population by an occupying power into a territory it occupied was considered a war crime. Based on the institution-building text, the universal periodic review outcome should be implemented through the engagement of the party concerned. However, today, the Human Rights Council had witnessed the repetition of a persistent lack of cooperation with its mechanisms. The continuation of that trend would culminate in the weakening of the reliability, credibility and integrity of the whole universal periodic review process.

764. Libya stated that Israel, the occupying power in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories, was violating the principles of international conventions. Israel should seriously review the outcome of the previous universal periodic review and its report, which had related violations of human rights and of international humanitarian law against the Palestinian people. Libya reiterated its call to the Human Rights Council to put an end to the violations of human rights in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories.

765. Madagascar stated that, given the high number of recommendations accepted by Israel, it invited the Human Rights Council to adopt the report of the Working Group. It wished Israel success in the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

766. Singapore commended Israel for its constructive participation in the universal periodic review process. It welcomed the positive response of Israel to the recommendations made by Singapore on the rights of persons with disabilities and on minority women. It supported the adoption of the report of the Working Group. Singapore wished Israel success in implementing the recommendations accepted and in promoting and protecting the human rights of its people while surmounting its complex security, social and economic challenges.

767. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela regretted the absence of Israel from the adoption of its report, demonstrating the State's complete disregard for the universal periodic review mechanism and repeated non-compliance with United Nations resolutions. It also regretted that Israel had not accepted many recommendations made in strict compliance with international law. It urged Israel to accept those recommendations without delay, including those regarding recognizing the right to self-determination of Palestine, putting an end to the illegal occupation, stopping illegal settlements, respecting the right of Palestinians to have access to their natural resources, ending the illegal detention of Palestinians, putting an end to the extrajudicial executions of Palestinians and complying with the State's international obligations.

768. Botswana welcomed the support by Israel for the recommendations it had made on making a commitment to cooperating with human rights mechanisms through the granting of access to mandate holders and human rights defenders; and on undertaking judicial reforms to ensure equal protection and treatment before the law, and that children were not exposed to arbitrary arrest and detention. It supported the adoption of the universal periodic review outcome of Israel and wished the State success in implementing the recommendations accepted.

769. Honduras expressed satisfaction with the support given by Israel for the recommendation to withdraw its reservations to articles 16 and 7 (b) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. However, it hoped that Israel would reconsider its position regarding the recommendations relating to: ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the Rome Statute, as well as the seven optional protocols to the conventions to which it was a party; issuing a standing invitation to the special procedures; establishing a national human rights institution in compliance with the Paris Principles; and incorporating explicitly the principle of equality and non-discrimination into its Basic Law.

770. Egypt expressed concern about racist practices at various levels, including social, judicial and institutional, affecting especially non-Jewish persons, particularly people of African descent and Arab Israelis. It stressed the importance that the authorities: adopt strict measures to ensure equal rights to all citizens in a manner that was consistent with the principles of citizenship and international human rights and humanitarian law; put an end to settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and dismantle existing settlements; and put an end to all violations of Islamic and Christian holy sites, which were under the de facto control of the Government of Israel.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

771. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Israel, 10 other stakeholders made statements.

772. United Nations Watch welcomed the examination of Israel under the universal periodic review, as it examined every country equally, which was the opposite of what would occur under agenda item 7 of the Human Rights Council. While welcoming improvements, it encouraged further progress to eliminate all forms of discrimination against Israelis of Ethiopian descent with the implementation of agreed upon measures and policies. It welcomed advances in the employment of minorities in the civil service but advocated increasing their numbers at senior and decision-making levels, as well as further improvements in other areas, such as education and infrastructure. It encouraged Israel to reduce gaps between the Arab population and Israeli society, especially for Arab women.

773. The Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, in a joint statement with the Al Mezan Center for Human Rights, noted that, although Israel had accepted a recommendation to ensure that constraints to freedom of movement did not restrict people's basic rights, a man had died while waiting for permission to go to a hospital in the West Bank. The acceptance of a recommendation on the excessive use of force should include full cooperation with the commission of inquiry established to investigate the recent use of deadly force against Palestinians participating in protests. The absence of Israel at the adoption of its universal periodic review outcome and the State's refusal to commit to a number of recommendations demonstrated a lack of political will to abide by its obligations under international law.

774. The World Jewish Congress commended Israel for having accepted in whole or in part 93 of the recommendations received. It stated that Israel shared in the commitment to combating hatred and antisemitism, and it encouraged the State to continue its efforts to combat those scourges and protect the rights of all minorities. It indicated that the diversity of Israeli society also expressed itself in its flourishing lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender community, and it commended Israel for having adopted recommendations relating to safeguarding lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender rights and gender-based equality. It praised the commitment of Israel to enable access to holy places to members of all religions and it encouraged the State to continue to build upon that commitment to ensuring that the rights of people of all religions were protected equally.

775. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, in a joint statement with the Women's Centre for Legal Aid and Counselling, stated that, in light of the impact of the Israeli occupation on Palestinian women, it was concerning that Israel had only noted a recommendation on the adoption of a strategy on the protection of women's rights in Gaza. It referred to a number of concerns and recommendations made by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women in light of the gendered impacts of the Israeli occupation on Palestinian women. Israel, as the occupying power, must implement the recommendations made by the Committee and other human rights bodies relating to the Occupied Palestinian Territory and to comply fully with its international obligations.

776. The International Fellowship of Reconciliation was deeply disturbed that, yet again, in the third cycle, Israel had received no recommendations on conscientious objection to military service, which was a grave human rights violation of Jewish citizens of Israel, particularly those who opposed the militarist policies of the Government. It stressed that Israel regularly imprisoned conscientious objectors for their refusal of military service and that there was no right to apply for alternative service on the ground of conscientious objection. The Israel Defense Forces had the discretion to grant exemptions on grounds of conscience without any civilian oversight. The treatment of conscientious objectors amounted to coercion to change their religion or belief, and the refusal to perform military service led to a lifelong stigma.

777. Al-Haq, in a joint statement with the Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, condemned the refusal by Israel to attend the adoption of its universal periodic review outcome and it noted the State's systematic refusal to engage with United Nations human rights mechanisms. It was troubled by the fact that Israel had not supported the recommendation to invite the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders as soon as possible. Out of 240 recommendations received, nearly two thirds had been noted, most of which were relating to the human rights of Palestinians and the situation in the occupied Palestinian territory. It deplored that the engagement of Israel with the universal periodic review was, once again, disingenuous.

778. The Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture stated that Israel had disregarded the majority of the recommendations of United Nations resolutions and had issued numerous racist laws against Palestinians. A number of those included the forced feeding of prisoners on hunger strike, the destruction of Palestinian homes in breach of the recommendations made by the Committee against Torture, the siege of Gaza, lasting over 12 years, the killing of Palestinians by the army, and the bill to prohibit the taking of photographs of soldiers when they were attacking Palestinians. The Centre called upon the Human Rights Council to demand accountability from Israel for its obstruction and lack of cooperation in implementing resolutions of the United Nations and the Human Rights Council.

779. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation referred to the continuing human rights violations against Palestinians. In its contribution to the summary of stakeholders' information, it had recommended that the authorities stop using excessive and lethal force during protests. It highlighted recent events in the Gaza Strip and the high number of killings and injuries of Palestinians by Israeli forces. It also referred to the detention of Palestinian human rights defenders and the high number of political prisoners. It expressed concern over the legislation enacted in 2017 enabling the authorities to block web content and arrest individuals for social media posts. It urged the Human Rights Council to call upon Israel to respect its international obligations by ending the occupation and recognizing Palestinian self-determination.

780. The Association of World Citizens stated that Israel, the occupying power, had a policy of racial discrimination. With regard to one recommendation, it wondered how to interpret the partial commitment of the country, when Palestinian citizens were being expelled from their homes to induce them to leave their country. It added that Israel continued to impose a strict blockade on Gaza, a zone considered as one of the most densely populated regions in the world, which had resulted in the long-term siege of two million Palestinians. Israel had not supported the majority of the recommendations relating to fundamental rights and freedoms and had only noted those.

781. Human Rights Watch indicated that, since its last review, Israel had further cemented institutionalized discrimination against Palestinians, which applied to virtually every aspect of life. It highlighted the systematic violations during the occupation by Israel of the West Bank and Gaza and inside its border, such as unlawful killings of Palestinian civilians, including children; illegal settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, in contravention of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War; forced displacement; restrictions on movement; and abusive detention. It deplored the refusal of Israel to participate in the adoption of its universal periodic review report, which was the latest example of a history of non-cooperation and illustrated the State's unwillingness to undergo international scrutiny of its human rights record.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

782. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 240 recommendations received, 70 had enjoyed the full support of Israel and 170 had been noted.

783. With all statements having been made, the President proposed that the Human Rights Council adopt the decision on the universal periodic review outcome of Israel.

Liechtenstein

784. The review of Liechtenstein was held on 24 January 2018 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 Liechtenstein 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.6/29/LIE/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.6/29/LIE/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.6/29/LIE/3).

785. At its 26th meeting, on 29 June 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Liechtenstein (see sect. C below).

786. The outcome of the review of Liechtenstein comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/38/16), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also A/HRC/38/16/Add.1).

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

787. The head of the delegation recalled what the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Justice and Culture had emphasized in the presentation of the report of Liechtenstein during the Working Group in January 2018, namely that Liechtenstein highly valued dialogue with international human rights bodies. For Liechtenstein, taking seriously the recommendations made by States and international committees was the result of the prioritization of human rights protection both in international organizations and internally. It was therefore a pleasure for the delegation to be at the Human Rights Council to present to it the response of the Government of Liechtenstein to the recommendations received in January 2018.

788. A total of 59 States had participated in the discussion on the report of Liechtenstein, and had provided 126 recommendations on a variety of areas. In a comprehensive process, the administration of Liechtenstein had carefully considered them in terms of political feasibility and desirability, and had proposed how to react to them. As a result of that process, the Government had decided on 22 May 2018 to accept 84 recommendations, meaning that Liechtenstein was planning to implement two thirds of the recommendations received in January 2018 in the course of the upcoming years. The delegation then highlighted some important areas and the reasons for the decisions of the Government.

789. As far as the ratification of international human rights instruments was concerned, Liechtenstein had not changed its position since the previous review regarding the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, as recommended by several countries. The same applied to accession to ILO, which would represent a precondition for the ratification of specific conventions within the framework of ILO.

790. The Government indicated its intention to ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, which Liechtenstein had signed in 2007. The revision of the Criminal Code that was currently in the decision-making process was expected to include provisions concerning that crime, thereby paving the way for ratification.

791. Regarding the most frequently mentioned convention in the recommendations, namely the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the Government had decided to accept the recommendations suggesting a detailed consideration of its ratification, while it had rejected the recommendations explicitly requiring its ratification. That differentiated approach was to be explained with the plans of the Government to start an open-ended process together with civil society in order to conduct an in-depth analysis of the expected benefits of the ratification. As Liechtenstein naturally shared the aim of the Convention to promote, protect and ensure the full human rights of persons with disabilities, the Government intended to tackle that process favourably but without anticipating its result.

792. Several States that had participated in the debate had recommended that Liechtenstein should develop new action plans or strategies to combat domestic violence or racism, or to promote gender equality. Although the Government fully supported the general aims of those proposals, it had rejected the relevant recommendations in view of the limited resources of

the national administration. Developing strategies represented a major challenge for small administrations. The Equal Opportunities Unit, which was in charge of elaborating such strategies, had recently started its work on a comprehensive integration strategy for migrants, as the Government had identified the integration of foreigners as a priority for the upcoming years. In view of the limited resources referred to, that left no room for developing further strategies at the present point.

793. The delegation emphasized that a multitude of recommendations relating to the equality of women and men in different areas of society, particularly in politics and the economy, were pushing open doors, as the Government was aware of the need for action to advance gender equality. The Government was fully committed to conducting an active policy on gender equality. That commitment was reflected in the national implementation strategy for the Sustainable Development Goals, which prioritized the promotion of gender equality (Goal 5). Measures had been implemented or were planned in order to promote the participation of women in decision-making, including through a media campaign in the run-up to the municipal elections in 2019. Furthermore, governmental working groups were currently focusing on the future of family policy and financing childcare. Additional measures in those areas were expected to have a positive impact on women's participation in both politics and the economy. The priority for the prevention of violence against women and domestic violence had been underlined in the plans of the Government to ratify the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention) before the end of the year, as had also been recommended by some countries.

794. The delegation clarified that the Government had decided not to accept some recommendations concerning gender equality, as they explicitly or implicitly called for a system of gender quotas in political or economic decision-making bodies. The Government had no plans to implement a system of gender quotas as that idea did not enjoy the support necessary either in Parliament or by the population.

795. The delegation referred to the action taken by the Government of Liechtenstein by having issued two mandates concerning the concrete follow-up on two recommendations. First, it had mandated the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Justice and Culture to organize a training event for members of the National Police, prosecutors, lawyers and judges. That training was aimed at informing about and discussing the consequences of revised article 283 of the Criminal Code, concerning the prohibition of discrimination. Second, the Government had mandated the Office for Foreign Affairs to prepare a proposal on how a permanent and efficient implementation procedure for coordinating and following up on the recommendations of international human rights bodies could be established. By considering the creation of such a permanent mechanism, the Government had demonstrated its commitment to improving further the follow-up to the recommendations on the further improvement of human rights in Liechtenstein.

796. Bearing in mind the developments since the previous universal periodic review of Liechtenstein, in 2013, it was clear that the recommendations of the Human Rights Council had already had a considerable impact on internal policy and human rights protection. To give a prominent example, Liechtenstein had established a national human rights institution according to the Paris Principles since its previous review. As an important part of civil society engagement, the dialogue between the State and human rights non-governmental organizations had been strengthened continuously, having resulted in the consideration of civil society positions in the most recent universal periodic review report.

797. The delegation reaffirmed the commitment of Liechtenstein to the Human Rights Council and the universal periodic review. Liechtenstein wholeheartedly supported the aim of the Council to promote universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms globally. The universal periodic review was an important part of that task, and Liechtenstein looked forward to continuing its dialogue with the Council.

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

798. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Liechtenstein, two delegations made statements.

799. Afghanistan commended Liechtenstein for its response to the recommendations received during the previous review. It was encouraged by the fact that most of the recommendations made by States had been accepted by the country. Afghanistan once again urged Liechtenstein to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and to ensure the implementation of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees.

800. Honduras welcomed Liechtenstein and thanked the State for its presentation and for having accepted the recommendations made by Honduras to ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and to review asylum procedures, taking into account a gender perspective in order to adopt specific measures to guarantee an effective response to the specific protection needs of women and girls, who could be victims of trafficking. It encouraged Liechtenstein to reconsider its position on ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, on ratifying the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and on adopting legislative and political measures to establish a legal and institutional framework to combat all forms of discrimination.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

801. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Liechtenstein, one other stakeholder made a statement.

802. Villages unis welcomed the adoption by Liechtenstein of the law on the human rights association, which formed the legal base for the national human rights institution and which had come into force on 1 January 2017, and the adoption by Parliament of the financial contribution to the institution over the coming three years, amounting to US\$ 360,000 per year. It also welcomed the fact that the national human rights institution was being developed independently by civil society, without government involvement. Civil society had adopted the statutes of the association and elected the board of the association for the term 2017–2020, composed of seven competent and well-known persons from Liechtenstein and abroad. The secretariat had been operational since July 2017. Villages unis commended Liechtenstein for having been convinced that the new institution would generate added value and thus would strengthen the high standard of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Liechtenstein. It noted that the creation of the national human rights institution was surely a part of the reform process and its goal was to bundle the competences and resources in the areas of integration and equal opportunity, which had previously been spread among numerous bodies, and to consolidate independent advisory and support tasks within the new human rights institution. It congratulated the Government of Liechtenstein on having adopted the law on the human rights association, which would surely help in the protection and promotion of human rights in Liechtenstein.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

803. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 126 recommendations received, 84 had enjoyed the support of Liechtenstein and 42 had been noted.

804. The delegation concluded by thanking all of the countries and non-governmental organizations that had participated in the discussion and demonstrated their interest in the human rights policy of Liechtenstein. It pledged to take the questions and suggestions back to the capital, where they would be carefully considered. On that occasion, the delegation reaffirmed the full commitment of Liechtenstein to the Human Rights Council and the universal periodic review as a crucial tool for furthering the implementation of human rights globally. The delegation emphasized that, in Liechtenstein, it had proven to be a powerful tool that stimulated debate on human rights issues, and the recommendations of past reviews

had been integrated into existing political processes or had provided impetus for new processes.

Serbia

805. The review of Serbia was held on 24 January 2018 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 Serbia 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.6/29/SRB/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.6/29/SRB/2 and Corr.1);

(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.6/29/SRB/3).

806. At its 26th meeting, on 29 June 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Serbia (see sect. C below).

807. The outcome of the review of Serbia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/38/17), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also A/HRC/38/17/Add.1).

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

808. The delegation of Serbia stated that numerous participants had produced a significant number of assessments and recommendations, and that the Government of Serbia had decided to support 175 out of 190 recommendations, the vast majority. Concerning the recommendations that had not been supported, the delegation stated that those had not been supported either because their implementation would have required changes to the legal framework, which it deemed to be adequate, or because the Government believed that they corresponded to situations that were not real. The delegation reiterated the commitment of the Government to democracy and the rule of law by shedding light on all of the measures taken to implement the recommendations on the ground. The Government's dedication to human rights was further underscored by the establishment of a special operating department, namely the Office for Human and Minority Rights.

809. The cooperation of Serbia with the United Nations mechanisms was greatly beneficial to the promotion and protection of human rights in Serbia, and the State's participation in the third cycle of the universal periodic review was a result of a broad and comprehensive consultation process that had included all relevant institutions at the national level, namely ministries, Parliament, and civil society organizations and other independent human rights organizations.

810. The delegation stressed that the process of implementing the recommendations of the United Nations had been institutionalized and that a special body had been established in that respect – the council for monitoring the implementation of the recommendations of the United Nations human rights mechanisms – in order to improve the process of reporting to the United Nations bodies. That body would be monitoring the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the universal periodic review.

811. That council would continue to cooperate with all relevant institutions in the country within the process of implementation, as well as within the process of implementing the Sustainable Development Goals in the areas relating to human rights.

812. The delegation commended what it defined as the excellent collaboration with OHCHR, the United Nations Office in Belgrade and the mission of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe in Serbia, which had helped in the preparation of the third cycle of the universal periodic review.

813. Lastly, Serbia believed firmly in the United Nations human rights mechanisms and their positive impact on Serbian society, as well as their wider contribution to regional and global peace and stability.

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

814. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Serbia, 12 delegations made statements.

815. Egypt commended the efforts made by Serbia to improve the conditions of human rights, the State's determination to ratify the international instruments to promote and protect human rights, the adoption of a strategic plan to fight against war crimes, and the efforts to promote tolerance and dialogue between cultures and respect and mutual understanding between persons, regardless of cultural, linguistic and religious identities. Egypt further commended the efforts of Serbia to promote gender equality and advance the status of women. It encouraged Serbia to continue its efforts to promote education and economic development for national minorities.

816. Honduras welcomed the acceptance by Serbia of the recommendations made by Honduras relating to: improving measures to eradicate all forms of social stigmatization, discrimination and violence on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity and HIV status; adopting specific measures to prevent and combat discrimination against women and girls with disabilities; redoubling efforts to promote tolerance towards minorities; strengthening measures to prevent and combat trafficking in persons; and adopting a policy to address internal displacement in Serbia. It encouraged Serbia to reconsider its position on ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

817. Iraq welcomed the delegation of Serbia and expressed its gratitude for the acceptance by Serbia of the majority of the recommendations made during the universal periodic review, including recommendations made by Iraq relating to education, domestic violence and asylum procedures. Iraq recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report on Serbia.

818. Libya welcomed the delegation of Serbia and thanked the State for its commitment to promoting and protecting human rights and its acceptance of recommendations. Libya appreciated the commitment of Serbia to implementing the recommendations and the State's intention to ratify international instruments on fighting corruption. Libya considered that to be a reflection of the positive engagement of Serbia with the universal periodic review and the State's determination to improve human rights in the country. Libya recommended the Human Rights Council adopt the report on Serbia.

819. The Russian Federation noted the success achieved by the Government of Serbia in promoting and protecting human rights, and the State's readiness to cooperate with the universal mechanisms for international oversight in the human rights field. It noted with satisfaction that Serbia had adopted the overwhelming majority of the recommendations made, which clearly demonstrated the fact that the country had adopted substantive measures to ensure respect for fundamental rights and freedoms. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report on Serbia.

820. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted the efforts made by Serbia to implement the recommendations accepted in the second cycle of the universal periodic review. It welcomed the creation of a new legal framework to combat all forms of discrimination, especially the amendments to the law to punish the spreading of hate speech and the incitement of racial, religious or national hatred. The Human Rights Council should recognize the efforts made by Serbia to fulfil its human rights obligations, which had been reflected in the State's third review.

821. Afghanistan commended Serbia for its acceptance of the majority of the recommendations during the review. It urged Serbia to finalize the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

822. Albania acknowledged the efforts made by Serbia with regard to democratization, the strengthening of the rule of law and the fulfilment of its international obligations in the field of human rights. It appreciated the continued commitment of the Government of Serbia to prevent and combat violence against women and domestic violence, in addition to the adoption of concrete national action plans to strengthen gender equality. However, Albania regretted that Serbia had only noted the two recommendations it had made, relating to the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, and identifying government officials suspected of taking part in war crimes.

823. Algeria noted that Serbia had ratified several regional legal instruments and amended its national law in accordance with the provisions of international human rights treaties. It welcomed the measures adopted by Serbia in 2016 as part of its national human rights plan, as well as the establishment of the council for monitoring the implementation of the recommendations of the United Nations human rights mechanisms. Lastly, Algeria recognized that Serbia had accepted a large part of recommendations, including its own to strengthen training programmes for State agents in the field of minority rights, and to grant the Protector of Citizens (Ombudsman) the financial resources necessary to fulfil its mandate.

824. Azerbaijan noted with appreciation that Serbia had accepted almost all of the recommendations, including those made by Azerbaijan. It reiterated its appreciation for the firm commitment of Serbia to cooperate with the United Nations human rights mechanisms.

825. China commended the constructive participation of Serbia in the universal periodic review and thanked the State for having accepted recommendations of China. China expressed the hope that the Government of Serbia would continue its efforts to promote sustainable social and economic development so as to meet the requirements for a better life for its people. China also hoped that Serbia would continue to take effective measures to promote gender equality and to better protect the rights of women. Lastly, China welcomed the reaffirmation by Serbia of its commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights and it endorsed the adoption of the outcome of Serbia.

826. Cuba noted that Serbia had accepted most of the recommendations made by States during the review. Implementing the strategy for prevention and protection in the matter of discrimination, and the related action plan, as well as continuing to elaborate measures to ensure gender equality, would contribute to the improved protection of human rights in the country.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

827. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Serbia, six other stakeholders made statements.

828. The Human Rights House Foundation was concerned about the shrinking space for civil society, including allegations of intimidation, attacks and harassment of human rights defenders and journalists who reported on sensitive issues. It declared that, although there were currently no legal barriers to freedom of association, civil society organizations, in particular those with a focus on human rights, were sometimes subject to vilification and smear campaigns in the media. It recommended that Serbia provide a safe and secure environment for journalists and human rights defenders, conduct investigations into all cases of attacks against and harassment and intimidation of them, and bring their perpetrators to justice. It further recommended that Serbia consult with civil society on the implementation of the recommendations from its universal periodic review.

829. Amnesty International welcomed the acceptance by Serbia of recommendations to strengthen the fight against impunity. However, it was concerned that, despite the delayed appointment of the war crimes prosecutor in May 2017, there had been no notable progress in issuing new indictments and there was still a significant backlog of pending cases. It further

expressed concern about the shrinking space for human rights defenders, misogynistic and discriminatory smear campaigns against women human rights defenders and harassment of journalists. It welcomed the support of Serbia for more than 20 recommendations to guarantee freedom of expression of the press, to ensure the protection of journalists and human rights defenders, and to investigate thoroughly all threats and attacks against them.

830. The International Commission of Jurists welcomed the acceptance by Serbia of all of the recommendations to strengthen the rule of law and judicial independence, including by limiting political influence over judicial appointments. However, it expressed regret that constitutional amendments currently under discussion in Serbia ran counter to those recommendations. It stressed that the judiciary and the prosecution service must exercise their functions free from direct or indirect external influences, threats or interference, including from the legislative and executive powers. Lastly, it urged Serbia to implement the recommendations accepted by precluding the involvement of the National Assembly in the appointment and dismissal of judges, court presidents, public prosecutors and deputy public prosecutors.

831. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation welcomed the agreement signed between the office of the prosecutor, the State Secretary of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and journalists and media associations in December 2016 on cooperation and measures to improve the security of journalists. It expressed alarm at reported acts of intimidation, attacks and harassment of human rights defenders and journalists who reported on sensitive issues, such as transitional justice, corruption or government accountability. It was furthermore concerned about the vilification of and smear campaigns against human rights defenders, civil society organizations and independent media outlets, which had undermined their work.

832. Human Rights Watch welcomed the acceptance by Serbia of a number of recommendations relating to pressing human rights challenges in the country, including those on combating discrimination against minorities and women, and accountability for war crimes. However, it regretted that Serbia had rejected a key recommendation to refrain from prosecuting journalists, human rights defenders and others as a way of deterring them from expressing opinions. It noted that Serbia had made considerable progress during the reporting period in developing an institutional framework harmonizing the protection of human rights in national law with the requirements to join the European Union. It expressed its concerns about smear campaigns and personal attacks aimed at journalists and human rights defenders. It urged the Government to pursue its previous pledge to implement a national war crimes strategy and prosecute war criminals.

833. The United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation stated that the migration issue had been used as a pretext by the Government to monopolize the attention of the public and consolidate fears of an “invasion”. It called upon the Government to focus on the real social challenges. Refugees and migrants had been trapped in Serbia and individuals who tried to access the European Union through Hungary and Croatia had been sent back violently to Serbia. According to its findings, in January 2018, as many as 800,000 migrants and refugees had reportedly been living in abandoned buildings where the temperature was often below zero. In May 2018, they had been sent to underresourced centres managed by the Government.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

834. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 190 recommendations received, 175 had enjoyed the support of Serbia and 15 had been noted.

835. In its concluding remarks, the delegation expressed its gratitude to all the delegations for their interest and constructive engagement. It assured the delegations present that their comments and remarks would be seriously considered by the competent national authorities. One of the values of the universal periodic review was that it provided an external perception of the human rights situation in the country.

836. With regard to the recommendations to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, the Government of Serbia had concluded that the rights of migrants in Serbia were equal to the

rights of Serbian citizens. Therefore, the ratification of the Convention would be a symbolic act only; however, the delegation did not exclude the possibility that the Convention could be ratified in the future.

837. Referring to the intervention by Albania regarding the vetting process of officials who had allegedly been involved in war crimes, the delegation stated that the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia had been established for that purpose. To that end, Serbia had concluded its cooperation with the Tribunal and prosecutions had already been conducted for numerous cases. Hence, any further vetting process would be needless.

B. General debate on agenda item 6

838. At its 27th meeting, on 29 June 2018, 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: Bulgaria¹⁵ (on behalf of the European Union), China, Cuba, Georgia, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay¹⁵ (also on behalf of Angola, Australia, the Bahamas, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Georgia, Haiti, Italy, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Seychelles, Slovenia, Sweden, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tunisia and Uruguay), Russian Federation¹⁵ (also on behalf of Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Philippines, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam), Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the League of Arab States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Libya, Malawi, Montenegro, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia (also on behalf of Jamaica, the Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Samoa, Seychelles, the Sudan and Tonga);

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA);

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ABC Tamil Oli, Alliance Creative Community Project, Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists (also on behalf of France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, International Educational Development, the International Fellowship of Reconciliation and the World Peace Council), Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association culturelle des Tamouls en France, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association of World Citizens, Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Association Thendral, Centrul de Resurse Juridice, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Federation, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, Institut international pour les droits et le développement, International Commission of Jurists, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International-Lawyers.org, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Iraqi Development Organization, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Ma'arij Foundation for Peace and Development, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Tamil Uzhagam, United Nations Watch, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, UPR Info, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Muslim Congress.

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

839. At the same meeting, the representative of Djibouti made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

France

840. At its 22nd meeting, on 28 June 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 38/101 on the outcome of the review of France.

Tonga

841. At its 23rd meeting, on 28 June 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 38/102 on the outcome of the review of Tonga.

Romania

842. At its 23rd meeting, on 28 June 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 38/103 on the outcome of the review of Romania.

Mali

843. At its 23rd meeting, on 28 June 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 38/104 on the outcome of the review of Mali.

Botswana

844. At its 24th meeting, on 28 June 2018, the Human Right Council adopted, without a vote, decision 38/105 on the outcome of the review of Botswana.

Bahamas

845. At its 24th meeting, on 28 June 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 38/106 on the outcome of the review of the Bahamas.

Burundi

846. At its 24th meeting, on 28 June 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 38/107 on the outcome of the review of Burundi.

Luxembourg

847. At its 25th meeting, on 29 June 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 38/108 on the outcome of the review of Luxembourg.

Barbados

848. At its 25th meeting, on 29 June 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 38/109 on the outcome of the review of Barbados.

Montenegro

849. At its 25th meeting, on 29 June 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 38/110 on the outcome of the review of Montenegro.

United Arab Emirates

850. At its 25th meeting, on 29 June 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 38/111 on the outcome of the review of the United Arab Emirates.

Israel

851. At its 26th meeting, on 29 June 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 38/112 on the outcome of the review of Israel.

Liechtenstein

852. At its 26th meeting, on 29 June 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 38/113 on the outcome of the review of Liechtenstein.

Serbia

853. At its 26th meeting, on 29 June 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 38/114 on the outcome of the review of Serbia.

VII. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories

General debate on agenda item 7

854. At the 28th meeting, on 2 July 2018, the representatives of the State of Palestine and the Syrian Arab Republic made statements as the States concerned.

855. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 7, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of)¹⁵ (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe), Brazil, Chile, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Kuwait¹⁵ (on behalf of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf), Nigeria, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, United Arab Emirates (also on behalf of the League of Arab States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Namibia, Oman, Russian Federation, Sudan, Turkey, Yemen, Zimbabwe;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al Mezan Center for Human Rights, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association of World Citizens, Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies (also on behalf of Al-Haq), Centre Europe-tiers monde (also on behalf of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers), Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Defence for Children International, European Union of Jewish Students, Human Rights Now, Human Rights Watch, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", Institute for NGO Research, Institut international pour les droits et le développement, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (also on behalf of the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies), International-Lawyers.org, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Palestinian Return Centre, Servas International, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, World Jewish Congress.

VIII. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

General debate on agenda item 8

856. At its 28th and 29th meetings, on 2 July 2018, 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: Australia, Austria¹⁵ (on behalf of the European Union), China (also on behalf of the Russian Federation, South Sudan and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Iraq, Mexico (also on behalf of Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay), Netherlands¹⁵ (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), South Africa, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Bahrain, Greece, Iceland (also on behalf of Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden), India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Libya, Mozambique, Namibia, United Republic of Tanzania;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ABC Tamil Oli, Action Canada for Population and Development, Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Action of Human Movement, Africa culture internationale, Alliance Creative Community Project, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association culturelle des Tamouls en France, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights, Association of World Citizens, Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Association Thendral, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, "Coup de pousse" Chaîne de l'espoir Nord-Sud, European Humanist Federation, European Union of Jewish Students, Global Welfare Association, Indian Council of South America, Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, Institute for NGO Research, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Service for Human Rights, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Iraqi Development Organization, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Ma'arij Foundation for Peace and Development, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Nouveaux droits de l'homme, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Prahar, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Society for Development and Community Empowerment, Tamil Uzhagam, United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Victorious Youths Movement, World Barua Organization, World Muslim Congress.

857. At the 29th meeting, the representatives of Iraq and Pakistan made statements 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 a special procedure mandate holder

Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

858. At the 29th meeting, on 2 July 2018, the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, E. Tendayi Achiume, presented her reports (A/HRC/38/52 and A/HRC/38/53).

859. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 29th and 30th 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: Belgium, Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Hungary¹⁶ (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czechia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Iraq, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Argentina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Colombia, Costa Rica, Djibouti, France, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Russian Federation, State of Palestine;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UN-Women;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Haq, European Union of Jewish Students, Human Rights Law Centre, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Minority Rights Group, Palestinian Return Centre, World Jewish Congress.

860. At the 29th and 30th meetings, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

B. General debate on agenda item 9

861. At its 30th meeting, on 2 July 2018, and at its 31st meeting, on 3 July, 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: Austria¹⁶ (on behalf of the European Union), Brazil (also on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala and Mexico), China, Cuba, Egypt, Mexico, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, South Africa, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Ukraine, United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Greece, India, Libya, Sudan, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey;

¹⁶ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ABC Tamil Oli, Action of Human Movement, Alliance Creative Community Project, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association culturelle des Tamouls en France, Association d'entraide médicale Guinée, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights, Association of World Citizens, Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Association Thendral, Center for Organisation Research and Education, China Association for Preservation and Development of Tibetan Culture, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Conselho Indigenista Missionário, European Humanist Federation, European Union of Jewish Students, Global Welfare Association, Health and Environment Program, Human Rights Law Centre, Indian Council of South America, Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, Institute for NGO Research, International Educational Development, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International-Lawyers.org, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Iraqi Development Organization, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Nouveaux droits de l'homme, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Prahar, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Servas International, Shivi Development Society, Society for Development and Community Empowerment, Solidarité Suisse-Guinée, Tamil Uzhagam, Palestinian Return Centre, United Nations Watch, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

862. At the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Brazil made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

863. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia and Azerbaijan made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

The incompatibility between democracy and racism

864. At the 40th meeting, on 6 July 2018, the representative of Brazil, also on behalf of Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.11, sponsored by Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, and co-sponsored by Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Cyprus, Ecuador, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Madagascar, Mexico, Montenegro, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Portugal, San Marino, Slovenia, Spain, Tunisia and Turkey. Subsequently, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mozambique, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Panama, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste and Zambia joined the sponsors.

865. At the same meeting, the representatives of Panama and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments on the draft resolution.

866. 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.

867. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 38/19).

868. At the same meeting, the representative of Australia made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote and general comments in relation to all of the draft proposals adopted under agenda item 9.

X. Technical assistance and capacity-building

A. Annual thematic discussion on technical cooperation in the promotion and protection of human rights

869. At the 33rd meeting, on 4 July 2018, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 36/28, an annual thematic panel discussion on technical cooperation in the promotion and protection of human rights. The meeting focused on the theme “Human rights and the Sustainable Development Goals: enhancing human rights technical cooperation and capacity-building to contribute to the effective and inclusive implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”. The report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (A/HRC/38/28), mandated by the same resolution, served as a basis for this panel discussion.

870. The Director of the Field Operations and Technical Cooperation Division of OHCHR made an opening statement. The Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Thailand to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Sek Wannamethee, moderated the discussion.

871. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: member of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, Nahla Haidar; United Nations Resident Coordinator in Nepal; Director of Strategy and Development and Focal Point for the Sustainable Development Goals at the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, Mary Wanyonyi.

872. The ensuing panel discussion was divided into two slots, which were held at the same meeting. During the first speaking slot, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Brazil (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries), Brazil (also on behalf of Argentina, Guatemala, Mexico and Peru), Denmark¹⁶ (also on behalf of Azerbaijan, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Ecuador, Fiji, Luxembourg, Portugal, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Thailand and Uruguay), Morocco¹⁶ (on behalf of the French-speaking States members and observers), Netherlands¹⁶ (also on behalf of the European Union, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Czechia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Hungary, Italy, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay), Portugal¹⁶ (also on behalf of Angola, the Bahamas, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Georgia, Haiti, Italy, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, Seychelles, Slovenia, Sweden, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tunisia and Uruguay), Singapore (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations), Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Turkey (also on behalf of Australia, Indonesia, Mexico and the Republic of Korea);

(b) Representative of an observer State: Myanmar;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: European Union, International Organization of la Francophonie;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of the Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights).

873. At the end of the first speaking slot, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

874. During the second speaking slot, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Pakistan, Senegal, United Arab Emirates;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Botswana, Chad, Costa Rica, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Sri Lanka;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UNDP;

(d) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: European Union, International Organization of la Francophonie;

(e) Observer for national human rights institutions: Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Association of World Citizens, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation.

875. Also at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

B. Enhanced interactive dialogue on the report of the High Commissioner on the situation in the Kasai region of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the oral update

876. At the 31st meeting, on 3 July 2018, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 35/33 and 36/30, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights presented his report on the situation in Kasai (A/HRC/38/31) and provided an oral update on the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

877. At the same meeting, the following made statements: acting Head of the United Nations Joint Human Rights Office in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; team leader of the team of international experts on the situation in the Kasai region, Bacre Waly Ndiaye; members of the team of international experts on the situation in the Kasai region, Luc Côté and Fatimata M'baye; Minister for Human Rights of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Marie-Ange Mushobekwa.

878. During the ensuing enhanced interactive dialogue, at the 31st and 32nd meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola, Australia, Belgium, China, Egypt, Spain, Switzerland, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Botswana, Czechia, Eritrea, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Sudan;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Amnesty International, Association Dunenyo, Franciscans International, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Federation of ACAT, International Service for Human Rights, World Evangelical Alliance.

879. At the 32nd meeting, the High Commissioner and participants of the enhanced interactive dialogue answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

C. Interactive dialogue on the report of the High Commissioner on the development of a national plan of action to implement recommendations of human rights mechanisms in Haiti

880. At the 31st meeting, on 3 July 2018, the High Commissioner presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council President's statement 34/1, his report on the development of a national plan of action to implement recommendations of human rights mechanisms in Haiti (A/HRC/38/30).

881. At the same meeting, the representative of Haiti made a statement as the State concerned.

882. Also at the same meeting, the national human rights institution Office for the Protection of Citizens (Haiti) made a statement.

883. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the High Commissioner questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Brazil, Cuba, France¹⁶ (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay), Mexico, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representative of an observer State: Canada;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Association of World Citizens, Franciscans International, International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme.

884. At the same meeting, the High Commissioner answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

D. Interactive dialogue on the oral presentation by the High Commissioner on Ukraine

885. At the 32nd meeting, on 3 July 2018, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 35/31, an oral update of the High Commissioner on the situation of human rights in Ukraine.

886. At the same meeting, the representative of Ukraine made a statement as the State concerned.

887. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Deputy High Commissioner questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Belgium, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Austria, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Human Rights House Foundation, Minority Rights Group, United Nations Watch, World Federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations.

888. Also at the same meeting, the Deputy High Commissioner answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

E. Interactive dialogue on the oral update by the High Commissioner on the human rights situation of Rohingya people

889. At the 34th meeting, on 4 July 2018, the High Commissioner presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-27/1, adopted during its 27th special session, an oral update on the human rights situation of Rohingya people.

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

891. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the High Commissioner questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Croatia, Egypt, Iraq, Japan, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Netherlands, Sweden, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, Human Rights Now, Human Rights Watch, International Commission of Jurists, Ma'arj Foundation for Peace and Development, Minority Rights Group.

892. Also at the same meeting, the High Commissioner answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

F. Interactive dialogue with a special procedure mandate holder

Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic

893. At the 33rd meeting, on 4 July 2018, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, Marie-Therese Keita Bocoum, provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 36/25, an oral update on her report on technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights in the Central African Republic.

894. At the same meeting, the representative of the Central African Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

895. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 33rd and 34th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Senegal, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Botswana, France, Gabon, Netherlands, New Zealand, Sudan;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Catholic International Education Office, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, Espace Afrique International, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Federation of ACAT, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, World Evangelical Alliance (also on behalf of Caritas Internationalis).

896. At the 34th meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

G. General debate on agenda item 10

897. At the 34th meeting, on 4 July 2018, the Deputy High Commissioner provided an oral update of the High Commissioner on cooperation with Georgia, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 37/40, and an oral update on the mission by OHCHR to improve the human rights situation and accountability in Burundi under agenda item 2.

898. At the same meeting, the representatives of Burundi and Georgia made statements as the States concerned.

899. At its 35th and 36th meetings, on 5 July 2018, 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: Australia, Austria¹⁶ (on behalf of the European Union), Brazil (also on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala and Peru), China, Cuba, Egypt, Egypt (also on behalf of Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Malaysia, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe), Hungary, Japan, Maldives¹⁶ (also on behalf of Australia, Azerbaijan, Canada, Chile, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Germany, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Poland, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Tonga, Turkey, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Nepal, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Peru (also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), South Africa (also on behalf of Algeria, Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Cuba, Ecuador, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Timor-Leste, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe), Spain, Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Ukraine, United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Estonia, Finland, France, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Latvia, Libya, Lithuania, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mauritius (also on behalf of Jamaica, the Marshall Islands, Samoa, Seychelles, the Sudan, Tonga and Zambia), Poland, Republic of Moldova, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UNICEF;

(d) Observer for national human rights institutions: Network of African National Human Rights Institutions;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ABC Tamil Oli, Al-Ayn Social Care Foundation, Alliance Creative Community Project, Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development (also on behalf of the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Conectas Direitos Humanos, the Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Watch, the International Commission of Jurists, the International Humanist and Ethical Union and the International Service for Human Rights), Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association of World Citizens, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Association Thendral, Center for Organisation Research and

Education, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Health and Environment Program, Human Rights Watch (also on behalf of Franciscans International, the International Commission of Jurists and the International Service for Human Rights), Human Security Initiative Organization, International-Lawyers.org, International Lesbian and Gay Association, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Conectas Direitos Humanos, the Human Rights House Foundation, the International Commission of Jurists, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, the International Lesbian and Gay Association and Peace Brigades International Switzerland), Iraqi Development Organization, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Solidarité Suisse-Guinée, Tamil Uzhagam, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace, World Barua Organization.

900. At the 36th meeting, the representatives of Cambodia, Morocco, Peru, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

H. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Technical assistance to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and accountability concerning the events in the Kasai region

901. At the 40th meeting, on 6 July 2018, the representative of Togo, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.8, sponsored by Togo, on behalf of the Group of African States. Subsequently, Belgium, Canada, Indonesia and the Netherlands joined the sponsors.

902. At the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that the draft resolution had been orally revised.

903. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Egypt and Slovakia (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.

904. At the same meeting, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo made a statement as the State concerned.

905. 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 Programme Support and Management Services of OHCHR made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

906. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 38/20).

Technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights in Haiti

907. Draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.21 was sponsored by Haiti and co-sponsored by Belgium, Brazil, France, Germany, Honduras, Italy, Paraguay, Spain and Turkey. Subsequently, France withdrew its original co-sponsorship of the draft resolution. Subsequently, Australia, Benin, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Morocco, Portugal and the Republic of Korea joined the sponsors.

908. As notified to the secretariat, the draft resolution was withdrawn by its sponsor on 6 July 2018, prior to its consideration by the Human Rights Council.

Annex I

Attendance

Members

Afghanistan	Georgia	Senegal
Angola	Germany	Slovakia
Australia	Hungary	Slovenia
Belgium	Iraq	South Africa
Brazil	Japan	Spain
Burundi	Kenya	Switzerland
Chile	Kyrgyzstan	Togo
China	Mexico	Tunisia
Côte d'Ivoire	Nepal	Ukraine
Croatia	Nigeria	United Arab Emirates
Cuba	Pakistan	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Philippines	United States of America
Ecuador	Qatar	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Egypt	Republic of Korea	
Ethiopia	Rwanda	
	Saudi Arabia	

States Members of the United Nations represented by observers

Albania	Greece	Myanmar
Algeria	Haiti	Namibia
Andorra	Honduras	Netherlands
Argentina	Iceland	New Zealand
Armenia	India	Nicaragua
Austria	Indonesia	Norway
Azerbaijan	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Oman
Bahamas	Ireland	Paraguay
Bahrain	Israel	Poland
Bangladesh	Italy	Portugal
Belarus	Jamaica	Republic of Moldova
Benin	Jordan	Romania
Bhutan	Kuwait	Russian Federation
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Samoa
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Latvia	Serbia
Botswana	Lebanon	Seychelles
Bulgaria	Lesotho	Sierra Leone
Burkina Faso	Libya	Singapore
Canada	Liechtenstein	Sudan
Central African Republic	Lithuania	Sweden
Chad	Luxembourg	Syrian Arab Republic
Colombia	Madagascar	Thailand
Congo	Malawi	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Costa Rica	Malaysia	Tonga
Czechia	Maldives	Trinidad and Tobago
Denmark	Mali	Turkey
Djibouti	Malta	Turkmenistan
El Salvador	Marshall Islands	Uganda
Eritrea	Mauritania	United Republic of Tanzania
Estonia	Mauritius	Uruguay
Fiji	Monaco	Viet Nam
Finland	Montenegro	Yemen
France	Morocco	Zambia
Gabon	Mozambique	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
United Nations Educational, Scientific
and Cultural Organization

United Nations Entity for Gender
Equality and the Empowerment of
Women
United Nations Institute for Training and
Research

Specialized agencies and related organizations

International Organization for Migration
International Telecommunication Union
International Trade Centre

World Health Organization

Intergovernmental organizations

Commonwealth
Cooperation Council for the Arab States of
the Gulf
Council of Europe
European Union
International Development Law
Organization

International Organization of la
Francophonie
Inter-Parliamentary Union
Organization of Islamic Cooperation
University for Peace

Other entities

International Committee of the Red
Cross

Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of St.
John of Jerusalem, of Rhodes and of
Malta

National human rights institutions, international coordinating committees and regional groups of national institutions

Australian Human Rights Commission
Commissioner for Human Rights (Poland)
Equality and Human Rights Commission
(England, Scotland and Wales)
National Consultative Commission on
Human Rights (France)
National Human Rights Commission
(Mexico)
National Human Rights Commission
(Nepal)
National Human Rights Commission
(Nigeria)

National Human Rights Committee (Qatar)
National Human Rights Council (Morocco)
Northern Ireland Human Rights
Commission
Office for the Protection of Citizens (Haiti)
Office of the Human Rights Advocate
(El Salvador)
Office of the Human Rights Advocate
(Nicaragua)
Scottish Human Rights Commission

Non-governmental organizations

ABC Tamil Oli
ACT Alliance – Action by Churches
Together

ActionAid
Action Canada for Population and
Development

Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs	Association of World Citizens
Action of Human Movement	Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi
Action on Smoking and Health	Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique
Africa culture internationale	Association Thendral
African Commission of Health and Human Right Promoters	Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII
African Development Association	Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights
African Regional Agricultural Credit Association	Baha'i International Community
Agir ensemble pour les droits de l'homme	Barinu Institute for Economic Development
Al-Ayn Social Care Foundation	Beijing Children's Legal Aid and Research Center
Al-Hakim Foundation	Bischöfliches Hilfswerk Misereor
Al-Haq	B'nai B'rith
Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement	British Humanist Association
Al-Khoei Foundation	Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies
Alliance Creative Community Project	Caritas Internationalis
Alliance Defending Freedom	Catholic International Education Office
Alliance globale contre les mutilations génitales féminines	Center for Global Nonkilling
Allied Rainbow Communities International	Center for Justice and International Law
Al Mezan Center for Human Rights	Center for Inquiry
Alsalam Foundation	Center for International Environmental Law
Alulbayt Foundation	Center for International Human Rights
Al Zubair Charity Foundation	Center for Reproductive Rights
American Association of Jurists	Centre d'action pour le développement rural
American Civil Liberties Union	Centre Europe-tiers monde
Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain	Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy
Amnesty International	Center for Organisation Research and Education
Anglican Consultative Council	Centre pour les droits civils et politiques
Article 19: International Centre against Censorship	Centro de Derechos Humanos Miguel Agustín Pro Juárez
Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum	Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales
Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development	Centrul de Resurse Juridice
Asian Legal Resource Centre	China Association for Preservation and Development of Tibetan Culture
Asistencia Legal por los Derechos Humanos	China Society for Human Rights Studies
Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul	Christian Aid
Association culturelle des Tamouls en France	Christian Solidarity Worldwide
Association d'entraide médicale Guinée	CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation
Association des étudiants tamouls de France	Colombian Commission of Jurists
Association Dunenyio	Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos
Association for Progressive Communications	Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches
Association for the Prevention of Torture	Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative
Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights	Conectas Direitos Humanos
Association for Women's Rights in Development	Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle
Association mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit	Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme
Association nationale de promotion et de protection des droits de l'homme	Conselho Indigenista Missionário
Association of the Egyptian Female Lawyers	Coordination des associations et des particuliers pour la liberté de conscience
	"Coup de pousse" Chaîne de l'espoir Nord-Sud

Defence for Children International
 Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers
 DRCNet Foundation
 East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project
 Eastern Sudan Women Development Organization
 Ensemble contre la peine de mort
 Equality Now
 Equal Rights Trust
 Espace Afrique International
 European Centre for Law and Justice
 European Humanist Federation
 European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Association
 European Union of Jewish Students
 Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland
 FIAN International
 First Modern Agro. Tools – Common Initiative Group
 Fondation Cordoue de Genève
 Fondation d’Auteuil
 Fondation pour l’étude des relations internationales et du développement
 Foundation ECPAT International
 Foundation for Human Rights and Freedoms and Humanitarian Relief
 France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand
 Franciscans International
 Freedom House
 Front Line: International Foundation for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders
 Fundación Vida – Grupo Ecológico Verde
 Fundación Latinoamericana por los Derechos Humanos y el Desarrollo Social
 Geneva Institute for Human Rights
 Genève pour les droits de l’homme: formation internationale
 Geo Expertise Association
 Global Action on Aging
 Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions
 Global Helping to Advance Women and Children
 Global Hope Network International
 Global Institute for Water, Environment and Health
 Global Welfare Association
 Graduate Women International
 Greenpeace International
 Health and Environment Program
 Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights
 Henry Dunant Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue
 Himalayan Research and Cultural Foundation
 Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries
 Human Rights House Foundation
 Human Rights Information and Documentation Systems International
 Human Rights Law Centre
 Human Rights Now
 Human Rights Watch
 Human Security Initiative Organization
 Il Cenacolo
 Indian Council of South America
 Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”
 Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee
 Initiatives of Change International
 Institut international pour les droits et le développement
 Institute for NGO Research
 Institute for Planetary Synthesis
 Institute for Policy Studies
 International Association of Democratic Lawyers
 International Bar Association
 International Bridges to Justice
 International Buddhist Relief Organisation
 International Career Support Association
 International Catholic Child Bureau
 International Commission of Jurists
 International Council of Jewish Women
 International Council of Russian Compatriots
 International Council of Women
 International Detention Coalition
 International Educational Development
 International Federation for Human Rights Leagues
 International Federation for the Protection of the Rights of Ethnic, Religious, Linguistic and Other Minorities
 International Federation of ACAT
 International Federation of Anti-Leprosy Associations
 International Federation of Journalists
 International Fellowship of Reconciliation
 International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission
 International Humanist and Ethical Union
 International Human Rights Association of American Minorities
 International-Lawyers.org
 International Lesbian and Gay Association
 International Longevity Center Global Alliance
 International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism
 International Movement ATD Fourth World
 International Network for the Prevention of Elder Abuse
 International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination

International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education	Réseau international des droits humains
International PEN	Roads of Success
International Planned Parenthood Federation	Russian Peace Foundation
International Police Executive Symposium	Rutgers
International Service for Human Rights	Save the Children International
International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development	Servas International
International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations	Settlement Services International
Iraqi Development Organization	Shivi Development Society
Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco	Sikh Human Rights Group
IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association	Society for Development and Community Empowerment
Iuventum	Society for Threatened Peoples
Jssor Youth Organization	Soka Gakkai International
Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture	Solidarité Suisse-Guinée
Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada	Sonke Gender Justice Network
Le pont	Stichting International Center for Ethnobotanical Education, Research and Service
Liberation	Swedish Association for Sexuality Education
Lutheran World Federation	Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights
Ma'arij Foundation for Peace and Development	Syrian Center for Media and Freedom of Expression
Maat Foundation for Peace, Development and Human Rights	Tamil Uzhagam
Maher	Tandem Project
Make Mothers Matter	Terre des hommes fédération internationale
Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association	The Law Society
Minority Rights Group	Tourner la page
Network of African National Human Rights Institutions	Union of Arab Jurists
Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational and Transparty	United Nations Watch
Norwegian Refugee Council	United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation
Nouveaux droits de l'homme	Universal Peace Federation
Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie	Universal Rights Group
Open Society Institute	UPR Info
Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés	Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik
Organisation marocaine des droits humains	Victorious Youths Movement
Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale	Villages unis
Organization for Defending Victims of Violence	VIVAT International
Palestinian Center for Development and Media Freedoms "MADA"	Women's Federation for World Peace International
Palestinian Return Centre	Women's Human Rights International Association
Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation	Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
Plan International	World Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations
Planetary Association for Clean Energy	World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace
Prahar	World Barua Organization
Presse emblème campagne	World Council of Arameans (Syriacs)
Refugee Council of Australia	World Environment and Resources Council
Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme	World Evangelical Alliance
Reporters sans frontières international	World Federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations
	World Jewish Congress
	World Medical Association
	World Muslim Congress
	World Organization against Torture

World Young Women's Christian
Association
Youth Coalition for Sexual and
Reproductive Rights

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

Documents issued for the thirty-eighth session

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/38/1	1	Agenda and annotations
A/HRC/38/1/Corr.1	1	Corrigendum
A/HRC/38/2	1	Report of the Human Rights Council on its thirty- eighth session
A/HRC/38/3– E/CN.6/2018/9	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: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/38/4	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: France
A/HRC/38/4/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/38/5	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Tonga
A/HRC/38/5/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/38/6	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Romania
A/HRC/38/6/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/38/7	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Mali
A/HRC/38/7/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/38/8	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Botswana
A/HRC/38/8/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/38/9	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Bahamas
A/HRC/38/9/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/38/10	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Burundi
A/HRC/38/10/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/38/11	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Luxembourg
A/HRC/38/11/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/38/12	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Barbados
A/HRC/38/12/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/38/13	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Montenegro
A/HRC/38/13/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/38/14	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: United Arab Emirates
A/HRC/38/14/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/38/15	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Israel
A/HRC/38/15/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/38/16	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Liechtenstein
A/HRC/38/16/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/38/17	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Serbia
A/HRC/38/17/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/38/18	2, 3	Procedures and practices in respect of civil society engagement with international and regional organizations: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/38/19	2, 3	Summary of the high-level panel discussion dedicated to the seventieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/38/20	2, 3	Improving accountability and access to remedy for victims of business-related human rights abuse through State-based non-judicial mechanisms: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/38/20/Add.1	2, 3	Improving accountability and access to remedy for victims of business-related human rights abuse through State-based non-judicial mechanisms: explanatory notes to final report: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/38/20/Add.2	2, 3	Improving accountability and access to remedy for victims of business-related human rights abuse: the relevance of human rights due diligence to determinations of corporate liability: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/38/21	2, 3	Addressing human rights protection gaps in the context of migration and displacement of persons across international borders resulting from the adverse effects of climate change and supporting the adaptation and mitigation plans of developing countries to bridge the protection gaps: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/38/22	2, 3	Summary of the intersessional panel discussion on the role of local government in the promotion and protection of human rights: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/38/23	2, 3	Summary report on the annual half-day panel discussion on the rights of indigenous peoples: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/38/24	2, 3	Review of promising practices and lessons learned, existing strategies and United Nations and other initiatives to engage men and boys in promoting and achieving gender

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		equality, in the context of eliminating violence against women: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/38/24/Corr.1	2, 3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/38/25	2, 5	Contribution of parliaments to the work of the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/38/26	2, 6	Operations of the Voluntary Trust Fund for Participation in the Universal Periodic Review: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/38/27	2, 6	Operations of the Voluntary Fund for Financial and Technical Assistance in the Implementation of the Universal Periodic Review: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/38/28	2, 10	Supporting effective and inclusive implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development through effective, coherent and coordinated technical cooperation and capacity-building: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/38/29	2, 4	Summary report on the high-level panel discussion on violations of the human rights of children in the Syrian Arab Republic: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/38/30	2, 10	Development of a national action plan to implement recommendations of human rights mechanisms in Haiti: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/38/31	4	Situation in Kasai: report of the team of international experts on the situation in Kasai
A/HRC/38/32	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to education on governance and the right to education
A/HRC/38/32/Add.1	3	Mission to Côte d'Ivoire
A/HRC/38/33	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights
A/HRC/38/33/Add.1	3	Mission to the United States of America
A/HRC/38/33/Add.2	3	Mission to Ghana
A/HRC/38/33/Add.4	3	Mission to Ghana: comments by the State

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/38/34	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association
A/HRC/38/35	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression
A/HRC/38/35/Add.1		Overview of submission received in preparation of the Report of the Special Rapporteur (A/HRC/38/35)
A/HRC/38/35/Add.1/Corr.1	3	WITHDRAWN - Corrigendum
A/HRC/38/35/Add.1/Corr.2	3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/38/35/Add.2	3	Mission to Mexico
A/HRC/38/35/Add.3	3	Mission to Liberia
A/HRC/38/35/Add.4	3	Mission to Mexico: comments by the State
A/HRC/38/35/Add.5	3	Encryption and Anonymity follow-up report: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/38/36	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health
A/HRC/38/36/Add.1	3	Mission to Indonesia
A/HRC/38/36/Add.2	3	Mission to Armenia
A/HRC/38/37	2, 3	Contributions of the right to health framework to the effective implementation and achievement of the health-related Sustainable Development Goals: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/38/38	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers
A/HRC/38/38/Add.1	3	Mission to Poland
A/HRC/38/38/Add.2	3	Mission to Poland: comments by the State
A/HRC/38/39	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons
A/HRC/38/39/Add.1	3	Mission to El Salvador
A/HRC/38/39/Add.2	3	Mission to Libya
A/HRC/38/39/Add.3	3	Mission to Niger
A/HRC/38/39/Add.4	3	Mission to El Salvador: comments by the State
A/HRC/38/40	3	Report of the Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity
A/HRC/38/40/Add.1	3	Mission to Cuba

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/38/41	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants
A/HRC/38/41/Add.1	3	Mission to Nepal
A/HRC/38/42	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the elimination of discrimination against persons affected by leprosy and their family members
A/HRC/38/43	3	Report of the Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity
A/HRC/38/43/Add.1	3	Mission to Argentina
A/HRC/38/43/Add.2	3	Mission to Argentina: comments by the State
A/HRC/38/44	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions on armed non-State actors: the protection of the right to life
A/HRC/38/44/Add.1	3	Mission to Iraq
A/HRC/38/44/Add.2	3	Mission to El Salvador
A/HRC/38/44/Add.3	3	Overview of activities undertaken by the mandate since 1 March 2017, including observations on communications transmitted between 1 March 2017 and 28 February 2018 and replies received between 1 May 2017 and 30 April 2018
A/HRC/38/44/Add.4	3	Mission to Iraq: comments by State
A/HRC/38/44/Add.5	3	Mission to El Salvador: comments by the State
A/HRC/38/45	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children
A/HRC/38/45/Add.1	3	Mission to Cuba
A/HRC/38/45/Add.2	3	Mission to Cuba: comments by the State
A/HRC/38/46	3	Report of the Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice
A/HRC/38/46/Add.1	3	Mission to Samoa
A/HRC/38/46/Add.2	3	Mission to Chad
A/HRC/38/47	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences on online violence against women and girls from a human rights perspective
A/HRC/38/47/Add.1	3	Mission to Australia
A/HRC/38/47/Add.2	3	Mission to the Bahamas

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/38/48	3	Report of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises
A/HRC/38/48/Add.1	3	Mission to Canada
A/HRC/38/48/Add.2	3	Mission to Peru
A/HRC/38/48/Add.3	3	Informe del Grupo de Trabajo sobre la cuestión de los derechos humanos y las empresas transnacionales y otras empresas sobre la “Tercera Consulta regional para América Latina y el Caribe: Implementación de los Principios Rectores de las Naciones Unidas sobre Empresas y Derechos Humanos, en el marco de la Agenda 2030 para el Desarrollo Sostenible
A/HRC/38/49	3, 5	Report of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises on the sixth session of the Forum on Business and Human Rights
A/HRC/38/50	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea
A/HRC/38/51	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus
A/HRC/38/52	9	Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance
A/HRC/38/53	9	Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance
A/HRC/38/54	3, 4, 7, 9 and 10	Communications report of Special Procedures: communications sent, 1 December 2017 to 28 February 2018; Replies received, 1 February to 30 April 2018

Documents issued in the conference room papers series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/38/CRP.1	4	Rapport détaillé de l'Equipe d'experts internationaux sur la situation au Kasai
A/HRC/38/CRP.2	2	Oral update of the High Commissioner for Human Rights on Situation of human rights of Rohingya people
A/HRC/38/CRP.3	4	The siege and recapture of eastern Ghouta

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/38/L.1 and Rev.1	3	Elimination of all forms of discrimination against women and girls
A/HRC/38/L.2	5	The Social Forum
A/HRC/38/L.3	3	Human rights and international solidarity
A/HRC/38/L.4	3	Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights
A/HRC/38/L.5	3	Human rights and climate change
A/HRC/38/L.6	3	Accelerating efforts to eliminate violence against women and girls: preventing and responding to violence against women and girls in digital contexts
A/HRC/38/L.7	4	Situation of human rights in Belarus
A/HRC/38/L.8	10	Technical assistance to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and accountability concerning the events in the Kasai region
A/HRC/38/L.9	3	Elimination of female genital mutilation
A/HRC/38/L.10 and Rev.1	3	The promotion, protection and enjoyment of human rights on the Internet
A/HRC/38/L.11	9	The incompatibility between democracy and racism
A/HRC/38/L.12	3	Human rights in the context of HIV and AIDS
A/HRC/38/L.13	3	The right to education: follow-up to Human Rights Council resolution 8/4
A/HRC/38/L.14	3	Human rights and the regulation of civilian acquisition, possession and use of firearms
A/HRC/38/L.15 and Rev.1	4	Situation of human rights in Eritrea
A/HRC/38/L.16	3	The promotion and protection of human rights in the context of peaceful protests
A/HRC/38/L.17 and Rev.1	3	Civil society space: engagement with international and regional organizations
A/HRC/38/L.18	3	Business and human rights: improving accountability and access to remedy
A/HRC/38/L.19 and Rev.1	5	The contribution of the Human Rights Council to the prevention of human rights violations
A/HRC/38/L.20	4	The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/38/L.21	10	WITHDRAWN - Technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights in Haiti
A/HRC/38/L.22	2	WITHDRAWN - Technical assistance to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and follow-up to the report of the team of international experts on the Kasai region

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/38/L.23	3	WITHDRAWN - Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.1/Rev.1
A/HRC/38/L.24	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.1/Rev.1
A/HRC/38/L.25	3	WITHDRAWN - Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.1/Rev.1
A/HRC/38/L.26	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.16
A/HRC/38/L.27	5	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.19/Rev.1
A/HRC/38/L.28	4	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.20
A/HRC/38/L.29	4	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.20
A/HRC/38/L.30	4	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.20
A/HRC/38/L.31	4	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.20
A/HRC/38/L.32	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.6
A/HRC/38/L.33	3	WITHDRAWN - Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.6
A/HRC/38/L.34	3	WITHDRAWN - Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.1/Rev.1
A/HRC/38/L.35	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.1/Rev.1
A/HRC/38/L.36	3	WITHDRAWN - Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.17/Rev.1
A/HRC/38/L.37	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.17/Rev.1
A/HRC/38/L.38	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.17/Rev.1
A/HRC/38/L.39	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.17/Rev.1
A/HRC/38/L.40	5	WITHDRAWN - Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/38/L.19/Rev.1

Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/38/G/1	4	Letter dated 3 April 2018 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/38/G/2	4	Letter dated 4 April 2018 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/38/G/3	4	Letter dated 20 April 2018 from the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United

Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/38/G/4	4	Note verbale dated 11 June 2018 from the Permanent Mission of Armenia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/38/G/5	3	Note verbale dated 2 July 2018 from the Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/38/G/6	3	Note verbale dated 29 June 2018 from the Permanent Mission of Belarus to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/38/G/7	4	Note verbale dated 25 July 2018 from the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Secretariat of the Human Rights Council

Documents issued in the national institutions series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/38/NI/1	3	Written submission by the Human Rights Defender of Armenia
A/HRC/38/NI/2	3	Written submission by the Office of the Ombudsman of Argentina
A/HRC/38/NI/3	3	Written submission by the Office of the Ombudsman of the Samoa
A/HRC/38/NI/4	7	Written submission by the Independent Commission for Human Rights of the State of Palestine

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/38/NGO/1	4	Written statement submitted by Coordination des Associations et des Particuliers pour la Liberté de Conscience, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/2	3	Written statement submitted by the First Modern Agro. Tools - Common Initiative Group (FI.MO.AT.C.I.G), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/3	4	Written statement submitted by the First Modern Agro. Tools - Common Initiative

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		Group (FI.MO.AT.C.I.G), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/4	3	Written statement submitted by the Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/5	10	Written statement submitted by the Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/6	2	Written statement submitted by the Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/7	4	Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice / Centre Européen pour le Droit et la Justice, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/8	3	Joint written statement submitted by the African Centre for Democracy and Human Rights Studies, the Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum and the International Movement for Fraternal Union among Races and Peoples, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/9	9	Joint written statement submitted by the African Centre for Democracy and Human Rights Studies, the Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum and the International Movement for Fraternal Union among Races and Peoples, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/10	3	Written statement submitted by the First Modern Agro. Tools - Common Initiative Group (FI.MO.AT.C.I.G), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/11	3	Written statement submitted by the World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/12	3	Written statement submitted by the World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/13	4	Written statement submitted by the public organization "Public Advocacy", a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/14	5	Written statement submitted by the public organization "Public Advocacy", a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/15	4	Written statement submitted by the public organization "Public Advocacy", a non-

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/16	4	Written statement submitted by the Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/17	10	Written statement submitted by the Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/18	10	Written statement submitted by the Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/19	4	Written statement submitted by the public organization “Public Advocacy”, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/20	4	Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice / Centre Européen pour le Droit et la Justice, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/21	4	Written statement submitted by the public organization “Public Advocacy”, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/22	4	Written statement submitted by the public organization “Public Advocacy”, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/23	4	Written statement submitted by public organization “Public Advocacy”, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/24	4	Joint written statement submitted by the American Association of Jurists, Asociación Española para el Derecho Internacional de los Derechos Humanos AEDIDH, Association mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, Association mauritanienne pour la transparence et le développement, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International-Lawyers. Org, Paz y Cooperación, Réseau Unité pour le Développement de Mauritanie, World Barua Organization (WBO), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, Liberation, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l’amitié entre les peuples, World Peace

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/38/NGO/25	3	Written statement submitted by Graduate Women International (GWI), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/27	4	Written statement submitted by World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/28	3	Written statement submitted by the World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/29	4	Written statement submitted by Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/30	4	Written statement submitted by Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/31	4	Written statement submitted by the African Centre for Democracy and Human Rights Studies, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/32	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/33	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/34	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/35	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/36	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/37	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/38	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/38/NGO/39	7	Written statement submitted by the Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/40	3	Written statement submitted by the Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/41	3	Written statement submitted by the Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/42	4	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/43	9	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/44	4	Written statement submitted by Coordination des Associations et des Particuliers pour la Liberté de Conscience, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/45	3	Written statement submitted by ANO “Organization” “Vector of Friendship”, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/46	2	Written statement submitted by Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés (OIPMA), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/47	3	Written statement submitted by Conseil International pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux Droits de l’Homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/48	3	Written statement submitted by Conseil International pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux Droits de l’Homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/49	3	Written statement submitted by Conseil International pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux Droits de l’Homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/50	3	Written statement submitted by Conseil International pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux Droits de l’Homme, 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/38/NGO/51	8	Written statement submitted by Organisation Internationale pour les pays les moins avancés (OIPMA), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/53	4	Written statement submitted by Shia Rights Watch, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/54	3	Written statement submitted by Action on Smoking and Health, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/55	4	Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/56	4	Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/57	6	Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/58	4	Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/59	4	Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/60	4	Written statement submitted by the Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a nongovernmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/61	5	Exposé écrit présenté par International Federation of Rural Adult Catholic Movements, organisation non gouvernementale inscrite sur la liste
A/HRC/38/NGO/62	3	Joint written statement submitted by Thalassaemia International Federation, Agrenska Foundation (Grosshandlare Axel H. Agrens Donationsfond), International Federation for Hydrocephalus and Spina Bifida - IF, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/63	4	Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice / Centre Européen pour le Droit et la Justice, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/64	4	Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice / Centre Européen

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		pour le Droit et la Justice, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/65	6	Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice / Centre Européen pour le Droit et la Justice, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/66	2	Written statement submitted by Coordination des Associations et des Particuliers pour la Liberté de Conscience, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/67	4	Written statement submitted by The Palestinian Return Centre, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/68	3	Written statement submitted by the Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/69	7	Written statement submitted by The Palestinian Return Centre, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/70	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Liberal International, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva general
A/HRC/38/NGO/71	3	Written statement submitted by the International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM), a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/38/NGO/72	3	Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/73	6	Written statement submitted by Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/74	3	Exposé écrit présenté par Liberal International, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif général
A/HRC/38/NGO/75	3	Written statement submitted by Liberal International, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/76	4	Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/77	3	Joint written statement submitted by New Humanity, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, Association Points-Coeur, International Volunteer Organization for Women Education

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		Development, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/78	4	Written statement submitted by the International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM), a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/38/NGO/79	3	Written statement submitted by Conseil International pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux Droits de l'Homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/80	4	Written statement submitted by The Palestinian Return Centre, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/81	3	Written statement submitted by Al-Khoei Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/82	3	Written statement submitted by Make Mothers Matter, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/83	3	Written statement submitted by Rencontre Africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/84	4	Written statement submitted by the International Federation of Journalists, a non-governmental organization with special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/85	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/86	9	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/87	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/88	3	Joint written statement submitted by the International Service for Human Rights, Allied Rainbow Communities International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit - COC Nederland, International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission, International Lesbian and Gay Association, Swedish Federation of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights - RFSL, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/38/NGO/89	3	Written statement submitted by Christian Solidarity Worldwide, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/90	3	Written statement submitted by the World Federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/91	3	Written statement submitted by Centre Europe - tiers monde, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/92	4	Written statement submitted by Christian Solidarity Worldwide, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/93	3	Written statement submitted by the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/94	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/95	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/96	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/97	4	Written statement submitted by Christian Solidarity Worldwide, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/98	7	Written statement submitted by the Global Institute for Water, Environment and Health, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/99	3	Exposé écrit présenté par International Catholic Child Bureau, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/38/NGO/100	4	Written statement submitted by the Global Institute for Water, Environment and Health, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/101	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/102	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/103	3	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/38/NGO/104	3	Exposé écrit présenté par International Catholic Child Bureau, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/38/NGO/105	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/106	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/107	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/108	7	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/109	5	Written statement submitted by the Ecumenical Federation of Constantinopolitans, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/110	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/111	4	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/112	4	Written statement submitted by International Educational Development, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/38/NGO/113	2	Written statement submitted by the International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/114	3	Written statement submitted by the Framework Convention Alliance for Tobacco Control, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/115	7	Written statement submitted by the Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/116	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/117	5	Written statement submitted by the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Relationship with the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/118	9	Written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/119	7	Joint written statement submitted by Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man and BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/120	7	Written statement submitted by United Nations Watch, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/121	4	Written statement submitted by Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/122	4	Joint written statement submitted by the Women's Human Rights International Association, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/38/NGO/123	3	Joint written statement submitted by Le Pont, ABC Tamil Oli, Action of Human Movement (AHM), Alliance Creative Community Project, Association Bharathi Centre Culturel Franco-Tamoul, Association Burkinabé pour la Survie de l'Enfance, ASSOCIATION CULTURELLE DES TAMOULS EN FRANCE, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, Association pour les Victimes Du Monde, Association Solidarité Internationale pour l'Afrique (SIA), Association Thendral, Integrated Youth Empowerment - Common Initiative Group (I.Y.E. – C.I.G.), L'observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Society for Development and Community Empowerment, Tamil Uzhagam, Tourner La Page, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/124	3	Joint written statement submitted by Le Pont, ABC Tamil Oli, Action of Human Movement (AHM), Alliance Creative Community Project, Association Bharathi Centre Culturel Franco-Tamoul, Association Burkinabé pour la Survie de l'Enfance, ASSOCIATION CULTURELLE DES TAMOULS EN FRANCE, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, Association pour les Victimes Du Monde, Association Solidarité Internationale pour l'Afrique (SIA), Association Thendral, Integrated Youth Empowerment - Common Initiative Group (I.Y.E. – C.I.G.),

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		L'observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Society for Development and Community Empowerment, Tamil Uzhagam, Tourner La Page, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/125	9	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", International-Lawyers. Org, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/38/NGO/126	7	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", International-Lawyers. Org, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/38/NGO/127	3	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", International-Lawyers. Org, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/38/NGO/128	4	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", International-Lawyers. Org, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/38/NGO/129	3	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", International-Lawyers. Org, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, World

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/38/NGO/130	4	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, International-Lawyers. Org, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/38/NGO/131	3	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, International-Lawyers. Org, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/38/NGO/132	10	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, International-Lawyers. Org, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/38/NGO/133	4	Written statement submitted by First Modern Agro. Tools - Common Initiative Group (FI.MO.AT.C.I.G), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/134	3	Written statement submitted by Association Bharathi Centre Culturel Franco-Tamoul, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/135	3	Written statement submitted by Tamil Uzhagam, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/136	3	Written statement submitted by Tamil Uzhagam, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/137	3	Joint written statement submitted by Tamil Uzhagam, ABC Tamil Oli, Alliance Creative Community Project, Association Bharathi Centre Culturel Franco-Tamoul, Association Burkinabé pour la Survie de l’Enfance, ASSOCIATION CULTURELLE DES TAMOULS EN FRANCE, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit,

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		Association pour les Victimes Du Monde, Association Solidarité Internationale pour l'Afrique (SIA), Association Thendral, Le Pont, L'observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Society for Development and Community Empowerment, Tourner La Page, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/138	4	Written statement submitted by the Jssor Youth Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/139	3	Written statement submitted by the Al-Ayn Social Care Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/140	4	Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/141	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/142	4	Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/144	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/145	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/146	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/38/NGO/148	3	Written statement submitted by the Norwegian Refugee Council, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Annex IV

Special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-eighth session

Special Rapporteur on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment

David R. Boyd (Canada)

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

Javaid Rehman (Pakistan)

Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises (member from African States)

Githu Muigai (Kenya)

Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises (member from Eastern European States)

Elzbieta Karska (Poland)

Working Group on the use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination (member from Western European and other States)

Sorcha Macleod (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)
